

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **FULL COUNCIL SESSION**

**Hilton Cocoa Beach Oceanfront  
Cocoa Beach, FL**

**June 17, 2016**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

#### **Council Members:**

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair  
Robert Boyles  
Dr. Roy Crabtree  
Jessica McCawley  
Chris Conklin (via webinar)  
Doug Haymans  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Rob Beal

Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair  
Jack Cox  
Anna Beckwith  
Ben Hartig  
Chester Brewer  
Mark Brown  
Zack Bowen

#### **Council Staff:**

Gregg Waugh  
Mike Collins  
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
Kim Iverson  
Julie O'Dell  
Myra Brouwer  
Roger Pugliese

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

#### **Observers/Participants:**

Capt. Mark Gordon  
Rick DeVictor  
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith  
Iris Lowery  
Erika Burgess  
Tracy Dunn

John Sanchez  
Nik Mehta  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Jocelyn D'Ambrosio  
Dr. Andy Strelcheck  
Jeff Radonski

Additional Observers Attached

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Hilton Cocoa Beach Oceanfront, Cocoa Beach, Florida, Friday morning, June 17, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I would like to go ahead and call the council session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to order. The first item is Adoption of the Agenda. Are there any modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Are there any modifications to the minutes from our March 2016 council session? Seeing none, the minutes are approved.

I just want to make sure we recognize again our liaisons who are here, and thank you very much for being here. They are Captain Mark Gordon; John Sanchez, with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; and Bob Beal with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Unfortunately, our Mid-Atlantic Council liaison, Rob O'Reilly, had to leave a little bit early, but I just wanted to take time to recognize those around the table.

I also wanted to ask if we could just observe just a few moments of silence for a good friend of ours who passed away, unfortunately, between the last council meeting and this one, and that's Joe Graham. Joe was our transcriptionist and parliamentarian for this council and for the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission for a number of years. He was truly part of the council family, and we will miss him, and so if we could just observe a moment of silence, please.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed in memory of Joe Graham.)

DR. DUVAL: Thank you. The next item, I would love to say I have the pleasure of doing, but it's really more like the displeasure of doing, and that is bidding goodbye to another member of our council family, Jack Cox, who has served a three-year term. Jack, it's been a great experience getting to know you and to see you grow within this council process.

I know that everyone has really enjoyed working with you here, and everyone has really appreciated all of the contributions that you have made, your thoughtfulness in considering all aspects of the issues that we're challenged with these days, and we're really going to miss you. Handily for Anna and I, we all live in the same town, and so we can still continue to hassle you as the days go on, but we very much appreciate everything that you've done here at the council. If you will come forward, we have a little gift for you.

This says: Proudly presented by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to Jack Cox for his distinguished service as a council member and outstanding contributions in the conservation and management of our nation's marine fisheries resources. Congratulations.

MR. COX: Thank you so much. I've got to say that it's truly been an honor to serve on this council with you folks, and I think it's amazing what we've got done in three years, and thank you very much. I've enjoyed meeting each and every one of you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Jack, and we know that you will not be far from the process as you move forward in your other endeavors, and so thank you. Chester.

MR. BREWER: Given some of the confusion that we've seen in our discussions and different opinions as to Roberts Rules of Order, would it be in order to suggest that somebody volunteer or

that somehow or another that we have a parliamentarian? I loved him, and he was always right, but we've had discussions back and forth about what a particular motion means and whether it can be made at a particular time or does it require a second or not require a second, and so a suggestion that somebody sit down and actually read Roberts Rules of Order and be prepared to give us information on that.

DR. DUVAL: One of the things that Gregg just whispered in my ear is that he has actually been working with a consultant who works with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission to do parliamentary procedure workshops. I know ASMFC species management boards seem to have a special talent for getting themselves wrapped around the axle with multiple motions and substitute motions, and I think it's really more folks just kind of want to show off their parliamentary skills than anything, but I mean that's a great suggestion, Chester. Gregg, do you have a sense of when we might be able to schedule something like that?

MR. WAUGH: We're shooting for either the September or the December council meeting.

DR. DUVAL: But I do think it's a good suggestion that we perhaps have a go-to person on staff that we could direct those inquires to. That's a great suggestion.

MR. WAUGH: We learned in our SOPPs and handbook, and we don't have -- Actually, the Vice Chair was identified as the parliamentarian, but that's something that you all need to discuss and figure out who you want to be responsible for that.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to suggest that at council training that one of the sessions is on Roberts Rules. It's not just on Roberts Rules, but it's on conducting meetings. It's an excellent handout they give us, but I was going to -- Chester beat me to the punch. I was waiting for Other Business, but I thought Vice Chair was -- Not just because Charlie was there, but I thought was a good role for the Vice Chair each time coming up, is they have to review Roberts Rules and be ready with a copy of whatever the handout is to read off of it, but I like the idea of us having a parliamentarian.

MR. BREWER: Charlie, I've still got the handout book with the flash cards.

MR. PHILLIPS: You are most kind. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: All right. Great suggestions, and I'm glad, Gregg, that you're looking into that. We will move forward with our usual order of business. The first thing we're going to go through is the Snapper Grouper Committee Report. Just so folks know, all the committee reports are in the committee reports folder under the briefing book materials link on the council meeting page. If you have difficulty accessing those, just hit the refresh button and it should hopefully load up after a few minutes, and all the committee reports are there, and so we're going to go ahead and start with the Snapper Grouper.

The Snapper Grouper Committee met June 14 and 15, 2016, and received updates from the Regional Office staff on the status of commercial and recreational landings for snapper grouper species. We also requested that the recreational landings be provided twice per year, at the June and December meetings, and also requested that blueline tilefish be added to the list of species for

which updates are provided. Then we received our usual review on the status of snapper grouper amendments under review and recently implemented.

We received a presentation on the Southeast Reef Fish Survey update for 2015 from Dr. Joey Ballenger, and he made a number of points. There is concern about the drop in catch per unit effort of black sea bass, a red snapper drop in CPUE in 2010, but an increase thereafter. There were some questions from the committee with regard to video data being included into the CPUE analyses, and the committee indicated they are interested in putting more effort into updating our indices of abundance.

We then received two presentations from the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation pertaining to species under snapper grouper management. We then received the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel Report from Kenny Fex, Chair of the Snapper Grouper Panel, who provided us with the committee's recommendations for items under consideration.

We then received a report from Scientific and Statistical Committee Chair Dr. Marcel Reichert. Marcel gave us a report regarding the Socioeconomic Panel deliberations as well as terms of reference for upcoming stock assessments and some recommendations on data reporting. The SSC reviewed the research/operational track assessments. They also, most importantly, reviewed the golden tilefish assessment update as well as the red snapper benchmark assessment through SEDAR 41 for red snapper and gray triggerfish.

The red snapper 2016 season numbers were reviewed by Dr. Michael Larkin of the NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office. We did note that there was a miscoding error in the data for North Carolina during 2015. There were questions about the discard mortality estimate from the landings for 2015, and it was explained that, since the ABCs came from the previous stock assessment, it's was the previous assessment's discard mortalities that were being applied.

We then received the presentation on the review of SEDAR 41 for red snapper and gray triggerfish from Dr. Luiz Barbieri. Dr. Barbieri was the Chair of the Review Committee for SEDAR 41. Some items of interest were a new approach to estimating natural mortality that was used in this assessment, some of the biological characteristics of red snapper, questions and concerns about data from the early part of the time series, the sensitivity runs that were conducted, uncertainties in the post-moratorium data, different estimates of stock productivity that have been produced in the last three benchmark assessments, and questions regarding adequate rebuilding progress being made for red snapper. Another thing we discussed was using a specifications process similar to what the Mid-Atlantic Council used, and so we'll be looking into that.

We did discuss a letter received by thirteen members of Congress expressing concerns about the red snapper assessment, which Dr. Barbieri then addressed for us. There some questions about recruitment patterns that Dr. Reichert answered. We discussed the makeup of our Scientific and Statistical Committee with regard to NOAA participants versus non-NOAA participants, and then we had an update on the assessment for gray triggerfish, which was not accepted as best scientific information available or adequate for management, and so, right now, we are using the existing ORCS approach to establish an ABC.

After all of those presentations, our items of business started with Amendment 37, which was hogfish. The committee reviewed the actions and alternatives and made the following motions.

**The first motion is to approve the suggested edit to the Preferred Alternative 2 under Action 6. 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 Sub-Alternative 2a as an additional preferred under Action 11. 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 Preferred Alternative 2 under Action 12. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

The next item of business was Amendment 41, mutton snapper. The committee reviewed the actions and alternatives and made the following motions. **The first motion was to approve the suggested editorial changes to the titles of Actions 1 through 7 in Amendment 41. 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 Sub-Alternative 2a under Action 5 as a preferred. 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 4, Sub-Alternative 4b, under Action 6 as preferred. 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 3, Sub-Alternative 3b as preferred under Action 7. 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 selection Alternative 2, Sub-Alternative 2a under Action 7 as a preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. There was a substitute motion to select Sub-Alternative 2c as a preferred. The substitute motion failed, and so we were back to the main motion. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

**The next motion was to select Alternative 3 as a preferred under Action 8. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

**The next motion was to move the minimum size limit action to before the current Action 5, the spawning season action. 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 Amendment 41 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

The next item of discussion was Amendment 43 for red snapper, and we reviewed a synopsis of red snapper data, including landings and discards, and then, subsequently, Florida Council Member Ben Hartig delivered a presentation on a possible new approach to manage red snapper, and the committee made the following motions.

**The first was to request the SSC review additional runs at Fmax and F20 percent SPR at the October 2016 meeting and provide advice regarding risk of these as reference points for overfishing. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

**The next motion was request the SSC evaluate the current red snapper MRIP estimates to determine if they are reliable and adequate for management, including quota monitoring and discard information. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?**  
Robert.

MR. BOYLES: Madam Chair, thank you, and just a question. Just anticipating what that report back to the council will say, what if the report comes back and says they are not reliable and inadequate? Where does that leave us?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would hope that they would make a recommendation about where that leaves us, a recommendation about what to do moving forward about those estimates and how they're going to be used for management. I would hope, instead of just saying that no, they can't that they would also have a recommendation for a path forward.

DR. DUVAL: I'm sure that our SSC liaison will ensure that that question is answered and we receive some advice in that regard, but thank you, Robert, for bringing that up.

DR. CRABTREE: Do we know the dates of this meeting? Has it been scheduled yet?

DR. DUVAL: It has been. I know it had to be moved up, and so it's the week of October 10. Is it October 18 to 20? Wasn't there an email going around about moving that earlier?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We were exploring that, due to some difficulties in finding a space, but I think we found a space that originally scheduled week, because there were a lot of issues with trying to move it, between people's other schedules and the holiday.

DR. DUVAL: Great. Thanks, John. It's October 18 through 20. Any other discussion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

Next, we had direction to staff to take the suite of options and structure into a scoping document to include bag limits, size limits, trip limits, gear-related actions, seasonal area closures, surgical area closures (aka hot spots), and a snapper grouper stamp, and we have some language here of does the committee want to include any other items covered in the presentation, such as data collection, and so that was where there were several options with regard to electronic reporting and perhaps having a subset of recreational anglers who might get a snapper grouper stamp be reporting via an app.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Does stamp also include tag? That's not one of the options that's going to be explored here?

DR. DUVAL: If we put it in there, it could be explored. I think the question is, in that direction to staff, do we want to include those other data collection items and then do you want to make sure that that includes exploration -- Are you thinking of a harvest tag system, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am just confused, because I didn't know if we were going to look at a tag per red snapper or this is just something like the Gulf Reef Fish Survey, where someone has to sign up to say that they are intending to fish for red snapper or reef fish or whatever. To me, it's different.

DR. DUVAL: I mean it's pretty specific in here what's in the stamp. It would be required for any private angler to fish for or possess species in the snapper grouper complex harvested in or from state waters, and so it's like the Gulf reef fish stamp. The question is do we want to make sure that, included in this list of items, were the other data collection items that were in the suite of options that we reviewed, such as electronic logbook and things of that nature? I would assume that we would want to add any of those data collection items that were in the list.

MR. BREWER: Would it be appropriate to include the efficacy of descending devices as one item in here? I mean we're talking about the stamps, and so I have always thought that, in conjunction with those stamps, that you would be pretty well required to utilize a descending device, and then electronic reporting or methods of electronic reporting or apps for electronic reporting might also be appropriate. That's just a thought.

DR. DUVAL: The descending devices were definitely included in the gear-related actions, and so I think yes, include data collection items that were in the briefing paper that we reviewed. The next item was a visioning blueprint amendment for fisheries seasonality and retention. Staff reviewed the outcome of discussions from our March meeting, as well as recommendations from the advisory panel.

The committee provided the following guidance, to develop two amendments to the Snapper Grouper FMP, one to address commercial management measures and one to address recreational management measures. There is a list of items that would be included in each, respectively. First, for the commercial fishery, a variety of split seasons for deepwater and shallow-water, trip limits and step-downs, a variety of ways to limit commercial trips to a certain period, and reevaluation of a shallow-water grouper closure. In the recreational fishery, a recreational stamp, reconsideration of the aggregate bag limits, evaluation of the shallow-water grouper closure, a recreational season, and then a seasonal area depth closure.

Staff will advise the committee on which items can be addressed via the existing framework procedure and which would necessitate a plan amendment. We then provided some input on differentiating these amendments from our, quote, unquote, regular amendments, that they would include some reference to the vision blueprint.

MS. BROUWER: I was just wondering whether the committee still wanted to address the fishing year change for the golden tilefish hook and line sector and if that item might not be included in the commercial amendment.

DR. DUVAL: I think there are probably a couple of different ways we could do that. I mean we might as well throw it in there for consideration, if we're looking at shifting fishing year start dates for any other species, in conjunction with say split seasons.

MR. COX: Madam Chair, during public comment this week, and I've had a few phone calls, I've had some fishermen asking, in the commercial fishery -- Charlie, I'm sorry that I haven't had a chance to talk to you about this, but they asked us to evaluate looking at a 500-pound trip limit on vermilion, on the second season, starting like July 1, just to see if we could get more than two-and-a-half months out of that vermilion fishery and see what it would look like. I was wondering if that would be something we can include here.

DR. DUVAL: Sure. I mean examination of trip limits and step-downs is one of the bullet items, and so maybe just a specific note that folks are interested in vermilion, in particular.

MR. COX: I mean, last year, it closed September 22. It lasted about two-and-a-half months. It may be worth looking at.

DR. DUVAL: Great. Anything else on that, Myra? Okay. The next item of business was limited entry for the for-hire sector. The committee received a briefing from council staff on the number of for-hire permits active in the region, and we had a discussion centered on whether compliance for upcoming reporting amendments would be enhanced if a limited entry system was established for the for-hire sector, and so we made the following motions.

**The first motion was to establish a June 15 control date for the three open access charter vessel/headboat permits.** We then had a substitute motion to establish an April 30, 2016 control date for the three open access charter vessel/headboat permits. That substitute motion failed, and so I offer the main motion on behalf of the committee. Is there any discussion?

DR. CRABTREE: I am told by our Permits Office that we have seen a 9 percent uptick in South Atlantic for-hire permits this year relative to last year, and so there does seem to be some people getting permits, and that may all be relative to this discussion.

MR. BOWEN: I tried to allude to that as well, Dr. Crabtree, but I just didn't have the percentages. I can watch Georgia's permits, just because there is -- I think we started with thirty-two, and, as of Wednesday, it had risen to forty-seven. It's the highest it's been in the history that I can look back and see. With that, in lieu of the comments that we had at the public comment, in lieu of the emails that have received since Wednesday, when the discussion took place, I would like to make a motion, if that's okay, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: We have a motion on the floor to establish a June 15, 2016 control date for the three open access charter vessel/headboat permits. Are you offering a substitute to that motion?

MR. BOWEN: No, ma'am. It's a completely different motion, and I'm sorry.

DR. DUVAL: I would advise that we dispense with the motion on the table and then you may offer another motion.



MR. BOWEN: Okay. If Dr. Crabtree would offer up a motion, I would probably be willing to listen to it and to support it.

DR. DUVAL: Any more discussion on this motion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

MR. BOWEN: **As I spoke just a minute ago, in lieu of the comments that we've reviewed, the emails I've received, the updated information that Dr. Crabtree just notified us about the uptick in permits, I would like to make a motion to direct staff to develop a limited entry amendment for the three for-hire permits.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Zack. Is there a second? Seconded by Jack. The motion is to direct staff to begin development of a limited entry amendment for the three for-hire permits. Is there discussion?

MR. COX: Again, this is just to go out to scoping, is that correct, what we're doing here?

DR. DUVAL: The first phase in development of an amendment is usually an options paper that then would come back to the council at the next meeting and move forward from there.

MS. BECKWITH: Zack, I would actually support this motion if you changed it to say that the development of this amendment would start when the implementation of the logbook happened.

MR. BOWEN: No, I refuse to say that. My rationale for refusing to say that is, as we discussed yesterday, the ELB amendment is liable to take two years before that gets finalized, and we need this now. Actually, we needed this ten years ago when we were in the same position with the red snapper assessment. We need it now. I will not amend my motion to say that.

MR. BREWER: I don't know what public comment Zack was listening to, but I heard the Past President of the Florida Guides Association, I heard the present President of the Florida Guides Association, and if you take a look at the breakdown that we were provided with regard to the distribution of guides, the State of Florida has over twice as many permitted guides as all the other three states combined. You also had public comment in written form from the current President of the National Association of Charter Boat Operators. That's the largest organization of its type in the United States. All of them were vehemently opposed to a limited-entry program.

