

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Savannah Hilton DeSoto
Savannah, GA**

March 6-7, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

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

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

Council Staff:

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

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

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

Dr. Jack McGovern
Doug Boyd
Pres Pate

Additional Observers Attached

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Madison Ballroom of the Savannah Hilton DeSoto, Thursday afternoon, March 6, 2014, and was called to order at 4:15 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: We're going to call to order the South Atlantic Council Full Council. The first item on the agenda is adoption of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Is there any objection to approving the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved. The next item of business is approval of the December 2013 minutes. Are there any changes, deletions, or corrections to the minutes? Is there any objection to approving the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. We've got a couple presentations we'll make, and I think I will start out with Bob as the lead-in for one of them.

MR. MAHOOD: I don't know how many of you folks know that one of our staff members is taking on a new position and leaving the council. I believe the position title is called wife. Anna is getting married, and so we were extremely excited about that until we found out she was going to have to leave town.

Anna has been with us now for a while and she has really come along. She is an excellent employee. I think you all that have kind of seen her grow up on the staff here realize what a great employee she is. We certainly hate to see her go; it is going to be very difficult to replace her. We would like Anna to come forward.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you; I'm not a council member.

MR. HARTIG: No, but you are a valued staff.

MR. MAHOOD: Council family.

MR. HARTIG: The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council proudly presents you with this really cool box and barometer and clock for her dedicated service and outstanding contribution to the council in the conservation and management of our nation's marine fisheries resources. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. MAHOOD: I've got one more. The next presentation is an absentee presentation. Otha Easley, our law enforcement person from the Southeast Regional Office, retired. He failed to tell anybody. I think in even in his own office he kind of slipped out according to Tracy. I called Otha and I said, "What were you doing, you didn't give us a chance to say goodbye and talk about you and talk to you?" I said, "You are a civilian now, you know we can pay your way back to the meeting." But he couldn't make this meeting and we wanted to go ahead and make a presentation to him. Tracy has assured me that he will make sure that the box is delivered. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, do you want to read the inscription on the box?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, certainly; proudly presented by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to Otha Easley for his distinguished service and outstanding contributions in the conservation and management of our nation's marine fisheries resources. We'll get this to Otha by way of Tracy somehow. I'm not going to mention how, but somehow we'll get it to him.

From my perspective, working with Otha over the years has been a pleasure. He is a real stand-up law enforcement guy and he will keep you to where you need to be, but he will also work with you. He has worked with the council very well over the years in trying to come to compromises between law enforcement and council management. I sincerely appreciate Otha's participation in the process over the years. He has been a great asset to the process.

MR. DUNN: I will try to relay the message. I don't think it will be verbatim, but I'll try.

MR. HARTIG: All right, that is it on the presentations for today, so I think what we'll do is start with status reports. Roy, so you have anything on your status report?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, just a few things. The recreational and commercial quota tables have been updated on our website. We hope to have the headboat data for 2013 included in it very soon. We have no exempted fishing permit requests and just a few protected resources things going on.

We had a while back a petition to list Nassau grouper and we also have a petition to list queen conch under the Endangered Species Act. We are now going through a status review for both of those species; and our goal is to make a determination by July of this year. I think we've talked in the past about the petition to list 66 species of corals under the ESA; and there were some extensions to that to gather additional public comment.

We expect to make final determinations on that by June of this year. We're also going through a relook at loggerhead sea turtle critical habitat. There was a proposed rule published on July 18, 2013. We're now evaluating the public comments; and the goal is to have a final rule by the fall of this year.

Then on December the 9th of this year we published a final rule on right whale issues, and in particular on the ship speed regulations in a number of areas. That, when it was originally set up, had a sunset provision and the final rule eliminated the sunset provision and maintained those ship speed regulations. That is my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Roy; any questions for Roy? Monica, do you have anything?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do not; thank you.

DR. PONWITH: I do, Mr. Chairman. I have got a presentation on the update of the headboat program. The Southeast Region Headboat Program completed its first year of collecting logbook data electronically in the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. Since the 1st of January, 2013, a total of 22,586 trip reports were entered electronically through a secure website or through the mobile application.

That represents about 96 percent of the headboats reporting electronically. We're continuing to work with the vendor on a clickable map to be able to isolate fishing areas. We're also adding in a module that will allow socio-economic information to be included and improve the quality of the types of data that we're able to collect by this.

We think that the rollout of that is going to be in the spring of 2014. We're continuing the transition. Again, we had talked a little bit about the Oracle System. We're continuing that transition to the Oracle System to improve the data storage and our access capabilities for the people who use these data.

This is the first year that we've estimated our landings from the electronic data. This says anticipated, but that was because it was sent in to meet the briefing book deadline, but those estimates are completed. They are undergoing their final peer review this week. My expectation is they should be posted either this week or next week.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, is the stock assessment peer review. As you will recall, last year we conducted a peer review of data collection programs and data management programs that support stock assessments for species managed under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. This year we're going to conduct a programmatic peer review of the stock assessments themselves.

This is being done at each of the six fisheries science centers, so we'll be able to compare and contrast how we're doing, what our strengths of our programs are, what areas of opportunity of improvement exists. That peer review is going to be the 8th through the 11th of July. It will be held in Miami.

As soon as we've nailed down the actual venue, I will get a notification to the council so that they can post this. We're excited about this peer review and look forward to the benefits that it is going to bring to improving the quality and the timeliness of the stock assessments we're doing on behalf of the council.

Another thing that I wanted to report on is a project that we had mentioned earlier today about advanced technologies. This week we deployed some instrumentation off the South Atlantic. It is a project that was funded through our Advanced Technology Working Group Program. We deployed an ocean glider off the coast of Florida, out of Daytona Beach.

It has been programmed to collect data for the next four weeks, so basically it will be at large collecting data based on programming that we've done on the hard drive. It is instrumented with hydrophones; and they are going to be collecting data on sounds of winter spawning groupers in those deep shelf break waters.

It will be collecting these data autonomously; and after its four-week excursion we'll be able to collect those data and see what we have. This is something that has national implications. What we learn from this cruise will be valuable for all the other science centers who are interested in deepwater spawning aggregations. We're pretty excited about using this as kind of a pilot of some new technologies to be able to collect data that are absolutely germane to contemporary issues we're grappling with here on the council. That is my report.

DR. DUVAL: Wow; way freaking cool! How long did it sort of take you guys from start to finish to kind of get this thing literally on the floor of the ocean? How long has it been in progress to get this technology? This is so cool! I want to hear some fish spawning.

DR. PONWITH: Glider technology is not new. It has existed for some time now, and we tend to use glider technology for physical oceanography. The notion of a glider is this; it has got a

hard drive where you boss it around and tell it what you want it to do. It has got a propulsion system.

But, of course, if it is autonomous, that is going to run off a battery and batteries run down pretty quickly. This propulsion system is designed – at least this is a generic. I am not familiar with the specific instrument; but typically the way a glider operates is the propulsion system brings the vessel up toward the surface and then basically stops and allows this instrument to glide down through the water column. Of course, as it does that, because it is broad, it gains forward motion.

Then as it gets closer and closer to the bottom, the instruments on this vessel tell it that it is time to kick in the propulsion system again; and that propulsion system sends it back to the surface and then turns itself off to save on the battery and it glides for the next forward motion. It is able to be at large for a lot longer time than something that is just making forward motion steadily. Yes, it is again a pilot to collect these data. We're all very, very interested in what kind of promise this type of equipment can have for us.

MR. BELL: You may have said this and I just missed it. Do you know where they're going specifically or is there any chance that they are going near any of our existing MPA sites or near them? I'm just curious where they are scheduled to go.

DR. PONWITH: It took off from Daytona. It is going to be heading toward Cape Lookout, North Carolina, and it is following the shelf break.

MR. HARTIG: Any other questions for Bonnie? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: That is why I asked Mel to ask the question and he wouldn't do it, but how many staff to download and analyze all of that acoustic data?

DR. PONWITH: I don't know the answer to that. I will see what we expect the volume of data we're going to be collecting over that four-week period will be and see if I can get an answer to that and be able to report back before we knock off for the week.

DR. LANEY: Doug asked my question, Mr. Chairman. Just one sort of additional part to that, Bonnie, is does somebody have to listen to the whole thing or will you subsample it? Do you already have a computer program that can, as opposed to having to run through the whole file, pick out the sonogram signature for the spawning grouper?

DR. PONWITH: I don't know the answer to that specifically for this project, but I can tell you that just last week I sat in on a presentation by a scientist from our staff who is using passive acoustics to monitor right whale migrations. Instead of listening to hours and hours and hours, they collect those data.

They have visual graphics of sound that they record; and those visual graphics are very, very fast to run through. What they do is they can run through and look at large volumes of data visually by recognizing what the visual graph of these sound signatures look like. This may be the case with winter spawning grouper; I don't know. But, again, as I learn more about this, I'll keep you in the loop and let you know how it all comes out.

MR. HARTIG: I think the other really cool thing about this project is working with the fishermen. The fisherman platform is being used to deploy this thing and probably being used to retrieve it. These types of thing – as we go forward, I am just watching the evolution of the science center and the cooperative work with the fishermen.

I'm very pleased to see the progress we've made in that regard; and only more in the future, Bonnie. Maybe we can be more cost effective by utilizing these platforms. I'm so glad that this is continuing; thank you. Preston, do you have anything from the Mid-Atlantic?

MR. PATE: No; we haven't been doing anything the last couple of meetings; we're just resting in the snow. (Laughter) Our last meeting was cut somewhat short by the snowfall we had in New Bern, North Carolina. I don't have anything else to say.

MR. HARTIG: Doug; how about the Gulf? Do you want to elaborate on anything that you're doing? You're not doing anything very controversial, so I just wondered.

MR. BOYD: No, we're pretty passive. No, I think we've discussed most everything throughout this week that we're working on just in bits and pieces. I don't have anything else to report.

MR. HARTIG: We appreciate you chiming in from time to time to just remind us what you all are going through.

MR. PATE: Well, I take back that I wasn't going to say anything. We are interested in what is happening with the blueline tilefish and appreciate an opportunity to comment on the EA or the management plan for that coming up in June. The next meeting we will not have anybody here because it coincides with our meeting.

MR. HARTIG: I got you. The blueline tile; I was interested in your comment you made the other day about concern about fishermen being impacted by the regulations. You're talking about Mid-Atlantic fishermen affected by our regulations?

MR. PATE: That's right.

MR. HARTIG: I wasn't sure if you were talking about the North Carolina fishermen or the Mid-Atlantic fishermen who were reaping benefits of expanding stock to the north. Obviously, it is the Mid-Atlantic fishermen that will be impacted.

MR. PATE: Yes, that is right, there is some fishery out of Wanchese, but there is more effort up in Maryland and Virginia, also.

DR. DUVAL: Well, only because we have the time; I think some of the frustrations of the fishermen fishing north of Hatteras on blueline tilefish is that other states have set landing limits of 300 pounds, 200 pounds, 300 pounds here and there. They're saying to me this is the South Atlantic managed species; how is it that these other states are allowed to set these landing limits that should not be allowed?

What I've explained is that in the past we did have this effort to kind of look at expansion of the snapper grouper fishery management jurisdiction up into that area; but just simply due to

Magnuson Reauthorization requirements, that amendment was put on hold. Maybe after this Climate Change Governance Workshop, those kinds of issues could be taken up again.

There is a lot of concern because as Press mentioned there are landings all the way up through Montauk. While they are very small in comparison to the total landings from the South Atlantic Region in terms of data collection; that is one of the things that I think some of the fishermen who participated in the data workshop brought up is that we can get that submission of data to help expand what we know about age and growth of these fish.

MR. PATE: Michelle reminded me of something to mention. The first day of our last meeting was dedicated to presentations by various experts on the research they've been doing relative to climate change. It was intended to be a workshop as a precursor to the larger workshop, which some of you all will be attending in Washington, D.C. this month.

There are really some good presentations. I have to admit they changed my mind somewhat about what is happening in the ocean not only with climate change but with ocean acidification as well. I'm looking forward to the workshop we have in March in D.C. Hopefully, it will give us some leadership or guidance in developing some parameters to use for management purposes.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that; I'm looking forward to participating in that as well. There are things happening in some regions that are, well, relatively intuitive and then some things happening in other regions that aren't. Like the water is getting colder in South Florida; that doesn't make much sense; but based on current dynamics, at least in the area where I fish, on average the water has gotten cooler.

Black sea bass has become the dominant reef fish in the area that I fish, and that never happened in my time on the water. We have a number of other species that are showing up that are in cooler waters normally. Sharpnose shark is usually cooler than South Florida temperatures, and Atlantic bumper, which is one of those huge biomass species that inhabits the Atlantic as a forage species. We're seeing it over the entire year when we just used to see it in the winter.

I'm looking forward to having these discussions at that workshop and some of the things that aren't so noticeable. You've got to collect the data. That is the problem we had with king mackerel, looking at it; we didn't have the bottom data, the bottom temperature. While these thermo clines that we see sometimes relate to the surface waters, they don't always. But they will still have the impacts on the species we fish for because the water washes up on the shelf; although it doesn't always turn over, and you get the surface temperature changes. All these things, looking at collecting the right data in the future to answer these questions is critical. All right, Doug, what is going on in Georgia?

MR. HAYMANS: Ben, it's raining. It's a rainy night in Georgia. It's not night yet, but it will be soon. I do apologize for the liquid sunshine. It can't always be perfect down here. I guess I wrote down a couple of things and I was cheating off of Mel's sheet over here, because there are so many in common.

Unlike South Carolina who used our new process to ask for a federal closure; we probably could have in the state of Georgia. We didn't experience the 9 degree temperatures for 10 consecutive

days, but we did have significantly lower landings in the fall, to the point where at the request of our fishermen we asked the governor to request a federal fishery failure in the shrimp industry.

That process is in the works right now. The letter has been submitted from our governor to the National Marine Fisheries Service and they are exchanging data. It was pretty bleak for the shrimpers. I noticed Mel had something about reef deployment, so I'll just say we did put out a 110 foot barge a couple weeks ago, and we're constantly trying to put materials out there. It was one of the things.

I was going to mention, when Roy was talking about MRIP earlier, it is kind of an interesting coincidence. A couple of days ago Monica asked about some of our license processes; and I mentioned the SIP license, the Saltwater Information Program. We got our results back. We can track it, but we don't have direct access to the data. We have to go ask for copies. We got it in last week and it is very surprising.

MRIP estimates 229,000 saltwater anglers in Georgia, and we actually sold 220,000 SIP permits last year, so we were very surprised that those two numbers matched up so well. I'll see if that trend continues or not. I guess that is all I've got. I guess if anybody is hanging around the weekend, I don't know if you're planning to enjoy Savannah or not, the Savannah Boat Show starts tomorrow, right across the river at the Convention Center if you're interested in that. That's all I've got.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions of Doug? I don't know that I formally thanked you for your hospitality on Monday night. That was a really nice layout. The fish was excellent; the food was very good and you got us out of the rain, which was very cool. We sincerely appreciate the effort.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, on behalf of Zack, Charlie and myself, you are sincerely welcome.

MR. BELL: I didn't copy off of Doug's paper. It seems like the last two times I've told you we're just about ready to sink the first installment of the deepwater reef. Where that went was the folks that, God bless them, are paying the bill kind of kept wanting to make some modifications and modifications and so that kept going.

Finally, it sort of pushed in to the bad weather, but we were actually supposed to go last week. That didn't work out. They were supposed to go this week. The contractor needs like 48 hours of nice sea, so maybe next week, but the first barge is ready to go. I think I've shot pictures of that around. If you would like to see it, I can show you. That will be good when that goes out. That will be actual material out there on that site. We're anxious to at some point and somehow be able to monitor it. That will be really interesting to watch that develop out there.

