

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Sawgrass Marriott
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL**

June 13, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

Ben Hartig, Chair
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley
Chris Conklin
Doug Haymans
Dr. Wilson Laney
David Cupka

Dr. Michelle Duval, Vice-Chair
Jack Cox
Anna Beckwith
Charlie Phillips
Lt. Morgan Fowler
John Jolley
Zack Bowen

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Dr. Brian Chevront

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Tracy Dunn
Phil Steele

Dr. Jack McGovern
Leann Bosarge
Dr. Andy Strelcheck

Additional Observers Attached

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Sawgrass Marriott Hotel, Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida, June 13, 2014, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: I would like to bring the full council session to order. The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved. The order of business is approval of the March 2014 Minutes. Are there any changes, corrections or deletions to the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That brings us down to our presentations.

Obviously, today we've got a significant presentation to make. The first one we will make, though, is to John Jolley, which is also significant as a good friend of mine for a number of years and someone who has had data near and dear to his heart throughout our entire process. John, if you'll come forward, we have a plaque for you. Our next presentation is to Dave Cupka, and I think I'll have Bob say a few things initially and then anyone else who wants to chime in.

MR. MAHOOD: Dave has been around for a long time. He has been a friend of mine for a long time. He has probably provided more service to the council system – and not just this council – than any one person that I know of in this country. Just a little background on Dave; he says he's almost 70 years old, but he is really 90. He looks pretty good, too.

He was employed as a marine biologist with the South Carolina Division of Wildlife and Marine Resources Department for a long time. He served as the director of the Office of Fisheries Management for eight years. During that time, of course, he served on the council. He was one of the first SSC members appointed with the South Atlantic Council; one of the originals.

That goes back to 1978. He served on the SSC through 1993. Dave has been a council member for 21 years, 1993 to 2014. I thought maybe he had a national record, but evidently there is a state director out in Oregon that has been there about 25 years as a council member; so just a little short. If we had kept him one more term, we would have been okay.

The interesting thing is during those 21 years Dave has served in the leadership role of either vice-chair or chairman over half of that time. He has played a major role in the leadership of this council during the past 21 years. He was vice-chair for five years and council chairman for seven years. Those are a couple of records there, I believe, that he holds for our council.

Under David's leadership as chairman, we created four new FMPs; Dolphin Wahoo, Golden Crab, Sargassum, and Ecosystem-Based Management. During his leadership as chairman, there were 36 amendments and other actions that were developed, approved and implemented, including the first BRD requirements in shrimp trawls.

A lot of you here don't realize that we were involved in the BRD and shrimp trawl business early on. The ACLs that were mandated in the 2007 amendments to the Act were implemented under his guidance. Overfishing was pretty much ended and rebuilding plans for all of our overfished species were established. I think Dave has a lot to be proud of. Many of you don't know his mentor, Dr. Ed Joseph.

I know some of you do, but Ed has passed on and I know he'd be very proud of the accomplishments that Dave has achieved during his career and especially with the council. Mr. Chairman, that is just a little background. It is amazing when I started digging into this. I just thought he was an old guy. I didn't realize that he's done so much. With that, I'll turn it back to you.

MR. HARTIG: I've had the pleasure of serving as David's vice-chairman a couple of times. He is hard working, mentor, statesmanship, dedicated leadership and leading by example. The statesmanship quality has been a very important part of his working with this council and with others as was exemplified in his ability to take a unanimous vote against something we wanted to try and do and get the Gulf Council to turn around in Amendment 20B. That speaks volumes about David's ability to work within the process and work with people. The relationships he has developed over the years and being able to move things forward and his institutional knowledge will be irreplaceable.

He was on a number of research cruises in his early days, saw what the fisheries looked like, has some of that long-term knowledge about where we were and where we are and has been able to move us to rebuild a number of our fisheries, not the least of which were mackerel fisheries during the mackerel wars back quite some time ago, which were very controversial. We deal with controversial things now and it was just if not more so back then. I mentioned his ability to work behind the scenes and with partners is unsurpassed. I would just like to thank him for his friendship over the years, which I value a lot. Thank you, David.

DR. DUVAL: I first met David when I was an advocate for EDF and coming and bird-dogging these council meetings. Bob likes to make smart comments about how he has seen me grow up like a big girl now. It has really been an honor and a pleasure for me to serve as a council member; and I really thank David for the opportunities that he has given me to be in leadership roles here.

They were tremendous opportunities; and I really appreciate your trust in my abilities, probably more so than I have had in myself. I hope you don't mind that we'll keep you the speed dial so that we can continue to take advantage of all of your institutional knowledge. I thank you very much for everything that you've done for me.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to say that I first met David about 14 years ago on the Dolphin Committee on the Take Reduction Team. I knew that I needed to sit next to him because of all the experience over there, but I also learned I had to pay very close attention and listen very closely because he talks so softly. I finally figured out how to hear him after 14 years; and I just appreciate, David, being able to serve you on those couple of committees here and thank you for your tutelage.

MR. JOLLEY: David and I go way back in this fisheries' thing. We knew a lot of the old-timers together and I just want to thank you for your friendship and your hard work. I just don't know how you did it, but good going!

MR. CUPKA: Bob said I was 90; actually I'm just 27. (Laughter)

DR. CRABTREE: I think I've served on the council with David for 13 years, maybe. There aren't that many folks who have been on. I think the only one who might give you a run would Corky Perret, David, for what that is worth. If you think about the years David has put in and the hours behind all that, it is just an extraordinary thing.

This system, for all its faults, works pretty well sometimes; and even though it is easy to get lost in the frustrations of the bureaucracy and the complications and all that; if you back up and look at it over the long term, we really have done a lot of good things. I think our fisheries are in the best shape they've been in decades; and I think a lot of that is because of folks like David who could put in so many years and stuck with it for so long. We really will miss that institutional long-term knowledge that we're losing as folks go off the council who have been around for quite a while. We do appreciate it, David, and thank you for all the years and all the work; and it has always been a pleasure working with you. Thank you.

MR. COX: When I coming through the council process as a fisherman years ago, I just remember David's approach and wanted to ask him a lot of questions. I just want to say thank you for all that. It is always nice having you there.

MR. PHILLIPS: I want to say thanks because when I first came up here, I didn't know anything. I appreciate your patience with me. I'm still not sure what I do know, but it was worse then, and I appreciate your patience because I could come and ask you something and you kind of kept me between the ditches more or less most of the time. I want to thank you for that.

DR. LANEY: David, I'm probably one of the few people sitting around the table that actually has delved into the literature that you've produced, which nobody else has mentioned. Based on Google Scholar, you at least have 20 publications to your credit through the years. One of them in particular I know I used a lot when I was a green, new biologist at the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1981.

That was the one you did on The Seasonality and Spatial Patterns of Ichthyofauna in the Surf Zone in South Carolina, which was part – it wasn't part of my work area but certainly a paper of interest to me and one that we cited often when we were dealing with beach dredge-and-fill projects. I appreciate all the contributions have made to the science behind what we do as well as to the tremendous contribution you have made with regard to the policy. I also have enjoyed the conversations we have had about books and haunting used book shops. I appreciate it. You are the consummate southern gentleman; and I salute you, sir.

MR. CONKLIN: I'm new to the council and I remember over the years my dad being involved in the process and he always looked up to Mr. Cupka. I sure can tell why by just having the privilege of sitting next to him here and hearing him crack a little joke or a smile here and there. We sure have had a good time and I'm going to lose a lot of good knowledge sitting next to me. I'm going to be lost without you, David, and I'm going to miss you, Buddy.

MR. BELL: I owe a lot to David. He was willing to take a chance on me over 30 years ago. That is how I ended up working for the Wildlife Department back then and then started my career with what is DNR now and artificial reefs. We have a lot to be thankful to David for

locally in South Carolina. We mentioned earlier he actually started the Artificial Reef Program way back and a lot of stuff related to recreational fisheries and things that we're building on today.

What we have today is built on his shoulders and we, of course, appreciate that. From a council perspective, I didn't realize this until I had chance to actually get around and talk to a lot of people from other councils. This is a very unique council in terms of I guess our culture. An organization's culture is based on its leadership; and David has provided us with a lot of leadership, direct and indirect, over the years and helped us build this culture.

We're very unique in how we get along and how we move things forward. We're even envied. I've had people from other councils say, "We wish we got along like you guys did and could work together." I attribute that a lot to David and what you've done in terms of establishing that culture here. Even though you may not be coming to meetings anymore; you will be here because that is the way we operate and we owe a lot to you. Thanks.

MR. PUGLIESE: I've known David coming up on probably close to three decades now. We've worked on some of the similar things early on. I looked at his early days and guiding the beginnings of the SEAMAP Program and chairing that and moving forward. I think he is really proud of how far it has come and really the foundation of research in our region.

Whenever we talk nationally about how the South Atlantic Council is leading the nation in habitat conservation and the move toward ecosystem-based management; I look at all the different types of innovative plans, amendments and vision into the future and that those embrace; and many of those pretty much – almost all those were under David's guidance as chair or vice-chair in moving those forward.

I think that foundation really has provided a national view and it is a lot to do with his guidance and vision and providing the motivation as a staff member to keep the vision alive and keep it moving forward. I think what you've done is you've really set the stage in our region.

I try to explain that sometimes when we get out of our thing about we talk about the culture, about how it is almost a family in our region and really that embedded desire to see things advance and really have the long-term view is inherent; and I think David has embodied that. I have tried to and continue to try to keep that moving forward. I appreciate and I'm definitely going to miss you involved in these; but I'm sure you'll keep involved.

MR. DUNN: Well, Dave and I have never worked together and he hasn't done a doggoned thing for me or my career. (Laughter) I really like him and I'll miss him.

MR. MAHOOD: Now, wait a minute, Tracy, when he first met you, you were just a lowly foot soldier trying to get out of Key West and now you're running the whole show in the South Atlantic.

MR. HARTIG: Proudly presented by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to David Cupka for his distinguished council service and outstanding contributions in the conservation and

management of our nation's marine fisheries resources. Thank you, David. (Applause) I can't help but say on his plaque there is a fatally flawed – his years of service are mixed up, and so we're going to correct the plaque. I think the fatally flawed part David would appreciate because he has never heard of that term in the council process.

MR. MAHOOD: And it wasn't Julie's fault; it was me.

MR. CUPKA: I did have about a 45-minute speech I was going to give, but I know everybody is anxious to get out of here as I am. I just want to say thank you. It has been a pleasure. I have made a lot of good friends and I'm going to miss you. Hopefully, our paths will cross again some time; and if they don't, I want to wish everybody the very best and may God Bless You. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. HARTIG: All right, the next item of business is our committee reports. The first committee report is Dr. Duval on Snapper Grouper. I would just remind everybody that we're really going to try something different at this meeting and just reading the motions unless you have something that was extremely important that was mentioned in your committee report that we should be appraised of.

DR. DUVAL: The Snapper Grouper Committee met on June 10th and 11th in Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida. Our first action items had to do with Regulatory Amendment 16, which is the black sea bass pot closure. **The first motion was to approve the recommended IPT's suggested changes to the purpose statement; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to accept the IPT's wording for the needs statement; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 1 and Alternative 2; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Alternative 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. There was guidance just to clarify that this area refers to the right whale critical habitat within that alternative.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Alternative 4; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Alternative 5; and behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. We provided guidance to be consistent in units of measure, feet versus meter.

The next motion was to approve Alternatives 6 and 7 as presented; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to give the IPT latitude to construct an alternative that is a combination of Alternatives 3 and 8; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to direct the IPT to use data from 2004 through 2013 for the analyses; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Just understand that we may get some issues with the economists in terms of trying to define what the baseline is and all; so we may end up having to revisit this. I really don't think we ought to be giving this sort of specific guidance to the analysts, so I'm going to oppose this motion.

DR. DUVAL: Any other discussion? Any objection? The motion passes with one objection. The next agenda item was an update on Amendment 22. There were no motions from that. The next agenda item was Amendment 29. This is the ORCS and gray triggerfish approach. **The first motion was to approve recommended edits to the purpose and need statement; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to add new Subalternative 4D to Action 2; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The motion was to select Subalternative 4D under Action 2 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested modifications to the alternatives under Action 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to modify Alternative 5 under Action 3; and that motion was disapproved by the committee. **The next motion was to modify Alternative 5 under Action 3 to read as follows: "Action 3; establish ACLs for selected unassessed snapper grouper species at ACL equals OY equals 0.8 times proposed ABC for scamp." On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to select Alternative 5 under Action 3 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 2 under Action 3 as the preferred for the remaining species except for the Deepwater Complex; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to the language of the alternatives in Action 4; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection. Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edit to Alternative 1 under Action 5; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 3, Subalternative 3B, as an additional preferred under Action 6; and that motion failed. That was the last motion under Amendment 29; and I have received a request to stop.

MS. BROUWER: I'm sorry, Madam Chair, I'm using an earlier version of the committee report; and I just want to make sure that I am using the latest. If you'll give me just one minute, we can resume. Okay, I'm ready.

DR. DUVAL: The next action item was Amendment 32, blueline tilefish. **The first motion was to approve inclusion of Action 1 and select Alternative 2 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Jack.**

MR. COX: During this blueline tile, I just wanted to bring everybody's attention again that I did say that with the problems with the assessment and the situation that we have; that this again would be a perfect case for a state quota; state management.

DR. DUVAL: Any other discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next motion was to include an action to revise accountability measures for the Deepwater Complex in Amendment 32; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 3 and its alternatives; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stand approved. We provided direction to staff to add the projected 2018 ABC/ACL numbers to the tables under Action 3.

The next motion was to add an alternative that extends the ACL established through the emergency rule until the next stock assessment; and that motion failed. **The next motion was to select Alternative 3 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Anna, are you objecting? The motion passes with one objection.**

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to alternatives under Action 4; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 2 under Action 4 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to alternatives under Action 5; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2C, as the preferred under Action 5; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Next we provided direction to staff to include revisions to the Deepwater Commercial Accountability Measures in this action.