At the very least, you're talking about something here that is going to be controversial, and I don't know if we really want to spend staff's time, which is very limited at this point, on getting into this. I think it's so controversial, so very controversial, and I really don't want to see us go down that road.

MR. BOWEN: Madam Chair, to his point, since my name was called?

DR. DUVAL: Certainly, Zack, and then Dr. Crabtree.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you. Chester, I was listening to the same ones you were listening to. To be specific, I listened to Robert Johnson, who is a past chair of our advisory panel, who is a resident and permit holder of Florida. I was listening to Ira Lax, who is our current Chairman of the King

and Spanish Mackerel Advisory, that is a federally-permitted holder in the State of Florida, and you're right that Florida does have probably the most permits, but they also have 97 percent of the historical catch for red snapper. We need to get a handle on this. Thank you.

DR. CRABTREE: Zack got a little of that. I mean I heard the comment too, and I've known Pat Kelly for thirty years, I bet, and a lot of those Florida Guides Association guys, but they're inshore guides, largely snook and inshore things, but the real offshore charter boat guys that I heard get up there, like Robert and Ira, were very supportive of it. To the timing issue that Anna brought up, in all likelihood, it will take us two years to get this done, because we're going to have to go through a whole plan amendment and then there's going to have to be an application process, and we'll have to issue the limited access permits.

I would be surprised if we actually had a -- The other thing that would be part of this, of course, is recall there's a limited entry program, but the other option is a moratorium. When we did this in the Gulf, we put a moratorium on issuing new permits for some period of time, and we've done that in a number of limited entry cases. In all likelihood, we wouldn't have any limited entry in place for at least two years, I would guess.

MR. HARTIG: I don't know if this makes any difference at all, but I've been thinking on how we go in the future and do this. I have been thinking to take the money out of the equation. Take it all out. You will have a limited access permit system. When someone gets out of the charter boat fishery, that permit will go back into a common pool, and whoever wants -- Whoever is asking to get into that permit pool, by lottery or however it's decided, you could have that kind of a situation set up. I think taking the money out of it makes a big difference in moving forward with this, and I think it's critical that that's one of the things that we include going forward.

DR. DUVAL: These all sound, to me, like things that would be included in an options paper that would come back to the committee for discussion and decision on whether or not to move forward with anything.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roy, when you talk about a moratorium, say for two years, could they transfer permits from one person to another or it was just that was that?

DR. CRABTREE: That would be up to you. I wouldn't support a moratorium for just two years, because we would have to start working on it the minute it went into place, but I think, when we did this in the Gulf, and we would have to check and see, but it may have been five years or ten years. When we did the moratorium on shrimp permits in the Gulf, it started out as a moratorium. We're in the process of extending it now, and so we've oftentimes done a moratorium and then come back and see, and maybe you could argue in this case, since red snapper is driving a lot of this, to put a moratorium on permits for five years or something, ten years, and then see where we stand with red snapper down the road when it comes up.

It would be up to you whether to make the permits transferable. In every one of these programs I've seen, you will see some permits go by the wayside from people who aren't really using them and don't renew them, and, of course, if you make the permits non-transferable, you're going to create -- You're going to prohibit new entrants from coming in, and so we have not -- I can't think of any limited access permits we have that aren't transferable.

DR. DUVAL: Jack, and then we're going to wrap this up and take a vote.

MR. COX: I have owned these permits in the South Atlantic for thirty-five years, and I'm going to tell you, from my past experience, what makes me lean in this direction is that I have seen compliance and data collection gets a lot better when people know that they've got something they've got to take care of, because, if they lose it, they may not get another one, and so that's just where my mind goes as we have this discussion.

DR. PONWITH: Just to this point, this is a management question, but it has strong science implications, and I can't disagree with the last comment. I think that's really an important tool for that purpose.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. Is everyone ready to vote on this motion? **Could I please see a show of hands of those in favor of the motion? I see six in favor. Those opposed, like sign. Five opposed. Abstentions. The motion carries six to five.**

Next, we come to our timing and tasks motion, which is pretty lengthy. I have had some discussions with John Carmichael and staff about some of the SSC requests, and so just bear with this. **The draft motion is to approve the following tasks and timing: prepare Amendment 41 for public hearings in August 2016; request that the SEFSC provide further explanation for the differences in the outcomes of SEDAR 24 and SEDAR 41 for red snapper; investigate what methods have been or are being used in the Mid-Atlantic to assess the status of golden tilefish; council request that the SSC further review the golden tilefish update assessment and address the following: 1)review productivity estimates of previous tilefish assessments, identify uncertainties that impact productivity estimates and comment on how well overall stock productivity is determined at this point in time, and identify research or data needs that could improve estimates of productivity for future estimates; 2)review application of the P\* technique to the tilefish update, provide an explanation for the apparently unusually large difference in yield between the OFL at P\* equals 0.5 and the ABC at P\* equals 0.3, compare the buffer estimated for tilefish with those for other assessments with similar P\* values, identify which assessment uncertainties are driving the P\* and analysis and the high buffer, consider whether the P\* approach is appropriate for this assessment and whether basing ABC on yield at 75 percent FMSY and OFL on yield at FMSY is a viable alternative; 3)review the performance, accuracy, and reliability of tilefish assessment projections from past assessments, and the council is concerned with the impact of the high age of fishery selectivity combined with the lack of fishery-independent information for younger fish on stock projections, and identify research or data needs that could improve future projections; 4)comment on the biological risk and the social and economic impacts of a phased-in approach to implementing the reduced catch levels for tilefish, such that the ABC is set equal to OFL in year one and then ABC is specified through the standard application of the control rule in later years and also consider providing a constant ABC for later years, specified in three-year blocks. Finally, request that the SSC consider revising the ABC control rule by removing stock status from the factors contributing to the uncertainty adjustment. This is requested because the agency has final authority to determine stock status and because the ABC control rule is intended to address assessment uncertainty, whereas stock status is an assessment outcome rather than a source of uncertainty. Therefore, status is more appropriately considered by the council in establishing its risk tolerance. Request that the SSC discuss and evaluate the new approach used to estimate natural mortality in SEDAR**

**41. You see a couple others there. Prepare scoping documents for visioning amendments.** I think we probably will need to run through Executive Finance first, before anything additional. If someone is willing to make a motion to adopt the timing and tasks as indicated.

MR. HAYMANS: **Madam Chair, I move that we adopt the timing and tasks as presented.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug. Is there a second? It's seconded by Charlie. Is there any other discussion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none that motion stands approved.** That concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee Report, fifteen minutes early. I am going to turn things over to Mr. Hartig to go through the Mackerel Committee Report.

MR. WAUGH: While we're waiting, remember during Laurilee Thompson's comments during the public comment session, she attributed a comment made to a senior staff, council staff, person. We have researched that and spoke with Laurilee, and she was misremembering who made that comment and where it was made, and so that was not a comment made by council staff at that visioning workshop. I spoke with her afterwards about it, and it was very amicable, and so there's no hard feelings in either direction there.

MR. HARTIG: All right. We are ready to go. The committee met yesterday afternoon. We adopted the agenda and approved the minutes and council staff provided an update on actions by states and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission in regard to cobia management in recent months. Next, council staff reviewed public input received during the public Q&A meeting in May 2016 and via email and the online comment form, and those comments were considerable.

The next action we went into, we jumped right into cobia, Framework Amendment 4, and the committee voted on the following motions and recommendations to the council. **The first motion I bring before you is to approve the purpose and need.** On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion was to add Action 1-1 to the public hearing document. 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 add Action 1-2 to the public hearing document. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion was, under Action 1-1, select Option 2a as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion was, in Action 1-1, to select Option 3c as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion was, in Action 1-2, to select Option 2c as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection?**

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chair that was Motion 6? Is that correct? Was that Motion 6?

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

MR. HAYMANS: It says 2c, but yet the wording underneath is 2b. It is for thirty-six inches and not for thirty-five inches, and is that correct?

MR. HARTIG: I've got my staff going back and looking to make sure that's correct.

MR. HAYMANS: I marked thirty-six inches in my book.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: These are the mackerel motions from yesterday. It was 2c. Thanks for catching that, Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: You're welcome.

MR. HARTIG: So we're good? What motion are we on, Kari?

DR. DUVAL: We're still in the middle of Motion 6. It hasn't been -- It's still under discussion, I guess.

MR. HARTIG: You want to redo 6?

DR. DUVAL: I don't think we need to redo it. That was just an error in the copying, and so it's just whether or not there's any objection to it.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. Did I get all the way through approving that one? That's what I was wondering. On behalf of the committee I so move, and is that where I left off?

DR. DUVAL: You did move the motion on behalf of the committee, and you asked for discussion, and Mr. Haymans pointed out the error in the wording that did not reflect the actual option that the committee chose, and so now I think we just need to determine if there's any objection to the motion that you offered.

MR. HARTIG: I'm just going to go back to the beginning with 6.

DR. DUVAL: I think you can just ask if there's any objection to the motion. You've already offered it and we had some discussion. That's all we need.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. **Motion 6, is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Now I'm on track. **The next motion was add an alternative in Action 2 for April 1 through March 31. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion was to add Action 2 with recreational fishing year. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion is in Action 2 to select Alternative 2 as the preferred. 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 add Action 3 to the public hearing document. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion is, in Action 3, to select Alternative 2, Sub-Alternative 2b, as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion was add an alternative to Action 3 that reflects the recreational AM for Atlantic king mackerel. 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 add Action 4 with Alternatives 1 through 4. 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 Framework Amendment 4 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next item of business was Framework Amendment 5, revise permit restrictions. We had a number of discussions on that and several motions came out of the committee to bring to the council. **The first motion out of Framework Amendment 5 was add South Atlantic to Framework Amendment 5. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Go ahead, Doug, for discussion.

MR. HAYMANS: Sorry, Mr. Chair, and I was trying to get your attention. Back to Motion 13, if I could, for just a second.

MR. HARTIG: Sure.

MR. HAYMANS: Did we add an alternative, and, if so, it's not reflected in the report.

Dr. MACLAUHLIN: Alternative 4 was the one that Jack added, and then the committee approved the action with all four, and so, underneath there, where it says "Alternative 4", that's the one that Jack had added.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Kari.

MR. HARTIG: That was the way I remember we did it. Go ahead.

MS. LOWERY: Thank you. I just wanted to bring up -- There was a suggestion yesterday to add an alternative as far as the -- I believe it was the fishing year for cobia, and bringing up this idea of having kind of rolling open seasons, and I indicated that I would look into that, and so I don't

know if that's something that the council is still interested in or not. I just wanted to make sure that that didn't go by the wayside unintentionally.

DR. DUVAL: That was a concept brought forth by our Mid-Atlantic Council liaison, Rob O'Reilly, and looking at -- It was rolling season dates and also having per-state with some number of fishing days that each state would be allowed to fish, and I think if there's a way to include that in the scoping document -- It might not necessarily be something that we find we are able to do easily, but I think Mr. O'Reilly was trying to get to a more equitable approach that would allow for access throughout the range of the resource, and so, Iris, if you have more information, I would like to hear a little bit more.

MS. LOWERY: Unfortunately, I can't provide a definitive answer right now, since this did come up pretty late yesterday, but it does seem like there could be potential problems with both including this in a framework if this did -- As Roy indicated yesterday, this could, depending on how it's set up, amount to an allocation, which isn't included in your framework provisions for CMP, and it would also potentially present some National Standard 4 considerations.

Since I'm only providing preliminary guidance at this point, one possible path forward could be to include it in the document, but maybe provide staff with the ability to edit the document if GC determines that that's not a viable option, in consultation with your Executive Director and Madam Chairman.

DR. DUVAL: First of all, I apologize for referring to it as a scoping document, because it's actually public hearing. Gregg corrected me, but I think if we could do that, give staff that latitude to work with the Regional Office staff and with NOAA GC, and if we find that this approach would, like you said, run into National Standard 4 issues or be seen as an allocation issue and therefore be outside of our framework, we can remove it and I think just explain to folks, but, for the sake of equity, if we can consider it, I think it would be nice to include language in there.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I had that as direction to staff in the timing and tasks motion, to bring back like an options paper or something considering all different parts and pieces of how that would work. As far as if you wanted it in this document right now, the schedule is to take final action in September, and so we would need complete analysis. If you wanted to do that, we would really need the actions and alternatives that you wanted, so we could get the analysis going.

DR. DUVAL: Then maybe we could include at least some language in the public hearing document that indicates that we're exploring this type of approach. Would that be okay? Are folks okay with that? Doug looks like his face is a little hesitant.

MR. HAYMANS: I keep coming back to the allocation. First of all, just to make sure that I didn't go to sleep at the wheel, this is the staggered opening dates as you move up the coast. I can't see how that's an allocation issue. I mean, if anything, it allows for a fair and equitable share of the catch by all the states. What I didn't like, when we talked about it yesterday, was a sixty-day season, but, anyway, I am just putting that out there. I don't see how that's an allocation issue to stagger the opening.

MR. BOYLES: I think one of the things we talked about at ASMFC, and let me put that hat on for a moment, is 82 percent of the catch comes from state waters. I think, as a result, this does

really scream for heavy involvement by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. One of the things I was going to ask, and I didn't, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize, just in the interest of time, but was this is a little bit of uncharted waters for those of us in the South Atlantic. We do joint management on Spanish mackerel, but I think that's it, in terms of our shared management.

As ASMFC moves through its process, I think it's important that we have as much potential flexibility on the table as we explore these options, in terms of cross-walking state management and potentially shared management, joint management, or complementary management, and so I understand the questions and I understand the concerns about National Standards, but I think, at this point, I think we need to have as much flexibility as we can as we try to crack this nut. Thank you.

MR. WAUGH: Following up on what Robert said, we have asked ASMFC to work closely with us. I think, when we get to the timing and task, it might be a good idea to formally direct staff to send the public hearing document to ASMFC for their review and consideration at their August meeting and ask them to provide us some formal comments and guidance back, so that you can address that at the September meeting.

DR. CRABTREE: While it might be a really good idea to look at staggering dates and all those kinds of things, I agree with Kari that it's problematic, in terms of the timeline we're on, to do something quickly for next year. If we weren't under the timeline pressure, then we could do a plan amendment, and the whole issue as to whether it's an allocation or not an allocation would not be an issue, and we could do it the way we wanted to do it, but I think it's going to be hard, under any circumstance, to work all that out and bring it in September and be ready to vote it up on final action.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with Roy. I guess I just don't want to lose the idea and have the public think that we're ignoring possible mechanisms that would allow for equitable access, and so if there is just a little bit of discussion in the public hearing document that we're looking into this and wanting to make sure that we explore it as mindfully as possible, that would be great. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Any other discussion? Kari, I was on 14, I believe?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I think it's 15.

MR. HARTIG: 15? Okay. Had I already read it?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I don't remember.

MR. HARTIG: All right. **The next motion was add South Atlantic to Framework Amendment 5. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion was to accept the draft purpose and need.** On this, we have another draft purpose and need that is just hot off the presses from the Gulf, I believe, or the IPT. I will let Kari explain it.



DR. MACLAUHLIN: Because of the briefing book deadlines for our meeting and the Gulf meeting, the purpose and need -- There was an updated purpose and need with input from GC that went into the Gulf briefing book, and so we are pulling that one and then adding the language to add the South Atlantic to it. I would like for the council to review and approve this lower one, the one to align with the most recent Gulf version.

The purpose of this action is to eliminate permit restrictions unique to commercial king and Spanish mackerel permit holders in the Gulf, South Atlantic, and Mid-Atlantic regions. The need for this proposed action is to standardize vessel permit restrictions applicable after a commercial quota closure, remove restrictions on recreational fishing, and reduce the potential for regulatory discards in the king and Spanish mackerel component of the CMP fishery.

MR. HARTIG: I would need someone to make that motion.

MR. BOYLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. **I make that motion, that we accept that purpose and need as presented by staff.**

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Robert. It's seconded by Doug. Is there further discussion? **Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The next motion we had was to add Action 1 and alternatives. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

That brings us to the timing and tasks, I believe, and there are several things here, and I think we've added that last one that was suggested. The ones I have are explore adding an alternative that would designate a certain number of fishing days per state for recreational harvest of Atlantic cobia; prepare Framework Amendment 4 for public hearings; prepare Framework Amendment 5 for the Gulf Council meeting. Then that last one was to include language in the Framework 4 public hearing document that the council is exploring state seasons for cobia management. Then 5 would be to send public hearing documents to the ASMFC for their August meeting. Would someone like to make that motion?

DR. DUVAL: **I move that we adopt the timing and tasks motion as indicated.**

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Michelle. It's seconded by Doug. Is there any discussion? Go ahead, Iris.

MS. LOWERY: My only concern here is that I wonder if saying "state seasons" might be somewhat confusing to the public, in light of the fact that this really would just be designating days rather than establishing any sort of season in state waters.

MR. BOYLES: I wonder if that item might be perhaps to include language in the Framework 4 public hearing document that the council is exploring joint complementary and exclusive management with the states through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. I'm getting a nod from Gregg. Is that maybe the appropriate language?

DR. DUVAL: But we're already doing that. I mean we sent a letter to ASMFC after the last meeting, and that was in the timing and tasks motion from our March council meeting, and so I think the council -- Perhaps the council is exploring -- Would it be rolling openings by state?

MR. HAYMANS: I was thinking of latitudinal season openings or something like that, rather than using the word "state", because that may not fall state-by-state. It may fall on the line of latitude.