Doug mentioned; so thanks to the efforts of the council in Amendment 9 to the shrimp plan, we found ourselves in a position to need to request closure of the EEZ for shrimping. I will say I just was impressed; we met the criteria. The minimum criteria were 9 degrees for seven or more days. When we met that, we sent the letter down to Roy; and wham bam, the next thing you know it is closed. That worked; that worked really well.

The old process, if you recall, we would have still been talking about this in April or something trying to get it closed and at that point it doesn't help. The position that we were in, we were a little bit colder than Georgia was. We did our January sampling and realized we couldn't find any shrimp. That was a scary thing; but on top of that, we met the temperature criteria. We have really, really good correlation data going back decades with temperature and shrimp.

We felt real comfortable in using that criteria, but we actually met both of the criteria technically at the time. That worked out, and, Roy, thanks to your staff and all for getting that done. They mentioned the jellyball fishery; I don't need to talk about that anymore. Again for us that is experimental. We are going to see how that goes.

We're constantly hearing about some of the concerns I brought up earlier, and I suspect will be in the news here in the next month or so. You may see some stuff floating around about our General Assembly is expressing their opinion in resolution form related to what we're doing with MPAs here, but that is something they were doing last year. We'll see how that goes.

There is also a bill floating through our General Assembly to provide additional protection to great white sharks in South Carolina waters, which, of course, they are already federally protected and they are already protected in South Carolina waters because of the protection in federal waters; but this is some additional protection.

The interest in great white sharks, of course, you guys probably know has to do with the fact that there are a number of them running around now with tags in them. You can go on a website right now, and you can find where your favorite great white shark is hanging out this afternoon. What got folks interested at a local level was – there are a couple of them.

The first one I think was Mary Lee, but Mary Lee; she goes up the coast, she comes down the coast and had a tendency to come visit inside. According to the data point, it looks like she came in or close to a couple of our Sounds. That got people all atwitter about – I think she was 13, 16 foot. It was a big shark; but that got people interested.

Lionfish, we keep hearing about lionfish; what is the state of South Carolina going to do about lionfish? We're willing – one of the areas where we kind of have an interest as a state is we have a number of artificial reefs that are in federal waters that are permitted. They are also special management zones established by the council.

The state has kind of a vested interest certainly in those specific spots. With the artificial reefs, you have a small manageable area that you probably can, using some methodology, go down and kind of keep the lionfish population suppressed on those areas. That is sort of a rational reason for us to be out there doing that sort of thing if we can; but again you never – it is like fire ants or kudzu; I don't think we'll ever get rid of them; we'll just simply kind of have to deal with them.

We may look at some things this year about how we could at least try to keep maybe some of our reefs clean or something. Then just because it is near and dear to all of our hearts, the Research Vessel Palmetto has been in the yards, and she was supposed to come out several weeks ago; but due to the weather up in North Carolina – she is in the yards up in Morehead – they could never finish the exterior paint.

They could never get a day where it wasn't raining or it wasn't freezing or it wasn't below a certain temperature. But she should be back – although I'm not sure, but she'll be ready to go for this season. Of course, Palmetto is critical to our MARMAP data. She will come back looking pretty when they can finally paint her. I think that is it.

DR. LANEY: A lot of my updates were provided during the Protected Resources Committee, so I'll not review those again. I think you all may be interested in the fact that we in fact, we being myself and Roger Rulifson and the Cooperative Winter Tagging Cruise Group of ASMFC and Maryland DNR and North Carolina DMF and NMFS and Virginia, deployed a glider last year during January 2013; at the same time that we did the Cooperative Winter Tagging Cruise, the trawl portion of the cruise; and it was equipped with an acoustic receiver to detect acoustically tagged fish, and it did detect some.

We borrowed actually Dr. Barbara Block's glider from the west coast, and she sent a technician over with it. It was deployed a day or so before we left the dock. That was kind of interesting to be out there at the same time the glider was out there doing its thing. We did conduct this year the hook-and-line component of the coast-wide striped bass tagging program, so we did 10 trips out of Rudy Inlet, Virginia.

Four of them were goose eggs, with the exception of one foul-hooked spiny dogfish; but we did find striped bass on the other six trips a long way offshore and not very accessible to a recreational fisherman, which is in contrast to previous years. We did catch 926 of them; we tagged 922.

We caught one fish that we had tagged in 2008 on a previous cruise off the coast of North Carolina; and that fish had grown about an inch a year during its five years, six years at large. That once again proved to be a viable methodology for tagging. What has been of interest to me is last year when we did both the trawl and the hook and line, the hook-and-line caught fish are clearly larger.

There is a significant difference between the length frequency median for the hook-and-line tagged fish as opposed to the trawl-caught fish. I had hoped to have three years of dual tagging approaches, so we would have a robust sample size to compare. We're still hoping that we may find the funding to do the trawling again, perhaps next year now.

We did have the RV Savannah lined up to do that work; but we didn't come up with the funding to match our existing Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant from North Carolina. I think that is about it from the Fish and Wildlife Service. If anybody has any questions, I'll be happy to try and answer them.

DR. DUVAL: I think, just like Mel, I've been saying the same thing for the past several meetings, but we are working out way towards implementing the for-hire relicensing structure as a result of legislative changes last year. We've presented those issue papers to our commission and are in the process of actually getting those changes in place.

Basically we held a bunch of stakeholder meetings with the for-hire industry and really wanted to get rid of a few of our existing permits that weren't doing what the industry needed and were

not necessary for us to keep in our data base. We've implemented a couple of new blanket-type for-hire licenses and one non-blanket-type for-hire license.

Now that that is going into place, that has allowed us to move forward with one of the other legislative requirements, which is a for-hire logbook. Like all inshore guides, this covers headboats, charterboats, everybody. We just sent out a survey to all of our licensees to determine who they have to report to now and what are your preferred methods of reporting, et cetera.

Our recreational statistic staff has communicated closely with Ken Brennan and the Beaufort Lab regarding the electronic reporting technology that they're using. Obviously, anything we do, we're going to try to not reinvent the wheel; so moving forward on that. I think the only other thing – and Mel's reference to our lovely North Carolina winter this year reminded me that we actually have had several cold-stunt events for speckled trout in North Carolina. We have a protocol that we used to close the fishery; and we met that with our chunks of cold weather at the end of January and beginning of February this year. Our speckled trout fishery is closed until June 15th. I think that is of note that I can actually speak about.

DR. LANEY: I did forget one other thing, which Bonnie already knows. We did get an inquiry from a fisherman via Captain Monte Hawkins, who some of you know if you are associated with the Mid-Atlantic Council, about the possibility for getting ages on some large snowy grouper and blueline tilefish from further north; I think off Maryland somewhere.

Bonnie graciously agreed to have the Beaufort Lab age those otoliths. I think they are on their way or will be shortly to the Beaufort Lab. It will be really interesting to see. Some of those snowies were fairly large and were I think state records from up north. That will be interesting to see those fish.

MR. HARTIG: Absolutely! I think the question I had for Michelle would be do you have a fishery-independent index for your cold-stunt animals that you'll do at a certain time to see impacts of what the cold did?

DR. DUVAL: We do collect samples as much as possible from the areas where the cold stunts have occurred. As with anything like this, it is a lot of anecdotal reporting. There is a bunch of fish here, there is fish here; and so we have to have confirmation before we will actually close the fishery.

It has got to be four counties; and we'll send staff out to collect biological samples and just look at the distribution of size ranges of fish that were subject to the stunt, et cetera. It is not a fishery-independent index specific to the cold-stunt fish themselves, but we're collecting biological information to inform that.

MR. HARTIG: The question that I had would you go out some time in the next few months to see what the impacts of the cold weather was on those particular species? Don't you have a gillnet survey, a fishery-independent gillnet survey that you run?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, we have several independent surveys; so any information from those surveys would certainly inform that.

MS. McCRAWLEY: In order to try not to say the same thing that I've been saying every time, I came up with a list of some new things. Our state legislative session began this week on Tuesday. Also, recently in the past couple of weeks, the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery was awarded over \$6 million in disaster assistance.

Also, we're doing some workshops this week on the Gulf Coast about an offshore reef fish permit or registry. We're doing this with the help of some NFWF oil spill money. This would be a mandatory permit for private recreational anglers. It would be free for the first five years, because that is the length of time that we were awarded the grant.

This is part of a larger data collection effort. It would be required of all private recreational anglers to take red snapper, gag, amberjack, red grouper, black grouper, vermilion snapper and gray triggerfish. This is just in the beginning stages. As I mentioned, we're going out to public workshops this week and next week and then hopefully doing some rulemaking and have it in place maybe later this year. That is about all I have.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions for Jessica? I think as we go through this process we're finding these different kinds of things that are trying to be done to give us more accountability in the recreational fishery. Hopefully, as we go through time, we'll find the means to marry them with MRIP and get better answers. I'm heartened that these things are going forward. In the future possibly we'll find a way to use them. Thank you.

LT. FOWLER: Two or three weeks ago the Charleston Pilots Association came down to District 7 to meet with the admiral. They were trying to request that the entire Charleston Harbor and entrances were going to be exempt from the right whale speed restriction. They had asked for it in, was it 2008 – or, no, when it was originally implemented? It had been approved then by the captain of the port and the admiral at District 7, but then was denied at the headquarters level.

We did have to explain to them that they could go online and fill out that petition on the Federal Register, and that the Coast Guard's job in this instance was to enforce the law and not to decide when, where and to whom it applied. They pushed for it. I guess they were misinformed. One of our cutters issued fishing violations for missing turtle mitigation gear and did not have an operable VMS onboard.

We had several terminations for safety violations. One vessel had 12 CFVS violations, so they were terminated. After sequestration ended, we have started doing a lot more LMR operations and we're kind of ramping that up. We've got a couple of ops going on in Jacksonville targeting manatee zones and targeting offshore commercial fishing vessels.

We've conducted several Grays Reef patrols. There is a National LMR Conference for all Coast Guard LMR officers going on right now in Quantico, but I did not attend because I'm here with you. If you would like a trip report from that, I can provide that if anyone is interested. Also, I will be going to the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council Meeting in April, so I can also send a trip report from that if any of you would like to see what is going on down there. Nothing further pending your questions.

MR. BELL: Morgan, you might want to explain "terminated". It wasn't terminated with extreme prejudiced, right?

LT. FOWLER: No lethal force was used. When we terminate, we get approval from the captain of the port to send them back to the docks. We escort them back to the dock, tell them to tie up and you can't get underway again until you correct these things that you had wrong with your safety gear. Someone comes out and does the inspection and gives them a letter saying they are good to go. But, yes, no violence, no deadly force, nothing like that.

MR. BELL: Thank you; that sounds better.

MR. DUNN: Well, this is unusual; I don't have anything to say.

MR. HARTIG: That is very unusual.

MR. DUNN: I will submit a report as soon as I can find it.

MR. HARTIG: It has been a pleasure to have you at our meeting all week. I appreciate you being able to come in and chime in when needed. Thanks for that. Okay, we've got almost a half an hour; we've got 27 minutes. What I think I'm going to do is go ahead and not go into any more reports for today.

We'll go ahead and have the public hearing at 5:30 and take an extended break. I want to talk some with our fishermen who showed up, and it will help me tremendously. One thing I will tell you about the public hearing; what you have done for the king mackerel fishermen is what they wanted. However, what I have told them is talk to us like we're the Gulf. Sincerely, bring all the passion you have for why you need these changes.

I invited a number of king mackerel fishermen to come to this meeting, because I've been trying to tell you what their objection to the season change is. They are here in person to tell you tonight. I thought it would be better to hear what they had to say about it than me all the time. We'll break until public hearing at 5:30.

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Madison Ballroom of the Savannah Hilton DeSoto, Friday morning, March 7, 2014, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: We'll bring the full council session back to order. We're going to change around a little bit. The first committee report we'll have this morning is the Dolphin Wahoo report.

MS. BECKWITH: The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met on March 5, 2014, and received updates on the status of commercial and recreational catches as well as the status of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5. The committee discussed Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7 and the Comprehensive Allocation Accountability Amendment.

The first thing I need to do is actually consideration of the minutes since I had not had the opportunity to review them prior. Did anyone have any additions or corrections to the December 2013 minutes? Seeing none; those minutes stand. The first thing we're going to go through is the Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7/Snapper Grouper Amendment 33.

Of course, this was done in a number of committees, so I need to ask permission of Mel and Michelle to be able to bring forth motions from the other committees. If you guys are okay with that, then I will go ahead and move forward. Okay; the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel, Law Enforcement, Snapper Grouper and Dolphin Wahoo Committees met separately between March 3rd through 5th, 2014.

Each committee discussed the continued development of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7/ Snapper Grouper Amendment 33. The LEAP made several requests of each committee and passed motions that are being forwarded to the South Atlantic Management Council for their review and resolution. The committee passed the following motions as recommended to the council. The first is the purpose. There were a couple of different variations on the purpose; so what I would like to do is have Brian put – go ahead, Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: What we're really trying to do here is that sometimes the motions were made in three different committees; and we're trying to merge them all together and resolve Dolphin Wahoo 7, so we don't end up with motions that end up going cross purposes from the different committees.

The purpose and need is the first one that actually we needed to be careful about, because both the Snapper Grouper Committee and the Dolphin Wahoo Committee modified the purpose and need. The motion that was made by the Snapper Grouper Committee is shown here. Then just down below that; Motion Number 2 is the one that was made by the Dolphin Wahoo Committee. Then as I was reviewing this, I noticed that there was still a grammatical error in there.

I recommended that we modify the motion that was made by the Snapper Grouper Committee. What I would like to do is to show you the merged version of what would be here if we took all of these suggested motions and turned them into one. When you merge them all together, this is the version of the purpose and need that you would come up with.

The purpose: The purpose of these management measures is to allow recreational fishermen to bring dolphin and wahoo fillets from the Bahamas into the U.S. EEZ and update regulations to allow recreational fishermen to bring back snapper grouper fillets from the Bahamas into the U.S. EEZ.

The need: The management measures are needed to increase the social and economic benefits to recreational fishermen by removing impediments to the possession of fish in the U.S. EEZ that were legally harvested in Bahamian waters. I guess what needs to happen now is that now that you are at full council, anybody could make a motion regarding the purpose and need for this amendment.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, just another quick grammatical thing; what is up on the screen is the purpose of these management measures are; and it should be the purpose of these management measures is. Purpose is singular so it should be "is". **Then I would be happy to make a motion to accept the purpose and need as modified.**

MS. BECKWITH: Do I have a second; Jessica. Any discussion? Opposition?

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to ask the question with regard to snapper grouper species. The way it reads it is as if this were going to allow the snapper grouper species for the first time rather than – I don't know; I was just thinking something along the lines of regulations which currently allow snapper grouper or something like that. But it's okay.

DR. CHEUVRONT: It does have the verb "update" in there at the beginning of that part.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, I see that. It's okay; we know the intent.

DR. DUVAL: If I may, Madam Chair, I think maybe, Doug, what would address your issue is if that second phase which starts "and update regulations", if instead it said "and update regulations allowing recreational fishermen"; because the regulations are already there is your point.

MS. BECKWITH: We haven't voted.

MR. HAYMANS: I would make that as a substitute or a friendly amendment to this motion, with, Michelle, if you would provide your wording. Now we've got to start from scratch; that works for me.

MS. BECKWITH: Great; is there any additional discussion? Okay; the purpose reads, "The purpose of the management measure is to allow recreational fishermen to bring dolphin and wahoo fillets from the Bahamas into the U.S. EEZ and update regulations allowing recreational fishermen to bring back snapper grouper fillets from the Bahamas into the U.S. EEZ."

The need: The management measures are needed to increase the social and economic benefit to recreational fishermen by removing impediments to the possession of fish in the U.S. EEZ that were legally harvested in Bahamian waters. Yes, John.