The next motion was to approve inclusion of Action 6 and its alternatives in Amendment 32; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add a new alternative to Action 6 that mirrors the Alternative 4 and its subalternatives in Action 1 of the Comprehensive Accountability Measures Amendment; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2C, as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. At this point I did want to note for the committee that although we included new Alternative 4 into this action that mirrors this alternative in the Comprehensive Accountability Measures Amendment, we did not select it as a preferred. In the Comprehensive Accountability Measures Amendment we selected Alternative 4, Subalternative 4B as a preferred. I wanted to pause at this point and see if the committee had a desire to do the same thing here for consistency.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; I think we would want to do that; so the motion would be to –

DR. DUVAL: Select Alternative 4, Subalternative 4B as a preferred under Action 6.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I would make that motion to select Alternative 4, Subalternative 4B under Action 6 as our preferred.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Ben.

DR. DUVAL: When we get to the Joint Dolphin Wahoo/Snapper Grouper Committee Report; you will see that we selected this as a preferred subalternative as well; so I wanted to make sure that for consistency we do the same thing here. **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 7 and addition of alternatives; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to include a new alternative for commercial trip limits of 300, 200 and 100 pounds year-round; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add an alternative that would set a 100 pound commercial trip limit with a step-down to 50 pounds once 80 percent of the ACL is met or projected to be met. That motion failed. **The next motion was to approve suggested edits and new alternatives for Action 8; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to add alternatives that mirror what is being considered for snowy grouper in Regulatory Amendment 20 in order to be consistent in managing Deepwater Species; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve Amendment 32 for public hearings in August 2014; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next topic was Regulatory Amendment 22 dealing with gag and wreckfish.

Under gag the first motion was to modify the ABCs and ACLs for gag and wreckfish under the regular framework; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the range of alternatives and select Alternative 2 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add an action and alternative that increases the recreational bag limit to two per person per day or three per person per day. The intent is to remove gag from the aggregate; and the intent is to separate gag and black. Black would remain at one per person per day. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. I'm sorry, the motion passes with one objection.

For wreckfish the first motion was to select Alternative 2, Action 2, as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 2 as the preferred for Action 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next item of business was Regulatory Amendment 20, snowy grouper.

The first motion was to accept the IPT's proposed wording for the purpose and need; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to accept the IPT's proposed wording changes for Alternatives 1 through 4 under Action 1; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to apply the council's existing allocation formula as it applies to snowy grouper (average of landings from 1986 through 2005) using the SEDAR landings' data. The resulting allocation would change from 95 percent commercial/5 percent recreational to 83 percent commercial/17 percent recreational. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to accept the IPT's proposed wording for Alternative 1 under Action 2; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve Alternative 2 under Action 2 as a preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Under the previous motion with the table; the estimated recreational fish numbers, those were the ones based on just the 95/5 percent. I'm guessing that is going to get updated? The estimated number of fish with the new 17 percent recreational should have been closer to 4,000 or 3,000; my number of fish. The motion that approved Alternative 2 under Action 2 as our preferred; that table I don't think is correct.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; I would assume that we would include updated tables in the public hearing document to reflect that. Doug, is there something you would like to say on the record?

MR. HAYMANS: Well, Myra, if you'll scroll down just a bit; that table right there; is that right, Anna? Okay, that's the table we're talking about.

MR. WAUGH: I would suggest you give us editorial license to update that in the Final Snapper Grouper Committee Report; so as that is distributed, we have the right table in there.

DR. DUVAL: Would you like that in the form of a motion?

MR. WAUGH: No, just direction to do that will be fine.

DR. DUVAL: So we can include direction to staff to update the table under Action 2, Alternative 2. **Okay, moving on, the next motion was to accept the IPT's proposed wording for Action 3 and Alternatives 1 and 2 under Action 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to accept new Alternative 3 as suggested; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Alternative 2, Action 4, to the considered but rejected appendix. That motion was withdrawn. **The next motion was to move Alternative 2, Action 4, under Action 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to move existing Alternative 4, Action 4, to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add revised Alternative 4, Action 4; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move revised Alternative 4 to Action 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Action 4 to the considered but rejected appendix; and note this refers to the remaining items in Action 4 that were not moved to the Action 3. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to accept the IPT's proposed wording for Alternatives 1 and 3 under Action 5; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 1 under Action 5 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Note that the committee consensus is that this is the intent: Option 3, clarify that the council's intent is that snowy grouper remain within the aggregate grouper bag limit in Alternatives 2 through 4 under Action 5. What I need now from the committee is a motion to actually approve Regulatory Amendment 20 for public hearings. We failed to do that. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I would move that we move Regulatory Amendment 20 for public hearings.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug; seconded by Charlie. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next item of business was Amendment 36, Spawning SMZs. The motion was to approve the Alternative SMZ Approach, Amendment 36, for scoping in August 2014; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next item of business was Amendment 35; remove species. **The first motion was to approve the modified purpose and need statement; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to modify the document and remove Nassau grouper from consideration; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Again, I would need a motion from the committee to approve Amendment 35 for scoping. We did not do that. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I'd move that we approve Amendment 35 for scoping.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug; seconded by Jessica. Discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. We have our draft timing and task motion that is up there on the screen. I think we would just need a motion from the committee to approve the draft timing and task motion as displayed. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I would move that we accept the draft timing and task motion as displayed on the screen.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug; seconded by Charlie. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

(Whereupon, the following timing and task motion was approved:

Direct staff to conduct another review of the Oculina Closed Area Evaluation Plan in 5 years, once the entire area has been mapped; direct staff to continue to develop Regulatory Amendment 16 (BSB pot closure) and prepare the amendment for review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to prepare Amendment 29 (ORCS & Gray Triggerfish) for approval for Secretarial review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to prepare Amendment 32 (Blueline Tilefish) for public hearings in August 2014 and Council's final review at the September 2014 meeting; request the SEFSC to provide the average weight by year for wreckfish for 2015 through 2020 to convert pounds whole weight to numbers of fish. This is needed by June 30, 2014, to complete analyses for the public hearing document to be reviewed at the September 15-19, 2014 Council meeting; direct staff to prepare Regulatory Amendment 22 (Gag & Wreckfish) for review and approval for public hearings at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to prepare Regulatory Amendment 20 (Snowy grouper) for public hearings in August 2014 and Council's final review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to revise the scoping document for Amendment 36 (Spawning SMZs) for scoping in August 2014 and Council's review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to revise the scoping document for Amendment 35 (Removing Species) for scoping in August 2014 and Council's review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to

work with NOAA GC and SERO staff to address the golden tilefish longline endorsement issue and report back to the Council at the September 2014 meeting and Council's review at the September 2014 meeting.)

DR. DUVAL: There are two quick items under other business for the committee. The first one has to do with blueline tilefish. Just to bring some closure to the rather extensive discussions we've had on this issue this week; I've asked John Carmichael to provide a quick overview of sort of where we started from and how we got, with regards to the results of the assessment, to the catch level projections that we've seen here. I think this will help bring this issue to a close. John has his presentation on the screen; and I've asked him to just quickly run through this. I know Jack had one item that he wanted to bring up.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All of our discussions on blueline; and I wanted to look back, you know, we talked about it a lot in December and the SSC has first looked at it back in October. I was kind of looking to see if we were to ask the SSC to look at some more things, what might we ask them to do; or if we were to ask the Center to do yet more sensitivities or projections, what might they be. I went back to the very beginning to try and understand what has gone on as these projections have progress over time.

If folks can remember, when we first looked at this assessment, the outcome was actually quite good. It was very promising. It was slightly overfishing; it wasn't overfishing depending on what you chose for MSST. I think all of us were a bit taken aback by what has happened and how we got to these such low catch limits, which were unexpected.

We've seen them develop; but actually if you go back to October, there were actually unexpected. As I said, not overfishing and not overfished; but at that time we didn't have the P-star projections because the new assessment we didn't have values to rely on; and it gave an MSY, though, of just over 200,000 pounds.

That is important because the ABC that we have is 4 or 500,000 pounds. We knew that the yield of this stock appeared to be much lower than the ABC that we had in place. When we got this assessment and then after the SSC looked at it in October, there was concern over the projections. They started showing those low landings; and when we got to December of 2013 with P-star, then that gave us, for example, a 2015 yield of 26,000 pounds.

So what has happened then is a number of refinements; we had the emergency rule go in; we had made a request that the Science Center look into age composition information for the recent years; and none of those have really alleviated the concerns that we've had with the assessment. I just tried to look at how these projections have changed to understand what is going on with the population; and, importantly, really what is going on with our understanding of this population.

If we go back to the original SEDAR 32 assessment, the last year of data was 2011. There was a change taking place in 2013; and they used a mean F. I'm going to show some pictures here looking at Fmsy projections and how they have changed over time. Then we did in December 2013 – well, at that point we had landings for 2012 and we wanted those included to be more

accurate and more up to date with a change in 2015 because if the stock were overfished, then we have two years to get actions in place to put in the rebuilding plan.

That used the 2012 landings carrying forward basically for the next couple years. Well, that gave us some really surprising results, as we remember, including some strange F levels; and we were further concerned about the landings' assumption during that interim period; and we wanted to reduce that interim period.

That gave us April of 2014 and more projections go to the SSC. Well, we had more data so we have actual landings through 2013. We have a change going in 2014 through the emergency rule. In this case I looked at Fmsy on the interim for the projections I'll show. Well, we had some then – yes, first we had just looking at the landings in 2014 and then also in April 2014 we have the emergency rule going in, which would further reduce 2014 landings.

Then we had yet another version in April of 2014 which came to the SSC during the meeting because being early in the year there was some certainty about the 2013 recreational harvest; so that had been changing a bit. And, you know, there are issues in stocks like these where we're dealing with Monroe County because some databases include Monroe County and some don't; and you have to do some tweaking of the MRIP data.

All of that just means we had a recreational catch value that was kind of wandering around. What really changed in all of those scenarios, if you look at them, it is really the landings that occurred during 2012, 2013 and what may happen this year in 2014. It is typical for us to request this updated information and not really unexpected when we're early in the year to see these updates continuing through the SSC meeting.

This shows what the landing stream for this progression of projections over time. Right here in the first column is what we had in the initial assessment; and the first thing to notice here is that when we first did these, we had landings around MSY; but then we got those projections in December which raised all of our concerns.

Notice here that the assumption was landings around 485,000 pounds; so almost 500,000 pounds of landings being removed. First is at the MSY level and what we know about the stock abundance what the population could remove at MSY; the expected yield was a little below MSY in that initial assessment. In 2013, in December, we thought, well, maybe there was quite a bit more removed.

What you can see noticeably here is the difference in what you can then yield, of course, in 2015 and 2016. The bottom column down here in bright red shows the cumulative removals from the population during 2012 to 2014. The more that you remove during that period, the less you have available that you can remove in 2015. This is pretty common particularly for a long-lived stock.

There is a volume of biomass out there; and you can fish that down often in a lot of cases. We call that sort of the mining-type fishing that goes on in snapper groupers and such. Some stocks may respond a lot quicker. In this case you take that biomass out and these projections are still showing – you know, in these first couple of years still showing getting average recruitment and

all of that; but you see in 2015 to not overfish, to not have F rates exceeding the overfishing level, your yields have to be very low.

As you move across this last couple of things here, you can see how our change in perceptions have been about what we could actually remove in 2015 and 2016. It comes over here to the far right to the most recent version, using the MRIP as we've done where you can remove like 36,000 pounds in 2015.

But you notice our best information right now is that we removed on the order of 1.2 million pounds during that three-year period against an MSY of around 200 or 240, maybe, thousand pounds; so we really removed many time MSY; removed nearly twice the MSY yield. In a way I looked at this and I thought, well, wow, that is sort of what has happened; we've removed so many more fish than MSY.

If you look back in this, you see it back to 2010; and 2011 when it dropped down, that was the deep-water closure, these landings this high extended back to maybe 2008 or so; so we've had a lot of years of removing twice or so of what our sustainable yield is. When I think about that, I thought, well, we're kind of lucky that when we did this terminal assessment year that this stock wasn't much more overfished, considering how much population, how many poundages we've taken out of this fishery over the last couple of years.

As I said, those projections are varying in the terminal year of catch; and that has really been what has changed in our information. The Fmsy are the same; the yield has stayed the same. The assessment had a production model and age-structured model. The production model doesn't have the steepness type issues that may affect the age-structured model; but the MSY yields were the same.

After the SSC meeting, a guy who has recently retired from the west coast, Alec MacCall, who has done the DB-SRA type things, he did sort of just his own curiosity applied his DB-SRA to the data from this and got an MSY very similar to that as well. It was right in line around 200 and some thousand pounds; and he got results that didn't match the production model very well.

The biggest difference in the production model and the age structured was just in the status, which is an issue here, but I think what we've really been focusing on is what the yield is; because that is what really matters. Whether it is overfished or overfishing is an issue for us as managers; but fishermen care about the yield; so that's why I focused on the MSY here.

All those different models have been right in step with each other on the MSY; so I think that is probably a pretty robust estimate. Looking at this in a graphic way, these different lines, you can see the yellow line here, that is the MSY level of landings approximately. You come down here, everybody is the same in 2010 and things start diverging after 2011; 2010 and 2011; deep-water closure here; total removals at that point were down below the MSY level.

Then this blue here is the original stock assessment, SEDAR 32. It shows that if you kept landings below the MSY level in 2012 and 2013 and 2014, you'd be catching pretty well close to

it in 2015 and 2016. However, we know that is not what happened. We knew the landings were high in 2012 and likely in 2013 back when we did the 2013 projections.

We thought maybe they would be high in 2014; that would have given us this red line; and with the highest landings so the greatest separate here on this red line, the area between this red and this yellow, that is how much harvest we've removed more than MSY; so as a result we get a lot less harvest relative to MSY going forward into the future.