DR. DUVAL: I like it, latitudinal season openings. I like it.

MR. WAUGH: To the point Robert made, I think we should include, somewhere in the discussion, and maybe Kari already plans to do it, but explaining that we have requested ASMFC to look at different ways of managing, and just have something in there so that the public is aware of that.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. What do we need to do now? Have we changed anything substantially?

DR. DUVAL: I don't think so. I think Gregg's point is just that, in the public hearing document, just making sure, in the spirit of completeness, that we are including the fact that we have requested that the ASMFC explore complementary joint or sole management.

MR. HARTIG: All right, and so you're good on that motion, the timing and tasks motion? All right. Is there discussion on the timing and tasks motion, any more discussion on the timing and tasks motion? **Is there any objection to approving that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Madam Chairman that does conclude my Mackerel Report, and thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Chairman Hartig. The next report is the Spiny Lobster Committee Report and Chairman McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The committee adopted the agenda and approved the December 2015 meeting minutes. Council staff provided a review of landings for spiny lobster for recent years, including the preliminary landings for the 2015/2016 fishing year. We then looked at the Review Panel and Advisory Panel recommendations. In the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 fishing years, the landings for spiny lobster have exceeded the annual catch target, which required that the Spiny Lobster Review Panel to convene. In March of 2016, the review panel convened to discuss landings and if corrective action was necessary. Staff reviewed the recommendations from that panel.

Also, the Gulf and South Atlantic Spiny Lobster Advisory Panels met jointly on April 25, 2016, and we received an AP report and recommendations from Bruce Irwin, the Chair of the South Atlantic Spiny Lobster AP. The Gulf Spiny Lobster SSC met in June 2016 and concurred with the Review Panel and AP recommendation to calculate the ACL and OFL based on landings from the 1991/1992 through the 2014/2015 year.

On June 8, NMFS notified the councils that landings for 2015/2016 year also exceeded the ACT and also recommended that the council follow the recommendation to use landings from the 1991/1992 through the 2014/2015 year to set the ABC for spiny lobster. The committee discussed these reports and agreed with the recommendations that the ACL should be reconsidered based on the fact that the original ACL was based on a low period. The committee also discussed having an evaluation tool to indicate that reconsideration of quota may be necessary.

Then the committee received a report from Tom Matthews on a presentation of the results of a study that was conducted by FWC on compliance of closed areas, and we then had a discussion on trap regulations outside of Florida. This was based on a letter from April of 2016 that NMFS had issued for gear-specific markings for recreational harvest of spiny lobster with traps to an individual who had made a request to conduct this activity off of North Carolina. The committee expressed concern about the use of traps for recreational harvest, since they are not currently an allowable gear for recreational harvest off of Florida, but not explicitly prohibited outside of the state.

The Committee voted on the following motions as recommendations to the Council. **The first motion is direct staff to work on an amendment to revise the ACL, including an option based on the review panel recommendation, which was, as I mentioned, the 1991/1992 through 2015/2016 fishing years. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion of this motion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

**The second motion that the committee made was to include the AP recommendation for the low-landing monitoring measure in the amendment.** On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

**The committee made a third motion to include an action to prohibit recreational traps in South Atlantic EEZ. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

There were some items for direction to staff: to have SSC review the motions made by the committee, include range of alternatives with prohibition and restrictions, include recreational traps on a future AP agenda, and follow up with the North Carolina fisherman using traps. There is a timing and tasks motion. Would someone like to make this?

**MR. HARTIG: I would make the timing and tasks motion. It would be move to direct staff to have the SSC review the motions made by the committee at their October meeting, work with Gulf Council staff to prepare an options paper for Spiny Lobster Amendment 13, and coordinate with FWC for a presentation on spiny lobster regulations in Florida at the next committee meeting.**

MR. BREWER: Second, Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We have a motion and a second by Chester. It's under discussion. **Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none that motion stands approved.** Madam Chairman that concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Jessica. The next report is the Joint Dolphin Wahoo/Snapper Grouper Committee Report, Chairman Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. The Joint Dolphin Wahoo and Snapper Grouper Committee met June 14, 2016, and received updates on the status of the commercial and recreational landings for dolphin and wahoo species. The joint committee received an update by Amber von Harten on the council's new online comment system and how to access submitted comments.

The committee discussed potential actions that could be in Joint Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10/Snapper Grouper Amendment 44 and decided on a list of items for consideration in a future dolphin wahoo amendment. The committee voted on the following motions as recommendations to the council.

**Motion 1 is a list of items to take out to scoping, which included a common pool allocation, reserve category, two different sorts of temporary allocation shifts, and a combined ACL. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We also had a motion to take out for scoping a permanent allocation shift for dolphin. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Our third motion was to take out to scoping a permanent allocation shift for yellowtail snapper. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Our fourth motion was to take out for scoping an allocation by gear type for the commercial sector in the dolphin fishery. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We also added some direction to staff to keep the potential actions for scoping in a general format, and then we compiled a master list of items to be considered in a future dolphin wahoo amendment. **We have a draft timing and tasks motion to direct staff to develop a scoping document, send Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10/Snapper Grouper Amendment 44 out for scoping in August of 2016 via webinar, and bring scoping comments back to the council for consideration at the September 2016 Council meeting.** Do I have a volunteer to make that motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Charlie. Do I have a second? Second by Doug. Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.** That concludes my report, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Anna.

MR. COX: Anna, I was wondering, in this report, should we put the control date that we have set for the dolphin wahoo limited entry in?

DR. CHEUVRONT: That wasn't done in this committee.

MR. COX: Yes, but I was just wondering if it should be in the report though, that the date should be in there, so if people look at the report that are not familiar with it.

DR. DUVAL: So you're talking about the motion that was made during the Snapper Grouper Committee for establishing a control date of June 15?

MR. COX: Yes, and my reasoning behind this is because some of the longline guys have asked me to send the report to them, and it would just help them know where we are on that, if that would be possible.

MR. PHILLIPS: I guess you could always put an asterisk and a note at the bottom that some things changed in Snapper Grouper, to refer them that way. That doesn't really change the report.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm willing to add a note in there, just saying that this was changed during the Snapper Grouper Committee, and put it as part of the report, if that's the general consensus that it's okay to do that.

DR. DUVAL: The next committee report is Protected Resources. I will turn it over to Chairman Laney.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Protected Resources Committee was presented updates from the National Marine Fisheries Service Protected Resources Division by Jennifer Lee regarding green sea turtle distinct population segments, Atlantic sturgeon critical habitat, Snapper Grouper FMP Biological Opinion, turtle excluder device requirement for the skimmer trawl fishery, and Nassau grouper, and from the United State Fish and Wildlife Service regarding red knot critical habitat and the Atlantic sturgeon stock assessment being conducted by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. The details for each of those updates is provided in the report, Madam Chairman, and so I will not read those, in the interest of efficiency.

With regard to the Atlantic sturgeon stock assessment, since Mr. Beal has joined us since we had the committee meeting, I will ask Bob if he wants to add anything with regard to either the stock assessment or the potential for the commission to consider the critical habitat. I guess, Bob, per our conversation, they're going to do that at their August meeting, and so anything to add?

MR. BEAL: Thank you, Dr. Laney. No, I think you've covered it. The Sturgeon Board will meet in August, and the commission will decide what, if any, comment they want to provide on the habitat designations. The stock assessment, while it's cumbersome and a lot of work, it seems to be moving along as well as we can hope, and we're still shooting for the 2017 timeline. I have nothing else to add.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Mr. Beal. I think, Madam Chairman that pretty well concludes the report. The committee did not vote on any motions or make any motions as recommendations to the council, and there were no directions to staff.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Wilson. The next committee report is AP Selection. I will turn it over to Chairman Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Madam Chair. The AP Selection Committee met on June 14, 2016, and reviewed options for having fishing persons or persons interested in fishing representation on the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel and the Information & Education Advisory Panel. The committee also reviewed proposed changes to the advisory panel application form, so as specify details for SEDAR pool applicants and requirements for advisory panel applicants to have access to a working email account and internet access. There was a pretty good bit of discussion about

the internet access, because it was pointed out by some of the committee that we may have folks that are worse dinosaurs than even me and don't have a working email address.

Their access, for the AP members, there is a need for them to have not necessarily their own email address, but have access, so that they can be advised of meetings and get meeting materials and this sort of thing. The application, Kim was asked to modify the application to make it clear that if they have a family member, a child or their wife or whoever, that has an email account or access to the internet that that would be fine, but they just want to be able to have access to the information.

We also discussed the need to provide opportunities for appointments to advisory panels to represent the council's jurisdictional range for species, such as cobia and dolphin, and I think everybody will remember that we had a number of written comments in which people were complaining with regard to dolphin and complaining with regard to cobia that they felt like there was, quote, taxation without representation. Currently, we do have a Mid-Atlantic representative on the CMP Advisory Panel.

With those discussions in mind, I have three motions to bring before the full panel. **Motion Number 1 was to add a new seat to the Information & Education Advisory Panel and to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel for fishing representatives.**

Now, I will say that, after we had our meeting, there was some discussion that perhaps it should be specified that these new representatives, or I should say one to each, which was the way it was said in the motion, that it might be better and more equitable to specify that you would have actually two new members for each of these APs, one being recreational and one being commercial, and I would entertain some discussion on that proposal.

DR. DUVAL: **I would be more than happy to make a substitute motion to add two new seats each to the Information & Education Advisory Panel and the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel for fishing representatives, with the understanding that there would be one representative for each sector.** I think the only question I might have is additional cost. This would be adding four new members to our advisory panels. That's the only question I have.

MR. BREWER: I do think that everything would be subject to the approval of the Executive Board, because it is an additional expenditure. We have a motion. Is there a second? I saw Zack first. Has everybody had a chance to read the substitute motion? Is there any further discussion? **Is anyone opposed to this motion? Seeing no opposition, it's deemed approved.**

**Motion Number 2 was require a working email address and internet access for advisory panel applicants.** Again, it's not requiring that they have their own email address, but they have some family member or friend or at the fish house and they have the ability to get the information as it comes out. Is there any discussion on this motion?

MR. HAYMANS: **Might I suggest then that we add into the wording to require access to a working email address and the internet?**

MR. BREWER: Is that one of those friendly amendments?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, it would be. Thank you.

MR. BREWER: Yes, and I think that better captures what the committee was discussing and thinking along the lines of. The friendly amendment, or the motion as amended in a friendly manner, has been seconded by Mr. Phillips. Is there any further discussion? **Anyone opposed? Seeing no opposition, the motion passes.**

**The last motion was to add two new seats to the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel for a member within the Mid-Atlantic and New England jurisdictions.** The idea here is that we would have -- Well, first of all, we wouldn't have the problem of maybe commercial or recreational here, because you're going to be taking the people who are essentially appointed by those other councils. This is directed towards the concerns that were raised in the public comments that, hey, wait a minute, you guys are managing dolphin down there and we don't have anybody that's on that AP. That's what this motion is meant to take care of. Is there any discussion on this motion?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I would like to ask the council to be a little more specific here or just to outline the -- The way that this representative is currently designated on our Mackerel Advisory Panel is as a liaison, and so the Mid-Atlantic Council -- I work closely with their staff, and they have someone that they choose to represent them. If we follow that same protocol for this, that would -- I see nodding of heads, and so that would be okay. It's my understanding that I would reach out to those councils and have them appoint that person to be the representative.

MR. BREWER: Absolutely, and I think that was clearly the intent of the committee.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BREWER: Any further discussion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.** Madam Chair that concludes our report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Chester. The next report is the SSC Selection Committee and Chairman Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: The SSC Selection Committee met on June 14. The SSC Selection Committee considered SSC appointments. **Motion 1 is move to reappoint Luiz Barbieri, Jeff Buckel, Churchill Grimes and George Sedberry to the SSC for three-year terms. On the part of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? The motion passes.**

**Motion Number 2 is move to appoint Dr. Robert Ahrens and Dr. Genevieve Nesslage to the SSC for three-year terms. On the part of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

**Motion Number 3 is move to designate Scott Crosson, Sherry Larkin and Tracy Yandle to the SSC Social Sciences and Economics seats. On the part of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

**Motion Number 4 is move to postpone filling the nineteenth SSC seat until the next council meeting. On the part of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

**Motion Number 5 is move to appoint Jennifer Tookes to the SEP. On the part of the committee, I so move. Is there discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, the motion passes.** Then we get to timing and tasks, and I will let John go through those.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We have a timing and tasks motion to address things that we need to do. It starts with preparing letters of thanks to those SSC members who were not reappointed. We send letters to folks regularly and we thank those who are not reappointed. Prepare letters of appointment to the newly-appointed SSC and SEP members. You gave approval to invite AP representatives to attend the SSC meeting in October to help with assessment prioritization scoring. You directed that we develop a proposal for consideration in September for conducting SSC peer review of complex analyses, such as the management tools. We will have a meeting of the SSC Selection Committee in September 2016, including a closed session to fill the vacancy, which we noted in the earlier motion. Charlie, I've also added here, based on some discussions, a sixth item, which is develop guidelines for what constitutes a conflict of interest for SSC members, given the discussions we had about the lack of clarity in that area.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and we need to have some discussions on I guess how we would like to direct staff to work with Gregg, the Chair, the Vice Chair, and General Counsel on what kind of guidelines or templates we may want in considering possible conflicts of interest or perceived conflicts of interest. Can we have some discussion on how we might approach this?

MR. HARTIG: Did you get the timing and tasks? Did someone make that motion for you?

MR. PHILLIPS: Nobody has made the motion to accept timing and tasks, but what I would hope we would do was get this last task down and do it all together, but we can do the other and then add this.

DR. DUVAL: I mean is there something in -- Is there something that we can look to, I think, in terms of the conflict of interest, I would think, for council members that might be helpful in that regard? I mean there's been a lot of discussion about that at the Council Coordination Committee meeting and some updated guidance on what constitutes a real or perceived conflict of interest. I know that Gregg was going to just briefly touch on that when we got to Executive Finance.

MS. LOWERY: What I would highlight here is that the conflict of interest requirements under the Act, or at least restrictions, are different for council members and for members of the SSC, and so both council members and SSC members are required to fill out financial disclosure forms, but only council members are recused from voting on matters where they're determined to have a conflict of interest and how that conflict of interest is determined, I think, is what Michelle was just talking about.

NOAA GC has been working on how that's done, and I think there was a discussion at the CCC meeting, but, as far as an SSC member's conflict of interest, they do fill out financial disclosure forms, but there aren't any associated requirements for any recusal on matters where an SSC member has filled out -- Where there might be something before the SSC where that member has some sort of financial interest.



As kind of a separate but related point, there is this requirement -- At least what the statute says as far as who can be an SSC member. That includes independent experts, and I think that that's something that the council maybe also is discussing.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So is there any issue with the council doing what's proposed there in Number 6? Then my other question is kind of like why do the SSC members fill out conflict of interest forms if they don't recuse them? Ours don't even vote. We don't know what happens to the forms or how they're reviewed. No one comes back to the council and says NOAA has reviewed this form that was submitted per the Magnuson Act and this person has a potential conflict on these SSC topics.

It's like we go through the time and effort of collecting these forms from our folks every year. Everyone who applies submits a form. If we have twenty people apply, every one of those people has to submit a form before they -- You guys have to have it six weeks before this meeting and then what? It doesn't seem like it really means anything.

MS. LOWERY: I can't speak to the reason that the Act is set up the way that it is, but I can let you know that that's the statutory requirement and the associated regulations that are implementing those requirements are set up so that council members are recused from decisions where they have a financial conflict of interest, and SSC members do not have that same requirement.

MR. PHILLIPS: Is there any other discussion or thought? Hearing none, can I get a motion to accept the timing and tasks as written?

MR. HARTIG: **So moved.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Ben. Do I have a second? Zack, thank you. **Any opposition?** Any further discussion? **The motion passes.** Madam Chair, I guess that concludes my report.

MS. LOWERY: Sorry to get this after the motion has passed, but, as far as the -- I think it is appropriate for the council to think about what kinds of conflict of interest or independence they want from their SSC members, but I don't know -- When you're saying to develop guidelines, what are you looking for there?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I don't think we know at this time. I think we would like a little bit more than submitting a form that goes to the agency. Maybe one part of that becomes those conflict of interest forms come back to the council members, and maybe the council members have some review of them to consider if they're comfortable with what other activities their SSC members are doing. I think it sort of starts there, but, otherwise, I don't know. We did some research on this for SEDAR a number of years ago, and I will turn to that and dust that off and see what we decided there and where to go from here.

MS. LOWERY: Okay, and maybe that's something that NOAA GC can be in touch with you, just about how that works within the confines of Magnuson.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I definitely foresee reaching out to you guys for help on this.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Iris. I think it's going to be kind of a broad template, just so we can have a general feel on how we want to run this rabbit. Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, then I will conclude the report again.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Charlie. Next is the SEDAR Committee Report. The SEDAR Committee met on June 14 and considered appointments for SEDAR 50 and 53 in closed session. During open session, we considered the schedules and Terms of Reference for SEDAR 50 and 53, cobia assessment timing, and future assessment priorities, including MRIP revisions.

**The first motion was move to appoint those shown in the table of SEDAR 50 participants and observers to SEDAR 50. 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 appoint the suggested participants to SEDAR 53. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Just a quick question. On the appointments to the blueline, I know that there was a question that we left open between Mark and Ben. Is that -- Okay?