MR. JOLLEY: I can't help myself, just wordsmithing again. It is a pet peeve; I'm not going to get into it but if you want me to cut it down by 20 percent, I would be glad to. It's gone.

MS. BECKWITH: **Okay, seeing no opposition; this motion carries. Okay under Action 1, allowing dolphin and wahoo fillets from the Bahamas, the committee has put forth a motion to remove Subalternatives 2B through 2E under Action 1.** The rationale was the Bahamian regulations state limits in terms of numbers of fish unlike like Bahamian regulations for snapper grouper species, which state limits in terms of pounds. There are currently no empirical estimates on the average weights of fillets from either dolphin or wahoo. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion?

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm still trying to catch up where we are. Should we be following what is happening on the screen or should we be following the committee report? I'm having a little trouble figuring out where we are.

DR. CHEUVRONT: You have two reports. We start with the Dolphin and Wahoo Committee report; and then there is the other Dolphin Wahoo Document that you were sent is a document that merges all the motions made by all the committees for Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7; DW 7/SG 33.

MS. BECKWITH: We're on Page 2 of that. **Any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries. Motion 4 was add an action that adds language to the documentation requirements that require a passport be stamped and dated to prove that vessel passengers were in the Bahamas when harvesting snapper grouper species. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.** The next motion was for Action 2, which exempts dolphin and wahoo from –

DR. CHEUVRONT: Anna, there is another draft action that was recommended by the Snapper Grouper Committee.

MS. BECKWITH: Draft new action in addition to possessing valid Bahamian cruising fishing permits. Do you want to just list that up on the screen?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, it is right here. Let me explain a little bit what happened here. When the Snapper Grouper Committee got to this point in the document, even though this was a dolphin wahoo action, they requested that a new action be drafted that would require stamped and dated passports to bring snapper grouper species back because that would not have been in the regulations for snapper grouper.

What I did was I drafted, based on what you already had for dolphin and wahoo, a draft action that you all might want to look at and decide whether you want to change this; but this is following along what the Snapper Grouper Committee had recommended. It is projected here, and so you might want to discuss this now as well.

MS. BECKWITH: Are there any comments on this draft? I assume we'll need a motion to approve this.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Correct, because nobody has made a motion for this wording at all, so you might want to look at it and wordsmith it or whatever you want to do with it.

MS. McCAWLEY: I make a motion to approve this new action, including its alternatives.

MS. BECKWITH: John is the second. Is there any discussion? **Okay, the motion is to approve the new action and alternatives below:**

Action 4. In addition to possessing valid Bahamian cruising and fishing permits, require stamped and dated passports to prove that vessel passengers were in The Bahamas if the vessel is in possession of snapper grouper fillets in the U.S. EEZ.

Alternative 1 (No Action): Vessels bringing snapper grouper fillets into the U.S. EEZ from The Bahamas are required to have valid current Bahamian cruising and fishing permits onboard the vessel.

Alternative 2: Vessels bringing snapper grouper fillets into the U.S. EEZ from The Bahamas are required to have stamped and dated passports to prove that the vessel passengers were in The Bahamas, as well as valid current Bahamian cruising and fishing permits onboard the vessel. Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

Under Action 2, which is the section that discusses exempting dolphin and wahoo from bag and possession limits; Motion 5 was to add an Alternative 3 to exempt wahoo from U.S. bag and possession limits and modify Alternative 2 to exempt only dolphin:

Revised Action 2. Exempt dolphin and wahoo harvested lawfully from The Bahamas from the bag and possession limits in the U.S. EEZ.

Alternative 1 (No Action): The bag limit for the possession of dolphin and wahoo lawfully harvested from The Bahamas, is 10 dolphin (60 dolphin per boat)/2 wahoo per person per day, in the U.S. EEZ.

Alternative 2: Exempt dolphin lawfully harvested in The Bahamas from regulations for bag limits in the U.S. EEZ.

Alternative 3: Exempt wahoo lawfully harvested in The Bahamas from regulations for bag limits in the U.S. EEZ. On behalf of the committees, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

Under Action 3, which was the reporting requirement section, we had a motion to move Action 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. The rationale of that motion was that no law enforcement organization, federal or state of Florida, had the ability to monitor this type of reporting system for such a large number of participants. On behalf of the committees I so move. Is there any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

Under Action 4, which is the section that requires fillets of dolphin, wahoo and snapper grouper to have skin intact; there was a motion that read select Alternative 2 under Action 4 as a preferred and add clarifying language to indicate that skin must be intact for the entire fillet. This particular alternative was in reference to snapper grouper. On behalf of the committees I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

There is an additional motion under that action which was to select Alternative 3 under Action 4 as a preferred and add a clarifying language to indicate the skin must be intact for the entire fillet. This was in reference specifically to dolphin wahoo. On behalf of the committees I so move. Is there any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

Under Action 5, which was the section that discussed removing the exemption that allowed snapper grouper fillets from the Bahamas, move Action 5 to the considered but rejected appendix. On behalf of the committees I so move. Is there any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.

Under Action 6, which was the section that exempted snapper and grouper species from the bag and possession limits; there was a motion that read move Action 6 to the considered but rejected appendix.

The rationale for that was the committee decided that there were not any significant issues with requiring fishermen bringing snapper grouper fillets from the Bahamas in terms of bag and possession limits.

By requiring fillets bought from the Bahamas into the U.S. EEZ; fillets from the species prohibited from possession in the U.S. EEZ would not be allowed. On behalf of the committees I so move. Is there any discussion? Opposition? **Seeing none; that motion carries.**

Then additional request and guidance; the LEAP requested an opportunity to give the issues in the amendment more consideration as well as the state management agencies to review it as well. They also gave some guidance to staff to clarify the documentation that if fish from the Bahamas are sold in the U.S., it would constitute a violation of Bahamian Law and the Lacey Act would apply.

Now we're going to switch back over to straight dolphin wahoo. We're going to go through the portion of the committee report for Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 8/Snapper Grouper Amendment 34. That is in the original Dolphin Wahoo Report that you guys have in your e-mail.

Under Action 1 of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 8, we did not have any motions in regard to Action 1. **Under Action 2, Dolphin and Wahoo motion was to accept the IPT's wording change recommendations for Alternative 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; the motion carries.** Then we directed the staff to edit language as appropriate for accuracy for Action 2. That was not a motion. Thank you; that is my report.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Anna and Brian, for leading us through a very complicated issue. I appreciate that. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: That was a great job, Anna, but it was very confusing the way we dealt with this one. It seems to me what we ought to do at the next council meeting is deal with this as a – if it is going to involve multiple committees is to go through it as a Committee of the Whole one time and then have the Committee of the Whole report to the council and do it that way, so we don't have to go through it so many times.

MR. HARTIG: It was apparent to me very quickly that we made a mistake and that we should have done that; and we will do that, Roy. Thank you very much for that suggestion. Okay, Snapper Grouper report.

DR. DUVAL: I think folks may have just gotten this report, so we'll give everybody a minute or two to catch up. Does everyone have the draft report now? The Snapper Grouper Committee met on March 4th and 5th in Savannah; and the first thing we went over as usual was the status of landings for quota-managed snapper grouper species.

Dr. McGovern gave us an update on the status of commercial and recreational landings for species under ACLs. The current recreational landings presentation provided by the Southeast Region includes effort data; however, this information is difficult to parse out on timeframes less than one year.

Therefore, the committee requested that effort data be only provided on a yearly basis from now on. Dr. McGovern gave a presentation on a possible red snapper season for 2014 and stated that 2013 data are currently being finalized. The data from a study conducted by the state of Florida will be available soon; and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Report is expected in May, including the estimate of total removals that will determine whether there will be a season in 2014.

Next we went over the status of amendments approved for secretarial review; and again Dr. McGovern led us through that. Amendment 27, which is the management authority framework crew size and blue runner issue; this amendment was approved and regulations became effective on January 27, 2014.

Regulatory Amendment 14, which included measures for multiple species; this was submitted to NMFS on January 15, 2014. The proposed rule package is at headquarters and a proposed rule is expected to publish soon. Next is the emergency rule for blueline tilefish. This is under review at the Regional Office and is expected to go to NMFS headquarters soon.

Regulations could be effective in late March or early April. The rule will be effective for 180 days and can be extended for an additional 186 days. The next was an update on the Oculina Experimental Closed Area Evaluation, and Anna Martin, council staff, briefed the committee on planned activities to address the 10-year reevaluation of the Oculina Experimental Closed Area.

The evaluation team was originally going to convene via webinar on February 13 to start those discussions on reevaluation; however, the webinar had to be rescheduled due to weather-related issues. A series of breakout groups to discuss the research, outreach and law enforcement portions of the evaluation plan will be held the week of March 10, 2014; so that is just next week. The OECA Evaluation Team's final report will be presented to the council at their June meeting.

Next was Regulatory Amendment 16. This is the black sea bass pot closure and Myra Brouwer, council staff, presented an overview of scoping comments received on the amendment during the January 2014 round of hearings. The committee provided guidance and made the following motions. **The first motion was to approve the IPT's suggested edits to the purpose and need; and on behalf of the committee I so move.** Is there discussion?

MS. BECKWITH: I would like to strike the word "potential" in the need. Negative, but just potential; I guess I would offer a substitute motion to accept the ITP's recommendation but strike the word "potential" in the purpose – or rather in the need.

DR. DUVAL: There is a substitute motion by Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, I would amend the word and strike "potential".

DR. DUVAL: Anna is offering an amendment to the motion to strike the word "potential" from the need statement. Is there a second to that? Seconded by Jessica. Discussion? Anna, it sounds like you are offering this because you are saying that there is clearly going to be economic impacts; that they are not potential, but there will be economic impacts to the fishery.

MS. BECKWITH: That is exactly right.

DR. DUVAL: The motion reads amend above motion to strike the word “potential” from the needs statement for Regulatory Amendment 16. Is there any other discussion on this motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Now we still have to approve the amended motion. The amended motion now becomes the main motion. Is there any opposition to the main motion? **Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

Next the committee gave guidance to expand the no action, Alternative, 1 with existing provisions in the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan and Snapper Grouper Amendment 18A, but clarify that existing measures would stay in place. We also clarified that the intent would be for the area depicted in Alternative 4, which is the existing critical habitat for right whales to remain unchanged even if right whale critical habitat boundaries change as a result of its reevaluation. We also gave guidance to include a timeframe of November 15 through April 15 to the language of Alternative 4.

The next motion was to accept the language and revisions to Alternative 5 as submitted by the NMFS Protected Resources Division; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to include a revised Alternative 6 in the document for analysis but to use waypoints to delineate the boundary; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add an alternative that would close pots and waters off North Carolina from November 1st to December 15th in all EEZ waters off North Carolina; from November 1st to December 15th in waters shallower than 25 meters; from March 15th to April 30th in all EEZ waters off North Carolina; from March 15th through April 30th in waters shallower than 25 meters. There was guidance given to staff to structure this in a manner than would facilitate analysis. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Discussion.

MR. BELL: Yes; we heard Chris Long for the previous two evenings kind of describing the very small fishery now out of Little River, which is almost in North Carolina. What I’m trying to figure out here is if we could maybe perhaps modify this to instead of being off of North Carolina it might work better if it were North Carolina and South Carolina.

We would in essence be sliding the line down to the Georgia line where Georgia doesn’t have any endorsements. We’ve only got a handful, but the same fishery that we’re concerned about here in North Carolina is really the same fishery off of South Carolina. Maybe the simplest way to do that would be to modify that motion to be North Carolina/South Carolina.

DR. DUVAL: I think you would be offering an amendment to include South Carolina in that set of alternatives.

MR. BELL: Correct; would I have to actually amend each little sentence there?

DR. DUVAL: I think if you offer an amendment to this motion to include South Carolina in that set of alternatives, and if someone seconds your amendment and we vote on it and it passes; we just go through the same process we just went through.

MR. BELL: I move that we amend the above motion to include South Carolina in each of the alternatives.

DR. DUVAL: **There is a motion by Mel to amend; seconded by Anna. Discussion? Any other discussion on this? Is there any opposition to this amendment? Seeing none, that stands approved; so the amended motion now becomes the main motion. Any other discussion on what is now the main motion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that stands approved.**

The next motion was to move Alternative 3 to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that stands approved.

The next motion was to add alternatives as suggested by the Humane Society to Regulatory Amendment 16 for analysis: 1) Number 1, pot closure and petitioned right whale critical habitat; 2) pot closure in southeast seasonal gillnet restricted area; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Opposition? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

Then we gave guidance to staff to include discussion on why a pot closure is needed in the southeast region versus the northeast region where pots and traps are numerous and there are limited gear restrictions. The next item on our agenda was an update from NOAA GC on Amendment 22. This is the Recreational Harvest Tag Program.

NOAA GC is currently developing guidelines that can be applied nationally to determine whether proposed programs fit the criteria of a limited access privilege program. More information is currently needed to determine whether the proposed recreational harvest tag program in Amendment 22 would be considered a LAP; and to that purpose NOAA GC began by asking a series of questions from each of the state directors. However, it was decided thankfully that directors would be contacted directly and more details would be provided to the committee and the council at their June 2014 meeting.

The next item was Amendment 29. This is the ORCS approach and gray triggerfish and Myra Brouwer, council staff, provided a summary of public comments received on the amendment during the January 2014 hearings. The committee made the following motions and issued the following guidance under each action.

The first motion was to accept the IPT's recommended changes to the purpose and need; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

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

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

The next motion was to approve using a risk tolerance scalar of 0.7 for white grunt and request that the SSC provide guidance on whether two separate ACLs are needed for this species; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add an action to establish ACLs and include a range of ACL alternatives. Alternative 1 would be no action, ACL equals OY equals ABC; Alternative 2, ACL equals OY equals 0.95 times ABC; Alternative 3, ACL equals OY equals 0.9 times ABC; and Alternative 4, ACL equals OY equals 0.8 times ABC; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the IPT's recommended edits to the language of Action 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add an alternative that would establish a 14-inch fork length minimum size limit for gray triggerfish off of East Florida. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I would like to add – I'll tell you what I want to do and then I can make this in the form of a motion. What I would like to do is for all of the action alternatives – so everything except for Alternative 1; I would like to break out the size limits so there is like an A and a B; an A for recreational and a B for commercial.

That way we could choose one size limit for recreational and one size limit for commercial. I'm thinking that the best way to do that is to add subalternatives to Alternatives 2 through I guess it is 5 since we've added a new action. If Myra thinks that is the best way to do that, then I can make a motion. Okay, so I make a motion to add subalternatives to Alternative 2 through 5 that would allow a choice for the size limit for recreational and commercial.

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion by Jessica to add subalternatives to Alternatives 2 through 5 that would allow a choice for the minimum size limit to apply to the commercial and/or recreational sectors. Is there a second to that? Seconded by Jack.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Just to clarify; right now both A and B would have the exact same values for size limit right now under each one of these. Okay, I just wanted to clarify.

DR. DUVAL: Other discussion? I think we've heard preferences for different size limits from both commercial and recreational sectors. I think probably most of what we heard from the commercial sectors; they prefer a larger size limit. Certainly, Florida has its own special issues with trying to make things consistent on both sides of the peninsula. Then for much of the for-

hire recreational sector, I think we've heard that they would prefer a smaller size limit, cutting down on discards and that sort of thing. Is there any other discussion on that?

MR. CONKLIN: I just was going to comment where there were some issues in our region with the black bass having two different size limits. When they were closed commercially, the commercial fishermen who possess recreational fishing licenses could still bring in bass, but they had to be a little bit bigger.

They are doing the same thing with triggerfish. I don't know how consistent that is going to be if we put a trip limit on a triggerfish and then fishermen bringing in the small ones as their recreational catch as well. They are limited to 20 of them. I just see issues coming up in the future.

DR. DUVAL: I see what you're saying. Your concern is that when the commercial season is closed but commercial fishermen are still allowed to retain the bag limit; adhering to the recreational size and bag limits, that it could create a little bit of an enforcement issue if they have what are perceived to be undersized commercial fish on their boat as opposed to recreational fish.