That is just an expected outcome when we take – it is like you took much money out of the bank; so it is not there anymore. Where we are now with our best estimate is here with the light blue line where we know we had the high landings in 2012; we know we had high landings in 2013; we want to get landings down under the emergency rule to they're just slightly below the MSY level in 2014.

We had hoped by taking that faster action and by not allowing those really high landings that you see here in this red line, that we would get more benefit in the future and we wouldn't have to cut these catches as much; but as you can see, that's really not making a huge difference in this case. It's really the cost of all of this area in here above this yellow line that we're dealing with right now in terms of this.

Comparing this high as the worse-case scenario really was those projections we had after that December meeting and where we are now. This is really the separation between these two lines is the difference in yield. If you took out more here; you're not going to get as much there; and if it goes over MSY, we've taken more than MSY in the past and we're going to have to pay that essentially back by not having the yields in the future years.

I've expected that affects the SSB. This is the SSB at MSY level here; so in our original assessment we were a little below it, the same colors; the blue line comes up and we'd be darned close to it in 2016. But we look at the April 2014, under the emergency rule, we're not going to be that much below SSB_{msy}; but we are enough below it and we were enough below it there that we're going to cost ourselves some yield.

Hopefully, it is short term. If we can weather the storm of these low yields for a couple of years because the biomass is not terribly low; that we don't get into a long-term rebuilding thing and we can quickly be up to landings a little below MSY as we'd expect it like the 75 percent F_{msy} fishing strategy.

The last thing is another thing was in December we asked that the Science Center investigate recruitment recently because one place of hope is that, well, maybe there was better recruitment in 2013 than what we've seen or 2012. If there was a good year class, that is more fish. That is like you got a bonus so you put more money into the bank and you can sort of make up for maybe your past overspending.

The Science Center looked at the age composition information across the different fishery sectors that was available for 2013; and the conclusion presented to the SSC was that there really wasn't strong evidence for a recent strong year class. The SSC didn't see anything in there to

contradict that statement; so they agree with that, that there is just not evidence at this time that we've had a really good year class.

These projections, keep in mind, they're not assuming a bad year class. They're assuming recruitment at the MSY level back six or seven years. They're assuming we've been getting recruitment as we could expect. Obviously, if one of these year classes was worse, then things would be worse. That is the other side of this uncertainty point.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that, John, I really appreciate it. I don't know if there are any quick questions for John. I just thought that this might help folks understand a little bit more clearly. This is what I have told the fishermen who have asked me about this; we didn't expect landings in 2013 to be as high as they were. There is obviously uncertainty in MRIP estimates of landings. That is a problem for several of our managed species; so as I've said before, hopefully this can be the impetus for moving forward with some alternate means of tracking those deep-water species.

MR. BELL: Could you share that with us; would be okay?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, we'll get that out to you very shortly.

DR. DUVAL: Jack, I know you had one other item you wanted to bring up.

MR. COX: Yes; I would like the council to consider removing the almaco jacks from the jack complex. What this will do is it will keep the ACL separate for the banded rudders and the jacks; so when our almaco is closed, that we will still be able to catch banded rudders or vice versa, whichever one closes first. It is something fishermen have asked me to bring this before you guys; and you guys have heard it from the AP, so I would like to introduce that in the form of a motion, if I could.

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion from Jack to remove almaco jack from the jacks complex. Seconded by Chris. Discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that is fine, but understand that you can't do that just by making a motion. The motion really should be to start work on a plan amendment to look at making changes to the jacks complex. We will have to go through all the process to do that.

DR. DUVAL: And I think Jack understands that. He is just trying to bring attention to this issue that the fishermen have brought up that they would like to see almaco jack removed from that complex. It is really more of I think get the ball rolling kind of motion. Other discussion?

MR. COX: Yes; I brought this up at the last meeting under further business at the end of the meeting; and I'm just trying to keep this thing rolling. I get this question asked a lot; so, yes, if we could start work on it, that would be great. I need to modify the motion then to read something a little bit different than what we have.

MR. HARTIG: While you're doing that, I would add that the problem is you have banded rudderfish that occur in the early spring off of South Florida; and there is a pretty intense harvest of those animals. Then almaco is caught at a more leisurely pace, so to speak, so what happens in the complex is it is dominated by rudderfish. This will change that and hopefully allow that northern part of the fishery, which catches most of the almacos, to be able to participate better in the almaco fishery. I think it is a lot fairer way to manage that stock.

DR. DUVAL: So, Jack, your motion now reads begin work on a plan amendment to separate almaco jack from the jacks complex. Is seconder okay with that modification? Is there anymore discussion on this? Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I'm just going to throw it out there. There are plan amendments that are being developed. Amendment 35 comes to mind; and perhaps you might consider adding an action to an existing amendment as opposed to starting a whole 'nother one.

MR. COX: Yes; that makes good sense; so if we can already add that to Amendment 35, we could just put in there.

MR. WAUGH: I just asked Monica about whether this could go into a regulatory amendment, too, and you might just direct staff to look into which vehicle is the – I assume you want this to move quickly; so which vehicle might be the fastest to get this done.

DR. DUVAL: So does the current motion capture that and we could provide direction to staff to examine which vehicle is best? **So the motion would read direct staff to determine the best vehicle to separate almaco jack from the jacks complex. Are the motion maker and seconder okay with that?**

MR. COX: Yes, it looks good to me.

DR. DUVAL: Is there any other discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. If there is no other business to come before the committee – Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Madam Chair, I brought it up at the end of the last meeting about the council considering rescinding the circle hook rule. If my memory serves me correctly, I thought we had asked for some information on it. I hadn't seen any thus far; and I just want to bring that back up if we could possibly get some information on that.

MS. McCAWLEY: There is some information that is being prepared on the circle hook rule for the South Florida item. From what I can tell, it is being prepared by staff for the Gulf; but it looks like it would cover both councils.

DR. DUVAL: So, Zack, perhaps once those materials are prepared, we could bring them towards the full council. I mean pretty much anything that South Florida management group works on is going to come before the council, anyway.

MR. BOWEN: That's perfect; thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Is there any other business to come before the committee. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Zack, you're interest is more in a study that possibly compares J-hooks with circle hooks and mortality; is that what your issue was?

MR. BOWEN: Well, I'm interested in anything that will shed some light on us being mandated to use the circle hooks. If my memory serves me correctly, that was based on one study and we have no other studies since then. For what not only I but my constituents see; it is not better for the fish.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think we should include that study at least in this review, Karen Burns' study on circle hooks, if that is the one you're referring to – and I think it is – and any other information that may be available on the scientific validation of circle hooks versus J-hooks.

MR. COX: I just had one other thing; and somewhere along the same lines of a circle hook issue is we've heard a lot of talk about the descending devices. Could somebody remind me are we watching some research being done on that and just kind of monitoring that and seeing where that is headed?

DR. DUVAL: There is actually quite a lot of work going on right now. We have studies going on in North Carolina; some cooperative research going on with fishermen in the southern part of the state looking at descending devices. Obviously, we would bring that forward as that information is analyzed. There are barotrauma meetings and work being conducted in multiple places; so I think we can bring that forward. Is there any other business to come before the committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MS. BOSARGE: If you don't mind, if you will permit, I just have a short comment to make on some observations. It is regarding the rock shrimp and the Oculina Bank. I'm not on your committee nor your council; so will you permit me to speak for just a moment?

DR. DUVAL: Leann, I'm just wondering if it might be better to bring this – if this is in regards to the rock shrimp issue and the closed areas, it might be better to bring that up under the Joint Habitat/Ecosystem Committee Report, because that's where that topic was discussed. I'm certainly not trying to squelch anymore comments.

MS. BOSARGE: No, that's fine. I thought you had actually covered it under snapper grouper when we did it in committee, so that's fine. I just thought this is where it was supposed to go.

DR. DUVAL: No problem. I hesitate to say this; any other business to come before the committee? Seeing no further business, Mr. Chairman, my report is concluded. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Michelle, for a great committee report. All right, the Mackerel Committee met yesterday. Leann, I neglected to welcome you. Thank you very much for being here. We've very much enjoyed you participating in a number of our discussions this week.

Under Framework Amendment 2, Atlantic Spanish mackerel trip limits in Florida, the committee approved the following motions.

The first motion was to move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected appendix; 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 to accept the proposed Southern Zone Quota as a trigger mechanism; 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 to have the alternatives in Framework Amendment 2 apply to the EEZ off the southern zone; 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 to accept the alternative as modified; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion was to accept the modified purpose and need; 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 to accept the modifications to the purpose and need to reflect that they apply to the entire southern zone; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The last motion to come out of that discussion was to approve Framework Amendment 2 for the August public hearings; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Under the timing and task motion; the motion is adopt the timing and task items as presented: Prepare Framework Amendment 2 for the public hearings in August 2014; and to continue work on the options paper for Amendment 24 to present in December 2014. On behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Is there any other business to come before the Mackerel Committee? Seeing none, we will move on to the Dolphin and Wahoo Committee.

MS. BECKWITH: The Joint Dolphin Wahoo/Snapper Grouper Committee met on June 12, 2014. The joint committee passed the following motions as recommended to the council. In reference to Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7/Snapper Grouper Amendment 33, the first motion was to accept the IPT's recommendation for the purpose and need. On behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Under Action 1, the motion was to accept the IPT's recommended language changes, except the language that deletes the language referencing passports in Alternative 2. On

behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Our third motion was to make Alternative 2 of Action 1 the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion gave staff editorial license to add language regarding stowage of fishing gear while in transit. Florida was going to provide some of that suggested language. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Under Action 2, Motion 5, we accepted the IPT's recommendations and made Alternative 3 as the preferred. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion was for Action 3, to accept the IPT's recommended wording changes for Action 3. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Under Action 4, we chose Alternative 2 of Action 4 as a preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Under Action 5, we had a motion that read add the first IPT recommended action regarding fillets of snapper grouper species into the document. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion was to make Alternative 2 of the new action the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

We had an additional motion that recommended the modified draft of Dolphin Wahoo 7 and Snapper Grouper 33 to be sent out for public hearing in the August round of 2014. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

We did seek some clarification from FWC regarding whether MRIP data collectors exclude fish brought from the Bahamas in their data collection. The concern was whether Bahamian fish could be counted against U.S. ACLs. Jessica determined that Bahamian-caught fish were excluded from Florida MRIP data collection.

The next amendment that we dealt with was Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 8/Snapper Grouper Amendment 34. Under the purpose and need, we moved to approve the IPT's recommended language for the purpose and need. Now, before I bring this forth, I think we also need to clarify

that we need to remove the deep-water species from the purpose and need; so we can do that by possibly adding a phrase in the first sentence that would read: “The purpose of these three amendments is to modify the accountability measures for snapper grouper species with the exception of the deep-water species.” Would that work, Brian, or did you have some other language?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Well, what we have here, we have listed the species that are included in the accountability measures. The thing to do here would be to subtract the ones that you want out of the list from the ones that are listed here. Let’s just get some clarification that we know exactly which species you’re talking about because the motion that was made before was the deep-water snapper grouper species. We don’t actually have a grouping called deep-water snapper grouper species, if I recall that correctly. If we could get explicit direction as to exactly what species you’re referring to here and not just listing –

MS. BECKWITH: So if Michelle can take a moment to clarify since this is more of a snapper question.

DR. DUVAL: I’m sorry, Madam Chair, I was not paying attention. Would you like me to name the deep-water species or make a motion to remove those?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes; somewhere it was stated deep-water snapper grouper species complex; and we don’t actually have one called deep-water snapper grouper complex.

DR. DUVAL: Well, we do have a deep-water complex.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We do have a deep-water complex. I guess what I’m trying to do is just make sure that we’re very specific as to which species we are talking about.

DR. DUVAL: So I would be happy to make a motion that the deep-water species refers to blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, silk snapper, misty grouper, queen snapper, sand tilefish, black snapper and blackfin snapper.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, I didn’t quite get them all written down but that’s okay.

DR. DUVAL: Blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, silk snapper, misty grouper, queen snapper, sand tilefish, black snapper and blackfin snapper.

MS. BECKWITH: Do I have a second to that motion; Charlie. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries. Okay, under Action 1, we had a motion to accept the IPT’s recommended changes for Alternative 1, Action 1. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

The next motion was to select Alternatives 2C, 3C and 4B as preferred alternatives for Action 1. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved

The next motion was to remove the deep-water snapper grouper species from Action 1 of the Snapper Grouper Amendment 34; so there, too, we would be adding clarifying language that is actually the deep-water complex. That would need to be a new motion or is that just direction to staff.

DR. CHEUVRONT: No; I think we handled that by getting the species from Michelle. I need to add that motion up above; but did you actually pass Motion 11, approve the IPT-recommended language for the purpose and need.

MS. BECKWITH: Probably not; so let's deal with this one and then I'll go back to that one. So you just need direction; you're good with the direction?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm good with that. I can add that motion that Michelle made that was passed.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, so for this motion, is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries. I'll go back and make sure that with the clarifications we approve the IPT's recommended language for the purpose and need. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries. We did offer some direction to staff that the Wreckfish ITQs would cover the commercial sector AMs for that fishery. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Brian, my only question is do we have to do anything – so we didn't address the recreational AMs for the wreckfish sector?

DR. CHEUVRONT: The recreational AMs are listed already in the document. There already are recreational AMs in place for wreckfish; so there is nothing else additionally that we would need to do for that.

DR. DUVAL: I guess my question is more along the lines of if those are – are they consistent with what we're doing for the other recreational sectors?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, under Action 2 we selected Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative for Action 2. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

We had one additional motion to approve the modified Draft Dolphin Wahoo 8/Snapper Grouper 34 to be sent out for public hearings in August of 2014. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Is there any other business to come before this committee? Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes; we have a timing and task motion, which I've got projected up here. Since it was not made by the committee, somebody on the council would need to make that motion.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I make a motion that we accept the timing and task as presented on the screen.