DR. DUVAL: Good catch. **The next motion is to approve the schedule for SEDAR 50. 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 SEDAR 50 terms of reference, including staff recommendation Option C for Data Workshop Term of Reference 7 and Assessment Workshop Term of Reference 8. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

**The next motion was to approve the schedule for SEDAR 53. 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 terms of reference for SEDAR 53. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

**The next motion was to request a benchmark of Cobia in 2018 and include cobia in the SEDAR stock ID workshop in 2017. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?**

MS. BECKWITH: I would like to revisit this in September. I know that we'll see the schedule again. I still have some concerns about doing a cobia stock assessment in 2018, but I don't want to use up the council's time when we'll have an opportunity to talk about it September, and so I'm just voicing my concerns.

DR. DUVAL: Any other discussion? **Is there any objection? The motion passes with one objection.**

**The next motion was to approve Table 6 in Attachment 6 as South Atlantic Fishery Management Council assessment priorities, with red snapper, hogfish, red grouper, black grouper and blueline tilefish as priorities for MRIP revision assessments. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

Then we have a motion to address what Anna brought up earlier, a draft motion to appoint the following council representatives for SEDAR 50, which would be Anna Beckwith for the Data and Review Workshop, Michelle Duval for the Assessment Workshop, Ben Hartig for the blank workshop, and Mark Brown for the blank workshop. I see Mr. Hartig is not here, but, Mr. Brown, have you all had any conversation about this?

MR. BROWN: We have not. I tried to get him to arm-wrestle me, and he wouldn't do it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The workshop is in October, and so it's after the September council meeting. I suppose we can keep both of them involved in the lead-ups to this and you could decide in September which of our esteemed council members will take part in which aspects of the SEDAR 50.

DR. DUVAL: How does that sound, Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: That's fine.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We will do that then.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, and so I think we still need someone to make this motion. Anybody can do it.

**MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I make the motion that we move to appoint the following council representatives for SEDAR 50: Anna Beckwith for the Data and Review Workshop and Michelle Duval for the Assessment Workshop.**

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second to that motion? It's seconded by Anna. Any other discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: We didn't consider council representatives for SEDAR 53, red grouper, and so I put a placeholder in there for that.

DR. DUVAL: What's your pleasure? Who would like to do red grouper?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's a standard. There's a single workshop and a series of webinars.

DR. DUVAL: Charlie, are you volunteering?

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, as I mentioned earlier in the week, I would be interested in swapping red grouper with white grunt, and maybe we could put that in timing and tasks, to see if it's possible. If it's not, yes, I would be willing to be an observer.

DR. DUVAL: I am going to let John speak to red grouper, because that's scheduled for the second quarter of this year. I think, once those wheels are turning, I'm not sure you can put the brakes on them, but, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You are correct, Madam Chair. Considering the timing, the wheels are turning on that. You have people preparing in terms of indices and age data and all of that type of thing, and so if you were to say get rid of red grouper, you would probably be left with a hole there, and you wouldn't be able to say bring in white grunt. White grunt, in particular, is one that you cannot -- We really have to plan ahead a long time.

This will be the first benchmark of white grunt. There is preliminary discussions from a few years ago where there is a complex stock structure and they thought at least three stocks down along the coast, and so that's going to need a dedicated stock ID workshop. The 2017 stock ID workshop, I would say, is fully committed with the things it has to do, and so white grunt is probably one that can't just jump in here at any place, and I think you would probably be setting things back. If you wanted to delay red grouper, that's your choice, but I don't think we have anything that could jump in and fill that slot at this late date.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, John, and, per my conversation earlier, we're killing the industry with jumping around with these catch levels. They've got to have some consistency somehow, and I understand if you have a benchmark that it's probably going to change some, but it's getting to the point where fishermen used to look forward to assessments, hoping they would get some more fish.

Now it's to the point where I think they would rather not have an assessment, because of the way it's been running. They're getting killed from the uncertainty, and it's not because good people aren't doing their best with what they've got. I want to make that clear. It's not because of lack of effort, but it's just not working for a lot of fishermen to get new assessments, the way they've been coming, and so I will let it go at that, and hopefully we can get better, lower some uncertainty, and make it where people can live, because it's really tough.

We heard industry talking about trying to get long-term leases or buying buildings or boats, and you just can't do it the way we've been doing it, and the recreational fishermen have their own issues too, and so thank you for letting me express that, and if you all want me for an observer, I will go.

DR. DUVAL: All right, and so we would need a motion to appoint Charlie Phillips as a council observer for SEDAR 53.

**MR. COX: I would like to make the motion to appoint Charlie Phillips for SEDAR 53, the red grouper assessment.**

DR. DUVAL: It's seconded by Zack. Is there any further discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

Next, before timing and tasks, apparently we need to talk about mutton snapper again. This is a question that was raised by council staff in regards to projections for mutton snapper, given the catches that occurred in 2014 and 2015. The total harvest levels were above the projected ABCs

coming out of that assessment, and so we thought we had made a decision to move forward without asking for revised projections, given the timeline of this amendment, but apparently the Gulf would like to request updated projections, and if either John or Gregg would like to speak to that, I would welcome it.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have talked staff-to-staff with the Gulf, and we have a difference of opinion. They are of the opinion that new projections will give a higher ABC. We're concerned that it might be lower. In either case, getting new projections will delay the development of that amendment, and I know, in our informal discussions with State of Florida representatives, they were not in favor of requesting those additional projections, and so maybe just some guidance here that Anna can take, and John is here, and he can take this to the Gulf next week and hopefully resolve this, because if they go forward and request additional projections and the Center does them, then that will delay the amendment.

MR. CARMICHAEL: As to the landings, so the last two years appeared higher. The two years before that appeared lower. If you add them up and look at it across the board, we're within something like 5 percent of what was assumed in the projection scenarios going forward, and so it's likely to be a wash.

There's another uncertainty that those landings we're looking at in the recent years are based on the changes in the MRIP program and they haven't been calibrated back, and so it may very well be that what looks like catching too many fish could simply be related to the fact that it's a different survey technique, and, once the calibration is applied, and it could be applied, you may find out that all those prior years come up and you really just need an update or an adjustment in your numbers to reflect the calibration, and so we kind of felt, for those reasons, that there were a lot of uncertainties about this, and that's one of the reasons the South Atlantic staff didn't support going forward with requesting those, because of the number of uncertainties that would have to be calculated into this, the update of projections.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't think we need new projections right now. I agree with John that we need to wait for the MRIP changes, and, also, this is a timing issue. We've sequenced this whole thing with the FWC. We start rulemaking next week, and so this likely would put FWC well out in front of the councils, and likely not sync up the regulations, which was the goal of these amendments. Since we couldn't get this through the South Florida Committee, it was to have FWC go and then the council go and then FWC go and then back to the council.

This will mess up this entire process, and I can tell you that it could likely result in FWC passing something a lot different than what the councils pass, and I'm not convinced that our commission would then want to go back and change the regulations again. Because of these number of issues, I don't want to slow this down and do these updates, and because there are other issues involved here.

DR. DUVAL: It seems like mutton could be one of those species, given the sort of recent nature of that assessment, that, once the new effort survey has been implemented, that an MRIP revision could be applied, and you could capture everything all at once. Okay. Anna and John, I guess you all can take that forward next week in Clearwater.

Now we have the timing and tasks motion, which is move to direct staff to request at the October 2016 meeting that the SSC provide recommendation for stocks to consider for data-limited assessment methods. Is there anyone willing to make that motion?

**MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I make the motion that we request at the October 2016 meeting that the SSC provide recommendation for stocks to consider for data-limited assessment methods.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie. Is there a second? There is a second by Ben. Any other discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.** That takes us to the Data Collection Committee Report and Chairman Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, fifty demerits to the Executive Director for misspelling my name. I am going to add a couple of G's to his name. The Data Committee received reports on CE-BA 3 and bycatch reporting, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center electronic commercial logbook pilot project and voluntary commercial logbook reporting, and discussed the charter reporting amendment. The following motions were made.

**Motion 1 was to move to recommend that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center conduct a cost analysis, considering agency and fishermen costs, on the set-level electronic reporting program developed through the pilot project. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**Motion 2 is to move to include in the charter amendment the core variables as listed: to add economic variables of charter fee, such as price per trip; fuel used and price per gallon; and to modify area reporting to be consistent with the existing headboat reporting. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**Motion 3 is to move to add a description in the amendment that it is the intention of the council to use compliance with logbook reporting as an eligibility criterion for any possible future for-hire limited entry program. There was an additional motion made to postpone until the next meeting, September of 2016.** That motion was approved by the committee. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. If this motion were to fail, then we would be able to reconsider my previous motion, and, given that the council moved to begin development of a for-hire amendment, I think it would be prudent to add into the for-hire amendment the intention that the council would use compliance with the logbook as an eligibility criterion for any future for-hire limited entry program. That would assist us in putting a little carrot-and-stick into our logbook, our future logbook, program, and so I would hope that we will vote this motion down and reconsider the previous motion.

MR. HAYMANS: If I may reiterate, to make sure I understood what you said, that if this Motion Number 4 to postpone is not approved by the committee, then we could reconsider Motion Number 3, which is to make sure that the council's intent is that compliance with logbook reporting is an eligibility requirement of limited entry.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, sir.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. With that said, is there any more discussion?

DR. DUVAL: Since the Snapper Grouper Committee passed a motion to direct staff to begin development of a for-hire limited entry amendment, the first step in that process is development of an options paper, and so I would think that something like compliance with logbook reporting as an eligibility criterion might be part of that options paper, which we would see in September anyway, and so I don't have a problem with supporting this motion to postpone, because I think that's when you will see it.

MR. BOWEN: I was actually going to say, and not as well said as Dr. Duval said it, but about the same thing. When we directed staff -- In the Snapper Grouper part of this, when we directed staff to come up with an amendment, I think we're going to have an array of actions and alternatives in there, and I feel confident, especially based on this discussion, that this would be part of those actions and alternatives, and so I could not support Motion Number 3 right now. I would still like to see it postponed.

MS. BECKWITH: To that point, I mean I was going to ask that we consider resending the for-hire amendment out through our public hearings in August as a way of giving the industry an opportunity to comment on the core variables, and then, as part of our education process, to make sure that they understand that the logbook is important and we are looking to put some teeth behind it, and we are looking for a high level of compliance with the logbook program when it is implemented, and I think this is a first step.

What we are saying with Motion 3, if we consider it, is that we will be considering logbook compliance as an eligibility criterion and not as an eligibility requirement. That will be chosen through the future scoping, but that it will be considered as an eligibility criterion, and I think that is a fair assessment of what we would be doing, and so I would hope that we would move this forward as a first step to educate the industry that this is coming and the logbook is important and we fully expect them to buy into it.

MR. BOWEN: When we send this out, as you say, to public hearings, I feel like the public needs to be fully abreast of the options and alternatives that would be in the limited entry amendment. I think if we send this out with the ELB amendment, without all the options and alternatives in there that it's just not being -- It's not giving the public the full gist of what's coming down the road.

MS. BECKWITH: That doesn't make any sense to me, Zack, because you're making it sound like our expectation of compliance with the logbook is somehow dependent on any version of a future limited entry program and some direction that we take, and it's not. You guys have moved forward that we will explore limited entry.

What we also need to move forward is that we have a 100 percent expectation that the industry needs to comply with the logbook upon implementation, and they need to be aware that that is the intent of this council and that we will be looking at compliance with the logbook requirement as something that is imperative to be successful, period. I don't understand your argument, and I don't see what the opposition to this is, because what I'm hearing you guys say, by not supporting

this, is that somehow compliance with the logbook is not a priority for this council, and that doesn't make sense to me.

MR. CARMICHAEL: If I could make a suggestion. I think one of the issues is that this motion says it is the intention of the council to use compliance. Would it suffice if, within this data amendment, that we added acknowledgement that the council is considering limited entry and developing an options paper along that regard, and one of the things they may consider is compliance with the reporting? I think that's a pretty different statement to put in there like that, and then I think, with public hearings -- We had the variables.

We indicated at the public hearings that we were considering core variables, and we had the list from the two programs that led to what we got, and we got feedback on the variables, particularly with fishermen's opinions about keeping them concise and tight and that sort of thing, and so I felt like, at the public hearings we held, we had a lot of feedback on the variables, and so I don't think it would add a whole lot more there.

I think what we need to look at, our next move with the fishermen, is, once this reaches implementation and we know the programs and we know where the data are going and all that, we need to get out with them, so they understand what's coming, but, since we haven't even gone to final approval, that's sort of a ways down the road yet, and so I think we should hold off until we have a little more information to take to the fishermen, because I expect, at this point, they will still have the same questions they had when we went out last time, which is really about the specifics and the timing and all of that sort of stuff.

MR. HAYMANS: Do you have enough information, John, or do you need to put that into the timing and tasks?

MR. CARMICHAEL: If you like the compromise, we could put that in the timing and tasks, where we acknowledge the impending consideration of limited entry and that this may be something the council considers, and I think that would avoid the idea of this specifying that that will be considered.

MS. LOWERY: I would certainly support that approach. I think that there are potentially some kind of concerns from a GC perspective and enforcement, and that's something that, as the council moves forward, and, as John said, considers this, that we could work through and consider and provide some more informed guidance on that, but it just seems like it's -- It's certainly a kind of creative approach, I think, and is something worth discussing, but, at this point, it might be premature to move forward with indicating that the council will sort of move forward on that.

MR. HAYMANS: Any additional discussion?

MS. BECKWITH: Since this compromise language is going into the timing and tasks, do we need to deal with this by the motion or the direction to the staff to add to the timing and tasks is sufficient?

MR. HAYMANS: I think we will vote on the timing and tasks as a motion, and, if that motion passes, then that language is captured, unless there is edits to the timing and tasks. We are back to Motion 4, which was the motion to postpone until the next meeting. Does everybody understand



where we are? Okay. Is there any additional discussion on Motion 4? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to Motion 4? I see three in opposition. I don't want to suppose that everybody is going to abstain, and so let's see a show of hands for those in favor. I see seven. The motion carries.** That Motion 3 is postponed.

That brings us down to timing and tasks. Those timing and tasks, as they exist right now, is to provide an update on the SAFMC-ACCSP electronic logbook pilot project at the September meeting, to modify the charter reporting amendment to include core variables as approved here for review at the September meeting, to propose an alternative name for CE-BA 3 that reflects the bycatch reporting actions that remain, and to add language to the charter amendment acknowledging the council is considering limited entry in the for-hire industry and may consider compliance with reporting requirements among the eligibility criterion. Do I have a motion to accept the timing and tasks?

MS. BECKWITH: **So moved.**

MR. HAYMANS: We have a second by Michelle. Is there discussion?

MR. BOWEN: **In Number 4, just to add maybe some amendment to that. It says to add language to the charter amendment. I think we probably should be a little more specific in saying the charter ELB amendment, maybe, because charter amendment could go --** Do you know what I mean?

MR. HAYMANS: Adding ELB? I assume that's electronic logbook?

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir.

MR. HAYMANS: Is that okay with the motion maker?

MS. BECKWITH: **Yes.**

MR. HAYMANS: And the seconder? Okay. Any additional discussion?

MR. COX: I would go ahead and write out electronic logbook. ELB is not something that we see a lot of.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **How about I call it the charter reporting amendment, because that's what we called it up here in Number 2.**

MR. BOWEN: That's fine. I just felt like it lacked specificity.

MR. HAYMANS: Is that still okay with the motion makers?

MS. BECKWITH: **Yes.**

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. Any additional discussion? **Any opposition?**

MS. LOWERY: Just to clarify on that Number 4 there, and I could have gotten lost for a second, and so please correct me if I did, but it sounded like, in the previous discussion regarding this using compliance reporting requirements as eligibility criteria for any limited entry, that was being discussed as an alternative for the options paper moving forward for limited entry, whereas this -- Is that correct? Okay. Sorry about that. Thank you for the clarification.

MR. HAYMANS: Any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, the timing and tasks motion carries.** Madam Chair, that concludes the Data Collection Committee Report, and, as soon as Roger comes up, we will start Habitat.

The Habitat Protection/Ecosystem-Based Management Committee met on June 13, 2016, and addressed the following, a Fishery Ecosystem Plan II status report delivered by Roger Pugliese and Brett Boston and an Ocean Technology Session, which was presented by Ken Childress, Jon Robertson, and Dr. Laurent Cherubin of Harbor Branch, a very abbreviated Ocean Investment and Collaborative Sustainability presentation from Brett Boston, and an Applying Emerging Technologies presentation by Brett Fitzgerald, Tina Udouj, and Jim Morley.

There was one motion made. **The motion was to direct staff to provide executive summaries of the new climate variability and food web and connectivity chapters and draft policy statements in advance of the September council meeting for discussion at that meeting. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any additional discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Finally, there was two timing and task items. The first was that the FEP II Food Web and Connectivity and Fisheries and Climate Variability Sections and associated team policy discussions be completed for the September council meeting. I think that means that those sections are completed and presented to us by the September council meeting. Finally, the staff coordinate participation in a technology test bed, engaging Ocean Area and Submarine AUV, Teledyne Marine and South Carolina DNR, SEAMAP, and MARMAP for a potential late July test bed off Charleston, SC. The Chair would entertain a motion for the timing and tasks.

MR. BOWEN: **So moved.**

MR. HAYMANS: Zack, thank you, and it's seconded by Ben. Is there any additional discussion?

MR. BREWER: Could we do that test bed off of Palm Beach County? I would really love to be there.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm sure that will be quite interesting work. Any additional discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Madam Chair that concludes the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Doug. The next committee is Law Enforcement and Chairman Brown.