MR. CONKLIN: That's right. Well, we've been through it with bass before. It is nothing new. I don't have an issue with it. I just was speculating.

DR. DUVAL: Just pointing it out.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Yes, I agree, I think it is something that we certainly need to consider. I just wanted to make sure that we had options in here since I think we're going to try to finalize this the next time and just to make sure we had some options in there that were already analyzed.

DR. DUVAL: All right; any other discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next motion was to retain Alternative 3 as a preferred; and that was ruled out of order. The next motion was to restructure Alternative 3 to remove East Florida from the alternative; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select new Alternative 5 as a preferred, which is to establish a 14-inch fork length minimum size limit for gray triggerfish off East Florida; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Alternatives 2 and 3 under Action 4; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

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

This next motion that you see that is all crossed out; this was approved, but another one was made right after it to do exactly the opposite and that is what you see on the next page. That motion was actually to remove the suggested IPT wording from Alternative 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2B as a preferred with no step-down; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next amendment was Amendment Number 32, which is blue line tilefish. Gregg Waugh, council staff, presented an overview of the options paper for Amendment 32; and the committee made the following motions. **The first was to select Alternative 2 as a preferred; on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to request the SSC's guidance regarding maintaining catch levels at the yield at 75 percent Fmsy equilibrium until the next stock assessment; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to direct staff to look at a proportion of landings in the South Atlantic versus north of North Carolina and calculate a percentage of the ACL for the South Atlantic; and on behalf of the committee I so move. I think Mike Errigo has done a little bit of analysis for this. Gregg indicated that Mike had just a few numbers regarding what the landings were in the South Atlantic's area of jurisdiction versus north of North Carolina, just to give the council a sense of how that split would work out.

DR. ERRIGO: It is very small. Recreationally it is almost nonexistent. There are only three years from 1993 to the present that have landings of blue line tilefish recreationally, '07, '08 and '09; the highest being 344 pounds. The total is less than 1 percent recreationally. The commercial data came from ACCSP actually.

I couldn't pull it. We don't get that transmitted from the science center because we don't track it. A lot of it was confidential so ACCSP pulled it and gave it to me in a form that is non-confidential, but it is all here. Commercially, I don't have any landings prior to 1999, but from '99 to 2012 the overall average is 4 percent, and it jumps around quite a lot until 2008. It just stabilizes after that. It is very consistent, their landings, from '08 to 2012. During that time period, the percentage is an average of 2.6 percent of the landings. If you look at the total and if you add everything up and just look at the total percentage, it is around 3 percent from '99 to 2012; and those last stable years, it is 2.5 percent. It is very, very low.

DR. DUVAL: Let me just make sure I understand this. You said for the last few years where it is stable, it is 25 percent?

DR. ERRIGO: Two point five percent.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, thank you, 2.5. I was going to have a little heart attack there. Thank you for doing that, Mike; I think that sort of helps. I am wondering if perhaps do we need any other motions to give staff guidance to develop a range of alternatives to allocate a proportion of the ACL solely for the South Atlantic. Can we do that or do you want us to specify exactly what proportion of the ACL would apply to the South Atlantic?

MR. WAUGH: One correction; we should be talking about a proportion of the ABC not the ACL, because what we're going to do is set the ACL at some percentage of the ABC. To me, I think we have a motion that moved Alternative 4 to the considered but rejected appendix. That leaves us with ACL equal to the ABC, ACL equal to 90 percent of the ABC. Maybe you just want to add another alternative equal to 98 percent or 99 percent of the ABC.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, thanks for that guidance, Gregg, and that correction. If someone on the committee would consider making a motion to add an alternative under Action 2 that would set the blueline tilefish ACL equal to OY equal to 98 percent of ABC.

MR. CONKLIN: I would like to make a motion to separate blueline tilefish from the deepwater complex and establish annual catch limits for blueline tilefish; that the blueline tilefish ACL equal OY, which is equal to 98 percent of the ABC.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Chris; second by Jessica. Is there any discussion on that? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next motion was to move Alternative 4 under Action 2 to the considered by rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

I guess before we leave this topic completely of their landings and jurisdictions outside of the South Atlantic for a species for which we technically have management and jurisdiction; I was talking with Gregg about this a little bit before the meeting. I think at some point a table or explanation of kind of how the landings from different areas are incorporated into our ACL tracking.

I know we've had a lot of changes recently with post-stratification of landings, like from Monroe County, and how those have been in the past counted against a Gulf versus an Atlantic ACL. Clearly, we were getting to a point where we're seeing some shift in species' distribution, and we previously had an amendment to consider expanding our jurisdiction for snapper grouper north of North Carolina. That is something we may need to reconsider as we see more stuff like this.

I think it would help the committee understand and the council understand why we need to do things like calculate some sub-portion of the total ABC and reserve it for ourselves. I think there is probably going to be questions down the road like, well, what if the part of the ABC that we didn't allocate for ourselves gets sucked up and then some by jurisdictions north of us; how does that fall out?

I don't think we need to have a protracted discussion about it today. I just kind of want to put it out there for thought down the road. **The next motion is to move Alternative 4 under Action 3; which is the recreational ACT, to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of**

the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to use the most recent five years of recreational landings to obtain the percent standard error to calculate the recreational ACT; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Alternative 3 under Action 4, commercial AMs, to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion is to move Alternative 3 under Action 5, recreational accountability measures, to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

There was guidance to add language highlighted below to Action 6, which is the phrase “until the ACL is met or projected to be met” to clarify those. **The next motion was to move Alternative 5 under Action 7, recreational management measures, to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

Next there was guidance to retain Action 8, which is establish a rebuilding plan in the amendment until Regulatory Amendment 21 can address MSST for bluefin tilefish. The next amendment was Regulatory Amendment 20, which is snowy grouper. The committee reviewed the options for Regulatory Amendment 20 and made the following motions.

The first was to move mutton snapper actions from Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 20 to a future snapper grouper amendment that would include alternatives developed by the Joint Council Committee on South Florida Management Issues; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

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

The next motion was to use the normal framework procedure and develop Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 20 for review and final approval at the September 2014 council meeting; hold a webinar Q&A and public hearing in August 2014; and schedule a public hearing at the September 2014 meeting; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Action 1, the rebuilding schedule, to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Alternative 2, Action 1, rebuilding strategy, to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: That should be Action 2.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that should say Action 2. **The motion would then read move Alternative 2, Action 2, rebuilding strategy, to the considered but rejected appendix. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to select Alternative 4, Action 2, rebuilding strategy, as preferred; and request the SSC evaluate whether this is sufficiently close to the percentage from the ABC Control Rule for the council to use; specify that the ABC would increase for five years beginning in 2015; and that the 2019 value would remain in place until modified; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add Alternative 3 to Action 3, ACLs for snowy grouper, with ACL equal to 95 percent, 90 percent and 80 percent of the ABC; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I just want to make sure your intent is to also put OY in there; ABC equals OY equals ACL.

DR. DUVAL: I think we can clarify that the intent is to have ACL equal to ABC equal to OY equal to ACL; or whatever order you all put that in. **The next motion was to add Alternative 9 to Action 4, commercial trip limits for snowy grouper; “For a commercial trip limit from January 1 until the ACL is met or projected to be met”. That would be 9A, 300 pounds; 9B, 200 pounds; 9C, 150 pounds; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

I'll just say that these alternatives are going to get renumbered once staff has a chance to clean this document up, because there were quite a few as we moved through this that you will see were removed.

MS. BECKWITH: There was also some interest to consider an option for a split season. Can we do that in the form of guidance to staff to maybe consider developing an alternative that would look into a split season from, say, January 1st to April 30th and then May 1st through the rest of the year with some different options; or do we need that in the form of a motion?

DR. DUVAL: Guidance to staff to develop an alternative to consider a commercial split season. Would you want to clarify that the ACL would be split 50/50 from 50 percent January through April and 50 percent May through the end of the year; was that your intent?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes; and in terms of trip limits, that is what I'm not 100 percent comfortable stating now, but potentially 150 pounds, 200 pounds in each of those options.. I would rather do it a little bit as guidance rather than setting.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg has come to the table.

MR. WAUGH: Sorry, that would really be a new action. We would set a new action to look at modifying the fishing year, because we're talking about a split season. It is not really just modifying the trip limit. It would be a new action looking at a split season, and then that one set of dates, January 1 through April 30; May 1 through December 31; 50/50 each season.

DR. DUVAL: I see Anna nodding her head that was her intent, and then looking at it looks like a range of subalternatives for trip limits within each of those season, like 100, 150, 200 for each of those two six-month seasons. Gregg is telling us that this would actually be a new action as opposed to an alternative.

I would like to hear from the committee. How do folks feel about doing something like that? Anna, I don't know if you want to say something. It seems like your intent is to try to allow for access to the fishery by all geographic areas; but I don't want to put words in your mouth.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure, and Jack may be able to speak to this as well. The intent was if we are going to double the ACL and there is certainly an interest that the value of those snowy grouper are greater during that first season; then this would be a way of exploring a higher trip limit during that first season when they're most valuable, but still making sure that we retain access to those fish for the entire region during that second season when there are other species to fish for. But, certainly, interactions with snowy grouper will be happening; so retain some of that ACL to try and reduce discards.

MR. COX: I appreciate what Anna is trying to do here. Doubling the ACL, that is still not a whole lot of fish and we're still only talking about a 200,000 pound ACL. I think it is a good alternative but that it is not a directed fishery. Half of our boats are not participating in it now. Just like Ben said the other day, if we get up too high in the poundage, then we're going to have a directed fishery and it is going to get caught pretty quick. I just kind of wanted to put that out there.

DR. DUVAL: I think what I was hearing from folks, when we were discussing this at the committee level from Chris and Jack, that there are folks who are bringing in that as product during a time of year when the shallow water grouper closure is in place, so there isn't a whole lot of grouper so there is some demand for it.

I'm also conscious of folks at the very northern end of the range just simply not being able to access that resource until May. The weather patterns in that area just simply don't lend themselves well. I think it is a good action. It is probably simpler than some of the other alternatives we created as we were going through this document. Anna, now that there is a bunch of language up on the screen; would you be willing to actually make that in the form of a motion? That is pretty specific.

MS. BECKWITH: I would be happy to do that. **I move we direct staff to develop a new action with an alternative to consider a commercial split season with an equal split of the ACL between January to April and May through December, with different trip limit considerations of 100, 150 pounds and 200 pounds for each of the two seasons.**

DR. DUVAL: **Is there a second to that motion; seconded by Jack? Any other discussion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next motion is to move Alternative 8 to the**

considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Alternatives 2 and 3 to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion actually read establish a snowy grouper commercial trip limit of 150 pounds from January through April and a 50 or 100 pound trip limit from May through the end of the year. I think probably what it should say is add an alternative to establish a snowy grouper commercial trip limit. On behalf of the committee, I offer the original motion.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to say shouldn't that go under our new action as well since it is a split season?

DR. DUVAL: Doug is making a point that perhaps this should actually be another new action as opposed to a new alternative, because it would be doing something similar to what we just approved in terms of establishing a split season. I am wondering do we even need this, because I think we set something up pretty specific in the previous action. Chris, this was your motion in committee; and I just want to make sure that what we set up in the previous action would cover what you were trying to do here.

MR. CONKLIN: I think maybe Jack brought this up. Is this really a split season, though, or is this just a step-down and we're fishing the same quota – the same ACL excuse me.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, I see what you're saying; it is really a step-down.

MR. CONKLIN: I vote we get rid of it.

DR. DUVAL: Well, we have the option. The motion is on the floor, so it is up to the council whether we want to vote this up or down. Really, this is an alternative that would set up a trip limit January through April and then a step-down to either 50 or 100 pounds. Would you all like to keep this in here?

MR. COX: Yes, I vote we keep it in; I like it.

MR. CONKLIN: It is certainly worth looking at.

DR. DUVAL: Would we need to amend it to add that additional few words at the beginning that are highlighted? The original is the motion without those highlighted words.

MR. BELL: I move that we amend this motion by adding the words "add an alternative to" at the beginning.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Mel; second by Charlie. Discussion. Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The amended motion now becomes the main motion. Is there any other discussion? Any objection? The motion passes with one objection.

The next motion was to add a new alternative for a snowy grouper commercial trip limit of 100 pounds January through April for all areas and May through August from North Carolina through Cape Canaveral and south of Marathon, Florida, with Subalternative A of 200 pounds; B, 250 pounds; C, 300 pounds; then May through August, 100 pounds; and the rest of the area, September through the end of the year or until the ACL is met or projected to be met, the trip limit would be set at 100 pounds; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion.

MS. BECKWITH: This was my motion and I like the idea of a split season better, so I would be willing to put this into the considered but rejected or withdraw or whatever would be appropriate. This is pretty complicated I think for staff to analyze. I think I would rather put the energy into the consideration of a split season.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, we just need to not vote for it and then it goes away and it is done. It is simple.

DR. DUVAL: Jessica, you have a quizzical look on your face. This is sort of a combination of what many of the original motions were that we considered to try to get at some pretty specific geographic concerns from north of Hatteras and south of Canaveral and south of Marathon. I know it is definitely going to be some tricky analysis.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes; I'm leaning towards wanting to keep it in there, because I agree with you. It is kind of looking at a combination of some of the other things we've already talked about. My preference would be to leave it in.

DR. DUVAL: Other discussion on this? I think really the simplest way to move forward is let's just vote it up or down. **Could I please see a show of hands of those in favor of this motion; nine in favor; those opposed, two opposed. The motion carries.**

The next motion was to move Alternatives 4 through 7 to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next the motion was to move Alternatives 3 and 4 under Action 5, which is recreational bag limits, to considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to remove alternatives that do not maintain landings below the recreational ACL; however, that motion failed for lack of a second. The next motion is to move Alternative 8 to the considered but rejected appendix; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was that the council should consider another alternative to close the recreational fishery for snowy grouper; however, that motion failed for lack of a second. Then we moved on finally to Regulatory Amendment 21, which is minimum stock size threshold, and the committee provided guidance and made the following motions.

The first motion was to accept the purpose and need as presented; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the IPT's suggested edits to alternatives and subalternatives under the proposed action; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Subalternative 2C as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

The next motion is to approve Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 21 for secretarial review, give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document, and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions. This is a roll call vote as this is a final approval; so, Mr. Executive Director.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. McCawley.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: It passes unanimously.

DR. DUVAL: The next amendment is Amendment 33, transporting of filets from the Bahamas. We have already dispensed with this, thank goodness. We're going to skip through that part of the report since we have already dealt with all of those motions. The next amendment was the generic accountability measures amendment, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 34.

The committee reviewed the options and made the following motions. **The first motion was to accept the purpose and need as written; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to add the following alternative to Snapper Grouper Amendment 34. This would be Alternative 4, if recreational landings reach or are projected to reach the recreational annual catch limit National Marine Fisheries Service will file a notification with the Office of the Federal Register to close the recreational sector for the remainder of the fishing year; unless using the best scientific information available, the Regional Administrator determines that a closure is unnecessary with Subalternative 4A if the species is overfished; Subalternative 4B regardless of stock status; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion. Objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

Then we offered guidance to clarify that payback of an overage would apply only to the amount above the total ACL. **Then the next motion was to exempt black sea bass and vermilion snapper from the accountability measure revisions in Amendment 34; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion. Recall that these were addressed in Regulatory Amendment 14, which is currently under review. Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

Next we had an update on the visioning project. Council staff gave the committee an update of the port meetings that have been held to date, and in put gathered at those meetings. Five port meetings were conducted in South Carolina, with a total of 53 participants representing the commercial, recreational, for-hire and federal dealer sectors. The main issues discussed at the meetings were reporting, data collection and research, flexibility in management, reducing discards, regional and sub-regional management and time area management.