MS. BECKWITH: John seconds. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

(Whereupon, the following timing and task motion was approved:

For DW7/SG33: Public hearings in August 2014; distribute to MAFMC & NEFMC for them to publicize/hold public hearings and provide comments to SAFMC; public Hearing draft to be sent to The Bahamas for their review of the document; South Atlantic Council reviews public input, revises document as necessary, and takes final action in September 2014; Bahamian officials will be invited to attend the September Council meeting to comment and provide input on the actions in DW Amendment 8/SG Amendment 33; submit DW Amendment 7/SG Amendment 33 for formal review by October 31, 2014; target date for regulations to be in place by summer of 2015.

For DW8/SG 34: Public hearings in August 2014; distribute to MAFMC & NEFMC for them to publicize/hold public hearings and provide comments to SAFMC; SAFMC reviews public hearing comments, modify and approve all actions in September 2014; approve for formal review in December 2014; submit for formal review in December 2014; target date for regulations to be in place in 2015.)

MS. BECKWITH: Is there any other business to come before this committee? Jack.

MR. COX: I've just got a quick question. I've heard a lot about deep water during these conversations and stuff. What do we consider deep-water species; how deep is deep water?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I've got the list right here. Michelle, let me read it and you tell me whether I've got it correctly: blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, silk snapper, misty grouper, queen snapper, sand tilefish, black snapper, and blackfin snapper.

DR. DUVAL: So, Jack, those are just all included in a complex. Obviously, we're removing blueline tilefish through Amendment 32 from that complex; so it would then be the remainder of all those species minus blueline would be the deep-water complex after that.

MR. COX: Okay, and the second half of that question is what is considered deep water?

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think the SSC made these groupings of species; so you'd have to go back and dig through some of their deliberations regarding how those were set up.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, is there anything else? Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm all done.

MR. HARTIG: Next is the report on the Council Member Visioning Workshop.

DR. DUVAL: There were no motions from the Council Member Visioning Workshop. You all have a report of all the items that we discussed and the update that we received from staff.

MR. HARTIG: That moves us to the Law Enforcement Committee Report.

MR. BELL: Mr. Chairman, there were no actual motions from the Law Enforcement Committee Meeting; but we did select unanimously Ranger First Class David Brady from Georgia DNR as our 2013 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. That concludes my report.

MR. HARTIG: Join Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee Report; Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: A joint meeting of the Habitat and Environmental Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committees was held on June 9th in Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida. The following motions were made:

To approve the Marine Aquaculture Policy; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Motion Number 2 was to approve the SAV, the Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Policy. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Motion Number 3 was to approve the In-Stream Flow; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Motion Number 4 was to approve the Marine and Estuarine Invasive Species Policy. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Then there were three items under timing and task: To distribute the approve policy statements and post on the website by June 30; to work with the Habitat AP to further define existing and develop new EFH Policy Statements for consideration in December 2014; and to coordinate with council members, Habitat AP, State Sub-Panel Chairs and ecosystem partners to refine membership on review and writing teams for the development of FEP II and integrated EFH update; and to provide update on timing and participation in September 2014. If I could get a motion to accept the timing and task. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the timing and tasks as outlined.

MR. HAYMANS: And a second from Charlie. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? That motion passes. That concludes everything that I had. I believe Leann had some comments that she would like to make.

MS. BOSARGE: Obviously, I'm not on your council. Just so you understand where I'm coming from and why this peaked my interest; my background is in the commercial shrimping background. Although I'm not on the South Atlantic Council, we shrimp in both the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic. I do have an interest in what you're doing, especially when it pertains to shrimp.

We do both soft shrimp and rock shrimp in both the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic. As a result, when the rock shrimp fishermen made some comments both in the Q&A with Dr. Crabtree and the AP/committee about the closed area; and they spoke in the AP about the original closed area, your Oculina Bank. I think it is 92 square miles.

There was an area of it that they wanted you to consider for trawling; that they said they had historically trawled there. I looked at the tracks. I can see what they're talking about. Probably when that area was closed, probably 20 percent of their rock shrimp grounds were taken in that area. That is how productive an area it was.

I thought to myself, well, I don't know a thing about this Oculina Bank and I need to do some research to understand why it was closed, because there are two sides to every story. I listened to what was said in committee; and it sounded like there had not been a vast body of research done since the original area was closed.

I thought, well, maybe where I need to start is to go back and read the original amendment that closed the area and see what the rationale behind it was. Since Mr. Cupka has been on here probably the longest, 20-something years, and that amendment is 30-something years old, 32 years old, I'm not sure how many of you have read it.

I don't know why you'd have a reason to read it. I just wanted to share with you a couple of things that jumped out at me when I read it. First was why it even came to be. I heard a lot in committee about the ecosystem management focus of this council; and so I thought, well, that is probably where this is going and that is probably why we shouldn't open that back up; just because there is not coral there, it may be important.

Well, what I found out in the amendment was that this area or all of this area and not just this closed area was managed by the Bureau of Land Management under the Continental Shelf Lands Act. The reason this amendment came up, because we usually have to have something to prod us to make us start an amendment, was because there was a lawsuit that took that authority away from the Bureau of Land Management, which meant that this whole area that had been protected by them, this area of coral, was now open and people could go harvest it.

In the amendment it says the thrust of this plan is to conserve this resource, coral, at its present low level of harvest. That is why we closed this area because we wanted to protect that coral that was now unprotected after that lawsuit. It goes on in there to talk about the data that was used to close the area; and this is where I focused a lot of my time and energy when I researched it.

It said very well-published data exists on coral and coral reefs in the management area, which we know. That has been stated for the record. Most data concentrate on a limited number of species in a very few localities. Certain biological, socio-cultural and economic data are especially limited. The existence of these data gaps are documented throughout the FMP.

This is what caught my interest. In attempting to utilize the best available data, several sections of the plan rely heavily on informal interviews with knowledgeable professionals; not scientists, but professionals. If there was a good portion of this amendment that was based on informal

interviews with professionals, then in my mind the AP's request to have an independent scientific body, our SSC, reexamine this particular area that they're asking about is not unjustified.

In that request I would hope that the SSC would examine not only the scientific information, which I didn't get into the nuts and bolts of because it gets over my head when you actually start reading through these different corals and things like that; but not only the scientific information that was in this original amendment that was utilized to close the area, but also the scientific information that has been gathered since then as well as things we haven't looked at yet, which were brought up in the off-the-record session the other night, which were the governmental observers that are on these rock shrimp boats that take down the data on bycatch as well as the actual tracks from these shrimpers.

We have a computer plotter on our boats; and even when it was paper, all that has been put into the computer. You can see our tracks for the last 40 years. I know there is not much background on this council in the shrimp industry; so just to put it in terms that you may be more familiar with, what I'm talking about is when I say "tracks" – some of you know this so bear with me – a shrimper drags a line; and in the rock shrimp industry it is a very specific area that they drag.

They get on the edge of the Continental Shelf; they get on the edge of that shelf and they find the contour line. Your shelf over here runs north and south; so say they're on the 30 fathom line, they're going to drag north and south up that contour line wherever those shrimp are. Well, you've seen your box. Your original box took in a little bit of that.

When you extended it, that's what it does; it runs north and south down a narrow corridor on that shelf, which is right where they shrimp at. I mean, you're in their wheelhouse. When you look at these tracks, which I've looked at their tracks, especially on that southern box – I think the council did a great job on the extension of trying to stay out of their historical shrimping grounds; but on that original box, that southern-most box, you can see tracks from before you enclosed it, but the tracks from after you enclosed it to me tell the tale.

If it is a productive shrimp ground, if this is the box and here is right below the box, there will be an area this wide which just blacked out. They're going back and forth, back and forth, back and forth on that contour line. That is where they're catching their shrimp. If you extend that into your box, it is right there in your box; and it is about a third of your box.

For those of you that aren't familiar with shrimping, shrimpers and coral are like oil and water. They want nothing to do with each other. They don't mix. That is the last thing they want to do is get near any coral. If they drag over coral – if they've got a net, they drag over coral, all they do is put holes in their net and rip it up.

If you know anything about nets, you don't catch very much in a net that has got a bunch of holes in it; so that the last thing that they want to do. When they try and tell you, look, we've drug this area for years and years and year, we have the proof, we're telling you there is no coral there, there is no reason for them to tell you anything other.

It is not in their best interest to drag over coral. If they could drag over coral and clear an area and go catch a bunch of shrimp, then maybe I wouldn't believe them; but that's not how we operate. I believe what they're saying. I understand what you all are saying that just because there is not coral there, that doesn't mean that area might not need to be protected. It could be very important from an ecological standpoint; I understand that.

That is what I would like the SSC to take a look at, look at the original data, the new data and the data we haven't looked at yet, the fisheries' data, and let them tell us what they think the risk is of possibly opening this area back up. That is my spiel and you'll probably never let me come back; but for what it is worth, I hope you'll consider it.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Leann. I will say this in response; and that is in the development of Coral 8 as well as the initial habitat areas, the industry, the biologists and the scientists were considered – their input was considered heavily. There was, I would say, more debate and more input over Coral 8 over a two-year period than a lot of our amendments we've put through. It is not that this council has ignored anybody's input or has brushed anybody off. We continue to listen and improve those areas in my humble opinion. Charlie, I think you had something.

MR. PHILLIPS: Ben, is this as good a place as any to put this? Okay, I've talked with Roy, I've talked with several of the council, and we've listened numerous times to the rock shrimp fleet. I've talked with Gregg about how to structure this a little bit. After public comment and hearing them again talk about the algae on the south end of the bottom that was not there when we started the process; some of this economic data was not there when we started the process; I don't think anybody on this council knew that there had been an observer on one of those boats to see what the bycatch was.

I would like to make a motion that we reexamine some of these things and bring this back and look at it again. I think there is just too much economic damage to not – and I know we've looked at it and looked at it, but we need to keep looking at it.

MR. HAYMANS: Charlie, can you be more specific? I think reexamine some of these things –

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes; we want to look at the bycatch report. We want to try to document the algae moving in on the south. We want to document the economic data. We would like to see the track data and see how it has shifted to the north and any other things that might be added. Gregg, maybe you can help me fill in the list.

MR. WAUGH: The first thing would be is when do you want us to look at this. I'm assuming you're talking about look at this at the September Council Meeting?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, September council

MR. WAUGH: So what we would need is for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to provide us the most up-to-date VMS data up to as late in 2014 as possible; the rock shrimp bycatch reports; all the data from the observer trips; the mapping results from that area; what percent of the area under question has been mapped, what are the mapping results.

The one that is a little more squirrely that we're going to have to work on is how you get the shrimp industry to document the algae problem or get someone out there; but least those first three items, we would need those in our office by September 1 at the latest to prepare materials for you all to look at during the September Council Meeting.

MR. HAYMANS: We have a motion which is still being wordsmithed on the screen. Jessica has a question while that's being done.

MS. McCAWLEY: I completely agree. I guess I just had a question for Charlie and partly based on what Leann said; are you thinking that we're just going to look at the items that we're still waiting on the secretary to act on or are we going to go back to even the old original data that Leann is talking about? It is just unclear to me how far back we're going. Are we looking at just the newly closed areas or are we going back to the old areas and looking at the newly closed areas.

MR. PHILLIPS: No; I think we need to concentrate on the area where they're losing this most – it appears that they're going to lose this economic value. I don't want to open the whole can of worms up. I want to fix what needs to be fixed.

DR. LANEY: Just to let everybody know; I communicated with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in Region 4, which in conversations with Gregg seemed to be the appropriate place to go with regard to whether or not discharges of freshwater with nutrients might be a contributing factor to the algae offshore.

I do have any EPA contact so I'll work with Mike and Laurilee and other folks to try and document exactly where they're seeing the algae and apparent diminishment of macro benthos, which that is what they indicated they were seeing. I will work with them and provide that information to EPA and get back to the council with any input that EPA may have with regard to whether or not they think there is a connection between offshore discharges and what they're seeing on their shrimping grounds and whether or not there might be anything that could be done about that.

Then to Leann – and, Roger, correct me if I'm misstating here – the kind of coral that we're dealing with in those closed areas is a very delicate kind of coral that is very subject to damage by trawls. I'm not sure that trawling through lophelia would result in the kind of gear damage that you would get if you trawl through other types of reef-building corals. There may be a difference there. I'm seeing John nod his head in the affirmative; so I think that was the big concern that these deep-water types of corals were so much more subject to damage by trawl gear than typical reef corals are. That was again another justification I think for creating the area in the first place.

MR. MAHOOD: This is an interesting that has unfolded here; because initially when the negotiations between the scientists interested in protecting the coral and rock shrimp fishermen were ongoing, they actually gave up this area because they were no longer catching shrimp. That had in past years in not being productive' and then just now in the last couple of years have all of

a sudden this has become another major area again of where the rock shrimp are showing up and where they had significant catches the past two years.

I was talking to Mike; and initially, early on, they were very happy with the process; and in negotiations and that we listened to them and the areas they got, they were happy with. The trouble is the danged shrimp moved. The areas they got where they had been catching shrimp; the shrimp were no longer there and they moved back to some of the trawling areas in the more northern area and they had quite a bit of production.

Well, when our staff – and maybe Brian was going to talk about this – tried to look at the economic of the situation; and I think Brian explained maybe to some folks that they looked at the tracks of where they were fishing and then they assigned a certain percentage to each track of the total landings; and that is how they came up with a lower economic value.

The high catches, because there were fewer of them and they were more recent, were really kind of masked because they were assigned maybe a low catch level based on the overall number of tracks. We kind of got in this quandary not intentionally, obviously, but I think it would behoove us probably to go back and look and try to get some better economic value.

I know Mike Merrifield went to the fishermen and got more specific information, which he provided unfortunately at the eleventh hour, and now I guess the secretary will have to consider that information in his deliberations. We kind of got caught up in this in an awkward way. I think you could have a situation where next year the shrimp are back south again.