MR. BROWN: Madam Chair, the Law Enforcement Committee met on June 16, 2016, and discussed the following, the agenda items for the August 2016 joint meeting of the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel and the Law Enforcement Committee. The following items were approved for inclusion: draft language to describe what constitutes proper stowage of spearfishing

gear to suggest to NOAA OLE for inclusion in regulations; review the For-Hire Reporting Amendment and provide recommendations; discuss how to make enforcement more effective and how to prepare for future reporting requirements; receive a report from NOAA GC on the use of operator cards in other regions; receive an update from FWC on enforcement of regulations on the transport of fillets from the Bahamas; updates from state representatives on JEA activities; inclusion of SAFMC managed areas, including MPAs and spawning SMZs, in navigation charts; MPA Watch through citizen science.

The 2015 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year was in a closed session, and the committee reviewed the top three nomination for the 2015 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award that were selected from among five nominations submitted by members of the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Voting to select the recipient of the award was conducted via secret ballot. A deserving officer will be presented the award at the September 2016 meeting in Myrtle Beach. That concludes my Law Enforcement Committee Report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mark. The next report is Executive Finance, and we definitely have some unfinished business there. The Executive Finance committee met yesterday, June 16. The agenda was adopted and the minutes of the March 2016 meeting were approved.

The first item of business was the Council Year 2016 Budget Expenditures, and we received an overview from Mike Collins. The committee discussed and approved the budget. The next was the Council Follow-Up and 2016 Priorities. Dr. Brian Chevront, the Deputy Executive Director for Management, gave the committee an overview of the council follow-up, as well as the 2016 priorities that were approved in March.

We looked at those priorities and determined that they needed to be adjusted to address two new Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendments proposed by the Gulf Council as well as other amendments that were identified during our deliberations this week, and so we discussed those priorities and provided guidance on the changes, and we'll review those at the September meeting.

We then had a brief discussion on Standards and Procedures for Public Comments, presented by Gregg Waugh, Executive Director, and the committee provided input and review and a revised draft document will be prepared for consideration at the September 2016 meeting.

I am going to go through just the motions that we have here, and then we'll pick up the remainder of the business. **The first motion was to approve the Council Year 2016 budget. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

I think I will hold off on -- There is direction to staff to prepare a SAFE Report for red grouper for review at the September 2016 meeting, to revise the 2016 priorities for review, and then use Option B, the council meeting comment form, and timing for comments prior to and during council meetings and revise the public comment guidelines for review at the September meeting.

I will perhaps hold off on the draft timing and tasks report until we finish with the rest of our agenda. The next item on the agenda is really Agenda Item Number 7, which was a review of the Council Coordination Committee Meeting, and I think Gregg is going to -- That's Attachment 7a and 7b under the Executive Finance folder in the briefing book, and I think Gregg is going to touch

briefly on a few things. We had hoped to have, I think, a little bit more robust discussion about some of the letters that we're going to need to be sending, but I think what we'll do is probably get folks' review by email on some of these draft letters, and so, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Michelle. Just before that, we didn't get any guidance on the webinar meeting guidelines, and we don't have a lot in here for you. We pulled what's done in other areas. We were asking for some additional guidance, and I don't know if you all are ready to do this now or we could just defer it to the September meeting, but we wanted to -- The council welcomes the use of webinars to increase transparency and efficiency. Preliminary NOAA GC guidance is that members can participate in a meeting via webinar, but they cannot vote if not present, similar to how Chris participated this week.

We have had situations where the entire council has met via webinar and everybody has voted via webinar, and so we were just looking for some guidance to develop this further, in terms of which types of meetings would you like to establish a policy to be conducted by webinar meetings, and then do you want the council to -- Would you prefer for council members to be able to vote at these meetings, and we could explore how to do that, if at all possible? Again, I know we're short on time and we could just pick this up at the September meeting, however you all want to handle it.

DR. DUVAL: What's your pleasure?

MS. MCCAWLEY: The next meeting.

DR. DUVAL: The next meeting? I am seeing some nods around the table, and so we will pick that back up at the next meeting, and so I think then we would be moving on to the CCC briefing.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. We've got Michelle, Charlie, and I that attended the meeting. Jack McGovern was there representing Dr. Crabtree, and we've got a fairly detailed report here. I would be glad to answer any questions. There are a few things I would like to touch on. In terms of recreational fisheries update, they presented the value of that fishery as being \$52 billion. We had some discussion there and asked if there was any possibility of getting additional funds for more intercepts, given the high value of the recreational fishery. At least we got an honest and straightforward answer that no, there's not likely any additional funding.

In terms of the budget, there is \$7 million available for electronic monitoring and reporting, and I will talk about that again in a few minutes, but there is some wording in the Senate language. The councils' and commissions' budget is in one line item for all the councils and all the commissions, and there's some language in there talking about if amounts above what was provided in Fiscal Year 2016, it will be distributed in equal proportions between the councils and the commissions.

Then there was some more language about how that would be split proportionately, and this was discussed some at the CCC meeting, and we raised the importance of, at least on the east coast, of the services the council receives from ASMFC. That includes the ACCSP, Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program.

There was some suggestion -- I offered that it would seem to me that perhaps, if it were split equally between all the commissions and 50 percent for all the councils, that that would be a greater

incentive for the commissions to push for a higher budget as well as recognizing the importance they are as a partner, and they can lobby Congress.

Some of the other councils viewed it more in terms of proportion, perhaps totaling up the eight councils and the three commissions and divvying it up that way, and so we were just wondering if the council wanted to provide any guidance going forward in how we should pursue that, to the extent that we have some influence.

MR. BOYLES: Just to follow up on Gregg's comments, we've had extensive discussions about this at the commission, and one of the things that has concerned the commission, the Atlantic Commission at least, is that, as the line for councils and commissions has grown over the years, the commission's budget has remained flat.

The agency had a good explanation for that at the state directors meeting in New Orleans this spring, and, as I understand it, what Paul Doremus suggested to the directors was, well, the agency recognizes the councils' operational costs are -- Much of it is tied up in salaries, and those costs go up every year, but they viewed the commission line as a steady program line, and so I think we've seen very good coordination among the three commissions in going to the Hill, and so, Gregg, I appreciate the comments. The commissions have been very active in reaching out to congressional leadership, and so I just wanted to give the council a little bit more background on that. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Robert. We did have discussion about that at the last ASMFC meeting as well, and I think the contributions that ASMFC makes towards joint or complementary management are significant, and so, given that we have requested that the commission consider taking on some level of involvement in cobia management, given the proportion of harvest that occurs in state waters, I think supporting a 50/50 split is appropriate, but I would -- I mean the commission has taken on more and more over the past few years.

I think black drum comes to mind. That's another species that they've taken on and Jonah crab. That's more northern, but cobia. I mean we benefit directly from their involvement in black drum and cobia, if they choose to take cobia on, and so I am comfortable with a 50/50 split, but any other thoughts around the table? If not, silence is assent at this point of the week.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, and I just added that, and we'll come back to it in the direction to staff. In terms of legislative update, the councils, the eight councils, share in a contract with Dave Whaley, and Dave keeps us up to date on changes in anything related to the Magnuson Act and fisheries. Just to be absolutely clear, this is not a lobbying effort. He doesn't do any of that, but he just reports.

He has been reporting to whichever council is responsible for holding the meeting, and this year it was the Caribbean Council. I routinely forward those reports to Michelle and Charlie, as Chair and Vice Chair. If other council members are interested in seeing them, I can send them to everybody as well, and I am seeing several people say yes, and so I will, as those reports come in, forward them to all council members.

In terms of ecosystem-based fishery management, there's an informal forty-five-day comment period for the councils to comment by July 10, and there are a lot of various items that are sort of

coming to a close as the administration winds down, and it's funneling a lot of information with relatively short comment periods, and everybody is getting squeezed, but we want to take advantage of this. What we would propose doing is working with the Chair and Vice Chair to draft a response and shoot that out to all council members for them to look at. If that's okay with everybody, will proceed that way. Certainly, if you all have any comments now, we would be glad to hear them, or, as you get any, shoot them to us right away. That would be great.

In terms of the council definition of OY and update on National Standard 1, that proposed rule comment period closed. They have addressed the comments. That final rule is being reviewed by OMB, and so the agency couldn't discuss any of the specifics, but the proposed rule has some increased flexibility in it.

We presented our definitions of OY. The Pacific had some additional information that they presented, and that's referenced there if you want to look at that at some point, but we are the only council that separates OY into recreational and commercial sectors, and so, to the extent that that is causing some issues with parts of the recreational ACL not being harvested, we can resolve that by going to a more general statement of OY, and so that's something for us to come back to in the future, as we look at additional amendments.

Catch share update review, we have to, by the end of 2016, the draft guidance, we have to comment on that. This would only apply to our wreckfish ITQ program, and, once that guidance is complete, then we would have to reevaluate the wreckfish ITQ within seven years, and so we have time to do this, and, again, this is something we will put comments together and get out to everybody.

Bycatch, we have submitted our comments on the SBRM rule and the bycatch strategy, and you all were copied on those, and so we'll keep you posted as that moves on. The new operational guidelines and regional operating agreements, within one year of the effective date of September 30, 2015, and so by this coming September 30, each council has to review its regional operating agreements and then, thereafter, every three to five years.

One of the interesting points that was discussed, and I'm sure Iris will weigh in on this, is that when we did ours originally, we wanted NOAA GC to be a signatory on that document, and, due to staffing and other limitations, they could not at that time. The Pacific Council, NOAA GC has signed on to their agreement there, and the hope is that there's increased flexibility now and that perhaps we can get NOAA GC as a signatory on that agreement, and so we'll be discussing this with NOAA GC and bring something back to you at the September meeting. Iris, I don't know if you wanted to offer anything on that.

MS. LOWERY: I don't have anything additional to say, but I think that it certainly seems appropriate to have some further conversations about how to move forward on that.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. In terms of electronic monitoring and electronic reporting and the regional implementation plan, we'll be looking at making revisions to that, and we will get you all a chance to look at that. There is \$7 million available in 2016 and 2017, and it's expected that this will continue. In the first year, \$3 million went to NFWF and \$4 million was available to NMFS through an internal competitive process.

The fiscal year 2016 money has been distributed. They have used that to fund our ACCSP pilot program, and there is some monies to fund a workshop looking at fishery-dependent data that Jack could give us some more details on if you have any questions there, but we will work with the Region and the Center in preparation for the Fiscal Year 2017 funding cycle, to make sure we get in proposals that would provide the necessary funds for the Region and Center to implement our bycatch logbook reporting and, should we continue to pursue the private recreational logbook, this is an avenue that we can get some funding for the South Atlantic Council's area to do that work, and so we will be working closely with the Region and Center to do that.

EFH Summit, Michelle and Roger attended portions of that summit, and this is one subcommittee that the Coordination Council maintains, and they will continue to work and report back at the next meeting, and, Michelle, I didn't know if there was anything you wanted to offer further about that EFH Summit.

DR. DUVAL: Not really. It was a very well-run summit. There were a number of council members in attendance. It was really very much structured so that the NOAA Fisheries EFH Coordinators and staff and council staff could come together, and there was lots of opportunity for cross-cultural exchange between the staffs in the different regions and then some great breakout group discussions that included both staff and council members, where I think there was some really -- There were some great comments about sort of the foundational nature of EFH and how important that is in terms of moving forward with ecosystem-based fishery management efforts, and so it was a great conference, the day that I was able to go.

MR. WAUGH: Then, in terms of conflict of interest regulations, this was talked about. Adam Issenberg stated that the determination that NOAA GC has made is that if a council member has ownership in a corporation or corporations or businesses, they will attribute the full harvest amount, in pounds, as counting towards the 10 percent threshold, and so if you exceed 10 percent, that 10 percent threshold, in terms of poundage, then you can participate in the discussion. You can indicate how you would vote, but you couldn't actually vote, and there was some discussion - - We asked for clarification, because we were concerned that, if this was applied to the number of permits that are held, this might be a problem in say our black sea bass pot fishery, where we have a few number of permits, but they clarified that it is pounds. Charlie raised the issue of, okay, if you're looking at pounds, which year do you use, and so we've requested NOAA GC to look into that and give us some more guidance, and they have agreed to do that.

In the Communications Group, the I&E folks from each council got together and worked, and they have produced a -- They are revising the website, and there is a new council publication, and the website has a few more things that need to be done with it and then they're going to do a big roll-out with the publication celebrating the forty years and the website, and Kim has a copy of that publication if anybody wants to look at it. Once we get the copies in the office, we will send one to each of you.

Compliance with National Standard 2 and best scientific information available, Tom Nies and I presented some of the issues we've had from New England's perspective and ours with changing of status determination criteria, and our staff are going to work with the Region and Center to develop a set of comments for your consideration in September. Our staff and the Chair and Vice Chair will have gotten some input from our SSC Chair here to develop some informal comments.

They asked us to get any informal comments in right away, and so we are going to provide that to them.

The SSC Subcommittee of the Coordination Council, the Pacific Council has offered to host the next National SSC Meeting in late 2017, and John will be working with them in terms of an agenda. Then, under Other Business, the Coordination Council approved a resolution to the President concerning impacts of the national monument designation. This is an issue of concern in the Northeast, and it's a very big issue in the Western Pacific. There is a proposal that would essentially create a monument in probably close to three-quarters of their EEZ, and so it will have a huge impact. That's available if anyone would like to see it.

Government credit cards for meetings, this is an item we had under Other Business, but we can address it here as well. Mike has done a yeoman's job in literally fighting to get tax-exempt status. He had it and lost it and had it and lost it about three or four times, and now it looks as if we will have it. This is a big savings. To us, it's about \$40,000. To the Pacific, it's about \$75,000 to \$80,000 a year, just in tax savings. Some of the other councils haven't made use of this yet, and so it will be a cost savings to them, and so Mike has found yet another way to continue saving us money.

In terms of committees, the Coordination Council is keeping the Habitat Subcommittee, the SSC Subcommittee, and they have a Legislative Subcommittee. The Legislative Subcommittee is ready to deal with any quick action that may surface in terms of reauthorization to the Act, and Michelle was put on there, and I asked Miguel a question about who would chair it, and he put that on me, and so it's a little more work, and that's what I get for asking a question, but, also, it will give us, with having Michelle and myself on there, a good opportunity to look out for our council's and the other councils' interests, and we did approve continuing Dave Whaley's contract.

The final item on the CCC that I would like to get some guidance on is the next meeting, 2017, the two meetings are February 28 to March 1 in D.C. and then May 15 through 19 in Maine, and that's hosted by the New England Council. In 2018, it's the North Pacific's turn. Then, in 2019, it's our turn, and we wanted to get guidance just on a week. I know, looking at my calendar into 2019, it was pretty clear, and I'm sure everybody is probably not thinking that far in advance, but we generally do that the second full week in May, and that would be May 13 through 17. In terms of rotation, Charlie would be the Chair at that time or you would have already rolled off? Okay, and so we don't know who would be our Chair and Vice Chair. Just if you all would check your schedules before you leave here today and let me know if you have a conflict with May 13 through 17, 2019.

MR. BOYLES: Gregg, the only thing I would suggest is the May meeting date for ASMFC that spring meeting, has rolled around the month of May. It's been as late as the third week, and I'm quite sure that Laura does not have a date yet, but I would just ask that there are a number of ASMFC commissioners who are on the CCC, and so just to the degree that you can plan for that.

MR. WAUGH: I will check with Laura before we lock that in, and the reason for doing this is Charleston hotels fill up pretty quickly, and so we want to get a head-start on this, and so I will check with Laura on ASMFC. That's it for the CCC items.



DR. DUVAL: Are there any other questions for Gregg or Charlie or myself on the CCC? All right. Seeing none, the next item of business was Visioning for Other Species, and this came up at the last meeting, and so we had -- When we kicked off snapper grouper, we had an extensive discussion as to whether or not other species should be included in that, whether we should have done it for all of the council's managed species. King mackerel was certainly the species that was mentioned most frequently. I think, with some of the items that we've discussed in the Dolphin Wahoo Committee, that's -- We have talked about that being almost like a mini visioning amendment, that collection of items that we reviewed earlier today, and so what are your thoughts?

MR. WAUGH: We discussed this at the staff level, and our sort of guidance is let's have a little more time to absorb the snapper grouper vision and maybe move that along a little further. We just don't see the ability, certainly this year, to do a lot of these visioning workshops, and so, if we looked at this in maybe 2017, to pick a species to look at or something, but we just think it would be difficult to begin working on this, certainly this year, and we would have to look at how we block that out for 2017, given all the other items you have already approved for us.

MR. HARTIG: I certainly understand that, and I'm willing to do that. I just don't want to get into 2017 and say we don't have the time to do it then either. I just think we need, in 2017, to address this and make a concrete decision that we're going to do it.

MR. WAUGH: So then Brian is already going to be revising your priorities, and so what we can do is see where we would fit that in during 2017. Then I assume, Ben, since you're the one that spoke up, you would like to look at the king mackerel fishery or the coastal migratory pelagics or what?

MR. HARTIG: The whole coastal migratory pelagic, because Spanish is just as important, and it seems like cobia is getting there as well.

DR. DUVAL: I think one of the things we brought up at the last meeting was to sort of start off with our advisory panel maybe, in getting input from them on broad topics for that. Any other discussion on visioning for other species? Then the next item of business is ACCSP for Developing FMP Amendments, and so I think Gregg and Brian are going to cover this for us.