The last item on our agenda was an economic efficiency analysis and that benefit analysis. At our December meeting we had asked that the science center take a look at whether or not the data exists to support an economic efficiency analysis of current allocations and that benefit analyses of proposed reallocations in the snapper grouper coastal migratory pelagics and dolphin wahoo fisheries.

Dr. Ponwith briefed the committee on the science center's existing capabilities to address the council's request. Dr. Ponwith indicated that the commercial data are readily available in the form of ex-vessel prices and landings for all species. However, recreational data are only partially available.

Dr. Ponwith posed several questions to the committee to better evaluate the type of analyses that could be conducted and provide an estimate of how long the analyses would take. The committee expressed their desire to have the Socio-Economic Panel of the SSC evaluate the information provided by the science center.

The committee reiterated that allocation issues would not be addressed for the snapper grouper fishery until after the council has completed their visioning and strategic planning process. That was the last item on our agenda. Is there any other business? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman; my committee report – Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Just recalling, we mentioned something yesterday in one of the committees – forgive me; I can't remember which one – about the reviewing of the circle hook rule. Do we need to bring that up now?

DR. DUVAL: I think if that is something you would like addressed, you can bring it up now. We talked about this actually during Executive Finance when we were going over the South Florida Committee Report. I believe we decided that this was something that we would look at in the full Snapper Grouper Committee as well. It is a South Florida Issue and has been requested specifically by our South Florida fishermen; but I think if you wanted to go ahead and make an official request that it be considered during Snapper Grouper Committee as information is obtained, we can do that. I confess that I have not yet read the Executive Finance report, so I can't remember exactly what we did.

MR. BOWEN: It was brought up, and I just wanted to bring it to Full Council's attention. I would like to try to get more information or some data on it at minimum. I think it is something that we really need to consider.

DR. DUVAL: Myra is telling me it has come up during port meetings a good bit.

MR. COX: Under other business, I would really like for this committee to start thinking about taking the deepwater complex and breaking banded rudders and almacos into their own ACL at some point; if we could just start having some discussion on it.

DR. DUVAL: I think those are part of the jacks' complex and that is something Doug has brought up and that Ben has brought up. I think we will definitely try to do that; hopefully, maybe as an outcome of visioning. I hate to keep saying things like that.

MR. HARTIG: Well, to that point, it makes it pretty difficult when the SSC hasn't reviewed them under a new way to look at data-poor stocks. That is what is really the hold up, Jack. We have a catch level recommendation for the SSC; it is relatively small. Until we change that catch level recommendation, it is not going to do us any good because each one of them has relatively low catch level recommendations that in my opinion in no way relate to the productivity of either one of the stocks you mentioned, almacos or rudder fish.

MR. COX: Yes, I hear what you're saying.

MR. HARTIG: That is something that we need to work through with the SSC. I've been on Luiz about it and, hopefully, we'll be able to get some kind of new way of looking at those species we put off in the ORCS Amendment.

MR. COX: I feel like there is definitely a deficiency. I mean, we're catching these fish; it closed last year in June. We're interacting with them all year long doing a lot of discarding. We went over them by 66 percent last year. There is obviously a major problem here. I just wanted to try to get working on it as soon as possible.

MR. HARTIG: I'm with you; we're trying. Madam Chairman, I'm sorry, I do have one other piece of business that I need to bring forward; and Monica is involved in this and we haven't talked. I'm sorry, we haven't talked since we had the conversation about the golden tilefish endorsement situation that may or may not be a problem.

What has transpired since the endorsements have been in place; it was the intent of this council that if you participated in the golden tilefish longline endorsement portion of the fishery, you would not be allowed to participate in the hook-and-line fishery. However, some fishermen are pretty ingenious on ways to get around different things.

He is doing it straight up before law enforcement and other people, asking questions about, well, what do I do if I lease my endorsement to another fisherman; or, I let my endorsement lapse in that year? I have a year to renew my endorsement. If I don't have that endorsement in my possession, am I allowed to go bandit fishing for golden tilefish? I know Monica and I have talked about it. I don't know if she has thought about it anymore or been able to see what you could do under the law. It was clearly our intent that if you participated in that longline fishery, you would not be able to participate in the bandit fishery.

DR. DUVAL: Not only was the intent; that was what was in the recent Fishery Bulletin that was just issued is if you have the longline endorsement, you are not eligible to participate in the hook-and-line portion of the fishery.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, but that is where they are doing a lot of thinking. I thought you had to renew your snapper grouper permit and your endorsement for the tilefish at the same time. First when we started looking at it, as you recall Monica, we thought they had to do that and it wasn't going to be a problem; because if they didn't renew and let it lapse, even though they had a year to renew, they wouldn't have a snapper grouper permit.

But as it turns out you can renew them separately. You can go ahead and renew your snapper grouper permit, allow your golden tilefish longline endorsement to lapse, because you have a year to renew it; fish while it is lapsed, because you don't have it, with the bandit reel, and then renew it before the longline season starts.

That is kind of where we left it. I don't know if Monica has been able to look at it any further. Then the other issue, like Ben says, is they may lease it out to somebody else where they then would not have it in their name. They have been thinking about ways to get around what the intent was.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, you kind of summed it up. I guess maybe what would be helpful is to have some discussion, which you have already started to have on the record, so it is clear to the Fisheries Service exactly what you meant. Then we'll look at the regulations and see whether we're able to tighten those up and amend those in such a way to prevent that from happening.

I think the reason they could be renewed separately, being the endorsement and the snapper grouper permit, was for transferability reasons; because I think you allowed those things to be transferred. If we could have a little bit more discussion, which like I say you've already started to have, that would be helpful.

DR. DUVAL: In my mind it is simply not fair if you are an endorsement holder and you have an exclusive right to a portion of the ACL to be allowed to double dip. That is really what it comes down to. In our discussions, the whole reason that we removed consideration of an endorsement program for the hook-and-line sector was because that you were eliminating a whole suite of folks from being able to access that resource.

Obviously, the point of the endorsement program was to reduce effort in the fishery and try to keep the season going longer. There was originally consideration of an endorsement program for the hook-and-line sector; but we decided that if we went forward with that, we would be pretty much excluding – you would be allocating the entire ACL to just very few people. There are folks who are going to encounter golden tilefish as they're fishing for other species. By allocating 25 percent of that ACL to the hook-and-line sector, you would allow for access, you would minimize your discards. We had some pretty long discussions about not allowing endorsement holders to fish on that piece of the ACL, because it wouldn't be fair. It is double dipping.

MR. COX: A little bit to this; this is something I've been bringing up. When we're commercial fishing and we're able to access the recreational retentions on our commercial vessels; I've been saying this is something; you know, we're double dipping as well in that fishery.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: What I think would be helpful – and Jack reminded me that I think he and others looked at the minutes, and it was pretty clear that was the council’s intent from the minutes. What I would suggest is that you develop a motion and vote on it here to give the council chairman authority to redeem any kind of regulatory fix that we come up with.

In the region, when we’re looking at changing the regulations to eliminate these kinds of actions, if you would give the council chairman the authority to deem those as necessary and appropriate to carry out the amendment; I think that would be helpful. Then we might be able to get something into the regulations or at least propose them. I’m not sure exactly how we’re going to do it, if we could just do an interim final rule, I’m not sure. But if you would give the council chairman authority to deem those regulations, that would be a good idea at this meeting.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that advice, Monica. Is there someone willing to make a motion to give the council chair authority to redeem any clarifying revisions to the regulations for the golden tilefish fishery? I guess, Monica, would it need to be specific to the endorsement program or just give the council chair authority to redeem any clarifying revisions to the regulations for the golden tilefish fishery?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes; I think just what you said is fine.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I make the motion to give the council chair the authority to redeem any clarifying revisions to the regulations for the commercial golden tilefish fishery.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie; seconded by Zack. Other discussion? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It is clear from the discussion on the record that this motion goes to the endorsement holder issue that we just discussed.

DR. DUVAL: Yes. Is that satisfactory to everyone? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.** Is there any other business to come before the council? We might want to make note of the point that Jack brought up, which is allowing retention of the recreational bag limit when the commercial season is closed is of concern.

I think there are probably some law enforcement concerns with that in terms of fish being sold under the table; and it is a bit of double dipping. That is something for us to consider down the road. Any other business? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor back to you.

MR. HARTIG: Phenomenal job, Michelle, that was great? We’re going to take a short break. I’m going to do the mackerel report right after that.

MR. HARTIG: It looks like everybody is coming back in here. If you get back to your seats, we’ll try and get through this as efficiently as possible. The Mackerel Committee met; the agenda was adopted; the minutes from the December 2013 meeting were approved. NMFS staff reported on the status of commercial and recreational catch in addition to updates on submitted Amendments 20A and South Atlantic Coastal Migratory Pelagic Framework Actions for 2013; under Amendment 20B, zones and boundaries, framework procedures, cobia ACL. In December of 2013 the South Atlantic Council made a change in a preferred alternative under Action 2;

fishing year for Gulf king mackerel zones and subzones and took final action on Amendment 20B.

The Gulf Council reviewed the change but maintained their current preferred alternative of the fishing year in the Gulf western zone. The South Atlantic Mackerel Committee reviewed Amendment 20B and approved the following motions. **Under Action 2, fishing seasons for Gulf group king mackerel; the first motion was to add options A through C under Alternatives 2 and 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

The next motion under Action 2 was to choose Alternative 3, Option B as the South Atlantic preferred for the eastern zone, northern subzone; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

There was a motion to select Alternative 2A as a preferred. That motion failed with one person in favor of that motion. **The next motion was to remove the change in fishing season for the western zone from this amendment, Option A under Alternatives 2 and 3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on this motion? I'm going to have a little bit of discussion.**

We did have some discussion during the discussion we had under that change under that motion. We discussed that could be considered under another amendment possibly after a joint committee meeting. I was going to try and add this as a subscript under the motion, but what I think I will do, and after just talking to Kari about how we're going to move forward with this, is the chairman intends to write a letter to the Gulf Council on why we did this.

This is quite a different management option when we don't approve another council's preferred alternative in a joint amendment. What I think I will do, I will withdraw that discussion and I will put it in that letter. **Is there any more discussion to occur? I'm just thinking out loud, sorry. Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

Under Action 4, establish regional commercial annual catch limits for Atlantic migratory group king and Spanish mackerel; the first motion we had was to accept the IPT's recommended language change for Actions 4.1 and 4.2; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved. The last motion we had – Kari, did I miss anything?

MS. MacLAUHLIN: No.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, I'm just checking. **The last motion we had was to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 20B for secretarial review and deem the revised codified text as necessary and appropriate; give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text; and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text; and on behalf of the committee I so move.** Bob

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR MAHOOD: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. McCawley.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: It passes unanimously.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Bob. That brings us to the framework amendment for Spanish mackerel annual catch limits. **The first motion that was made was under Action 1 modify the annual catch limit for Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel, was to revise the first sentence in Alternative 2 to include 2016; on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection to that motion?** Go ahead, David.

MR. CUPKA: I was going to ask Kari if the Gulf had made that change yet or not; do you know?

MS. MacLAUHLIN: No, I don't think they approved the language change. I don't know if they do that all the time with theirs. At their April meeting, Ryan will review that.

MR. HARTIG: **Is there any other discussion? Is there objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Under Action 2, modify annual catch limits for Gulf migratory group Spanish mackerel, the motion was to make Alternative 2 and Action 2 as the preferred; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

The next motion was to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 1 for secretarial review; deem the revised codified text as necessary and appropriate; give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text; and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text; and on behalf of the committee I so move.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. McCawley.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: That also passes unanimously.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Bob. Under Amendment 24, allocations, the committee reviewed scoping comments for Amendment 24 which would examine the recreational and commercial allocations for Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel and Gulf migratory group king mackerel. The committee provided direction to staff for an options paper for the June 2014 meeting. Amendment 26, separate permits, the committee also reviewed scoping documents for Amendment 26 which would consider ways to separate commercial permits for Spanish mackerel and king mackerel into Atlantic and Gulf permits. The committee directed staff to prepare a white paper on methods for the September 2014 meeting.

Under Framework Amendment 2, which is just starting to be initiated, is Atlantic Spanish mackerel trip limits in Florida. In March 2013 the South Atlantic Council added an action to the South Atlantic Framework Action 2013 to consider changes in the commercial trip limit system for Atlantic Spanish mackerel in Florida, but decided to move that action to a later amendment in June of 2013.

The committee approved the following motion to add the action into a new framework amendment; and the motion is bring back the previous trip limit actions from original framework in a separate framework action for consideration; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion of that motion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

We've got a timing and task motion; and the motion would be to adopt the timing and task items as presented: Prepare Joint Coastal Migratory Amendment 20B for submission to the Secretary of Commerce following Gulf Council approval for submission at their April 2014 meeting; prepare Framework Amendment 1 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce following Gulf Council approval for submission at their April 2014 meeting; develop an options paper for Joint Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 24 for the June 2014 meeting; and develop a white paper on the methods for Joint Coastal Migratory Amendment 26 for the September 2014 meeting; and prepare Draft Framework Amendment 2 for the June 2014 meeting.

Motion by Charlie, second by Michelle. Discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Okay, that completes the king mackerel report. Is there any other business to come before the King Mackerel Committee or the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Committee? Seeing none; we'll move along to Data Collection Report, Mel.

MR. BELL: The Data Collection Committee meeting was held on March 6th. The agenda was adopted; minutes of the December 2013 meeting were approved. The first item was the Joint Gulf and South Atlantic Council Generic Dealer Amendment. Dr. Jack McGovern reported that the amendment was sent to National Marine Fisheries Service for formal secretarial review on the 26th of September.

The Notice of Availability was published on December 19. Comments were due February 18th. The Proposed Rule was published on the 2nd of January 2014 with comments due by February 3rd. Final Rule package is under review. The next item was the Joint South Atlantic and Gulf Council Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendment; South Atlantic headboats only.

Dr. Jack McGovern reported that the amendment was sent to National Marine Fisheries Service for secretarial review on April 23, 2013; Notice of Availability. The amendment was published in the Federal Register on September 18, 2013. Comments were accepted through November 18th. The Proposed Rule was published on September 18th.

Comment period ended on November 18th. The final rule was published on December 17, 2013; and regulations became effective on the 27th of January, 2014. Next the Gulf Framework to implement for-hire reporting headboat only; and Dr. Jack McGovern reported that the amendment was sent to National Marine Fisheries Service for secretarial review on July 18, 2013. The Proposed Rule was published on October the 25th. Comment period ended on November the 25th. The Final Rule published on January 3, 2014, and regulations became effective on March 5, 2014.

The next item was Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 3. Anna Martin reviewed the current status of CE-BA 3. Monica Smit-Brunello advised council on how to proceed with CE-

BA 3. Similar amendments in the northeast region have been disapproved due to Anti-Deficiency Act and other types of funding requirements.

If CE-BA 3 were submitted now, it would likely be disapproved for similar reasons. The New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils are working on a shared-cost approach to covering the cost of observers; and so the recommendation now is to not take action and to monitor what is going on in the northeast. Then the council could determine how best to proceed.

The council was also advised to address some of the discussion in the document on species-specific observer requirements. The next item was an update on commercial logbook pilot study. Dr. Bonnie Ponwith updated the committee on the status of this project. The committee discussed the original intent to provide fishermen the option of filing their logbook forms electronically or using the current paper logbook versus the current pilot study evaluation on vessel electronic logbook.

Input from the snapper grouper visioning process thus far indicates support for reporting electronically rather than via paper. The committee expressed interest in future discussions about providing the opportunity for fishermen to report electronically in addition to using paper. The next item was the Joint South Atlantic Gulf Council Generic Charterboat Reporting Amendment. Gregg Waugh provided us an update.