They not even be there as they had not in the past eight or ten years to recently. We can try to react to it and we can try to get more information. I'm not sure we're ever going to be able to solve the problem because we walk that fine line out there with protecting the coral, the live bottom, the hard habitat and allowing the fishery to continue. What we can do is what we can do.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I want to follow up with some of the stuff that Bob just said. There really is a lack of data comes from this fishery. When we were assigning values to the tracks, we only used those tracks when the vessel was traveling between two and four knots, which is time that they would probably have their gear deployed.

When they were traveling faster than that, no values were assigned to it. Bob was correct that what we could do was assume an equal value assigned to each track that we had that fit the parameters that we used, because we had no additional data to do additional economic analysis. I don't see that improving.

When we do this updated analysis; it is just that we're going to have more recent data. That's all we're going to have. I just wanted to get on to the record if you go through that economic analysis of the economic effects of that – I worked very closely with Dr. Stephen Holiman at SERO on doing this. I even went so far as to contact participants in the fishery, including Mike Merrifield, and got additional cost information that is not normally included in the analysis that we do.

In economics we're very careful when we talk about economic effects versus economic impacts, because those have very, very distinct and different meanings in the world of economics. What we are required to do is economic effects' analysis; and we tend to stick with direct economic effects. That is the value of the product.

We don't typically get into economic impacts; the indirect impacts, the induced impacts. At one point there was testimony that was given saying that we do that for the recreational fishery. No, we don't; we don't do that for the recreational fishery. We have direct effects is really basically what we report on.

However, in this analysis we did include more than that in there; and I really don't see that being able to improve much, because we just don't have the data. I think that we will be able to do is simply to update what we have. One thing that might be able to happen here in the economic analysis is if we can start to pull out perhaps where the tracks actually occurred; and we could probably show the effect of them.

If they are actually fishing more in that northern area, we could probably document that; but it still going to be on the same kind of scale as we've used before. I'm just hoping that you're not thinking you're going to get a lot more new revelation because that is really not going to be possible; because the ability to analyze that empirically is simply not going to be there.

DR. CRABTREE: We've had a good relationship I think with these guys over the past few years; and we've tried hard as we've moved down this path of coral protections to work these things out with them. There were a lot of comments that came in after the fact this time and exactly how we got to where we are on it is probably a lot of things.

It is clear to me that they're very concerned that this is going to have more impact than I think we expected it to have when we did this; and so I've heard enough that makes me at least want to go back and take another look at it. To me this is all a balance; and I guess I've heard enough to want to go back and revisit that balance.

Maybe we don't change things, but maybe we do; and so I agree with Charlie and the motion and I would like to relook at this area. I've looked at the economic analysis, too, Brian, and we will see what we can do with that. I think these guys would be willing to provide us information on their tracks they may have. I've talked to Mike Merrifield about that; and at least take another look at this and see if some changes are warranted.

MR. HAYMANS: I will remind everyone that we did an extensive review of the VMS datapoints; and we tried to get track data into a format that we could compare the two. The maps that we were provided of the tracks, they were never able to get those to us in format that we could compare them with the VMS data. We did see a track data from a lot of their trawls. I remind you we have a motion that does not have a second yet. I think we've got it crafted and we've had an awful lot of discussion.

DR. CRABTREE: I'll second it.

MR. HAYMANS: All right, Roy seconds; but we haven't even read through it yet.

MR. CONKLIN: I wanted to add something to it or make a clarification.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. Well, we have a motion and a second, which means I guess now we need to amend that motion. Chris, go ahead.

MR. CONKLIN: There was just a lot of information brought up at the Q&A from some of these guys about observer data that maybe the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Science Center does not have.

One particular gentleman was saying he carried observers from the University of Georgia with them; and there was some conversation this week that maybe that information never made into this consideration for this amendment. Somehow or another if we can request the industry help us get that information and bring it to the Service; new information is always welcome even though it is this late in the process. I just wanted to put that on the record,

MR. HAYMANS: I believe that data would be covered under number two there on the screen as far as the bycatch observer work.

MR. CONKLIN: I understand that. The motion is for the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Science Center to provide the data. I just wanted to make sure that it is not just data they already have in a file cabinet somewhere, that they try and reach out and maybe get some new data.

DR. PONWITH: When they talk about those observed trips, I don't have any context to know under what auspices those data were collected. If those data were collected as part of a federally funded project, then conceivably we would have access to those data, an expectation of having access to those data.

If it is a grant, we may have to wait for them to publish on it before we actually get those data. There are all kinds of rules about how that happens. If we collected the data, we have the data. If those data were collected based on some grant they wrote that wasn't funded by the federal government, we can politely ask for the data, but they're not required to turn that over basically until they publish and then we would see the published information just like everybody else.

Back to your original premise, I think it is a worthwhile question to ask the industry did you collaborate with academic scientists who would have access to data that might be above and beyond what we in the federal government might have. I think that is a worthwhile question.

MR. HARTIG: To that point, Bonnie, this observer information wasn't something that your shop put together. Do you have the authority to put observers on rock shrimp vessels? Okay, that question is answered; okay, you do have the authority.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, just a couple of quick things. Just following up what Doug had indicated, we did formally request – the chairman formally requested having the vessel track and

catch associated with the vessel tracks that we could compare those with the VMS; and so we would have catch associated with the area. That was in the process and we were given specific response indicating that was not something they could do.

Those were as part of the discussions. Now any of the considerations of a vessel operating; all of that would have been in there even it was a formal observer or not formal because they're all carrying VMS. Those points in terms of the analysis of where they were fishing; at least that is in there. We did have historic bycatch information that was used in previous amendments to the plan and the actions and were considered in the deliberations over time.

If there had been updates since that time, that would essentially be updates to what we know about the bycatch composition in the fishery and we could look further at those. We did include any of the original analysis in the review in this long-building process over many years from the original HAPC to a rock shrimp closed area to where we are now. Those have all been parts of these different things. We've have been trying to include as much of this and have included everything that has been available and tried to get as much from industry and collaborated with industry.

One point I did want to add to that was the fact that when we did the last iteration and finalized the document; some of the considerations that were not on the table is adjusting that any further input from our coral and habitat advisory and mainly from some of our coral advisors because of the discussions about what the implications of moving that line closer and into that in terms of habitat, in terms of species, because there was a lot of reasons why that was put on the first line, which was moved two additional times in this northern extension.

Just for the record, a lot of these things have been considered. Any refinement we can adjust and look at, but it is not as if there had been things that were just literally either not addressed or not tried to be addressed in this process.

MR. HAYMANS: Leann, I believe you had something.

MS. BOSARGE: Just real quick for clarification; there are two types of observers that they spoke about the other day. The governmental observer; that is a mandatory requirement of the permit for that vessel; that randomly NOAA will choose a vessel to send these observers out on. If we make a 30-day trip, they stay for 30 days.

They document all the bycatch and any other information from our fishery. You can pull that; that is governmental information that you should be able to pull. Who has it and holds it I don't know, but it is within the agency. The other observer from universities and such; you would need to reach out to the fishermen to see if they could contact those people or give you information to get that type of data. Then the last point; VMS data – and you've talked about the limitations of VMS data and really not being able to – you have to kind of put a weighting on it and this and that.

I talked yesterday about the electronic logbooks that we have in the Gulf. There are Gulf boats that rock shrimp in the Atlantic. We are some of them. We have five boats. Some of our boats

have both the ELB and the VMS. The great thing about the ELB – VMS is pretty much an enforcement tool. It is so that you know where they're at; and you can get them if you need to get them if they're over the line.

ELB is more of a data tool. It gathers information that your researchers and scientists use. There are some boats that are in the rock shrimp fishery in the Atlantic that you could actually get the ELB data for; and then you'd have more information because that ELB program, as Bonnie mentioned the other day, that has a logarithm associated with it that will actually convert that information to effort, productivity, things like that.

You can't associate a dollar value with it, but you can get a better idea of effort and where it is at rather than just an enforcement ping every however many minutes to figure out where the boat is at. That may be an avenue you may want to explore. You should be able to get some ELB data that will be more informative to use as well.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, we have a motion, which I will read, for the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries science Center to provide the following by September 1, 2014: VMS data to up to latest in 2014; South Atlantic rock shrimp bycatch results from observer trips; detailed mapping (percent of area mapped, et cetera) of the area (northern extension); observations on algae in the southern area of the rock shrimp fishery; updated landings through 2014; updated trip costs and value; ELB data from Gulf shrimp vessels operating in the South Atlantic. That was a motion by Charlie and a second by Roy.

I will say I have great concern over the September 1st deadline, whether or not the Southeast Science Center can provide the data and whether or not the council can put it into any meaningful format. Nevertheless, that is where we are. Is there any additional comment over this motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: Roy, we're automatically going to add the economic because I don't know that it was listed. We did want the economic data, whatever else we could add to it, I think.

DR. PONWITH: I share your concerns about the tight time constraints on this. We will do the very best we can; and we will consult with council staff if it comes to setting a priority this versus that, which one should we weight the heaviest, but we will do the best we can to get as much of this together as we can.

MR. WAUGH: We would obviously have to talk with the Chair and maybe the Chair of Habitat as well because that is cutting it very close to our meeting. That would give us the Monday – two weeks before the council meeting; that would basically us four days and the weekend to work on it to get this out to you in the second briefing book.

I think something of this importance; we can't dump it on you at the council meeting. I think in these negotiations and discussions, if the center is going to go past – and I recognize this is a lot to ask for; but if we go past that 9/1 deadline; then this may have to bump to the December meeting. If a significant portion of this and some of the critical parts of these items can't be provided for September, then there is no need to present it because you're not going to have the

complete picture. Based on the results from the center, this may have to bump to the December meeting.

MR. HAYMANS: I would agree with that. Anybody else? We have pretty thoroughly discussed this topic. **Okay, with regard to the motion that is on floor, is there any opposition to the motion that is on the floor? Seeing none; that motion carries.** Michelle, I know how you feel. Is there any additional business to come before this committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, that concludes the business of the committee.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you; we're going to take a ten-minute break. We're going to go ahead and get started again. The order of business is the Protected Resources Committee Report.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, the Protected Resources Committee met this past Monday; and I would direct everyone's attention to the committee meeting minutes that were sent out by Mike. There were no motions made; so unless there are any questions, that completes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: All right, the SEDAR Committee. **The first motion that was made in the SEDAR Committee was to approve the Black Grouper Terms of Reference as provided; 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 to approve the addition of Gray Triggerfish Terms of Reference 9 for SEDAR 41. On behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion was to replace the 2014 terminal year vermilion update with a standard assessment of blueline tilefish. 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 to move to establish South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Species Ranking as follows: blueline tilefish standard, number one; number two, golden tilefish update; number three, red grouper update; number four, red porgy benchmark/standard; number five, scamp benchmark; number six, vermilion snapper update; and to ask the SSC to consider if a standard assessment of red porgy will be adequate. 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 to approve the suggested modifications to the Peer Review Process; and to indicate that peer reviewers need to be members of the SEDAR AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The last motion for the SEDAR Committee was to approve the Research and Monitoring Prioritization Plan as modified. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved. There is some other

business to come before the SEDAR Committee. I had a conversation with Bonnie; and I will turn it over to Bonnie at this under other business.

DR. PONWITH: We've been working kind of behind the scenes with analysts on the red snapper or the timing of the red snapper stock assessment; and working with Dr. Crabtree from the management perspective; and doing some back-calculating on the dates; as you know, the review workshop for the red snapper stock assessment is currently scheduled to happen in June of 2015. What we've done is sort of looked at what the trigger points are for the timing of these three workshops, the reports coming out of those to inform the daisy chain of meetings that happen through the course of a benchmark stock assessment.

We believe that if we are bordering on militant about adhering to a really tight terms of reference for that stock assessment; and if we are willing to manage schedule changes for the stock assessment workshop, the review workshop and the SSC Committee Meeting coming up in the spring, we believe that it is possible for us to be able to generate a stock assessment result that could be presented to the South Atlantic Council at their June meeting. I guess I'm interested in the council's views on having the results from SSC's deliberations delivered to you at the June meeting instead of your fall meeting.

MR. HARTIG: Particularly from my viewpoint, that would be phenomenal if you guys can swing that and get that all done. That's incredible. Your question was about the SSC?

DR. PONWITH: Again, what it would require – right now we have the three workshops have been locked down. The data workshop would stay the same. The stock assessment workshop have to be moved sooner. The review workshop would have to be moved sooner. I believe we would have to change an SSC meeting by one week – instead of being the last week of April, moving it to the first week of May. With those changes and a willingness to really tighten our grip on those terms of reference to make sure that the assessment is manageable, I think it can be done.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, I'm not sure about the logistics of changing the SSC meeting; but certainly we can investigate it. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We've done some preliminary looks at it. We have not scheduled the SSC hotel yet, so that is an easy change. The assessment and review workshops have dates. The assessment workshop; I don't think we have finalized the contract, so that is very feasible. The review workshop we're checking on. I've talked with Julia as well; and we believe that all those changes are certainly logistically feasible. If the science center thinks they can get the work done in that time, we will do everything we can to make sure it can happen.

DR. PONWITH: One thing that I'd like to do is the other contingency is that for the data workshop we're going to have a lot of the data in our hands. The other thing that happens is that because gray triggerfish is linked to this workshop and therefore it would be caught up into that same timing; for this to succeed we need to make those changes in the dates.

We also need to agree that we will be really prompt with the delivery of the data needed for both of these stock assessments coming from the partners holding those data; and my recommendation is that perhaps the SEDAR Steering Committee members, who are part of the South Atlantic, that if we draft a letter going out to the participants in this workshop reiterating how the timing of this has been compressed and it makes timely delivery of those reports and those data absolutely essential for this compressed schedule to work. I think what that does is it builds kind of buy-in with the schedule and an understanding that it is going to take cooperation from all the players to be able to pull it off.

MR. HARTIG: I'm just making a note of that, Bonnie, that letter; and we will do that. Are there any other questions of Bonnie? Seeing none; is there any other business to come before the SEDAR Committee. Seeing none; we will move to AP Selection.

MR. HAYMANS: The Advisory Panel Selection Committee met on June 10, 2014, in Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida. The committee approved the following motions as recommendations to the council:

Motion 1 to move designated seats from the Wreckfish Sub-Panel to open commercial seats on the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Motion 2 to reappoint Randy Manchester to the Golden Crab Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Motion 3 to appoint Emily Helmick to the Habitat Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? I will say for the record that Emily just a few moments ago asked me to thank everyone for that appointment. She is excited to be on a Council AP. Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Motion 4 to appoint Sonny Davis, James Geiger, Barbara Muhling and Mitchell Roffer to the SEDAR Pool Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Motion 5 to reappoint Kenny Fex and Robert Thompson to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

Motion 6 to appoint Kerry Marhefka to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

There were just a couple of directions to staff. One was to write a letter to the NMFS Science Center to request a science center liaison, non-voting, to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. Secondly was to readvertise the South Carolina seat on the Mackerel Advisory Panel. Is there

any additional business to come before this committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, that concludes the AP Selection Committee Report.

MR. HARTIG: The next item of business is Executive Finance Committee Report. There is one motion that occurred in that committee. **The motion is to allow the council executive director, chair and vice-chair to draft comments on MSA bills. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.** Is there any other business to come before the Executive Finance Committee? Seeing none; we will move to the Data Collection Committee Report.

MR. BELL: The Data Collection Committee met yesterday afternoon, June 12, and we had one motion, which was following our discussion on the Joint South Atlantic/Gulf Council Generic Charterboat Reporting Amendment and also the discussion of our options paper. **The one motion was to direct staff to work with ACCSP in developing a commercial logbook electronic data entry form. The National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center would provide the data elements and participate in the development. The National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office would also participate and provide the linkage to the permits database. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion of the motion? Any objection to the motion? Okay, the motion carries.** Then we will need a motion to adopt the timing and task. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the task and timing as presented.

MR. BELL: Seconded by Doug. Any discussion of that or any objection to the approval of the timing and tasks? All right, that carries.

(Whereupon, the following timing and task motion was approved:

Direct staff to arrange presentations on northeast bycatch reporting for the September 2014 Council meeting; direct staff to assist in preparing the Council's comments on the Electronic Technology Implementation Plan; direct staff to work with ACCSP on developing a commercial logbook electronic data entry form. Gregg Waugh will be the staff person working on this and NMFS SERO and SEFSC will appoint an individual to work on this along with Monica Smit-Brunello (NOAA GC); direct staff to continue working on the charterboat logbook technical sub-committee to complete the report for the December 2014 meeting. A status report will be presented at the September 2014 meeting.

MR. BELL: Any other business to come before the Data Collection Committee. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. HARTIG: The next order of business is the SSC Selection Committee Report; Dr. Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: All right, the SSC Selection Committee met on Tuesday, June 10th, and the committee reviewed applicants for the SSC. **There was one motion and that is to reappoint Dr. Scott Crosson, Dr. Eric Johnson, Anne Lange, Dr. Marcel Reichert and Dr. Tracey**

Yandle to the SSC. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to appoint Dr. Amy Schueller to the SSC; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Is there any other business to come before the SSC Selection Committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, my report is concluded.

MR. HARTIG: The HMS Committee was not able to meet because of time constraints. However, if there isn't a point of order involved, I think we could meet as a Committee of the Whole to take care of one item; and that is the approval of the December 2003 minutes from the HMS Committee. Since there are only two members on this council that were here at that time and currently only one member at the table, I think it would be appropriate for David to make a motion to approve the minutes.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion that we approve the minutes of the 2003 HMS Committee Meeting.

MR. HARTIG: We were just asked Phil if he was going to second on behalf of Roy since he was the only other member here.

MR. STEELE: Yes, second.

MR. HARTIG: Is there any objection? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. The next item of business is the Golden Crab Committee Report.

MR. CUPKA: The Golden Crab Committee met yesterday and we have a couple of motions for you to consider; so you won't get off as easy as you did before. **The first one deals with Golden Crab Amendment 9, which is part of the Generic AM Amendment. The motion is to select Subalternative 2C of Action 1 as the preferred subalternative. 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 second motion was to approve Golden Crab Amendment 9 for taking out to public hearing in August 2014. On behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The third motion is the timing and task motion, which Brian has put up on the screen, and we will need someone to make a motion to approve the timing and task. Okay, motion by Doug; seconded by Mel. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; then that motion is approved.

(Whereupon, the following timing and task motion was approved: Public hearings in August 2014; distribute to MAFMC and NEFMC for them to publicize/hold public hearings and provide comments to SAFMC; SAFMC reviews public hearing comments,

modify and approve all actions in September 2014; approve for formal review in December 2014; submit for formal review in December 2014; target date for regulations to be in place in 2015.

Other Issues: Convene a meeting of the Golden Crab AP in the fall of 2014 for them to make recommendations regarding changes to the AGCFAs; bring the findings back to the Council at the December 2014 Council meeting.)

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, unless there are any questions; that will conclude my final committee report.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, before we go into the other items that are on the agenda; there is one other motion under the Snapper Grouper Committee Report that unfortunately the motion was passed in committee but it was inadvertently excluded from the committee report that was circulated. We do need to bring that motion before the committee; and then insert that into the committee report.

It was within Amendment 29. Under our discussion there, the committee had made a motion to select Alternative 1 as a preferred under Action 3 for the Deepwater Complex, which would not change the ACLs for those remaining Deepwater Complex Species. We just need to bring that motion up and approve it here at full council. In amongst some of the confusion, we just need to take care of this one final piece.

The motion reads select Alternative 1, no action, as our preferred alternative for the Deep Water Complex. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. That will conclude my addendum to the Snapper Grouper Committee Report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Myra is just projecting that updated table for snowy grouper that reflects reapplication of the existing allocation formula from Amendment 15B with the updated numbers. That will be reflected in the final committee report.

MR. HARTIG: All right, I&E did not meet at this meeting. That brings us into status reports. I guess we're going to go Phil; and I guess we have a couple of things. Go ahead.

MR. STEELE: The recreational and commercial quota monitoring tables have been updated on the SERO Website. The final rule for Mackerel Amendment 20A will publish on June 16th and will become effective July 16th. There are no EFP requests. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions of Phil? Seeing none, moving right along, we'll go to Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: First of all, before I go into the headboat overview, I just wanted to remind everybody that the Programmatic Peer Review we're hosting for stock assessments is going to be at the Mayfair Hotel. The dates are the 8th through 10th of July. SSC people are going to be there for a round table.

We will have opportunities for Dr. Crabtree, Council Chairs, and Executive Directors to reflect on some of their views of the process and our communication pathways for getting stock assessment results back to you and the councils. It is an open meeting. Anybody who would like to come is welcome.

The website on the Southeast Fisheries Science Center's Home Page is now hot; so you can go in there and see who the review panel is and a little bit more about the background materials. All the background materials that we give to the review panelists are publicly available. We're putting final touches on the presentations for that event.

I think those are going to be the ones, if you can't make it, will be really useful for you to go through. It includes kind of a 101 of how we do stock assessments from a technical standpoint, but then also overviews the SEDAR Process and some of the balancing points we have between through-out and transparency and how thorough we are in those modeling approaches. Again, it is an open meeting. If you want to be there, we'll see you there. I thank the people who are coming in advance for being there because I think it is going to make it a really productive event.

So on to the update on the headboat data entry; one of the good things is we've got an increase in efficiency of the electronic reporting. We've been working on converting into an Oracle Database. This work has been completed. Because of this work, we've been able to generate the 2013 estimates for headboat landings and angler effort well ahead of schedule. This was done by the 5th of March this year. Again, ultimately we will be working toward generating those estimates on the same periodicity that the MRIP is on; working towards doing that in two-month waves.

We have working with Bluefin, who is the company we're working on with this, to update the e-Log. That is going to include or does include clickable maps and socio-economic questions. Again, this improves the efficiency of the data collection and getting the data into the hands of the analysts a lot faster. Again, we're modifying the database to make these changes; and the rollout of the changes is expected to be completed either this month or next month.

We've received funding for a project; and that is the integration of dockside validation and at-sea observer data into the relational database. Basically, instead of just having the logbook data by itself and then completely separate; we've be able to integrate those in the database so that it makes the QA-QC and the analysis of those go more smoothly.

Again, that is all going to be in the Oracle Database. That is an update on where we are on the headboat electronic reporting. It has just been a really good project. Again, we owe a debt of thanks to the headboats that were willing to work with us in the pilot phase of this. I think we remain impressed with the headboat fleet's transition into this as a reporting mechanism. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions of Bonnie? Seeing none; I guess we're going to go to agency and liaison reports. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll just mention to quick items. One is the Service is continuing to work on the American Eel Status Review. Recall that is due in September of 2015; so we're still in the information-gathering mode and updating the last status review. We will keep you posted on how that's moving along.

I don't have a current report on the eelway use at Roanoke Rapids Dam, but I'll see if I can't have one by the next council meeting. The Atlantic Sturgeon Stock Assessment is proceeding along as well. We got Dr. Joe Hightower and Dr. Pollock from NC State both to agree to participate in the Sag Analysis Workgroup; so that's great since both of those gentlemen have a tremendous amount of expertise in that arena.

We're looking at a 25-year database from the Cooperative Coast-Wide Atlantic Sturgeon Tagging Program that they'll be analyzing. Hopefully, we'll have some analysis as well of a lot of the acoustic detection data that have been generated by all these fish that are swimming around with acoustic tags in them out there. I will keep you posted on that also. That's all I have.

MR. BELL: A couple of things to report from South Carolina. I'm happy to report we finally got both of the barges out on the Deepwater MPA Reef. Those were deployed this past month. We're hoping to have the NOAA Vessel Pisces come up later this month and actually do some quick examination of the sites, verify the positions for us and then hopefully get an ROV down so we can establish some baseline in terms of what the sites look like now.

We wouldn't expect to see a whole lot, but we'll establish a baseline. The idea would be in the subsequent years to take opportunities to get there with ROVs with the appropriate technology and take a peek and watch it grow. Our way of putting artificial reefs is sort that if we build it, they will come, so we'll just document that. So that's good news. Something of interest at the state level, our legislature just did pass a bill and we now have a bag limit on small sciaenids, which doesn't really affect us here other than those are bycatch or good food sources for other fish.

That will go into effect this – actually that is in effect right now. There is an aggregate bag limit of 50 spot, croaker or whiting per person per day. We also passed some additional protection for great white sharks in our state waters, which were already fairly well protected anyway, but now they're doubly protected.

I sent something around to folks I think last week. We can talk about this later or something, but we are seeing a lot of pressure on our cobia fishery at this time of the year. Usually between Mid-April and Mid-June there are documented spawning events particularly in the southern part of the state in some of our Sounds but also in the nearshore waters, offshore.

You may recall from some of the genetics' work our department has done is we've kind of established those may be two separate groups. Since we have provided additional protection to the cobia in state waters a year or so ago; there seems to be a little more pressure on the stock offshore that may be actively spawning.

We have some issues with illegal sale of fish and things down there; so there is a good bit of pressure on these spawning fish at this time of the year. It is just something that we need to be aware of and might warrant some future attention. We're trying to deal with it with enforcing the existing laws, but it may be that at some point we need to think about providing some additional protection to these fish, particularly as they're spawning this time of the year.

The only other thing that touches on sort of federal is we just completed the second year of our experimental jellyball fishery. The majority of the fishery occurred in federal waters. Of course, Georgia has had this fishery for a while; and I think a good bit of that fishery is in federal waters. It is not anything we manage.

It is not anything we have a plan for, obviously, and I'm not suggesting we want to; but it is a fishery and it is out there. It is getting some attention. The thing about it is they're pulling trawl nets and there is no requirement for TEDs. We require it in state waters as well as Georgia does; but that may be something that if it really catches on, we hear about it a little more in the future. It is pretty much done for the year because we just opened a shrimp season on Tuesday.

I do want to again thank the council and thank the Southeast Regional Office for helping us out this year. We had a cold weather event and we went to the Regional Administrator and asked for a closure of the waters in the EEZ to the shrimp trawl fishery. That was done really fast. I've never seen anything happen that fast. I think that really paid off.

We're seeing pretty good numbers on white shrimp, a good roe crop, and we're hoping for a good fall crop. Again, we just really appreciate the opportunity to have taken action based on something that years ago would have – well, we really wouldn't have been able to take action in a timely manner. So, thanks to Amendment 9 to the Shrimp Plan, we were able to do that. That is really all I have to report on.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions of Mel? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: There is not a whole lot to report other than the legislature is in session; and I know the state representatives know what that means. There are some significant budget cuts that we will be facing again, depending on which version of the budget goes through. The Senate Budget is not very kind to us right now.

We've lost about of our appropriated budget and over 30 positions in the last five years; actually since I started working for the division. That is sort of a bit of a low note right there. On the positive end of things is our staff attended the technical workgroup meeting with regard the electronic charterboat reporting that Mike gave us a presentation on the other day.

We were very grateful that he was able to be included on this. We are, as I've told you before, moving forward with a legal requirement for the for-hire industry logbook. There has been a lot of outreach thus far to the for-hire sector. Doug plans to maintain that on sort of a monthly basis with the monthly newsletter letting license holders know what the options are that we're examining with regard electronic versions versus paper versions as well.

We have a large inshore guide industry; and so we would like to capture that as well. Whatever is coming out of our efforts here is going to dovetail with our efforts in North Carolina; and it is our intent to make sure that the reporting burden is minimized; so that whatever reporting is required at the federal level, folks can do that at the state level with just one button.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions of Michelle? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: We also opened our shrimp grounds on Tuesday, June the 10th, with 155 boats out. I think that is very indicative of the price. It is still holding high right now; between \$8.50 and \$10.00 to the boat, that is pretty dang good right now. It is interesting that we've had boats from New Jersey and Virginia in Georgia. It has been a while since we've seen boats from that far away. Of course, we always get Gulf boats in there; a lot of slabs, freezer boats and whatnot.