MR. WAUGH: Perhaps we could cover this for developing amendments and the other for getting logbook data and headboat data into ACCSP, discuss them together. We run into situations where, in the last dolphin amendment, we're dealing with one dataset, the accumulated landings dataset that's used to do Chapter 3, the impact analysis. In Chapter 4, we use the logbook data that comes from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and sometimes there is differences there, because they're two different sources of data, and we just had a delay in the completion of a dolphin amendment, trying to resolve some of these differences.

In addition, the public has no way of verifying those data that are used in the amendment, and when ACCSP was created, the vision that all the partners had was that would be a common dataset that would be used by the fisheries managers, by the stock assessment scientists, by the public, and it would be fully transparent, and the public could obviously look at it and see what data were being used.

All the Atlantic states, the three councils, the commission, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and I think the District of Columbia might be the other one, but they're all partners, signatories, to this program, and so it's all our program. It just seems, to us, that if we had the commercial logbook data in ACCSP, the headboat data in ACCSP, and they have all the necessary guidelines in place to address things like confidentiality of statistics and so forth.

Then, when it came time to do an amendment, we could pull data from ACCSP, at the start of writing an amendment, and then everybody is preparing the amendment with one dataset, and this would reduce some of the duplicative work we've had, and it would meet some of the requirements for Public Access to Research Results, or the acronym is PARR, and then the public could verify our data as well. Obviously this would be something that, if you're interested in us pursuing, we would have to discuss it with the Region and the Center and work out the process to do this, but we wanted to surface this and see what guidance you might have for us.

DR. PONWITH: The agency, and certainly the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, is enthusiastic about public access to data. As you know, this administration has developed an Executive Order called PARR, which is the abbreviation for Public Access to Research Results. We are aggressively working to make our data publicly available. This is tricky when you start talking about fishery-dependent data, the landings data and the logbooks, because there are confidentiality issues.

We view ACCSP as a trusted and valued partner in our progress on that work, and so we concur that the logbook data and the accumulated landings data are data sources that should be publicly available. There is a but. But, we have an obligation, under the Magnuson Act, to make sure that we do protect and meet our obligations under the Act for confidentiality. We are absolutely confident we can do that, working with ACCSP, and make sure they have access to those data, as we have access to those data.

What we would like to do is do it in a way that the protocols we use for meeting the confidentiality requirements, which is essentially an aggregation protocol, are identical, so that when ACCSP implements its aggregation protocol and we do the same, it is the same, and it results in exactly identical numbers.

Just a little bit of an update on where we are on working toward this. We have been aggressively metadata stamping data, which is part of PARR, and preparing for making those databases publicly available. Right now, we're working on a summarization project that will be completed in 2017. Again, this is in response to PARR.

We are constructing a warehouse within the Southeast Fisheries Science Center which provides portals for confidential users to be able to have access to finalized landings data, logbook data, dockside sampling, and observer data for the entire region we're responsible for, the South Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and the U.S. Caribbean. We would be providing summarized information for public consumption, again using those protocols we work with ACCSP with, to make sure they're compatible.

The ALS system is slated for rebuild this year. This is going to result in our ability to present data at the trip level for all states, from Maine to Texas, so that all stocks that are managed by the Southeast have landings information in one database, which is good.

The Southeast is currently developing, again, that data warehouse, which will include a public portal, which we anticipate being available in 2017, to access that non-confidential data, and that will include trip-level information reconciled between logbooks, the discards, the economic data, the trip tickets, IFQ, TIP, observer, and permit data, to be able to serve as the definitive source for data once that is completed. Those linkages are going to be really important.

Again, the Southeast is an active partner with ACCSP. We work with them and we collaborate really closely with them. We are planning to provide the coastal logbook data to ACCSP, and, again, there are some data -- The data standards that we have are a little -- Let me just say the data we house are more inclusive than what the ACCSP database has in it right now, and so we need to work with ACCSP on what to do about that, whether it's modifying their database structure or some sort of a cross-walk table, and so the will is there. We just need to make sure that the two databases are set up in a way that they're compatible, so that ACCSP can absorb all the fields that we have.

Then the other thing that I wanted to talk a little bit about is derived products. The trick with derived products is some of these databases are raw and some of them are derived products. Estimating discards is not a raw data product. It's one where we have to do -- We have to do additional math behind the scenes, and so how we make those products publicly available is important as well, but it's just as important to understand that the raw data and those estimates are two separate things. Again, I think we've made good progress on this, and we're certainly eager to make additional progress through the year in 2017.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that thorough review, Bonnie. We really appreciate all the efforts that you guys are making to provide increased access to the data that you house and for making the efforts with ACCSP as well. I know it's not easy to get databases to talk to one another sometimes, and I know a lot of folks don't appreciate how much work that takes. Are there questions for Bonnie or Gregg about this item?

MR. HARTIG: It's really not a question, but just I'm really glad that this is taking place. I mean, when I'm outside the council and I'm asking for data requests to evaluate certain things, I am always faced with having the wrong numbers when I get up there to get a presentation, and so if we can get it to the point where I actually can have the right numbers, that will be a big improvement.

DR. DUVAL: Agreed.

MR. WAUGH: So then I guess we would continue to work with the Center on how to get those data into ACCSP or accessible through ACCSP, and then what about the issue on what data we use to develop our amendments?

DR. PONWITH: What I would really prefer is, in the interim, until we have completely linked these data, so we know they're identical or -- Let me just say that, in the Executive Finance Report, there were some statements in there that were not -- It talks about the ALS system. The ALS

system uses dealer reports and not the vessel logbooks, and so those are two separate things, and so what my preference would be is for council staff, ACCSP, and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to create kind of a common work plan, so there's a common understanding of where we are in the transition to compliance with PARR, so that, when the council shops for the information they need for their FMPs, the timing of where they go for the definitive data source is built into and synced up with that work plan, because what I don't want to do is have you go somewhere and find out that their ability to go there was contingent on certain steps for synchronizing those databases. I think that that is the smartest way to handle this at this point.

DR. DUVAL: Does that provide you with enough direction, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and I guess that would have to occur first, before we reconsider how we pull data for our amendments. Okay.

DR. DUVAL: All right. That pretty much takes us to the -- One of the things that came up is we have modified the name of our advisory panel to be the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Advisory Panel, in recognition of the fact that there's more species than mackerel that are included in that, and I think it's more transparent to the public of the species that are included in that.

We got some public comment during the last several months with regard to cobia that stakeholders were looking for where's the advisory panel for cobia, and what they see is the Mackerel Advisory Panel, and it is not indicative of the three species that are contained within that fishery management plan, and so the council has had a Mackerel Committee for years and years and years, and I think one of the things we're wondering is should we change the name of the committee to be reflective of the broader range of species for which management occurs and to match the advisory panel, so that there's less confusion.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I think that would be appropriate, given that cobia has received so much attention and probably will in the future. People will actually be able to know where to go, as far as the cobia goes, and if they want to apply for a seat on our AP, it would be much easier to find.

DR. DUVAL: I am seeing nods around the table to do that, and so I would be looking for a draft motion.

MR. BOYLES: I would make the motion that we rename the Mackerel Committee, Advisory Panel, to the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Advisory Panel.

DR. DUVAL: We already renamed the advisory panel. That occurred at the last meeting, and so it's actually just the council's committee.

MR. BOYLES: The committee. Excuse me.

MS. IVERSON: I would just take an opportunity to thank you. Very quickly, to say that we've discussed that at the staff level too, since the advisory panel name isn't consistent with the committee name at this point, and, with the number of calls that we've received on cobia, et cetera, perhaps, and I'm just throwing this out there for suggestion, is, similar to the Dolphin Wahoo AP and Committee, is to have a Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel and Committee. That way, it's very clear what's included, because, when I use CMP, or coastal migratory pelagics, there is kind of

this glazed look of like what does that mean, but if you say mackerel and cobia, it's very specific, and that includes everything that's under that coastal migratory pelagics.

**MR. BOYLES: As I said, Madam Chair, I would like to make the motion to rename the Mackerel Committee to the Mackerel Cobia Committee.**

MR. BOWEN: Second.

DR. DUVAL: Robert, if you don't mind maybe restating that motion again to include the advisory panel, because this would -- The advisory panel name was changed to the CMP Advisory Panel. Then I think we would all be crystal clear.

**MR. BOYLES: Absolutely. I would make the motion to rename the Mackerel Committee and the Coastal Migratory Pelagics AP to the Mackerel Cobia Committee and AP.**

DR. DUVAL: All right, and I think I saw a second from Zack. Is there any discussion on this? I think this makes things very clear. **Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

We have one more item. At this meeting, we had a very lengthy discussion and presentation by Dr. Barbieri on the results coming out of the SEDAR 41 benchmark stock assessment, and Dr. Barbieri is a member of the Scientific and Statistical Committee, and he was pressed for -- Thankfully, he's been very involved in the assessment for SEDAR 41 from start to finish and has been involved in assessments for red snapper previously, and so he was very well versed in the topic and was very much able to answer the questions, but one of the things that we wanted to bring up was maybe the possibility of the lead analyst for an assessment preparing or presenting a presentation on an assessment when we get an update.

Often we have Science Center staff that will make presentations by webinar and Regional Office staff that join us by webinar. Jenny Lee always joins us by webinar, and so we wanted to raise the topic of possibly having the lead analyst from the Science Center for a particular assessment give that brief overview, and not that we wouldn't have our SSC Chair to discuss it as well, but I think if there are questions that are specific to the guts of the assessment, so to speak, it might be more helpful to have the person who actually ran that assessment here to answer questions on the spot, and I think it probably puts the SSC member in less of a difficult position of trying to answer questions that maybe he or she don't necessarily know the answer to, and so I'm going to look to Dr. Ponwith for some comment and input on that thought.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center would be pleased to have the lead analyst for any given stock assessment make a presentation via webinar. It's one of those Catch-22s. Our ideal would be to have them physically here, but, as you know, we are still reeling under the travel ceilings that we've been put under and so, again, just to reiterate that a travel ceiling was imposed that cut the amount of travel that we were allowed to do in any given year by 30 percent from a benchmark year, and whether you have the money or not is irrelevant. It's you cannot travel more than 30 percent less than the benchmark year, and that puts some serious constraints on our travel.

Provided that the council is comfortable with a webinar presentation, I think that that is a very constructive addition to this, and we would be willing to have the lead analyst make a presentation at any of the meetings that you think that the council would benefit from that. What I would appreciate is if there is a dedicated period of time where the analyst can make the presentation, be engaged in a dialogue with the council and answer questions and then be excused from the meeting and then, if there are follow-on questions, we can bring them in again to remark on any follow-on questions, and that would be a way to have the benefit of them engaged in the council meeting without actually costing them a week of analytical time by traveling here. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Bonnie, for your willingness to do that. I think that would definitely make the conversation more productive. **We do have a draft motion on the screen, if someone would be willing to make that motion to request the lead analyst present stock assessment results to the council via webinar.**

MR. HARTIG: **I move that we request the lead analyst present stock assessment results to the council via webinar.**

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second to that motion? It's seconded by Charlie. Is there further discussion on the motion?

MR. HARTIG: I just would say, Madam Chairman, that we can have some questions ready before the analyst gives their presentation, and so they will have the questions already for some things and then others as they --

DR. DUVAL: I agree. If there are questions that come up prior to the council meeting that the analyst could be prepared to answer that would help them be efficient in their presentation. Any other discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

Then I think we come to the timing and tasks motion. That would be that staff prepare the red grouper SAFE Report, the revised 2016 priorities, public comment and webinar guidelines for review at the September 2016 meeting, prepare comment letters, and obtain council input. Is there someone willing to make that motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: **Madam Chair, I move that we have the staff prepare the red grouper SAFE Report, the revised 2016 priorities, public comment and webinar guidelines for review at the September 2016 meeting, prepare comment letters, and obtain council input.**

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second to that motion? Second by Robert. Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none that motion stands approved.**

That concludes our business under Executive Finance, and so now we're going to move into just a couple of presentations and liaison reports, and so we will go first to the Regional Office. Dr. Crabtree has left us, but Dr. McGovern is here. Jack, do you have anything?

DR. MCGOVERN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a few things. The proposed rule package for Dolphin Wahoo Reg 1 has gone to Headquarters, and so we expect a proposed rule to publish in the next couple of weeks. The DEIS for Snapper Grouper Amendment 37 published today, and the comment period on that ends on August 1.

Also, I would like to provide an update on our hiring. We've had a number of vacancies in Sustainable Fisheries for about a year now, and we're finally getting around to filling those vacancies, and we hired three new branch chiefs. Rick is the South Atlantic Branch Chief, as I said on Monday. We have a new Branch Chief for the Gulf Branch. When Steve Branstetter retires, it will be Sue Gerhart. For the Data Branch, replacing Andy Strelcheck, is going to be Jessica Stephen. Then we have done interviews for vacancies that we have in the South Atlantic Branch, replacing Kate Michie, the Gulf Branch, the Caribbean Branch, and the Data Management Branch, and so we will hopefully get those people onboard before the end of the summer.

Then the last thing I have is an update on revisions to the bycatch reduction device testing manual. This is something that's in your briefing book under Additional Folders for the Council Session, and so the Southeast Regional Office is making administrative changes to the BRD manual, and, to make these changes, we have to publish a proposed rule and a final rule, noting the changes to the public, so that they can comment on it.

The BRD testing manual establishes a process for evaluating whether a bycatch reduction device that's being proposed meets the established bycatch reduction criteria. If it meets the criteria, then it can be certified for use in the Southeastern shrimp fishery, and so the document is in your briefing book. It has all the track changes in it, with the proposed changes, and mostly it's editorial, but the other thing that's in there is the data forms that were appended to the manual have been removed, because those forms are incorporated into the broad family of forms used by the observer program and they can be obtained from the Science Center, and so that concludes my report, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Jack. Are there questions for Jack on any of those items? Okay. Seeing none, then we will move on. I don't believe we have any FEPs to review, and so we're going to move on to Dr. Ponwith, and Bonnie has a couple of presentations.

DR. PONWITH: Let me just start by giving a verbal update of where we are. Earlier this month, the S-K recommendations from the agency were put forward, and, again, in the 2016 Saltonstall-Kennedy call, there were a lot of proposals that were reviewed. Fifty projects ultimately were funded, for about \$11 million. Within the Southeast, which is the South Atlantic jurisdiction, the Gulf, and the U.S. Caribbean, about \$1.5 million worth of projects, six projects, were funded.

This is just an opportunity to take a look at those six projects and really be thinking about the S-K funding cycle coming up, the RFP for that coming up, and be thinking about those Saltonstall-Kennedy opportunities for cooperative research or unique research that will benefit the work that we're trying to accomplish here, and be thinking about what kind of projects might be put forward or collaborations might be encouraged in the upcoming year.

This is an update on the fishery-independent sampling that's being done, and this is just an update on where we are on the MARMAP/SEAMAP/SEFIS work that we're doing in the Gulf. We had approximately 120 sea days expected in 2016 for this work, which is about similar to where we were in the past. The sampling is going to be from Cape Hatteras down to the St. Lucie Inlet in Florida, and these are the vessels that we intend to be using this year, MARMAP using the Sand Tiger to begin this season, due to some problems that we're having with the Palmetto. She's in for repairs. These are just sort of a display of the trap effort that we've had between North Carolina and Florida over time, and I guess I will just leave it at that. Next slide.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's it.

DR. PONWITH: That's it? Okay. I apologize, but I didn't have that one pulled up on my own screen. The other thing that I wanted to talk with you about was the status of the South Atlantic Climate Region Action Plan. The NOAA Fisheries Climate Science Strategy was developed to help us meet the growing need for climate information for use in management decisions across the nation, and our goal is really to be better prepared for managing fisheries in the face of changing climate. One of the actions that the strategy called for was to develop regional actions plans, to develop those within NOAA Fisheries, but with heavy participation by our partners, the councils, the states, the commissions, the fishing industry, et cetera.

The regional action plan is intended to guide our work over the next five years, and the activities that we have within the regional action plan, or RAP, for the South Atlantic include some activities like strengthening our ability to assess climate data needs for the region, strengthening our dialogues with the fishermen who are observing these changes on the water, as we learn through public testimony, and being able to better connect those observations with tools like the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's citizen science effort.

We intend to be conducting vulnerability analyses, which would enable us to be able to look at the fisheries, the habitats, these human communities, and understand their relative vulnerability to impacts of climate change, and then also to develop tools for providing quantitative management advice under a range of climate scenarios and provide management strategies that are robust to the physical environment relative to biological changes in the region and really explore synergies with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Fishery Ecosystem Plan.

We have developed a strawman of actions, a table of actions that we have presented to the council and to the ASMFC for review and comment and, as those reviews are underway, we're developing the report. That's the heart of the report, developing the narrative around that, and, ultimately, when that narrative is ready, we will be posting that for public comment. We really value the council's look at that product when it is posted. Then, ultimately, the goal is to complete that by incorporating comments that we receive on it and have it ready to go final by the close of the fiscal year. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Bonnie. Are there any questions for Bonnie on that piece, on the regional action plan?

MR. HARTIG: It's just exciting to see that she has incorporated citizen science into that vulnerability analyses. That's very cool.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, definitely. Thank you. Bonnie, there are a couple of other presentations in that folder. One references updates to the South Atlantic Council research plan, I think Science Center updates. I didn't know if that was something that you wanted to speak to, and then there were just a couple of other short reviews, one on fishery-independent data program funds and then the headboat update.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, I can go through those with you. This report, which, again, I am getting up too early in the morning. I'm having trouble actually seeing the screen. In the briefing book, that shows up in the council folder?