Council staff reviewed the status of appointments to the technical subcommittee to work on the technical issues related to this amendment. The South Atlantic Council representative will be John Carmichael with Mike Errigo assisting; Gulf Council, John Froeschke; Dr. Andy Strelcheck from Southeast Regional Office; Ken Brennan and Vivian Matter from Southeast Fisheries Science Center; Dr. Katie Drew, ASMFC; and Dr. Ron Salz from MRIP. The HMS and ACCSP representatives are not designated yet.

The Gulf Council is interested in moving this amendment along and request that the technical committee provide their report by summer and approved a motion to develop a joint framework action to establish electronic reporting or other approved methods within the federally permitted reef fish and coastal migratory pelagics charter fishery.

The committee discussed this but felt that the technical committee would need the rest of the year to complete their work. The committee discussed work that could be conducted by the two councils to begin working on an amendment to require electronic reporting from charter vessels. Next we discussed the Electronic Technology Workshop Implementation Plan.

A National Electronic Monitoring and Reporting Workshop was held January 8 and 9, 2014, in Seattle. Council members Mel Bell and Dr. Michelle Duval attended. Robert Johnson from the Snapper Grouper AP also attended. The purpose of this workshop was to bring key decision-makers and stakeholders together in an effort to facilitate the implementation and integration of electronic monitoring into U.S. fisheries.

The committee discussed the workshop and just several things that were noted: Make it clear that electronic technology refers to electronic reporting and electronic monitoring and not just electronic monitoring. Terminology is critical in going forward with this. The South Atlantic

Council is focused on electronic reporting right now. That seems to be where the most interest would exist for us.

Reporting should link databases with common elements, example water body codes. There are other things that can be linked in. Agency does not need to build everything but should focus on developing the standards. Third party vendors should be involved from the start. The other thing we talked about was the amount of data from video monitoring is very large and costly.

Compared cost for observer versus electronic monitoring; that is something that we discussed we really should do when you look at this is to determine actual costs of both; and you might be surprised. The project by Scott Baker may provide some comparison. We talked about that. Regional implementation plans will be developed with the target date of December 2014.

Mel Bell is representing the South Atlantic Council. Dr. Andy Strelcheck is representing the Regional Office; and Ken Brennan and Dave Gloeckner are representing the Science Center. The Regional Implementation Plan should be considered a living document and change as we move forward.

Under other business, Dr. Roy Crabtree briefed the committee on issues arising in MRIP Wave 3 data for 2013. Methodology changed for the dockside intercepts and the landings for red snapper in Alabama and the Panhandle of Florida were the highest on record. The EEZ effort was the highest recorded.

On the Atlantic side, the EEZ trips have been low for the past several years, and Wave 3 effort was the lowest ever. There is a calibration workshop being held by National Marine Fisheries Service in Charlotte, North Carolina. That will be in September 8 to 10, 2014, to address this issue.

Under timing and task draft motion, the following draft motion has been developed based on direction from the committee. The motion was to approve the task and timing as presented, approved by council. There were several items: Direct staff to expand the discussion in CE-BA 3 on species-specific observer coverage as required by the ACCSP minimum data standards; and to bring the document back at the June 2014 meeting for further consideration.

We also requested a presentation on the status of work in the northeast on the approach to cover observer costs for the June 2014 meeting. Council staff and NOAA GC are to provide updates. Directed staff to provide some options on how commercial fishermen could report electronically and via paper; and to provide that at the June 2014 meeting.

Direct staff to follow up with ACCSP and HMS for their appointees to the Technical Subcommittee; and direct South Atlantic staff to work with the Gulf staff to provide support to the technical committee and facilitate the committee's work. Discuss what work can be accomplished on the amendment while the technical committee is completing their work. Report back at the 2014 meeting in June. Direct staff to attend the MRIP Calibration Workshop September 8 through 10, 2014 in Charlotte, North Carolina.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we accept the Timing and Task motion as presented.

MR. BELL: David seconds. **Any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? The motion carries.** Pending any questions or any other discussions here that concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Mel. We'll go right back to you for the Law Enforcement report, if you don't mind.

MR. BELL: This is a summary report for both the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel and Law Enforcement Committee meetings, which were held on Monday. The Law Enforcement Advisory Panel met during the morning of Monday, March 3, in Savannah, Georgia.

The Advisory Panel was not able to cover all the items on their agenda before lunch; however, the Advisory Panel met jointly with the Law Enforcement Committee during the afternoon session on March 3 and continued discussions and finalized their recommendations. This report combines a summary of the morning AP meeting, the AP recommendations to the Law Enforcement Committee and discussions that took place during the joint meeting.

The first item was the North Carolina Joint Enforcement Agreement. Colonel Jim Kelly briefed the Law Enforcement AP on efforts to establish a Joint Enforcement Agreement between the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement and the state of North Carolina. Colonel Kelly reported that efforts are underway, but stated that there has been considerable resistance from the commercial fishermen in North Carolina.

The Law Enforcement AP members suggested that a letter be submitted in support of establishing a JEA in North Carolina. Tracy Dunn with NOAA OLE, special agent in charge, stated that the NOAA OLE could also express their support. The next area covered was the Oculina Experimental Closed Area.

Anna Martin briefed the advisory panel on upcoming discussions by the Oculina Evaluation Team, which is tasked with evaluating goals and objectives in the Oculina Evaluation Plan. The OET was originally going to convene via webinar on February 13, 2014, to initiate discussions on reevaluation of the Oculina closed area; however, the webinar had to be rescheduled due to weather-related problems.

A series of breakout groups to discuss the research, outreach, and law enforcement portions of the evaluation plan will be held the week of March 10, 2014. The Evaluation Team's final report will be presented to the council at their June 2014 meeting. The Law Enforcement AP will need to review the draft report via e-mail or webinar at a later time, but before the June council meeting, and comment on the recommendations for this area. Recently completed and developing amendments; there was a rather lengthy briefing on that. Council staff briefed the AP on amendments recently completed and those still under development.

The AP provided the following comments. Regarding MPAs, the advisory panel reiterates its previous recommendations and requests that the council pay close attention to the purpose and need for action of any plan amendments addressing MPAs. The advisory panel would like to be closely involved in developing Snapper Grouper Amendment 22 when and if it goes forward.

Regarding Coral Amendment 8; the advisory panel recommends that the council look closely at definitions for gear stowage as they pertain to the shrimp fishery. Regarding CE-BA 1, the AP reminded staff and council agreed to reconsider the number of waypoints that define the boundaries of the coral HAPCs.

The suggestion was made to review minutes from the June 2009 discussions. That was a discussion we had about the more waypoints you have the more complex it is to try to enforce a boundary or something. The LEAP expressed concern over tournament-caught king mackerel being counted against the commercial ACL and would welcome the opportunity to discuss further as the council addresses similar issues.

Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7/Snapper Grouper Amendment 33 proposes to allow dolphin and wahoo fillets caught recreationally to be brought into the U.S. EEZ from the Bahamas as is currently allowed for snapper grouper species; that is, should dolphin and wahoo be exempt from the regulations that require the fish to be landed with head and fins intact?

The amendment also contains related actions such as how many pounds of fillets would constitute a single fish, whether fillets must have skin intact and reporting requirements. Both the LEAP and the Law Enforcement Committee were asked to discuss the proposed actions and alternatives and offer recommendations to the council.

The LEAP made no motions regarding the proposed changes; however, the advisory panel requested more time to give the issues in the amendment more consideration and take them back to appropriate agencies. The LEAP and the Law Enforcement Committee made the following recommendations and motions.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Do we have to go through these motions since we already covered that this morning?

MR. BELL: That would be great if we don't; thank you. Okay, you can kind of read all of that so that would take us to other business. No motions or recommendations were made regarding Action 6. Okay, other business, Mel Bell briefed the AP and LE Committee on the recent interest in the harvest of cannonball jellyfish in federal waters of the South Atlantic and in the state of Georgia and South Carolina.

Cannonball jellyfish are captured using vessel trawlers used to target shrimp, but with specifically modified large mesh nets that are fished near the surface. Shrimp trawlers are required to use turtle excluder devices and bycatch reduction devices, which are effective in excluding jellyfish from the catch.

Under the ESA, TEDs are required when trawling for shrimp in both the state and federal waters. Trawlers currently harvesting jellyballs in federal waters are not using TEDs, but in Georgia's fishery and in South Carolina's experimental fishery TEDs are required in state waters. The LEAP did not express any concern at this point and made not recommendations to the council on this issue or the fishery.

At their February meeting the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council requested that South Atlantic Council determine if there are issues with private vessels operating as for-hire vessels in

the South Atlantic waters in exchange for contractual services. This is an issue that the Gulf Council will be addressing in coming months.

Gregg Waugh briefed the LEAP and the committee on what the issues are and answered questions. The LE Committee made the a motion, which failed. I realize that failed, but I think part of the issue we might have had was that what we were focusing on was some very specific wording they had in their amendment.

We kind of missed an entire paragraph that they had in there. But the point is I think there was no comfort on the AP's part or the committee's part to kind of move along with that specific wording. I think there was some interest, perhaps, and so I will bring it to the council. There may be some interest or there may be some interest at the council level in somehow participating in this or looking into it further.

I think a preliminary check might have indicated it doesn't seem to be the same exact issues here in our area; but if we're going to go in or if the Gulf is going to move towards changing federal regulations related to the definition of charterboat, it would seem sort of logical that one definition should work for both the Gulf and the Atlantic. I am not really sure of the timetable the Gulf is trying to move this along. Maybe Doug could explain a little more on that or something to just kind of help us determine what we want to do.

MR. BOYD: The whole concept is in response to several charter for-hire operators in the Gulf. They have experienced and know firsthand of private boat operators who are circumventing the law and taking people on charters; and they're calling them seminars. The people are paying for a five-hour seminar, but they get to go fishing for free. That is basically what it is.

While we would like to respond to them and we would like to move forward if there is an easy definition; I don't think we want to make this something that is higher priority than other fishery management issues. With that in mind, we're going to continue to work on it, but I don't think that you all need to consider it to be one of your higher priorities.

MR. BELL: I talked to Tracy about this a little bit and Monica as well. I think it is something that we can certainly look at a little bit, but I really wouldn't want to burn up a lot of – given everything else that is on the plate right now; I don't know that we want to expend a lot of energy in it.

It just seems logical at some point if there is going to be a definition change, we would want to have the ability to weigh in on that. Does the council have any thoughts on any way you would like to go? At this point we can just sit back and let it ride or we can kind of look around. Monica, do you have any suggestions?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, we've discussed this in our office only very briefly, although I know I think Shepherd Grimes worked on this quite a bit. Next week I believe that we're going to get together in our office and look at this definition and see whether the wording as it is proposed now is appropriate to cover all situations or whether we would need to revise it somewhat.

I do also think it is a good idea for both councils to have the same definition for this particular item on for-hire. Maybe what you want to do is to wait until your June meeting to see how the Gulf deals with this at their April meeting; and then come back and perhaps adopt similar language if this is on their April meeting agenda. I think the attorneys need to do a little more work on making sure that this is the best language necessary.

MR. BELL: Okay; so then the best thing might just be to kind of chill a little bit. If you want to do a little more research, maybe you could kind of report back to us a little on what you think.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That would be my recommendation. I haven't looked into this issue at all, but I know others have. I want to make sure that we have the same understanding of what the language should be.

MR. BELL: Right; does that make sense to everybody?

MR. BOYD: One other comment. The problem that we've run into in the language is that we don't want to prohibit people going on trips and sharing expenses. We want everybody to be able to go and pay for gas and pay for ice and pay for bait, but we want to have people not circumventing the intent of the law. We're being very cautious in it and working with General Counsel.

MR. BELL: That was some of the wording we kind of missed when we were moving through this really quickly; but there was a whole paragraph in there that kind of dealt with some of the nuances there to try to not have an unintended consequences for legitimate sort of things. I think what we'll just do is just kind of look into this a little bit more and see how the Gulf goes with it and move on from there.

The last two items in the report. Karen Raine from NOAA OLE stated that the revised penalty policy is now available for comment. One advisory panel member brought up an issue regarding the requirement for an operator permit under the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan. The individual also possesses a permit from the northeast region that allows him to harvest dolphin and wahoo.

His question was whether he is required to have both permits to harvest these species in the South Atlantic. NOAA GC stated that the operator permit requirement is indeed part of the Dolphin Wahoo FMP and is required in the South Atlantic region. Mr. Chairman, pending any questions or comments, that concludes my report.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you Mel. Any questions of Mel? Seeing none; we'll move on to Joint Habitat and Ecosystem Based Management Committee Report by the dynamic duo, Doug Haymans and Wilson Laney.

MR. HAYMANS: Wilson, did word not get to you that you were going to read it today?

DR. LANEY: I didn't know I got to do this as a nonvoting member. I'll be happy to read the report. The committees received a status report from the Southeast Regional Office staff on Coral Amendment 8. Council staff provided an update on the status of the cooperative

agreement between the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and NOAA's Coral Reef Conservation Program for FY 2014-2016.

The proposal submitted in November 2013 remains under review. Rock shrimp industry representatives in December 2013 had submitted a request to further modify the coordinates for points 16 through 25 off the eastern boundary of the Northern Oculina Bank Extension. Council staff reviewed spatial representation of the new options for northern extension.

The committees recommended that the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel consider options that would allow industry representatives to demonstrate their gear does not damage deepwater coral and associated habitat resources or result in bycatch of managed species in this region of the Oculina Bank.

The committees provided guidance to staff to review options with the AP during their May 2014 meeting, such as research collaboration through a cooperative research program proposal and/or application for an exempted fishing permit. Council staff also discussed the revised SAFMC Essential Fish Habitat Policy Statements addressing alterations to riverine, estuarine and nearshore flows, marine aquaculture and submerged aquatic vegetation.

The committees discussed the benefit in having the Habitat AP review comments recently provided by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission on the redrafted policy statements. To facilitate a final review of the statements, committee members were requested to provide any additional comments to council staff in advance of the April 1st through 3rd, 2014 Habitat AP meeting.

Council staff provided an overview of the timing and process for revisions to the Fishery Ecosystem Plan 2 and update to EFH and completion of the EFH five-year review. Council staff also provided an update on ecosystem activities. Now, does Mr. Haymans have to do the motions or can I do those? Yes, I think Mr. Haymans has to do the motions.

DR. DUVAL: Wilson is not a voting member of the council.

MR. HAYMANS: The following motions were made by the joint committees. **The first was to recommend the Deepwater Shrimp AP consider development of an EFP for these particular areas for this particular gear type; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none that motion is approved.**

Then there was a motion to reconsider that previous motion. That motion was approved. The next motion then was to provide information to the Deepwater Shrimp AP at their next meeting to include a variety of tools and options available to conduct research in the area of interest. That motion was approved and became the main motion.

Therefore, on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Does everybody understand what the motion was then? Okay; seeing no discussion, is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Then there was a motion to adopt the timing and tasks as presented and they are:

A: At the May 2014 Deepwater Shrimp AP meeting provide information and research options. The deepwater shrimp industry may consider that characterized fishery impacts in the region of the Oculina Bank HAPC Northern Extension.

B: To work with the Habitat AP to further redefine the SAFMC policy statements and bring revisions back to the June 2014 meeting along with additional draft priorities.

C: To coordinate with the Habitat AP, state subpanel chairs and ecosystem partners to refine membership on review and writing teams for development of the FEP 2.

Do I have a motion for that; and I do from Charlie, and a second from Michelle. Is there any additional discussion on adopting timing and tasks? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

DR. DUVAL: This might be actually a question for Roger. Just thinking about the FEP 2 update and some of the new sections that you went over on climate change and some of the work that is being done on trophic interactions; I think just in considering the policy statements that we reviewed today, I was wondering if there had been any consideration given to establishing policy statements for a couple of those new sections of the FEP.

It seems like those are two really important issues that are going to impact the council's management. Climate change is clearly having some impacts on distribution of our managed species. I'm not a really big fan of the phrase "forage fish". I know what it means in this context, but I tend to associate that with menhaden and the shads and river herrings where there is a pretty big effort underway to consider those at the ASMFC in the Mid-Atlantic level.

I think really what we're talking about here is more the food web dynamics and trophic interactions, who eats who. We have this big multispecies fishery and clearly management measures that we put into place to rebuild species have the potential to alter those interactions.

I think just hearing our Snapper Grouper AP Chair talk about some of the research he has done in Florida trying to do surveys for red snapper, wading through all the black sea bass and the black sea bass are burping up baby B-liners; so I think it seems to me it would be beneficial to have some kind of policy statement from the council recognizing the importance of those interactions. I realize we don't have a lot of information on them, but incorporating that information down the road and having that to help inform some of our future management decisions. Roger, I just didn't know if the committee had discussed that at all.

MR. PUGLIESE: Well, I think in general we had discussed it. One of the things I think that is real important on those is that we've kind of set the stage to do that, but especially with the idea of having sections pretty much dedicated. I think in and of themselves that was going to help build the foundation for the discussion and establishment of a core of a policy statement.

I would have thought we probably would have gotten down that road, anyway, but that is a good thing to keep in the front end so we can actually begin to structure it. It is going to be the purview of the council to want to do that. I think there is a lot of support to do it. That is the whole reason of kind of putting them into context is then the next stage is what do we really do looking at climate in fisheries.

What do we really do with looking, as you said, food web interactions? That one specifically we have some good foundation, because we have the past work we had done. We have now been collaborating with Tom Okey and with some support through Pew on another generation of an Ecopath Model that will begin to build some of those iterations.

We've also talked about integrating an ecosystem-modeling workshop later this year that will provide I'm hoping another springboard to even get into a more directed modeling effort that will really kind of go further in terms of knowing the interactions. I think that, in combination with some other things such as our development of the ecospecies online system, that will begin to connect all these and actually maybe put inputs on individual species, prey and predator interaction information.

We have the opportunity to build the foundation for good policy directions for both of those key major areas, climate and fisheries, because the interactions are going to be there. We've got a lot of pieces already, like you said. In some of the policy statements you're already teasing some of those. The direction to move forward with that I think is a very strong thing. We'll be building the foundation, especially with the new section development to do that.

DR. DUVAL: That's great; and I am glad to hear that it is something you thought about. That is something I don't want to lose as we go forward with the second round of the FEP. I don't want to have obviously a protracted discussion about it here. I just wanted to put it out there so that other council members could think about it as well.

MR. PUGLIESE: One last real quick point; that is I think the beauty of taking our time with the FEP 2; and the difference from the FEP 1 is we just kind of pulled everything together last time and didn't allow the opportunity and the discussions under some of these overlapping types of areas of importance to be able to translate into policy discussions or directions. We have the opportunity now, so it is exactly in line with what I think the intent of going to the next generation of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan is.

MR. HAYMANS: Any additional questions for Roger or any additional comments or discussion points? Thank you, Michelle, for making sure we got that capture on record and thank you, Roger, for a thorough answer, Mr. Chairman, seeing no other questions or discussion, that concludes our business for this committee.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Doug and Wilson. The next committee report will be the Protected Resources Committee report from David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: The Protected Resources Committee met on March 4, 2014. The agenda was adopted; and the minutes of the December 2013 meeting were approved. The committee received an update from Andy Herndon with the Southeast Regional Office Protected Resources Division on two ongoing formal consultations for fisheries managed by the South Atlantic Council.

Currently there is an ongoing consultation for the southeast shrimp fisheries, including both the Gulf and South Atlantic Regions, to examine the affects of skimmer trawls without TEDs. The

draft biological opinion is in the last round of internal review and will tentatively be finalized at the end of March.

Additionally, a formal consultation is underway for the coastal migratory pelagics fishery, triggered by the listing of the Carolina and South Atlantic distinct population segments of Atlantic sturgeon as endangered under the ESA in 2012. The biological opinion is currently in progress.

These briefings were provided in accordance with a request from the council in June of last year for the Protected Resources Division to provide the committee with an update on any ongoing formal consultations and record the input from committee members for consideration during the consultation.

Council staff provided a brief presentation on the final report and recommendations from the Endangered Species Act Working Group, a joint working group to make recommendations on increasing transparency and improving the confidence and ESA consultations and fishery management plans.

The recommendations were reviewed by MAFAC in December of last year and by the Council Coordination Committee in February of this year. The working group recommends that NMFS headquarters provide guidance to the Regional Administrators and Councils on agreements for council involvement in the consultation process.

Council staff will keep the committee updated on the status of headquarters guidance and the next steps in the process. Dr. Wilson Laney provided an update on the status review for American eel. The American Eel Status Review is being conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service and is due by September 30, 2015.

The Service has assembled a core team of staff from all the Service Regions where American eel occurs to conduct the review. At present no workshops are planned in association with the status review; but rather the core team is reaching out to those with expertise on the American eel migration and marine habitat issues.

However, workshops will be considered for new climate change information and how that may impact the American eel spawning grounds. Dr. Laney provided contact information for the status review. Next Wilson provided an update to the committee on the Atlantic sturgeon stock assessment being conducted by ASMFC.

The Commission Atlantic Sturgeon Technical Committee has appointed a stock assessment subcommittee to conduct the benchmark stock assessment. The commission held a data workshop last year to discuss the Atlantic sturgeon data sets which are available and would be useful in conducting the assessment.

Terms of reference for the benchmark assessment were drafted and reviewed by the technical committee and approved by the Commission Sturgeon Management Board at their February meeting of this year. Dr. Laney provided contact information for the stock assessment. The committee received an update on the proposed listing for red knot by Dr. Laney. U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service proposed listing the Rufa red knot September 30 of last year as threatened. Comments on the proposed rule were due by November 29th last year.

As of March the third of this year, there were 563 comments received on the proposed rule, and the Service was in the process of reviewing them. The Service anticipates the proposed critical habitat for the species will be published in late spring or early summer. The final rule needs to be published by September 30th of this year.

The Service's Northeast Region has the lead for this species, and Dr. Laney provided contact information for the listing proposal. Finally, the committee received an update on the proposed critical habitat for loggerhead sea turtles from Dr. Laney. The economic analysis of the proposed critical habitat was completed and was made available for review with comments due by September 16th of last year.

A total of 398 comments has been received and posted on the proposed critical habitat and/or the economic analysis as of March the third of this year. Final critical habitat for the Northwestern Atlantic Loggerhead should be published by July 1st of this year. Dr. Laney provided contact information for the proposed critical habitat. The committee did not approve any motions; and unless there are any questions, Mr. Chairman, that completes our report.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions of David? Seeing none; thank you, David. We'll go right into the SEDAR report. The SEDAR Committee met on March 4th and received reports on current SEDAR and Steering Committee activities, discussed the fishery-dependent monitoring workshop, addressed the wreckfish assessment peer review and took administrative actions for SEDAR 41 Benchmark.

The committee supported the proposed objectives for a Fishery-Dependent Monitoring Workshop and directed staff to report back at the next meeting on organizing committee membership, timing and terms of reference. The committee requested considering red snapper fecundity estimates based on egg production, if feasible, in the upcoming assessment as well as any other measure deemed appropriate and reliable.

There were several motions that we made. **The first motion was to appoint Barbara Muhling and Mitch Roffer to the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

The next motion was to appoint Sonny Davis to the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop and Mark Brown to the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop and Assessment Workshop; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objection on that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion was to appoint Marcel Reichert and George Sedberry as wreckfish assessment panel co-Chairs and Steve Cadrin and Luiz Barbieri as wreckfish panel reviewers; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion was to appoint those listed on Table 3, Attachment A10 to the SEDAR 7 Procedural Workshop; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

TABLE 3

Table 3, SEDAR Committee Attachment 10. Name	Affiliation	Expertise
State/Regional Reps Trish Murphey	NCDMF	Shrimp review panel; NC shrimp data
Kevin Brown	NCDMF	Characterization of NC shrimp trawl fishery
Jeanne Boylan / Tracey Smart	SCDNR / SEAMAP	SA SEAMAP trawl survey
Larry DeLancey	SCDNR	Shrimp review panel; SC FI shrimp data
Eric Hiltz	SCDNR	SC FD shrimp data
Amy Fowler	SCDNR	SC Crustacean Research
David Whitaker	SCDNR	SC FI and FD shrimp data; strong knowledge of fishery
Pat Geer	GADNR	Shrimp review panel; GA shrimp data
Ryan Gandy	FL FWCC	FL FI shrimp data
Steve Brown	FL FWCC	FL FD shrimp data
Julie DeFilippi	ACCSP	Regional FD shrimp data
Frank Helies	Gulf and SA Fisheries Foundation	Pilot SA shrimp fishing effort study
Mark Stratton	VIMS	Doctoral research to potentially include SA regional white shrimp assessment
SSC		
Carolyn Belcher	GADNR	SSC; consider as workshop chair
Chip Collier	NCMDF	SSC
Eric Johnson	UNF	SSC
Marcel Reichert	SCDNR	SSC

The next motion was to move that Option 1, Attachment 2 for the blueline update, which is a 2015 update to the SSC in April 2016, is preferred unless the SSC recommendations on the current projections necessitate an earlier assessment. The SSC is asked to consider timing and the type of assessment required, particularly whether an update or a standard is appropriate to address spatial catch-per-unit effort distribution and recruitment issues identified by the review panel; and on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The last motion in the SEDAR Committee Report was to approve the wreckfish assessment peer review terms of reference; and on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved. That concludes the SEDAR Report. Was there any other business to come before SEDAR? Seeing none; that is concluded.

The last item of business as far as committee reports go is the Executive Finance Committee Meeting Report. The Executive Finance Committee met on March 6th in Savannah. The minutes from the December 2013 Executive Finance Committee were approved. The committee received presentations on the following agenda items.

For the 2014 council funding, Bob Mahood informed the council that we now have a budget for 2014. He explained the funding categories and levels of the council funding table developed by the National Marine Fisheries Service. It was pointed out that we received approximately \$112,000 more this year than we received in 2013, but approximately \$187,000 less than we received in 2012.

He also briefed the council on the SEDAR funding level for 2014 and over the past three years. Under the 2014 budget expenditures, Bob Mahood briefed the committee and council on council expenditures for 2014. It was noted that although there will need to be some adjustments to the budget, we are in good shape for 2014 because of the funds we were able to carry forward from the previous years combined with the increase we received this year.

Staff will revise the budget based on the new funding information and bring the budget back to the council at the June 2014 meeting for approval. On the Committee for South Florida Management Issues, Jessica McCawley presented the joint council committee on South Florida managed issues and ad hoc Goliath Grouper Joint Council Steering Committee Summary Report.

She summarized the results of the joint meeting held January 7 through 9, 2014, in Key Largo. Jessica referred to and discussed the number of highlights of the meetings. Jessica from the South Atlantic and Martha from the Gulf were elected as co-Chairs of the committees. Items discussed at the meeting addressed a wide range of issues centered on developing compatible South Florida management strategies and regulations.

Gregg Waugh presented the council staff recommendations for the followup to the South Florida management issue meeting. Items discussed included Goliath grouper, speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, a South Atlantic Council Only Snapper Grouper Amendment to remove Nassau grouper, dog snapper, schoolmaster, mahogany snapper and black snapper from the snapper grouper management unit and a joint amendment to address all other species and/or actions.

Preliminary actions and alternatives to be included in a Joint Snapper Grouper and Reef Fish Amendment were also discussed along with future modifications as a number of stock assessments are completed as well as the timing of moving forward. Discussions related to these presentations resulted in motions, and I will get to those in a moment.

On the council follow-up priorities, Gregg Waugh provided an overview of the council's followup and priorities document. He called the committee's attention to the large number of

advisory panel meetings that are coming up and the draft agenda for June 2014. He pointed out the current timeline and priorities and associated overall schedules.

Under the CCC Meeting Report, the council was briefed on the February CCC meeting held in Washington, D.C. It included a summary of some of the key items addressed during the meeting. The CCC members had the opportunity to meet the new AA for Fisheries, Eileen Sobeck, and discuss a number of issues with her.

Bob pointed out that one of the major items of the discussion centered on the issue of allocation. Overall, the meeting was very productive, although council funding was increased slightly. The councils were disappointed that their 2014 funding level was not restored to the 2012 levels. Here are the motions that came out of the Executive Finance Committee.

The first one was to take an action to remove Nassau grouper, dog snapper, schoolmaster, mahogany and black snapper from the Snapper Grouper Federal Management Unit; and on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The next motion was to approve the process described for how the Joint South Florida Management Issues Committee would operate; and on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

The last motion in that committee was approve the timeline and draft actions and alternatives as presented; and on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Is there any other business to come before the Executive Finance Committee? Seeing none; that concludes that committee report, which takes us to other business and upcoming meetings.

MR. MAHOOD: Our next meeting is going to be in Ponte Vedra Beach.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Mahood, I checked on greens fees for that resort; and it is \$189 a round; so could you negotiate something for us, please. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to seeing everybody in sunny Florida in June. I think it will be interesting. We've never met at this particular hotel, so it will be one of the few new experiences.

One of the things I might say, we try to book ahead, but we're running into a lot of resistance of hotels, especially these hotels that have meeting facilities giving the government rate. It is imperative that we book out ahead. Chris sent me a note yesterday asking if we couldn't meet somewhere else besides Charleston this coming year or this year.

I was able to write back that Mike jumped right on it and we're meeting in Hilton Head. We'll be meeting in Hilton Head in 2015 instead of Charleston. We are trying to find other places. I talked with Mike; and, Chris, if we can find some places further up the coast towards you, we certainly will look at that in the future.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes; there is a nice state park with some nice homey campsites and a covered shed, and we can meet in there. Good rates.

MR MAHOOD: Yes, we met at Litchfield; we've met at Myrtle Beach and Hilton Head before; but it would be nice to get up to that part of the state where you hang out up there. But, please, any of your council members that have recommendations. Now I think in 2015, in March, a year from now, we're going to be meeting at the King and Prince Hotel in St. Simons, which is a very nice facility.

We're trying to get good meeting facilities. I love big rooms like this where we have plenty of room to move around. Although we didn't fill the audience, particularly, although we did pretty good last night I thought the number of fishermen that showed up. But please help the staff if you have any recommendations.

Some of the key problems we have, number one; a lot of hotels don't like a 24-hour hold on a room like this. Sometimes that is a game ender. It is difficult to find the place we need for the type of meetings that we hold. Help us out if you find out about a new one or a good one to go to.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Bob. Is there any other business to come before the council? The South Atlantic March 2014 meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.

MR. BOWEN: Mr. Chairman, I have something after Jack as well.

MR. HARTIG: Is this other business?

MR. COX: Could we have the SSC look at the jack's complex to update the ABC? The reason I think it should be higher is I'm getting a lot of folks in the industry just asking me to look at this again, because this complex closes mighty early in the season. We interact with these fish and we're discarding 2 or 300 pounds per trip year-round in the jack's complex. I just wanted to put that out there, please. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Are you making that in the form of a motion that you want the SSC to address the jack complex as far as current landings?

MR. COX: Well, just to update the ABC.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, that's good.

MR. HARTIG: A motion by Jack; second by Chris. The other discussion we may have is other ways. I think we can do that without complicating this motion, but I think you can look at it in terms of the allocation things that we're looking at as well that may give the commercial industry some. I don't know what the recreational landings are in that complex, but that is something we can look at.

MR. COX: I'll read the motion. The motion is request the SSC to examine updating the jacks complex ABC.

MR. HARTIG: Is there any more discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Okay, Zack.

MR. BOWEN: I thought Bob might have mentioned it, but I think John and I are scheduled to go to the Saltwater Recreational Fishing Summit in Alexandria, Virginia. I think we fly out on the 31st of March and we will return April 3rd. I know I'm looking forward to it. Between John and myself, we'll bring a report back for our meeting in June.

MR. HARTIG: We very much appreciate you attending and I look forward to hearing that report. Okay is there any other, other business to come before the council? Seeing none; we're not adjourned. Thank you all very much for a very productive meeting.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:25 o'clock a.m., March 7, 2014.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
March 19, 2014

INDEX OF MOTIONS

DOLPHIN WAHOO COMMITTEE MOTIONS

DOLPHIN/WAHOO AMENDMENT 7/SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 33

PAGE 14: Motion to accept the purpose and need as modified. Motion carried on Page 15.

PAGE 15: Motion to remove Subalternatives 2B through 2E under Action 1. Motion carried on Page 16.

PAGE 16: Motion to add an action that adds language to the documentation requirements that require a passport be stamped and dated to prove that vessel passengers were in the Bahamas when harvesting snapper grouper species. Motion carried on Page 16.

PAGE 16: Motion to approve the new action and alternatives below:

Action 4. In addition to possessing valid Bahamian cruising and fishing permits, require stamped and dated passports to prove that vessel passengers were in The Bahamas if the vessel is in possession of snapper grouper fillets in the U.S. EEZ.

Alternative 1 (No Action): Vessels bringing snapper grouper fillets into the U.S. EEZ from The Bahamas are required to have valid current Bahamian cruising and fishing permits onboard the vessel.

Alternative 2: Vessels bringing snapper grouper fillets into the U.S. EEZ from The Bahamas are required to have stamped and dated passports to prove that the vessel passengers were in The Bahamas, as well as valid current Bahamian cruising and fishing permits onboard the vessel.
Motion carried on Page 16.

PAGE 17: Motion to add an Alternative 3 to exempt wahoo from U.S. bag and possession limits and modify Alternative 2 to exempt only dolphin. Motion carried on Page 17.

PAGE 17: Motion to move Action 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 17.

PAGE 17: Motion to select Alternative 2 under Action 4 as a preferred and add clarifying language to indicate that skin must be intact for the entire fillet. Motion carried on Page 17.

PAGE 17: Motion to select Alternative 3 under Action 4 as a preferred and add a clarifying language to indicate the skin must be intact for the entire fillet. Motion carried on Page 17.

PAGE 17: Motion to move Action 5 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 17.

PAGE 17: Motion to move Action 6 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 17.

DOLPHIN/WAHOO AMENDMENT 8/SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 34

PAGE 18: Under Action 2, Dolphin and Wahoo; motion to accept the IPT's wording change recommendations for Alternative 2. Motion carried on Page 18.

SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE MOTIONS

REGULATORY AMENDMENT 16

PAGE 19: Motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits to the purpose and need. Motion carried as amended on Page 19.

PAGE 19: Motion to amend above motion to strike the word "potential" from the needs statement for Regulatory Amendment 16. Motion carried on Page 19.

PAGE 20: Motion to accept the language and revisions to Alternative 5 as submitted by the NMFS Protected Resources Division. Motion carried on Page 20.

PAGE 20: Motion to include a revised Alternative 6 in the document for analysis but to use waypoints to delineate the boundary. Motion carried on Page 20.

PAGE 20: Motion to add an alternative that would close pots and waters off North Carolina from November 1st to December 15th in all EEZ waters off North Carolina; from November 1st to December 15th in waters shallower than 25 meters; from March 15th to April 30th in all EEZ waters off North Carolina; from March 15th through April 30th in waters shallower than 25 meters. Motion carried as amended on Page 21.

PAGE 20: Motion to amend the above motion to include South Carolina in each of the alternatives. Motion carried on Page 21.

PAGE 21: Motion to move Alternative 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 21.

PAGE 21: Motion to add alternatives as suggested by the Humane Society to Regulatory Amendment 16 for analysis: 1) Number 1, pot closure and petitioned right whale critical habitat; 2) pot closure in southeast seasonal gillnet restricted area. Motion carried on Page 21.

SG AMENDMENT 29

PAGE 21: Motion to accept the IPT's recommended changes to the purpose and need. Motion carried on Page 21.

PAGE 21: Motion to accept the IPT's recommended changes to the wording of Action 1 and Alternative 1. Motion carried on Page 21.

PAGE 21: Motion to accept the IPT's recommended edits to Action 2, Alternative 1, Motion carried on Page 21.

PAGE 21: Motion to approve using a risk tolerance scalar of 0.7 for white grunt and request that the SSC provide guidance on whether two separate ACLs are needed for this species. Motion carried on Page 22.

PAGE 22: Motion to add an action to establish ACLs and include a range of ACL alternatives. Alternative 1 would be no action, ACL equals OY equals ABC; Alternative 2, ACL equals OY equals 0.95 times ABC; Alternative 3, ACL equals OY equals 0.9 times ABC; and Alternative 4, ACL equals OY equals 0.8 times ABC. Motion carried on Page 22.

PAGE 22: Motion to approve the IPT's recommended edits to the language of Action 3. Motion carried on Page 22.

PAGE 22: Motion to add an alternative that would establish a 14-inch fork length minimum size limit for gray triggerfish off of East Florida. Motion carried on Page 22.

PAGE 22: Motion to add subalternatives to Alternatives 2 through 5 that would allow a choice for the minimum size limit to apply to the commercial and/or recreational sectors. Motion carried on Page 23.

PAGE 23: Motion to restructure Alternative 3 to remove East Florida from the alternative. Motion carried on Page 23.

PAGE 23: Motion to select new Alternative 5 as a preferred, which is to establish a 14-inch fork length minimum size limit for gray triggerfish off East Florida. Motion carried on Page 23.

PAGE 23: Motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Alternatives 2 and 3 under Action 4. Motion carried on Page 23.

PAGE 23: Motion to select Alternative 2 as a preferred under Action 4. Motion carried on Page 23.

PAGE 23: Motion to remove the suggested IPT wording from Alternative 3. Motion carried on Page 23.

PAGE 23: Motion to select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2B as a preferred with no step-down. Motion carried on Page 23.

SG AMENDMENT 32

PAGE 24: Motion to select Alternative 2 as a preferred. Motion carried on Page 24.

PAGE 24: Motion to request the SSC's guidance regarding maintaining catch levels at the yield at 75 percent Fmsy equilibrium until the next stock assessment. Motion carried on Page 24.

PAGE 24: Motion to direct staff to look at a proportion of landings in the South Atlantic versus north of North Carolina and calculate a percentage of the ACL for the South Atlantic. Motion not voted on.

PAGE 25: Motion to separate blueline tilefish from the deepwater complex and establish annual catch limits for blueline tilefish; that the blueline tilefish ACL equal OY, which is equal to 98 percent of the ABC. Motion carried on Page 25.

PAGE 25: Motion to move Alternative 4 under Action 2 to the considered by rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 25.

PAGE 25: Motion to move Alternative 4 under Action 3; which is the recreational ACT, to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 25.

PAGE 25: Motion to use the most recent five years of recreational landings to obtain the percent standard error to calculate the recreational ACT. Motion carried on Page 25.

PAGE 25: Motion to move Alternative 3 under Action 4, commercial AMs, to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 25.

PAGE 26: Motion to move Alternative 3 under Action 5, recreational accountability measures, to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 26.

PAGE 26: Motion to move Alternative 5 under Action 7, recreational management measures, to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 26.

SG REGULATORY AMENDMENT 20

PAGE 26: Motion to move mutton snapper actions from Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 20 to a future snapper grouper amendment that would include alternatives developed by the Joint Council Committee on South Florida Management Issues. Motion carried on Page 26.

PAGE 26: Motion to accept the IPT's suggested wording for purpose and need. Motion carried on Page 26.

PAGE 26: Motion was to use the normal framework procedure and develop Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 20 for review and final approval at the September 2014 council meeting; hold a webinar Q&A and public hearing in August 2014; and schedule a public hearing at the September 2014 meeting. Motion carried on Page 26.

PAGE 26: Motion to move Action 1, the rebuilding schedule, to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 26.

PAGE 26: Motion to move Alternative 2, Action 2, rebuilding strategy, to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 26.

PAGE 26: Motion to select Alternative 4, Action 2, rebuilding strategy, as preferred; and request the SSC evaluate whether this is sufficiently close to the percentage from the ABC Control Rule for the council to use; specify that the ABC would increase for five years beginning in 2015; and that the 2019 value would remain in place until modified. Motion carried on Page 27.

PAGE 27: Motion to add Alternative 3 to Action 3, ACLs for snowy grouper, with ACL equal to 95 percent, 90 percent and 80 percent of the ABC. Motion not voted on.

PAGE 27: Motion to add Alternative 9 to Action 4, commercial trip limits for snowy grouper; “For a commercial trip limit from January 1 until the ACL is met or projected to be met”. That would be 9A, 300 pounds; 9B, 200 pounds; 9C, 150 pounds. Motion carried on Page 27.

PAGE 28: Motion to direct staff to develop a new action with an alternative to consider a commercial split season with an equal split of the ACL between January to April and May through December, with different trip limit considerations of 100, 150 pounds and 200 pounds for each of the two seasons. Motion carried on Page 28.

PAGE 28: Motion to move Alternative 8 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 28.

PAGE 28: Motion to move Alternatives 2 and 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 28.

PAGE 28: Motion to establish a snowy grouper commercial trip limit of 150 pounds from January through April and a 50 or 100 pound trip limit from May through the end of the year. Motion carried as amended on Page 29.

PAGE 29: Motion to amend the above motion by adding the words “add an alternative to” at the beginning. Motion carried on Page 29.

PAGE 29: Motion to add a new alternative for a snowy grouper commercial trip limit of 100 pounds January through April for all areas and May through August from North Carolina through Cape Canaveral and south of Marathon, Florida, with Subalternative A of 200 pounds; B, 250 pounds; C, 300 pounds; then May through August, 100 pounds; and the rest of the area, September through the end of the year or until the ACL is met or projected to be met, the trip limit would be set at 100 pounds. Motion carried on Page 30.

PAGE 30: Motion to move Alternatives 4 through 7 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 30.

PAGE 30: Motion to move Alternatives 3 and 4 under Action 5, which is recreational bag limits, to considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 30.

PAGE 30: Motion to move Alternative 8 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 30.

SG REGULATORY AMENDMENT 21

PAGE 30: Motion to accept the purpose and need as presented. Motion carried on Page 30.

PAGE 30: Motion to approve the IPT’s suggested edits to alternatives and subalternatives under the proposed action. Motion carried on Page 30.

PAGE 31: Motion to select Subalternative 2C as the preferred. Motion carried on Page 31.

PAGE 31: Motion to approve Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 21 for secretarial review, give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document, and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions. Motion carried on Page 32.

SG AMENDMENT 34

PAGE 32: Motion to accept the purpose and need as written. Motion carried on Page 32.

PAGE 32: Motion to add the following Alternative 4 to Snapper Grouper Amendment 34: If recreational landings reach or are projected to reach the recreational annual catch limit National Marine Fisheries Service will file a notification with the Office of the Federal Register to close the recreational sector for the remainder of the fishing year; unless using the best scientific information available, the Regional Administrator determines that a closure is unnecessary with Subalternative 4A if the species is overfished; Subalternative 4B regardless of stock status. Motion carried on Page 32.

PAGE 32: Motion to exempt black sea bass and vermilion snapper from the accountability measure revisions in Amendment 34. Motion carried on Page 32.

MOTIONS UNDER OTHER BUSINESS

PAGE 36: Motion to give the council chair the authority to redeem any clarifying revisions to the regulations for the commercial golden tilefish fishery. Motion carried on Page 36.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE MOTIONS

MACKEREL AMENDMENT 20B

PAGE 36: Motion under Action 2, fishing seasons for Gulf group king mackerel, to add options A through C under Alternatives 2 and 3. Motion carried on Page 36.

PAGE 36: Motion under Action 2 to choose Alternative 3, Option B as the South Atlantic preferred for the eastern zone, northern subzone. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to remove the change in fishing season for the western zone from this amendment, Option A under Alternatives 2 and 3. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Under Action 4 motion to accept the IPT's recommended language change for Actions 4.1 and 4.2. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 20B for secretarial review and deem the revised codified text as necessary and appropriate; give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text; and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text. Motion carried on Page 38.

COASTAL MIGRATORY PELAGICS FRAMEWORK AMENDMENT 1

PAGE 38: Motion under Action 1, modify the annual catch limit for Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel; revise the first sentence in Alternative 2 to include 2016. Motion carried on Page 39.

PAGE 39: Motion under Action 2, modify annual catch limits for Gulf migratory group Spanish mackerel, to make Alternative 2 and Action 2 as the preferred. Motion carried on Page 39.

PAGE 39: Motion to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 1 for secretarial review; deem the revised codified text as necessary and appropriate; give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text; and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text. Motion carried on Page 40.

PAGE 40: Motion to bring back the previous trip limit actions from original framework in a separate framework action for consideration. Motion carried on Page 40.

PAGE 40: Motion to adopt the timing and task items as presented: Prepare Joint Coastal Migratory Amendment 20B for submission to the Secretary of Commerce following Gulf Council approval for submission at their April 2014 meeting; prepare Framework Amendment 1 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce following Gulf Council approval for submission at their April 2014 meeting; develop an options paper for Joint Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 24 for the June 2014 meeting; and develop a white paper on the methods for Joint Coastal Migratory Amendment 26 for the September 2014 meeting; and prepare Draft Framework Amendment 2 for the June 2014 meeting. Motion carried on Page 41.

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 43: Motion that we accept the Timing and Task motion as presented. Motion carried on Page 43.

JOINT HABITAT AND ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 48: Motion to recommend the Deepwater Shrimp AP consider development of an EFP for these particular areas for this particular gear type. Motion carried on Page 48.

PAGE 48: Motion to reconsider the previous motion was approved in committee.

PAGE 48: Motion to provide information to the Deepwater Shrimp AP at their next meeting to include a variety of tools and options available to conduct research in the area of interest. Motion carried on Page 48.

PAGE 48: Motion to adopt the timing and tasks. Motion carried on Page 48.

SEDAR COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 52: Motion to appoint Barbara Muhling and Mitch Roffer to the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop. Motion carried on Page 52.

PAGE 52: Motion to appoint Sonny Davis to the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop and Mark Brown to the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop and Assessment Workshop. Motion carried on Page 52.

PAGE 52: Motion to appoint Marcel Reichert and George Sedberry as Wreckfish Assessment Panel co-Chairs and Steve Cadrin and Luiz Barbieri as Wreckfish Panel Reviewers. Motion carried on Page 52.

PAGE 52: Motion to appoint those listed on Table 3, Attachment A10 to the SEDAR 7 Procedural Workshop. Motion carried on Page 52.

PAGE 53: Motion to move that Option 1, Attachment 2 for the blueline update, which is a 2015 update to the SSC in April 2016, is preferred unless the SSC recommendations on the current projections necessitate an earlier assessment. The SSC is asked to consider timing and the type of assessment required, particularly whether an update or a standard is appropriate to address spatial catch-per-unit effort distribution and recruitment issues identified by the review panel. Motion carried on Page 53.

PAGE 53: Motion to approve the wreckfish assessment peer review terms of reference. Motion carried on Page 53.

EXECUTIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 54: Motion to take an action to remove Nassau grouper, dog snapper, schoolmaster, mahogany and black snapper from the Snapper Grouper Federal Management Unit. Motion carried on Page 54.

PAGE 55: Motion to approve the process described for how the Joint South Florida Management Issues Committee would operate. Motion carried on Page 55.

PAGE 55: Motion to approve the timeline and draft actions and alternatives as presented. Motion carried on Page 55.

MOTIONS UNDER OTHER BUSINESS

PAGE 56: Motion requesting the SSC to examine updating the jacks complex ABC. Motion carried on Page 56.