If you're going to be in Orlando in July, Georgia DNR will be there in the ICAST. This council doesn't do much with – okay, let me back up. We have not had participation in the past in ICAST; but there is an awful lot of movers and shakers in the recreational fishing business there at ICAST. We have an opportunity at least from our state – and FWC is going to be there as well – to talk to those folks and maybe some time down the road we can look at the council participating. They cut us a pretty good price on the admission and floor space.

Don't be surprised if between now and the next council meeting or maybe December at the most that Georgia does a few radical things with regards to its recreational fishing. Whereas we received a letter from the Regional Administrator asking us to add federal fisheries to our regulated list; we may remove most of our federal fisheries from our regulated list. I'm seriously looking at things that don't occur in Georgia – that don't occur in state waters; not having a regulation for them in state waters. Don't be surprised if you see us start working in that direction. That's all I've got.

DR. DUVAL: Just a little bit on that; so you would –

MR. HAYMANS: I don't have red snapper in state waters so we're looking at pulling that. I don't have a lot of things in state waters, triggerfish, things of that nature; and so what we're looking at doing and trying to simplify our regulations as much as possible – and our anglers asked for this sort of thing all the time – is not to have regulations for those fisheries on our state books. Federal regulations don't apply.

DR. DUVAL: That was my question – that was key – just that your statute that pertains to complementing federal regulations would apply to those –

MR. HAYMANS: We don't have that regulation currently, that we complement federal regulations. It is not like South Carolina's regulation. I'm working basically to streamline – which I don't consider complicated, but which a lot of our anglers do consider complicated. Black sea bass is the one that has really got us bound up right now; because we're still at 15 fish and 12 inches and have been ever since we changed.

We're butting heads with some folks, legislators and whatnot, in going to 13.5; and they're requesting us just to get them all – we want to keep black sea bass because we have black sea bass in state waters; but we may clean house on some of the other stuff.

DR. DUVAL: So how do you complement federal regulations for like red snapper?

MR. HAYMANS: We wouldn't. If someone were found to have a red snapper out of season in state waters, they would be written because of our Joint Enforcement Agreement with having that red snapper illegally. Then if that person chose to challenge it; we are going to have to have a scientist submit the affidavit or testify that fish does not occur in state waters.

DR. DUVAL: So if I'm an angler and I bring a gag to the dock and you don't have any regulations on gag and I've got three of them; what happens?

MR. HAYMANS: Well, that would be the case; right now I don't have regulations on gag in state waters. If an angler were to bring three gag to the dock, our conservation ranger would write him in violation of that federal statute. The angler is going to say, "Well, I caught them in state waters." Well, if we go to court with it, then we will have to testify that those fish don't occur here.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so you're just relaying on your JEA to enforce that? All right, it is just a sore subject for anglers in North Carolina and fishermen in our state if other states are not necessarily complementing the federal regulations in some fashion; so whether or not enforcing or not complementing, whatever.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, a lot of recreational anglers got to our legislators over all these issues that we've been through and they sit and they look at our regulations and decide, well, we don't have that fish in state waters or that or that or that; why is Georgia managing it? We're just looking at a real thorough review of what we need to do with those. That turned out to be a lot longer than I thought it would be.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think the explanation was warranted and it helped tremendously. Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I'll try to be short. We will also be at ICAST like Doug said. I'm hoping that the Florida Booth is going to be bigger and better than Georgia's Booth, but we'll see when we get there.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, you've got 40 feet more that I've got so it probably will be.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Yes; we will have live fish on the show floor that I'm pretty excited about. I think maybe the biggest thing of note is that next week our commission is considering a final rule that would prohibit the import of live lionfish into the state. It would also prohibit aquaculture. We're also relaxing regulations for the harvest of lionfish using rebreathers. We would be allowing some special permits so that you could spearfish in areas that are currently

closed to spearfishing if you're going to be taking lionfish. There would be permits given to do this. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions? I guess I had one. How does the live rock stuff go into your aquaculture? Is it totally separate?

MS. McCAWLEY: Live rock is a separate – well, there is state live rock aquaculture permits and there are federal live rock aquaculture permits. Did I say live rock; I meant lionfish.

MR. HARTIG: No, no; I was just wondering how live rock fitted into the no aquaculture type situation. Since live rock is designated differently; your aquaculture prohibition wouldn't apply to live rock?

MS. McCAWLEY: Correct.

LT. FOWLER: For Coast Guard enforcement issues; of course, we have the regular terminations for lack of safety equipment on board commercial vessels. We've had a few shrimp vessels that have had bycatch reduction device violations for having their BRDS located too far forward of the cod end.

There was one notable case of an illegal alien working on board a shrimper off South Carolina that was transferred to state authorities for that. Regarding the comments that were made yesterday during the public comment period, we have suggested using drones for the Coast Guard for other missions like counterdrug and migrant interdictions; but we're still prohibited by the FAA from using them due to their controlled airspace zones around the southern U.S. We're trying to get that off the ground, but we're prohibited by the FAA from using those. It would be a great tool for us to use, but it is technically illegal for us to be doing that.

MR. DUNN: I don't think there was a pun intended with "trying to get that off the ground".

LT. FOWLER: It was.

MR. DUNN: We submitted our second quarter report covering January through March and you should have that by now. I always make sure you get that at the very end so nobody has any questions for me. I think everybody realizes on July 11th Bruce Buckson will be departing the agency. Our director has decided it was time to get out of the federal system. It was for personal reasons.

Matt Brandt; you met him, our deputy director, will be stepping up as acting; and then we'll figure it out from there as we have each and every time something like this has happened. I will officially assume the special agent-in-charge position on Sunday. I have actually been in an acting capacity while they worked out some workforce management issues. You're stuck with me for a good long time; because going into the SAC position now, as a federal agent you have to retire at 57. We've transferred the SAC position to a different classification; so I do not have a shelf life anymore, which was just a year away, and I will be around for some time. That's all I've got.

MR. MAHOD: I would like to congratulate you; and I attribute a lot of it to your activities with the council that got you to where you are today.

MR. HARTIG: It is nice to know your age, too. Leann, do you have anything from the Gulf?

MS. BOSARGE: No, but I will compliment you on your council. You all have blown me away. You seem to be very open-minded in coming to the issues and trying to look at both – the fact that you let me talk that long shows you're open-minded. You really do try and look at both sides of the issue. Even when you talk about punching each other, you still smile. We don't smile when we say it over there. (Laughter) I'd love to come back one day. Thanks for having me.

MR. HARTIG: We appreciate having you and thanks for the input. Is there anything else from the agency? We're good, right? Is there any other business to come before the council?

MR. MAHOOD: I just wanted to let everybody know that we do have the dates and venues for our 2015 meetings. There is an attachment in your briefing book for that. We will be at the King and Prince Hotel in St. Simons in March. We will be at the Doubletree Grande Key Resort in Key West in June. I believe that is the hotel, Mike, we met at the last time we were down there.

MR. MAHOOD: And the Gulf Council will be meeting on one side the road, we'll be meeting on the other, and there are going to be some joint meetings. In September we're actually going to be in Hilton Head, South Carolina, which kind of shows you how hard it is to get hotels nowadays. We love to meet in Charleston, obviously.

All of our standards places that we meet are just booked up. As the economy improves, I think we're going to start running into more problems. That is why we're out there looking for our meeting locations a year in advance. In December we'll be back in Atlantic Beach at the old Sheraton, which is now Doubletree by Hilton. It is supposed to have been refurbished. That is always a nice location to meet. We'll miss John; we'll miss David; but everyone else we look forward to seeing you in 2015 at all these sites.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions for Bob? Is there any other business to come before the South Atlantic Council? John.

MR. JOLLEY: Bob, we've love to get you down to West Palm Beach at some point in June; and I hope you'll keep that in the back of your mind. I've discussed it with Doug, but you'd be more than welcome if we can put it together. I think it's overdue.

MR. HARTIG: Is there any other business? Seeing none; I guess we're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:50 o'clock a.m., June 13, 2014.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
June 13, 2014

INDEX OF MOTIONS

SNAPPER GROUPEL COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Regulatory Amendment 16

Page 6: Motion to approve the recommended IPT's suggested changes to the purpose statement. Motion approved Page 6.

Page 6: Motion to accept the IPT's wording for the needs statement. Motion approved Page 6.

Page 6: Motion to approve the suggested edits to Alternative 3. Motion approved Page 6.

Page 6: Motion to approve the suggested edits to Alternative 4. Motion approved Page 6.

Page 6: Motion to approve the suggested edits to Alternative 5. Motion approved Page 6.

Page 7: Motion to approve Alternatives 6 and 7 as presented. Motion approved Page 7.

Page 7: Motion to give the IPT latitude to construct an alternative that is a combination of Alternatives 3 and 8. Motion approved Page 7.

Page 7: Motion to direct the IPT to use data from 2004 through 2013 for the analyses. Motion approved Page 7.

Amendment 29

Page 7: Motion to approve recommended edits to the purpose and need statement. Motion approved Page 7.

Page 7: Motion to add new Subalternative 4D to Action 2. Motion approved Page 7.

Page 7: Motion to select Subalternative 4D under Action 2 as the preferred. Motion approved Page 7.

Page 7: Motion to approve the suggested modifications to the alternatives under Action 3. Motion approved Page 7.

Page 7: Motion to modify Alternative 5 under Action 3 to read as follows: "Action 3; establish ACLs for selected unassessed snapper grouper species at ACL equals OY equals 0.8 times proposed ABC for scamp." Motion approved Page 7.

Page 7: Motion to select Alternative 5 under Action 3 as the preferred. Motion approved Page 7.

Page 8: Motion was to select Alternative 2 under Action 3 as the preferred for the remaining species except for the Deepwater Complex. Motion approved Page 8.

Page 8: Motion to approve the suggested edits to the language of the alternatives in Action 4. Motion approved Page 8.

Page 8: Motion to approve the suggested edit to Alternative 1 under Action 5. Motion approved Page 8.

Page 8: Motion to select Alternative 3, Subalternative 3B, as an additional preferred under Action 6; and that motion failed Page 8.

Page 41: Motion to select Alternative 1, no action, as our preferred alternative for the Deep Water Complex. Motion approved Page 41.

Amendment 32

Page 8: Motion to approve inclusion of Action 1 and select Alternative 2 as the preferred. Motion approved Page 8.

Page 8: Motion to include an action to revise accountability measures for the Deepwater Complex in Amendment 32. Motion approved Page 8.

Page 8: Motion to approve the suggested edits to Action 3 and its alternatives. Motion approved Page 8.

Page 8: Motion was to add an alternative that extends the ACL established through the emergency rule until the next stock assessment. Motion failed Page 8.

Page 8: Motion to select Alternative 3 as the preferred. Motion approved Page 8.

Page 9: Motion to approve the suggested edits to alternatives under Action 4. Motion approved Page 9.

Page 9: Motion to select Alternative 2 under Action 4 as the preferred. Motion approved Page 9.

Page 9: Motion to approve the suggested edits to alternatives under Action 5. Motion approved Page 9.

Page 9: Motion to select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2C, as the preferred under Action 5. Motion approved Page 9.

Page 9: Motion to approve inclusion of Action 6 and its alternatives in Amendment 32. Motion approved Page 9.

Page 9: Motion to add a new alternative to Action 6 that mirrors the Alternative 4 and its subalternatives in Action 1 of the Comprehensive Accountability Measures Amendment. Motion approved Page 9.

Page 9: Motion to select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2C, as the preferred. Motion approved Page 9.

Page 9: Motion to select Alternative 4, Subalternative 4B under Action 6 as the preferred. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to approve the suggested edits to Action 7 and addition of alternatives. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to include a new alternative for commercial trip limits of 300, 200 and 100 pounds year-round. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to add an alternative that would set a 100 pound commercial trip limit with a step-down to 50 pounds once 80 percent of the ACL is met or projected to be met. Motion failed Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to approve suggested edits and new alternatives for Action 8. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to add alternatives that mirror what is being considered for snowy grouper in Regulatory Amendment 20 in order to be consistent in managing Deepwater Species. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to approve Amendment 32 for public hearings in August 2014. Motion approved Page 10.

Regulatory Amendment 22

Page 10: Motion to modify the ABCs and ACLs for gag and wreckfish under the regular framework. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to approve the range of alternatives and select Alternative 2 as the preferred. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 10: Motion to add an action and alternative that increases the recreational bag limit to two per person per day or three per person per day. The intent is to remove gag from the aggregate; and the intent is to separate gag and black. Black would remain at one per person per day. Motion approved Page 10.

Page 11: Motion to select Alternative 2, Action 2, as the preferred. Motion approved Page 11.

Page 11: Motion to select Alternative 2 as the preferred for Action 3. Motion approved Page 11.

Regulatory Amendment 20

Page 11: Motion to accept the IPT's proposed wording for the purpose and need. Motion approved Page 11.

Page 11: Motion to accept the IPT's proposed wording changes for Alternatives 1 through 4 under Action 1. Motion approved Page 11.

Page 11: Motion to apply the council's existing allocation formula as it applies to snowy grouper (average of landings from 1986 through 2005) using the SEDAR landings' data. The resulting allocation would change from 95 percent commercial/5 percent recreational to 83 percent commercial/17 percent recreational. Motion approved Page 11.

Page 11: Motion to accept the IPT's proposed wording for Alternative 1 under Action 2. Motion approved Page 11.

Page 11: Motion to approve Alternative 2 under Action 2 as a preferred. Motion approved Page 11.