DR. DUVAL: It does. It's the council folder, and it is Attachment 3. There's a sub-folder that says A3, SEFSC Reports, and it just looks like these are notations made by your staff on here with regard to updates on the research plan that the council submitted. I guess we approved a modified version of the research plan back in September of last year.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you. I was having trouble putting my hands on it. The council put together a research priorities plan, and, of course, that's the council's prerogative. This is crucial. The Center is really eager for the council to take that seriously, and the reason is because those council research plans are being used to help set priorities in the Saltonstall-Kennedy RFP. These research plans are taken very seriously by the agency, and certainly by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

Of course, we were not co-authors of the plan, and so there are things in that plan that are infinitely doable and other things in the plan that are challenging. This is just kind of an update to walk you through where we are on progress on some of these items and where we're on track and where we have concerns. What I can do is walk you through each of these, the short-term time-dependent, Item I here.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center recommends that the council research needs for stock assessments be coordinated and synchronized with those of the SEDAR schedule. That would enable us to make sure that we're putting effort in the areas that are synchronized with that schedule and not off track from that schedule.

There was, for example, the update progress for the blueline tilefish. They talked about these items. The SEDAR has rescheduled blueline tilefish as a benchmark for August of 2016. We will partner with MARMAP and VIMS, and we're on track to meet that task for the stock identification.

It talks about the benchmark for scamp and gray snapper. Again, the comment on that is that's been rescheduled as a research track assessment, pending the approval of that approach by the SEDAR Committee, and we believe that, at this point, we're on track for that. The vermilion snapper, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is on track for that. The next bullet is the update for greater amberjack, and, again, greater amberjack has dropped from the SEDAR list within the next two years. I have to refresh my memory on whether that's back on again, but we certainly will be attentive to this.

Develop annual abundance indices, this is something that we talked at the previous council meeting about. For us to be able to do this, we are certainly willing to explore this. It is something that we do need to work very, very closely, with first the SSC and then ultimately the council on, to make sure that everybody recognizes what the implications are of this on timing, so that we're all confident, among the Center, the SSC, and the council, that that's the approach that we want to take. What I would recommend at this point is that the Center and the SSC work together to develop almost the equivalent of an options paper for what this approach would look like, what it gives the council, and what sort of the time implications of this would be.

Moving to the short-term needs for Spawning and Special Management Zones, many of these research needs are certainly ones we concur with, but have cost implications. That certainly is true of that first bullet. There are funding implications to be able to do monitoring of spawning SMZs.

The next one is to talk about the multibeam surveys in spawning SMZs. Right now, we're evaluating the extent to which these SMZs have been mapped, and what we have found is several of them we have actually made some good progress on those. There is a list here that we talk about where the mapping is completed. We do plan to map the unmapped portion of the South Cape Lookout SMZ during FY16 on the Nancy Foster, and so, that one, we're making very good progress on.

MPA monitoring is needed to be addressed within the next five years, and, again, we are using remotely-operated ROVs for surveys within the MPAs each year, to provide some baseline monitoring data. We do want to be careful to understand what these surveys can be used for and what they can't be used for. An example is they really don't provide good information on age structure or sex ratios of these species, and so we want to make clear what we can deliver with these surveys and what we would need some additional resources and time to be apply to to be able to accomplish that.

Again, that last bullet in blue is the systematic MPA monitoring to allow quantitative comparisons of age structure within and without. The sampling levels for those would be pretty high, to get answers to those questions with statistical confidence. We are certainly willing to work with the council to help develop what type of sampling levels would be needed to address those questions, but that's a high bar.

Characterizing spawning area within the deeper-water snapper grouper areas within and outside MPAs, again, the work right now is limited to ROV work, and those data, again, are good, but there are some questions being asked by the council where those data wouldn't have the statistical power or the capability to answer.

When we talk about the complete MPA multibeam surveys, the next section here is a description of where we are, the progress that we've made on the surveys of those MPAs. I want to be careful, in the interests of time, Madam Chairman. I can go through each of these, or what I can do is ask the council if they have specific questions about these. What I am interested in doing is continuing to work with the council. The council's perspective on research priorities is crucial.

I have the Science Center's perspective on research priorities, and that's important, but the management perspective on research priorities is unique, and we should expect some broad overlap of those perspectives, but not exclusive overlap. That management perspective on research priorities is really important.

The Science Center intends to take that perspective and essentially shuffle that deck. In other words, to take the Science Center's perspective on priorities and the management perspective and shuffle that deck and do that in collaboration with the council, because the research priorities will always outstrip the resources available to address them. That means we need to be extremely collaborative and quite strategic in how we make decisions about what is going to get done versus what will fall off the table because we ran out of personnel power, ship time, or finances before we hit that dotted line where the resources end. What I can say is, without going through this line-by-line, that the Science Center is absolutely committed to working with the council and with the SSC in doing exactly that.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's -- I apologize, Bonnie, if it came across that I was asking you to go through this line-by-line. I really just wanted to make sure that if there was anything in here that you wanted to make sure that the council paid attention to or anything that you wanted to highlight that you had the opportunity to do so.

I think it's great that your staff has provided this update to our research plan. I think it's great that we see this. I think it's really helpful, because it helps us understand what the limitations are on your staff and then also the feedback in terms of -- I see there are a couple of questions in here about prioritization and things like that, and so are there any specific questions for Bonnie on this? I mean, if folks haven't had the opportunity to read this, I would encourage you to do so. It is really nice to get this kind of update.

I'm not seeing any takers, and so I know that, Bonnie, there's just a couple of very short, like four and three-slide presentations. One is on the fishery-independent data program, status of past, current, and future funding outlook, and then the other one is just a couple of slides on the headboat update, and so maybe if we can pull those up, and then we'll move along to Kim's presentation on the Marine Resource Education Program.

DR. PONWITH: This is the fishery-independent data programs, the funding outlook. MARMAP has received funding prior to 1996, and the details of that annual funding is something that we're working on. I know that there's been some concern on the MARMAP front, in terms of the amount of resources they've been getting for this really crucial work that we're doing, and actually relying on heavily for in our stock assessments.

The slide here talks a little bit about the considerable increase in the SEAMAP funding in 2008 and what the causes for that were. It talks about the addition of the SEFIS Survey, which was first funded in 2010. The time series here shows the funding for fishery-independent survey programs in the Southeast by funding sources, and so, if you take a look at this, the MARMAP funding is that blue line, the reddish line is the SEAMAP South Atlantic, and the other line, the short line there, is the SEFIS funding line. Again, that kind of shows you what the trajectory of those funding sources have been over time.

Then, if you go to the next slide, the reason we did that first slide is because it shows a little bit better on the screen. This next slide is one you would have to look at on your computers to actually be able to see those numbers, because they are certainly quite small, and I guess I would just ask if there are questions on the funding.

DR. DUVAL: Any questions for Bonnie?

MR. BOYLES: Not a question, Madam Chair, but just a comment regarding funding. I think it's important for the council to understand new Department of Labor rules that have come down with respect to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The cost to MARMAP, those new rules, we have calculated would be about \$150,000, and so it is not insignificant. The rule I am speaking specifically about are the staff who are designated as exempt employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and so that is going to be another big challenge for us collectively.

DR. DUVAL: To that point, Bonnie?

DR. PONWITH: To that point, we are certainly familiar with the exemption issue that you're talking about, and what would be beneficial for us is if you could create just a one-page fact sheet, and that helps us to be able to communicate those needs when we talk about budgeting, and I just want to assure the council that when we talk about MARMAP that we use the word "our". This is something that, while the resources are going to a state partner for the conduct of this work, the way I describe it is it would be akin to an amputation to lose that program. It is part of the package we have for fishery-independent sampling in the South Atlantic. Fishery-independent sampling in the South Atlantic needs to be strengthened, and we can't afford to lose ground on the progress we've made thus far.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Bonnie.

DR. MCGOVERN: Just a comment as well. I was with MARMAP prior to 1995, and the funding in 1993 was \$425,000 a year. Then, roughly around 1995 or 1996, it doubled to \$850,000.

MR. WAUGH: We raised this issue at the CCC meeting, and Brian followed up with me afterwards. They looked into it, and we asked them, what is the prognosis for long-term fishery-independent funding, and the guidance that he can supply is that, basically, it's being about level funded in the budget. That's all the guidance that he can give, and so if we're seeing declines in either MARMAP or SEAMAP, then we can look more closely and see what is causing that, because, in terms of the budget, it's being pretty much level funded.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. If there are no other comments or questions on that, there's just a quick update on the Southeast Region Headboat Survey.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The program provided Wave 1 estimates on headboat landings on April 15, 2016. They, again, were doing wave estimates, and that was made possible because of the electronic reporting and the new efficiencies that we've gained by that and through database improvements.

The estimates are now available. What we used to do annually, the estimates are now available on a two-month wave, similar to the MRIP timing. Again, the two-month waves are necessary because we need length data, which come from dockside sampling, to be able to convert those landings into pounds.

Ken Brennan participated in the ACCSP For-Hire Inventory Workshop that was held last month, and the workshop reviewed the current for-hire data collection program, to try and reduce duplicate reporting in the Atlantic and in the Gulf of Mexico. The survey itself, some of the things that we've done, is we've been working on the relational database, and you can see -- I guess I won't go through these, in the interest of time, but this is the progress that we've made in integrating the dockside validation and at-sea observer data into one data source, which allows access to these following elements, and, again, that strengthens the data availability, and we've already talked about making data available to the public, and this is part of the data that we'll be working on, making sure that we're following proper protocols to protect confidentiality, but then making these data available.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Bonnie. It's good to see that effort moving forward. Are there any questions about the headboat survey? If not, our next agenda item is an Update on the MREP Program, and we'll turn it over to Kim.

MS. IVERSON: Thank you, and I apologize to Dr. Ponwith. In my enthusiasm for this program, I jumped up here and asked Myra to open my presentation first, and so, also, I just will go through quickly and provide the council an update on the Marine Resource Education Program. As you're aware, it's administered through the Gulf of Maine Research Institute. It's a workshop-based program, where we have workshops in the spring on the science and workshops again in the fall on management, and it's, most importantly, a program by fishermen for fishermen, and it continues to operate in that manner.

I wanted to just visually show you the expansion of this program. These are locations of participants, as the program was first initiated in New England. Those of you that remember Tony Iarocci, he and Ben Hartig traveled up to New England and participated in the program many years ago, and they came back and were quite enthusiastic. Since that time, we have MREP Southeast and Mid-Atlantic regions, and also the Caribbean program that has since expanded, and this is a geographic representation of participants from Texas all the way up through New England, and we will talk a little bit more about that expansion.

I wanted to note that we have about seventy-eight alumni from the South Atlantic that have participated. I counted seventeen of our current advisory panel members that have participated and graduated from this program, and that includes Ira Lax, our Chair, who has been active in this meeting this week. He started as an MREP participant. He had never really heard about the council, and he didn't know very much about the federal management process. Deidre Jeffcoat, who now is on our advisory panel, our Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel, and also serves on our Steering Committee. David Webb, who most of you have met, is now a member of our Habitat Advisory Panel, and several of these people also have participated recently in the Citizen Science Workshop, and so it's spreading. It's not just spreading geographically, but these people are actually becoming more and more involved in our process.

Of course, we have council members that have been involved. Ben sits on our Steering Committee, and he has now volunteered to be our primary contact for our upcoming workshops in 2016 and 2017. Doug Haymans and Charlie Phillips have participated. I know Anna wants to go. We have just had a lot of involvement at all levels. Dr. Crabtree has been involved, and our staff is involved in the program. John Carmichael attends the workshop and is active as an instructor and presenter.

We have a Steering Committee that continues to remain very, very active in guiding the program. We met in Puerto Rico back in September. Clay Porch, Dr. Porch, from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is on the Steering Committee and Luiz Barbieri. Ben Hartig is also on the Steering Committee. Again, members from our advisory panels are Kenny Fex, Deidre Jeffcoat, Dave Snyder, who was here earlier. Charlene Ponce from the Gulf Council and myself also serve on the Steering Committee, and it's a very active and productive group. We go every year and meet annually and review the program, review the curriculum, and we consider recommendations from evaluations that are received each year.

The science workshops and management workshops have been scheduled for 2016, and we had a very productive science workshop in St. Petersburg back in April. We had a total of thirty

participants, and so it's held at the Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute each year, which affords an opportunity for the participants to work very closely with FWRI staff. Luiz and his wife just do a really wonderful job of interacting and providing access to all of their staff.

When we think about the participants in the workshops, it's communication both ways. You have the facilitators that are there and also the fishermen representing commercial and recreational sectors as well as private industry, and it's a really dynamic three days. If you haven't had an opportunity to participate and you would like to, please let me know.

The curriculum, again, we go back each year, as part of the Steering Committee process, and evaluate. It continues to maintain those key components, talking about fishery-independent and fishery-dependent data, the stock assessment process. We have a lot of interaction with FWRI personnel, where fishermen are allowed to go into the lab and ask questions about how does this work and how are samples collected.

Then they actually get to go in and read otoliths, do some aging work. We had so many participants this year with the science workshop that it gets a little tight in the wet lab, and so we moved into the auditorium, but the FWRI staff, again, really is accommodating. We get to let the fishermen extract the otoliths and read them and do some aging work. They go back outside and they talk to the people that are responsible for gear, gear use, and data collection, in that manner.

Again, we will have our management workshop on October 4 through 6, and that's in Tampa, where we relegate fishermen to three days of being in a hotel meeting room, and it works, and so if you haven't had an opportunity to see that, it's quite a challenge, but it really does work well.

This year, for the science workshop, our evaluations were as positive as we have ever received. Again, we had a total of thirty participants, a lot of people exchanging ideas and information, and we always encourage people to be very, very truthful in evaluations, because that's how that Steering Committee makes changes, and they are, and so we feel really, really good about what happened with the science workshop, and we look forward to having many of those same people participate in our management workshop.

These are some of the quotes that are just pulled out of the evaluations, so that you can see how people are responding, and it's not just the participants, the people that sign up and apply for the workshops, but it's also -- Each year, it kind of recharges our batteries, as presenters and facilitators, to have that interaction on a very personal level and to see people that haven't been involved in management at all, didn't know anything about the fishery management council or how this process works, to come in and volunteer their time, their effort, to sit in classrooms and ask questions and learn. Someone said it's like trying to drink out of a fire hose, but it's really fun, and they said that there's a willingness to pay to contribute to that, which we may pick up on that later.

What's next? We continue to have the Steering Committee be involved in reviewing the project's objectives and priorities and doing evaluations. Continued funding is always a challenge, and, again, the program receives funding from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and other sources. The Steering Committee, I noted the council support as part of the visioning project, and they were very encouraged by that.

I just found out yesterday that we, the Marine Resource Education Program -- Again, kind of like Bonnie, it's we, but it's expanding out to the west coast, and we had Bob Dooley, who is a commercial fisherman from Monterrey, California, attend the science workshop, a wonderful gentleman, and he brought this enthusiasm with him. He is working closely with Alexa Dayton, who is the Program Coordinator, and Chris McCann, and also the Pacific Council in putting together workshops, and I knew that he was enthusiastic, but I didn't realize they were going to have two workshops this year, and so they're not waiting for the spring/fall thing. They're just doing it, and so the workshops are scheduled in Santa Cruz, California in August and again in October in Portland, Oregon, and so we're really excited about that as well.

Locally, I spoke with David Bush, and the North Carolina Fisheries Association is taking the MREP model and they are encouraging participants from both commercial and recreational sectors to come and participate in a shortened version of the MREP program, and so there's a lot going on. If you have any questions -- I know that we're kind of limited with time, but if you want additional information, you can see me or if you have time for questions today, Madam Chair. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks so much, Kim. It's always good to hear about the participation and enthusiasm for this program, and I certainly know that I take every opportunity that I have to talk it up and encourage people to join. Are there any questions for Kim?

DR. PONWITH: This is a wonderful program, and I just have to say that the scientists from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center who have participated as instructors love doing this. The interactions with the fishing industry people have been so enriching for them. I mean they're going to this to be able to explain how the science is done that supports the management that is so highly influential in their businesses, but they always walk away remarking on how much they learn from these interactions and how much they appreciate the interactions with these fishing professionals, and so I just want to congratulate the council for their involvement in this program.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Bonnie. That's great to hear that kind of feedback from your staff. The next item on our agenda is Agency and Liaison Reports, and then we'll cover other meetings. Captain Gordon, I didn't know if you had a liaison report for us.

CAPTAIN GORDON: Sure, I do, and thank you. One thing I didn't mention, and I feel remiss, previously is Lieutenant Prey, Lieutenant Tara Prey, since the last meeting was promoted to full Lieutenant, and so please congratulate her at the next meeting. She will continue to attend as Admiral Buschman's regular representative to the council, and so please give her your congratulations.

As far as boardings since March, 362 boardings, and we've issued fourteen significant violations. We did conduct an operation off of South Carolina, a joint operation involving four stations, some of our aircraft and intelligence assets, targeting snapper grouper fisheries. Thirty-one boardings were conducted during that operation, from May 9 to 13, and mostly safety violations were issued and five written warnings, and so we were successful in getting out there.

Then I just wanted to mention, for us, we are very focused on the lobster mini-season coming up. We will hopefully avoid fatalities this year. I think we had one last year, but obviously it's a very busy time as we approach that for the Florida Keys and even up the coast. Then we're working

on -- Obviously we represent Admiral Buschman, who is the District 7 Commander, and we're working on getting him to perhaps the next council meeting or one coming up. Certainly he considers fisheries and the Coast Guard's role in enforcement and safety critically important, and he does want to get out to address the council and meet everyone, and that was all I had, unless there were any questions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you very much, Captain. Are there questions for Captain Gordon?