Page 12: Motion to accept the IPT's proposed wording for Action 3 and Alternatives 1 and 2 under Action 3. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion to accept new Alternative 3 as suggested. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion to move Alternative 2, Action 4, under Action 3. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion to move existing Alternative 4, Action 4, to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion to add revised Alternative 4, Action 4. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion to move revised Alternative 4 to Action 3. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion to move Action 4 to the considered but rejected appendix; and note this refers to the remaining items in Action 4 that were not moved to the Action 3. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion was to accept the IPT's proposed wording for Alternatives 1 and 3 under Action 5. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 12: Motion was to select Alternative 1 under Action 5 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Motion approved Page 12.

Page 13: Motion to move Regulatory Amendment 20 for public hearings. Motion approved Page 13.

Amendment 36

Page 13: Motion to approve the Alternative SMZ Approach, Amendment 36, for scoping in August 2014. Motion approved Page 13.

Amendment 35

Page 13: Motion to approve the modified purpose and need statement. Motion approved Page 13.

Page 13: Motion to modify the document and remove Nassau grouper from consideration. Motion approved Page 13.

Page 13: Motion to approve Amendment 35 for scoping. Motion approved Page 13.

Page 13: Motion to accept the draft timing and task motion. Motion approved Page 13.

The following timing and task motion was approved:

Direct staff to conduct another review of the Oculina Closed Area Evaluation Plan in 5 years, once the entire area has been mapped; direct staff to continue to develop Regulatory Amendment 16 (BSB pot closure) and prepare the amendment for review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to prepare Amendment 29 (ORCS & Gray Triggerfish) for approval for Secretarial review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to prepare Amendment 32 (Blueline Tilefish) for public hearings in August 2014 and Council's final review at the September 2014 meeting; request the SEFSC to provide the average weight by year for wreckfish for 2015 through 2020 to convert pounds whole weight to numbers of fish. This is needed by June 30, 2014, to complete analyses for the public hearing document to be reviewed at the September 15-19, 2014 Council meeting; direct staff to prepare Regulatory Amendment 22 (Gag & Wreckfish) for review and approval for public hearings at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to prepare Regulatory Amendment 20 (Snowy grouper) for public hearings in August 2014 and Council's final review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to revise the scoping document for Amendment 36 (Spawning SMZs) for scoping in August 2014 and Council's review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to revise the scoping document for Amendment 35 (Removing Species) for scoping in August 2014 and Council's review at the September 2014 meeting; direct staff to work with NOAA GC and SERO staff to address the golden tilefish longline endorsement issue and report back to the Council at the September 2014 meeting and Council's review at the September 2014 meeting.

Page 19: Motion to direct staff to determine the best vehicle to separate almaco jack from the jacks complex. Motion approved Page 19.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Page 21: Motion to move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion approved Page 21.

Page 21: Motion to accept the proposed Southern Zone Quota as a trigger mechanism. Motion approved Page 21.

Page 21: Motion was to have the alternatives in Framework Amendment 2 apply to the EEZ off the southern zone. Motion approved Page 21.

Page 21: Motion to accept the alternative as modified. Motion approved Page 21..

Page 21: Motion to accept the modified purpose and need. Motion approved Page 21.

Page 21: Motion to accept the modifications to the purpose and need to reflect that they apply to the entire southern zone. Motion approved Page 21.

Page 21: Motion to approve Framework Amendment 2 for the August public hearings. Motion approved Page 21.

Page 21: Motion to adopt the timing and task items as presented: Prepare Framework Amendment 2 for the public hearings in August 2014; and to continue work on the options paper for Amendment 24 to present in December 2014. Motion approved Page 21.

JT. DOLPHIN WAHOO/SNAPPER GROUPE COMMITTEES

Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7/Snapper Grouper Amendment 33

Page 21: Motion to accept the IPT's recommendation for the purpose and need. Motion approved Page 21.

Page 22: Motion to accept the IPT's recommended language changes, except the language that deletes the language referencing passports in Alternative 2. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion to make Alternative 2 of Action 1 the preferred alternative. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion to give staff editorial license to add language regarding stowage of fishing gear while in transit. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion to accept the IPT's recommendations and make Alternative 3 the preferred. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion for Action 3, to accept the IPT's recommended wording changes for Action 3. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion for Action 4 to choose Alternative 2 of Action 4 as the preferred alternative. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion to add the first IPT recommended action regarding fillets of snapper grouper species into the document. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion to make Alternative 2 of the new action the preferred alternative. Motion approved Page 22.

Page 22: Motion to recommend the modified draft of Dolphin Wahoo 7 and Snapper Grouper 33 to be sent out for public hearing in the August round of 2014. Motion approved Page 22.

Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 8/Snapper Grouper Amendment 34

Page 23: Motion that the deep-water species refers to blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, silk snapper, misty grouper, queen snapper, sand tilefish, black snapper and blackfin snapper. Motion approved Page 23.

Page 23: Motion to accept the IPT's recommended changes for Alternative 1, Action 1. Motion approved Page 23.

Page 24: Motion to select Alternatives 2C, 3C and 4B as preferred alternatives for Action 1. Motion approved Page 24.

Page 24: Motion to remove the deep-water snapper grouper species from Action 1 of the Snapper Grouper Amendment 34; so there, too, we would be adding clarifying language that is actually the deep-water complex. Motion approved Page 24.

Page 24: Motion to approve the IPT's recommended language for the purpose and need. Motion approved Page 24.

Page 24: Motion under Action 2 to select Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative for Action 2. Motion approved Page 24

Page 24: Motion to approve the modified Draft Dolphin Wahoo 8/Snapper Grouper 34 to be sent out for public hearings in August of 2014. Motion approved Page 24.

Page 25: Motion to accept the timing and task motion. Motion approved Page 25.

The following timing and task motion was approved:

For DW7/SG33: Public hearings in August 2014; distribute to MAFMC & NEFMC for them to publicize/hold public hearings and provide comments to SAFMC; public Hearing draft to be sent to The Bahamas for their review of the document; South Atlantic Council reviews public input, revises document as necessary, and takes final action in September 2014; Bahamian officials will be invited to attend the September Council meeting to comment and provide input on the actions in DW Amendment 8/SG Amendment 33; submit DW Amendment 7/SG Amendment 33 for formal review by October 31, 2014; target date for regulations to be in place by summer of 2015.

For DW8/SG 34: Public hearings in August 2014; distribute to MAFMC & NEFMC for them to publicize/hold public hearings and provide comments to SAFMC; SAFMC reviews public hearing comments, modify and approve all actions in September 2014; approve for formal review in December 2014; submit for formal review in December 2014; target date for regulations to be in place in 2015.

JT. HABITAT AND ECOSYSTEM MOTIONS

Page 26: Motion to approve the Marine Aquaculture Policy. Motion approved Page 26.

Page 26: Motion to approve the SAV, the Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Policy. Motion approved Page 26.

Page 26: Motion to approve the In-Stream Flow. Motion approved Page 26.

Page 26: Motion to approve the Marine and Estuarine Invasive Species Policy. Motion approved Page 26.

Page 26: Motion to accept the following timing and tasks: To distribute the approve policy statements and post on the website by June 30; to work with the Habitat AP to further define existing and develop new EFH Policy Statements for consideration in December 2014; and to coordinate with council members, Habitat AP, State Sub-Panel Chairs and ecosystem partners to refine membership on review and writing teams for the development of FEP II and integrated EFH update; and to provide update on timing and participation in September 2014. Motion approved Page 26.

Page 35: Motion for the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center to provide the following by September 1, 2014: VMS data to up to latest in 2014; South Atlantic rock shrimp bycatch results from observer trips; detailed mapping (percent of area mapped, et cetera) of the area (northern extension); observations on algae in the southern area of the rock shrimp fishery; updated landings through 2014; updated trip costs and value; ELB data from Gulf shrimp vessels operating in the South Atlantic. Motion approved Page 36.

SEDAR COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Page 36: Motion to approve the Black Grouper Terms of Reference as provided. Motion approved Page 3.

Page 36: Motion to approve the addition of Gray Triggerfish Terms of Reference 9 for SEDAR 41. Motion approved Page 36.

Page 36: Motion to replace the 2014 terminal year vermilion update with a standard assessment of blueline tilefish. Motion approved Page 36.

Page 36: Motion to move to establish South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Species Ranking as follows: blueline tilefish standard, number one; number two, golden tilefish update;

number three, red grouper update; number four, red porgy benchmark/standard; number five, scamp benchmark; number six, vermilion snapper update; and to ask the SSC to consider if a standard assessment of red porgy will be adequate. Motion approved Page 36.

Page 36: Motion to approve the suggested modifications to the Peer Review Process; and to indicate that peer reviewers need to be members of the SEDAR AP. Motion approved Page 37.

Page 37: Motion to approve the Research and Monitoring Prioritization Plan as modified. Motion approved Page 37.

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Page 38: Motion to move designated seats from the Wreckfish Sub-Panel to open commercial seats on the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. Motion approved Page 38.

Page 38: Motion to reappoint Randy Manchester to the Golden Crab Advisory Panel. Motion approved Page 38.

Page 38: Motion to appoint Emily Helmick to the Habitat Advisory Panel. Motion approved Page 38.

Page 38: Motion to appoint Sonny Davis, James Geiger, Barbara Muhling and Mitchell Roffer to the SEDAR Pool Advisory Panel. Motion approved Page 38.

Page 38: Motion to reappoint Kenny Fex and Robert Thompson to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. Motion approved Page 38.

Page 38: Motion to appoint Kerry Marhefka to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. Motion approved Page 38.

EXECUTIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Page 39: Motion to allow the council executive director, chair and vice-chair to draft comments on MSA bills. Motion approved Page 39.

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Page 39: Motion to direct staff to work with ACCSP in developing a commercial logbook electronic data entry form. The National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center would provide the data elements and participate in the development. The National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office would also participate and provide the linkage to the permits database. Motion approved Page 39.

Page 39: Motion to approve the task and timing as presented. Approved Page 39.

The following timing and task motion was approved:

Direct staff to arrange presentations on northeast bycatch reporting for the September 2014 Council meeting; direct staff to assist in preparing the Council's comments on the Electronic Technology Implementation Plan; direct staff to work with ACCSP on developing a commercial logbook electronic data entry form. Gregg Waugh will be the staff person working on this and NMFS SERO and SEFSC will appoint an individual to work on this along with Monica Smit-Brunello (NOAA GC); direct staff to continue working on the charterboat logbook technical sub-committee to complete the report for the December 2014 meeting. A status report will be presented at the September 2014 meeting.

SSC SELECTION COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Page 40: Motion to reappoint Dr. Scott Crosson, Dr. Eric Johnson, Anne Lange, Dr. Marcel Reichert and Dr. Tracey Yandle to the SSC. Motion approved Page 40.

Page 40: Motion to appoint Dr. Amy Schueller to the SSC. Motion approved Page 40.

HMS COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Page 40: Motion to approve the minutes of the 2003 HMS Committee Meeting. Motion approved Page 40.

GOLDEN CRAB COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Golden Crab Amendment 9

Page 40: Motion to select Subalternative 2C of Action 1 as the preferred subalternative. Motion approved Page 40.

Page 40: Motion to approve Golden Crab Amendment 9 for public hearings in August 2014. Motion approved Page 40.

Page 40: Motion to approve the timing and task. Motion approved Page 40.

The following timing and task motion was approved: Public hearings in August 2014; distribute to MAFMC and NEFMC for them to publicize/hold public hearings and provide comments to SAFMC; SAFMC reviews public hearing comments, modify and approve all actions in September 2014; approve for formal review in December 2014; submit for formal review in December 2014; target date for regulations to be in place in 2015.

Other Issues: Convene a meeting of the Golden Crab AP in the fall of 2014 for them to make recommendations regarding changes to the AGCFAs; bring the findings back to the Council at the December 2014 Council meeting.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2013 - 2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

Ben Hartig

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Dr. Michelle Duval

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

Robert E. Beal

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

Mel Bell

S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Anna Beckwith

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

Zack Bowen

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

Chris Conklin

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

Jack Cox

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

Dr. Roy Crabtree

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

David M. Cupka

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

LT Morgan Fowler

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

Doug Haymans

Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
doughaymans@gmail.com

John W. Jolley

4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/732-4530 (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 McCawley

Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.,
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847(f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

Charles Phillips

Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

MONICA SMITH-BRUNELLO

BONNIE BOWDITCH

PHIL STEELE

TRACY DUNN

ANDY STRELCHECK

JACK MCGOVERN

LEANN BOSARGE

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

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

Deputy Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Staff Economist

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

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary / Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting

Full Council:

Friday, June 13, 2014

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION: AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER: EMAIL ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS:

WALTER HEPPLE USCG 305-415-6868 walter.e.hepple@uscg.mil

Ken Stump TDF/RET 202-390-9520 kstump@oceanfishery.gov WA DC

Family Helmut Pen ehelmut@Rutgers.org

Leslie Dunmore LDunmore@opentrusts.org

Rusdy D. Johnson RCFES DSF 386-233-0948 rd572009@aol.com 32120-9357

GSR Brogan OCEANA gbrogan@oceana.org

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

FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 2014

80	Takade-Heumacher, ...	htakade@edf.org	23377821 min
80	N, J	julie.neer@safmc.net	23377842 min
55	oliver, steven	steven73oliver@gmail.com	112 min
53	raine, karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov	240 min
46	blough, heather	heather.blough@noaa.gov	196 min
34	Records, David	david.records@noaa.gov	214 min
34	holiman, stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov	191 min
34	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	214 min
29	DeVictor, Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	231 min
24	michie, kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov	238 min
24	Byrd, Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	222 min
24	merrifield, mike	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com	53 min
24	gerhart, susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov	110 min
24	Gore, Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	188 min
24	Eich, Anne	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov	241 min
23	Sedberry, George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov	213 min
23	Crosson, Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov	91 min
23	Bresnen, Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com	201 min
22	sandorf, scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	144 min
21	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com	212 min
21	vara, mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	184 min
20	L, I	captaindrifter@bellsouth.com	241 min
20	Pugliese, Roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net	0 min