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Captain. I appreciate that report. In your thirty-one boardings, you said mostly safety issues. Were there any fishery violations of those thirty-one?

CAPTAIN GORDON: I will have to get back to you. I don't believe so.

MR. BOWEN: That was conducted, you said, off of South Carolina?

CAPTAIN GORDON: Yes.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: I am going to move around the table to my left, and, unfortunately, Jessica McCawley had to leave, but, Erika, I didn't know if you had some updates for us in her stead.

MS. BURGESS: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. We have mentioned it a few times this week, but I wanted to remind you all that we have our commission meeting next week in Apalachicola, and the South Atlantic items that will be on our agenda are bringing fish back from the Bahamas and the mutton snapper item that we've talked a lot about. The Gulf items we'll be considering that you may be interested in is modifying the circle hook requirement for yellowtail snapper, which is similar to what we have on the Atlantic now, and that's all I have for you. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Erika. Are there any questions for Erika? All right. Mr. Sanchez, our Gulf Council liaison.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just first want to start off by saying I am very sad to hear about Joe. He was a very special person, and I'm going to miss him. The Gulf Council, I've got a lot of things to cover, but I will try to be brief, because everybody wants to move forward and go home.

Yellowtail, final action on the framework, we're looking towards removing the circle hook requirement south of Cape Sable and modify both recreational and commercial fishing years to August through July 31. Hogfish, Amendment 33, it's a work in progress. It considers a management boundary to distinguish between a West Florida stock and an East Florida, i.e., Keys, stock. It seeks to define overfishing, set some overfishing thresholds, setting ACLs, and considering looking at increasing the minimum size to sixteen inches. We're probably going to see some final action next week.

King mackerel, Amendment 26, final action, if approved by the Secretary, it would modify allocation as follows. The Western Zone would be 40 percent, Northern Zone would be 18 percent, the Southern Zone Hand Line would be 21, and the Southern Zone Gillnet would be 21 percent,



respectively. It seeks to modify the boundary to a single year-round boundary on the eastern edge of the mixing zone and delegates management of the mixing zone to the Gulf Council.

It allows for retention and sale of Atlantic king mackerel caught incidentally by shark gillnet boats that possess both a federal king mackerel permit and a shark commercial permit. It allocates the Atlantic Southern Zone into two split season quotas. March 31 through September 30 is Season 1, and that's 60 percent, and October 1 through the end of the February would be the second one, the balance of the 40 percent. Finally, with king mackerel on Amendment 26, we're going to increase the bag to three fish.

King mackerel continued, Amendment 29, we're going to start creating options and looking at methods to utilize uncaught quota, what we referred to earlier in this meeting as allocation sharing. King Mackerel Amendment 5 Framework, consider removing prohibition on retention of recreationally-caught king mackerel, allowing basically a commercial boat to have a recreational bag limit when they're fishing and their quota is filled.

For-hire reporting, data collection, the technical committee discussed the for-hire census program with trip-level reporting and catch and effort, which include trip notification, submission of catch information prior to returning to the dock, with a passive location data via GPS, probably pinging every thirty minutes or so. Target implementation would be January 1, 2018.

Mutton snapper and gag framework action to modify ACLs and recreational management measures, mutton, as we discussed here, the latest assessment indicates the population is smaller than estimated, and so something needs to be done, possibly, to reduce harvest and avoid overfishing. The council is reviewing an options paper in June and considering modifying annual catch limits.

The council is also considering increasing the commercial size limit for gag grouper. The council may want to consider requesting a new yield stream for mutton for 2016, moving forward, as it may provide a slight increase in projected ABC. We already discussed that, and I think staff, both Gulf and Atlantic staff, are discussing this, to try to figure out and work our way around that, so we don't slow this process up and make it any slower than it already is.

Lobster, you heard Bruce. He gave a great presentation, and I was happy to hear it, and we're on the same page on lobster, and so I won't bore you with the details. I appreciate being here and seeing everybody, and I look forward to seeing Anna next week. Thank you for having me.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks a lot, John. Are there any questions for John? All right. For me, for North Carolina, it's sort of a revolving door. I have a new boss again, and so Braxton Davis, who is known to some folks from the State of South Carolina. He used to work with the coastal program there. He is currently the Director of the Division of Coastal Management in North Carolina, and he was also appointed the Director of the Division of Marine Fisheries, and so two jobs for the price of one, and so Braxton has jumped in with both feet, getting them wet, and meeting with various stakeholders and constituents, and he is certainly made even more busy by the fact that the legislature went into session not too long ago, and so there are a few fisheries-related bills that are making their way through, and we'll just have to see how that goes, but, other than that, I don't really have any other updates. I think those are big enough changes, and so I'm going to make my way around to Dr. Laney for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I will just mention two things which I think are rather significant, actually significant for the council as well as the Fish and Wildlife Service, because both of them, hopefully, will improve production of American shad and other species that constitute forage for council species.

The first one of those is the fact that the Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the National Marine Fisheries Service, managed to reach a settlement with the Exelon Corporation on fish passage, Section 18, Fishway Prescription, at the Conowingo Dam, which is the gateway dam on the Susquehanna River, and so that will mean improvements will be made to passage there for both American shad and American eel in the future, and so that was a great achievement by our Northeast Region team, which did include NMFS representation.

Then the second thing I will mention is that, on the Roanoke River, after many, many years, literally decades of discussion and negotiation and scientific studies, the Corps of Engineers has agreed to modify their operational flow at the John H. Kerr Dam to enable them to go from 20,000 cubic feet per second to 35,000 cubic feet per second when it's appropriate and thereby restore a more normal flow regime to the lower Roanoke River, which should benefit all of the diadromous species that use that system as well as all the natural resources in the riparian zone on the lower river. That will ultimately provide a more natural flow regime into Albemarle Sound and ultimately the Atlantic Ocean, and so two rather significant achievements, both of which entailed many, many, many different partners and many, many years of collaboration. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Wilson. It's nice to see things like that come to fruition. Are there any questions for Wilson? All right. Mr. Boyles. It's nice to have you with us again.

MR. BOYLES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will say, as I've said a couple of times that it seems like Groundhog Day. Let me say thank you to the staff and to the members of the council and our constituents for welcoming me back. It's nice to be back around the table, only for one time only, and Mel, again, sends his regrets, and I appreciate you all's forbearance with me as I get my feet a little wet, just this once, but thank you all for welcoming me back.

Just a couple of things. I've mentioned cobia already, but I would like to, Madam Chair, read an email that Mel Bell got from one of Dr. George Sedberry's students, who is on the NOAA ship Pisces and looking at some of the artificial reef material that was placed on the Charleston Deep Reef Site.

This is a quote: The deeper barge, in 100 meters, was absolutely loaded with deepwater grouper species, snowy grouper, yellowedge grouper, misty grouper, and warsaw grouper. I have never seen so many huge grouper in my life, three to five feet in length. The shallow natural hard-bottom rocky ledges of the Edisto MPA even had several now-rare speckled hinds. The habitat was loaded with diverse sponges, gorgonians, black corals, and coralline algae. We certainly appreciate NOAA's support and certainly Dr. Sedberry's interest and his students sharing that, and so we're excited about that and excited about the future.

Dr. Ponwith did mention our issues with R/V Palmetto. I am happy to report that the plan now is for the R/V Palmetto to be splashed next Tuesday or Wednesday, after a repower job that got to be really, really expensive and extensive. Those of you who operate boats certainly understand that, and we got more than we bargained for, but I'm told that the Palmetto will be, for all practical

purposes, a new ship, and so we're excited about that, and that concludes my report, Madam Chair, and thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Robert. Thanks for that report out on the underwater survey. I think that's really exciting news and great to hear. Are there any questions for Robert?

MR. HARTIG: Is there video information that we can look at eventually?

MR. BOYLES: I will find out. I think that's a good question.

DR. LANEY: I was just going to ask Robert if he would share Mel's message with everybody, so we could reread that and possibly transmit it to other folks that we know support that kind of work.

DR. DUVAL: All right. Last, but not least, Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Saved the best for last. I have a few items. Wilson has mentioned a couple of times the sturgeon critical habitat meetings. Just so you know, the meeting in Georgia is next Monday, the 20<sup>th</sup>, from 7:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M., at my office at Coastal Resources Division.

We opened shrimp season on June 1. There's been good catches so far. I don't have any specifics to mention, but in relation to shrimp, there is also a public informational meeting next Wednesday, June 22, from 1:00 to 4:00 at the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography. We have been working closely with several branches of UGA's research groups. South Carolina DNR, North Carolina, Florida, and Virginia have all contributed information to this and Mercer University and Troy University. It's a broad research effort looking at blackgill, and so there is an informational meeting on June 22, from 1:00 to 4:00 at the Skidaway Institute regarding that.

Finally, I guess the thing that I'm most excited about is at our 2016 legislative session, our legislators saw fit to allow the Coastal Resources Division to benefit from a new car license plate. I know it doesn't sound like much, but, for us, that's twenty-dollars per plate that goes directly to habitat enhancement, the only place it can go. To date, we've used SRF funds for offshore work, and we've used EPA dollars for some of our inshore work, and this will be the first time we've had a dedicated funding source for habitat work, and we really don't have a good feel for what it's going to generate, but we do hope it's going to be a constant stream of funds, and so there will be artwork. We have received three submissions from artists, which we will post on July 1 for public comment, and we will hopefully have the plate on the street by October 1. With that, I will conclude my report, and let's go home.

DR. DUVAL: All right. Thanks, Doug. Are there any questions for Doug? Seeing none, the final item on our agenda is simply Upcoming Meetings and Gregg, or Upcoming Meetings and Other Business.

MR. WAUGH: In terms of upcoming meetings, June 28, 29, and 30, we've got the Blueline Tile Stock ID Workshop in Raleigh. This is on Attachment 6 from Full Council. In July, we'll have a number of staff members traveling. That's a month that people take annual leave, and so if you can't find somebody, that's why, but you can always get in touch with me or Mike.

In August, we'll be very busy. We've got public hearings that start on cobia and mutton snapper, and scoping for the dolphin and yellowtail, and we'll be doing a hearing up in Virginia, and, the week of the 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup>, they're also presenting this to the Mid-Atlantic Council for their input. Of course, that first week in August is the ASMFC meeting, and so we'll get some guidance from them in terms of how they are interested in participating, and John will be attending that meeting. We finish up public hearings the week of August 15.

Then, of course, we have our September meeting. You will be getting the first notice for the September meeting later this month, on the 28<sup>th</sup>. The hotel cutoff for the September meeting is early for this one, July 28, and so you want to make sure that you get your reservations in once you get that memo towards the end of this month, and that's it.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Gregg. Is there any other business to come before the council? Seeing none, thank goodness, we are adjourned. Thank you all for your hard work this week.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned on June 17, 2016.)

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By:  
Amanda Thomas  
July 6, 2016

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP**

**COUNCIL CHAIR**

✓ Dr. Michelle Duval  
NC Division of Marine Fisheries  
3441 Arendell Street  
(PO Box 769)  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/808-8011 (ph);  
252/726-0254 (f)  
[michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov](mailto:michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov)

**VICE-CHAIR**

✓ Charlie 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](mailto:Ga_capt@yahoo.com)

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

✓ Anna Beckwith  
1907 Paulette Road  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/671-3474 (ph)  
[AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com](mailto:AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com)

~~Met Bell~~ **ROBERT BOYLES**  
✓ 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](mailto:bellm@dnr.sc.gov)

✓ Zack Bowen  
P.O. Box 30825  
Savannah, GA 31410  
912/398-3733 (ph)  
[fishzack@comcast.net](mailto:fishzack@comcast.net)

✓ W. Chester Brewer  
250 Australian Ave. South  
Suite 1400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33408  
561/655-4777 (ph)  
[WCBLAW@aol.com](mailto:WCBLAW@aol.com)

✓ Mark Brown  
3642 Pandora Drive  
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466  
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)  
[capt.markbrown@comcast.net](mailto:capt.markbrown@comcast.net)

VIA WEBSITE ✓ Chris Conklin  
P.O. Box 972  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
843/543-3833  
[conklinsafmc@gmail.com](mailto:conklinsafmc@gmail.com)

✓ Jack Cox  
2010 Bridges Street  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/728-9548  
[Dayboat1965@gmail.com](mailto: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](mailto:roy.crabtree@noaa.gov)

✓ Ben Hartig  
9277 Sharon Street  
Hobe Sound, FL 33455  
772/546-1541 (ph)  
[mackattackben@att.net](mailto:mackattackben@att.net)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)**

✓ 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](mailto:doughaymans@gmail.com)

✓ 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](mailto: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](mailto:jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com)

LTJG Tara Pray  
U.S. Coast Guard  
909 SE 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.  
Miami, FL 33131  
[tara.c.pray@uscg.mil](mailto:tara.c.pray@uscg.mil)

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](mailto:Warner-KramerDM@state.gov)

CAPT. MARK GORDON  
JOHN SANCHEZ  
RICK DEFLECTOR  
NEK MEHTA  
DR. BONNIE POWETH  
DR. JACK MCGOVERN  
IRIS LOWERY  
SOCELYN D'AMBROSIO  
ERIKA BURGESS  
DR. ANDY STRELCHECK  
TRACY DUNN  
JEFF RADONSKI

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**COUNCIL STAFF**

**Executive Director**

✓ Gregg T. Waugh  
[gregg.waugh@safmc.net](mailto:gregg.waugh@safmc.net)

**Deputy Director – Science & Statistics**

✓ John Carmichael  
[john.carmichael@safmc.net](mailto:john.carmichael@safmc.net)

**Deputy Director - Management**

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront  
[brian.chevront@safmc.net](mailto:brian.chevront@safmc.net)

**Fishery Scientist**

✓ Myra Brouwer  
[myra.brouwer@safmc.net](mailto:myra.brouwer@safmc.net)

**Public Information Officer**

✓ Kim Iverson  
[kim.iverson@safmc.net](mailto:kim.iverson@safmc.net)

**Financial Secretary**

Debra Buscher  
[deb.buscher@safmc.net](mailto:deb.buscher@safmc.net)

**Fisheries Social Scientist**

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
[kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net](mailto:kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net)

**Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
[cindy.chaya@safmc.net](mailto:cindy.chaya@safmc.net)

**Purchasing & Grants**

✓ Julie O'Dell  
[kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net](mailto:kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net)

**Fishery Scientist**

✓ Chip Collier  
[chip.collier@safmc.net](mailto:chip.collier@safmc.net)

**Senior Fishery Biologist**

✓ Roger Pugliese  
[roger.pugliese@safmc.net](mailto:roger.pugliese@safmc.net)

**Administrative Officer**

✓ Mike Collins  
[mike.collins@safmc.net](mailto:mike.collins@safmc.net)

**Fishery Outreach Specialist**

✓ Amber Von Harten  
[amber.vonharten@safmc.net](mailto:amber.vonharten@safmc.net)

**Fishery Biologist**

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo  
[mike.errigo@safmc.net](mailto:mike.errigo@safmc.net)

**SEDAR Coordinators**

Dr. Julie Neer - [julie.neer@safmc.net](mailto:julie.neer@safmc.net)  
Julia Byrd - [julia.byrd@safmc.net](mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net)

**Fishery Economist**

✓ John Hadley  
[john.hadley@safmc.net](mailto:john.hadley@safmc.net)

Timestamp	Full Name	Email	Mailing Address (If your	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply)
6/17/2016 8:38:50	David Bush	davidbush@ncfish.org	on file	NCFA
6/17/2016 8:40:33	sherrylanne mccoy	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	on file	Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler/Retailer
6/17/2016 10:33:10	Lora Clarke	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
6/17/2016 10:34:45	antonio giambanco	antoniogiambanco@me.com	on file	Commercial Fisherman
6/17/2016 10:37:17	Dean Foster	dfoster@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
6/17/2016 10:53:23	joshua mccoy	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	on file	Commercial Fisherman
6/17/2016 11:21:56	Jeanna Merrifield	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	on file	Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler/Retailer, Concerned US Citizen



FRIDAY - JUNE 17, 2016 WEBINAR ATTENDANCE

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Alvarado	Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noaa.gov
Austin	Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Ballenger	Joey	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Barbieri	Luiz	luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com
Beideman	Terri	terri.beideman@vac-usa.com
Bell	Mel	bellm@dnr.sc.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Bush	David	davidbush@ncfish.org
Busse	James	seafoodatlantic@gmail.com
Byrd	Julia	juliabyrd@hotmail.com
CONKLIN	CHRIS	CONKLINSAFMC@GMAIL.COM
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Cullen	Tim	tcullen@yahoo.com
D'Ambrosio	Jocelyn	jocelyn.dambrosio@noaa.gov
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Dunmire	Leda	ldunmire@pewtrusts.org
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jepson	Michael	michael.jepson@noaa.gov
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
L	I	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Lamberte	Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov
Lowery	Iris	iris.lowery@noaa.gov
MacLauchlin	Kari	kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net
Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
McHan	Chris	cmchan@gmri.org
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com
Merrifield	Mike	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org

## 6/17/16 WEBINAR ATTENDANCE

Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Shiple	Krista	krista.shiple@myfwc.com
Shipman	Susan	susanshipman@att.net
Smit-Brunello	Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov
Stafford	Pete	spstafford@gmail.com
Stephen	Jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
brown	mark	capt.markbrown@comcast.net
buble	walter	bublew@dnr.sc.gov
burton	michael	michael.burton@noaa.gov
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
smart	tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov