

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, GA**

March 11, 2016

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley
Chris Conklin
Doug Haymans
Dr. Wilson Laney
LTJG Tara Pray

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

Council Staff:

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

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

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dewey Hemilright
Erika Burgess

Leann Bosarge
Karla Gore
David Alberg
Ira Laks

Additional Observers Attached

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, Friday morning, March 11, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: We're going to go ahead and get started. I would like to go ahead and call the council session to order. The first item on our agenda is Adoption of the Agenda. I know that I have a couple of items under Other Business, and I'm actually going to move the order of a couple of things around, just because folks have to leave and catch some flights, but if there are any other items to add to the agenda -- Seeing none, the agenda stands approved.

The next order of business is Approval of the Minutes from our previous council session in December. Are there any modifications to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes stand approved. I'm just going to turn things over to Gregg for a couple of minutes, to review some of the staffing changes that have occurred.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have completed the hiring process for Deputy Executive Director. What I've done is I have created two deputies. We have kept some separation between data and science and management in our shop, and I think it's very helpful to continue that moving forward, and so John Carmichael is the Deputy Executive Director for Science and Statistics, and he will be supervising Mike, Julia, and Julie. We are planning to have a Citizens Science Program, and that would be housed under John.

Then Brian Chevront is the Deputy Executive Director for Management, and he will supervise the rest of the tech staff, and he is in the process of hiring an economist to replace himself. We're lucky that we're getting a number of applicants in already, and that period closes April 1. Our intent is to have an economist onboard by the June council meeting.

Then I will be supervising John, Brian, Kim, Amber, and Mike, and Mike is continuing to supervise the administrative staff. We have formed a management team of myself, Mike, Brian, and John, and we meet ahead of each staff meeting. That will give us sort of a senior management group to plan things. I would just like to thank all of our staff for the excellent job they've done and the help in this transition period. It's been relatively smooth. Very busy, but relatively smooth on our end. I would be glad to answer any questions that anybody has.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions for Gregg? If not, I just want to wish congratulations to the staff in their new roles, Brian and John. I think it's a great move and will definitely help keep things efficient.

DR. CRABTREE: Jack had to leave suddenly at the end of the day yesterday. He had an illness in the family, and so Karla Gore has been designated as my second for the day, and if I were to keel over -- I think most of you all know Karla. If I keel over or anything, she will be able to vote in my stead. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Welcome, Karla, and thank you.

MR. WAUGH: We tried to slip one of our staff in as his designee. Julie slipped her name in on the first version.

DR. CRABTREE: And I signed it. It has since been destroyed.

DR. DUVAL: The first switch-up this morning is a couple of our liaisons have to leave early. Both Lieutenant Pray and Ms. Bosarge have to leave early, and so I am going to give Lieutenant Pray first shot at an update liaison report.

LTJG PRAY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just something that came up after the meeting yesterday and I want to emphasize is the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 established the requirement for an out-of-water survival craft for commercial fishing vessels operating beyond the three-nautical-mile line. It included also a mandate that the rigid buoyant apparatuses would no longer be approved as survival craft, and so that particularly affected some commercial fishing vessels operating outside the boundary line, that three-nautical-mile boundary line.

That had been postponed, and was set to be in place on 26 February 2016; however, it has since been nullified by the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015. What I'm saying here is that the out-of-water survival craft requirement is not enforceable. There will be a lot of outreach and education going on about it. It is the preferred, but it is not enforceable at this time.

I know that's a huge financial burden for a lot of commercial fishermen, and so I wanted to let you know that that is not in place, and then an update on where we stand for significant fisheries violations, fiscal year to date, beginning October 1, we have issued eleven significant fisheries violations. Two were by the Caribbean area and then two in the Gulf.

Something that came up at the last meeting, the Coast Guard's definition for a significant violation is domestic or international living marine resource violations which result in one or more of the following conditions, and those are: significant damage or impact to the resource or fisheries management plan, significant monetary advantage to the violator over his or her competitor, or high regional or national interests. That's all I have, and if there's any questions.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Lieutenant. Are there any questions for Lieutenant Pray?

MR. HARTIG: What was the date that they pushed back the survival craft?

LTJG PRAY: It's in a rulemaking process. There is no date, and so right now, it's been nullified, and so the requirement has been eliminated, but I think there is steps in place that they want to get it approved by Congress.

MR. BROWN: Is that commercial and recreational?

LTJG PRAY: Yes, and so for recreational, typically the requirement is only the survival craft if you're operating outside of the three, and so it does apply to recreational as well, if they're operating outside of three.

DR. DUVAL: Did that help?

MR. BROWN: Yes, and it was just a little confusing for me, because I've had to have one for years, and then there were some different requirements for for-hire and for commercial, and so it was just --

LTJG PRAY: I can provide the actual memorandum that has it in there, and I may also provide it for your website as well.

DR. DUVAL: I think that would be a great idea, if you don't mind doing that. You can send that to Kim. Thank you very much. All right, Ms. Bosarge, our liaison from the Gulf.

MS. BOSARGE: All right, and I will try and keep it short and sweet. I'm going to update you on a couple of amendments that we have in progress over in the Gulf. The first one is the regional management of recreational red snapper. We decided to postpone further discussion on that amendment indefinitely at our last meeting, and I heard you all talking a little bit about it when you talked about red snapper, and so I wish you luck. I hope you can set the bar.

Reef Fish Amendment 43, which is our hogfish amendment, that is going to -- Let's see. We looked at it at our last meeting, and we're going to send it out for public hearing sometime after our April meeting. Our yellowtail snapper framework action to address the inconsistencies between the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils, the circle hook requirements, we did add an action to that document that looks at modifying the fishing year for Gulf yellowtail snapper, and that one is also going to be scheduled for public hearings in Key West and in Sarasota, and they just did them on March 1 and 2.

Reef Fish Amendment 36, which is our red snapper IFQ program, that's in a review stage right now, because it's been operating for a while, and so we go back and look at it and see if there's ways to improve it. We actually decided to split that document into two, because we decided there was some low-hanging fruit that came out of the review that we could probably address fairly quickly, and then there were some other things that were going to take a little bit of time and effort on our part, and so we split that into two different documents, 36A and 36B, and we'll take a look at them again soon.

Reef Fish Amendments 41 and 42 are also having to do with the for-hire sector on this side. That's the charter fleet and then the headboat fleet. We took a look at those and we heard the scoping summaries, and we added an action that would actually allow both the charter fleet and the headboat owner/operators to opt in or opt out of the program, and so we're going to have that added to both of the documents.

Of course, we started some new reef fish documents, as we always do. One is going to be a document that will look at the sunset that's in place for our sector separation, our Amendment 40. We had a sunset in that when we originally finalized it, and so we're going to start a document to look at either extending that sunset or eliminating it.

We started another reef fish framework action to adjust the red grouper annual catch limit and then another one that will help to develop a mechanism that will allow the recreational red snapper season to reopen in the event that the annual catch limit is not met during that primary season.

Then, in Data Collection, we reviewed our proposed amendment which is going to modify the frequency and method of reporting for charter and headboats fishing for both reef fish and coastal migratory pelagics.

Hopefully, at our next meeting, and I think Bonnie is working on it now, we're going to get some kind of flow chart from Bonnie, because we just have a -- It's the chicken and the egg that I referred to yesterday, and we, not being data people all around the council table, were having trouble wrapping our hands around what elements Bonnie really needed from us in order to stand something up and how, if we changed just one minor thing, it really was going to be a big deal on her end, because we don't understand all the details of it. She's going to get us a flow chart that will say, okay, if you go this way, this is what you're looking at and if you go -- So we really know how these decisions are going to affect the program.

In shrimp, we took final action on Shrimp Amendment 17A, which was addressing the expiration of the moratorium on federal shrimp permits, and we sent it to the Secretary. We voted to extend the moratorium for another ten years and to continue the royal red endorsement that's out there for those permits.

Coastal Migratory Pelagics, you know about most of this. We reviewed and chose our preferred alternatives for Amendment 26, which you all looked at yesterday, and we also started a draft framework action, and this was something that came out of our CMP AP, our Mackerel AP, to remove the prohibition on retaining the recreational king mackerel bag limit on a vessel that has a commercial permit, or a dually-permitted charter boat, when they're not actually commercial fishing.

In other words, these boats were in a situation where, because they had some commercial permits on their boats, they couldn't take their families out recreationally fishing and keep the bag limit of king mackerel, and these are kind of the smaller center console boats that I was asking about yesterday, and so they use them for both. Madam Chair, I believe that's the end of my report. Thank you for having me, and I hope I didn't talk too much and you'll let me come back before a couple of years this time.

DR. DUVAL: You are welcome back any time, Leann. It actually was very helpful to have you here, and we really appreciate the updates that you give, and it's always good to hear sort of where you guys are in your amendment processes. Staff keeps us very well updated, but it's great to get council members' perspectives as well.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The Gulf Council's actions have been keeping our office, or some in our office, busy with litigation, and so I think some of it would be interesting to you all, and I had hoped to bring something to this meeting, but workload didn't allow it. For the next meeting, I would like to give you just a litigation update of what's going on over there. I think you'll find it interesting, and maybe we'll even have some decisions by then, but, at any rate, you should expect that from me at the next meeting.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Monica. Are there any other questions for Leann? Seeing none, we're going to go back to our regularly-scheduled agenda, which takes us to the Snapper Grouper Committee Report.

Hopefully everyone has that report. That should have been emailed around to you all yesterday. The Snapper Grouper Committee met on March 8 and 9, 2016. We received our usual status of landings for snapper grouper species under ACLs. We received an update on the status of amendments approved for secretarial review and where they are in the pipeline.

We received a presentation on the black sea bass pot selectivity study from Paul Rudershausen. We then received a presentation from Marcel Reichert, our Scientific and Statistical Committee Vice Chair, regarding their evaluation of two different methods for determining how to track the recreational ACL for hogfish in numbers.

We then reviewed Amendment 37 pertaining to hogfish and made the following motions. **The first motion was to approve the suggested edits to the purpose and need, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 1, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 2, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 3, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

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

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

The next motion was to deselect Alternative 3 as a preferred and select Alternative 2 as a preferred under this action, and that motion failed. **The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 6, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to accept the suggested edits to Action 7, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 8, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to change the current preferred for the Florida Keys/East Florida stock from Sub-Alternative 3b, fifteen-inches fork length, to Sub-Alternative 3c, sixteen-inches fork length. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to change the preferred for the Georgia/North Carolina stock from Sub-Alternative 2b, seventeen-inches fork length, to Sub-Alternative 2e, twenty-inches fork length. That motion failed.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 9, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to change the preferred alternative for the Georgia/North Carolina stock from Sub-Alternative 2c, 500-pounds per trip, to Sub-Alternative 2d, 750-pounds per trip. That motion failed.

The next motion was to add Alternative 4 to establish a commercial trip limit for the Georgia/North Carolina stock during May and June and include Sub-Alternatives 4a through 4c of 200, 250, and 300-pounds. That motion failed.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 10, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to accept the suggested edits to Action 11, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add an action to change the fishing year for the Georgia/North Carolina stock and the Florida Keys/East Florida stock from the calendar year to July 1. That motion failed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I would like to make that motion again to add an action to change the fishing year for the Georgia/North Carolina stock and the Florida Keys/East Florida stock from the calendar year to July 1. If I can get a second, then I will give my explanation again.**

DR. DUVAL: There's a motion by Jessica and it's seconded by Anna. Go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Once again, what we're trying to do here, I feel like, with Action 11 is basically we're creating a known fishing season so that recreational anglers can have a predictable time period when they can fish, and we're also, in my opinion, pretty much creating a spawning season closure, because we're avoiding that spawning time period for the Florida Keys/East Florida stock, which is November to April.

I would like to start the fishing year on July 1, because of the fact that we have a preferred sub-alternative that would be July to September. That's the preferred time period which folks would like to fish, and then you would not be fishing during the spawning season. Then, if there's quota available, I would like that second round of quota to come in play from May to June, and so you're basically effectively creating a spawning season closure by using this action to choose the open seasons, and so that's why I would want to start the fishing year on July 1. I'm trying to make it so we don't leave quota on the table, even though the quota is very small.

DR. DUVAL: Just a note that the next motion that you actually change your preferred alternative from July through September to July through October. That's just a note.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and I support this as well for our Georgia/North Carolina stock, because if -- We've chosen to not include a spawning season closure or a lowering of the bag limit, and so if we have a July 1 start date, then if there happens to not be any ACL, which means that the commercial have been able to harvest their entire quota, then it would close during the peak of the spawn. It would be a win-win, allowing the commercial guys to harvest their ACL, but if it closes, then it closes during the spawning season, which adds some additional protection.

To the point that having a January 1 fishing year is better, I understand that, but we have lots of examples amongst our species where we have fishing years that begin during different times, mackerels, black sea bass. There's plenty of examples and we're able to manage that, and so I think this is a conservative way to handle this stock. Thanks.

DR. DUVAL: Anybody else?

MR. HARTIG: Refresh me on what are the downsides of doing this in this amendment at this time? I mean there was concerns about changing things right now and that was -- I believe I remember that was the discussion at the committee level.

DR. DUVAL: I think John came to the table and discussed the fact that when you change the fishing year to something other than the calendar year that it does create some difficulties on the assessment end of things, because your fishing year isn't matching up, necessarily, with your biological year, and so you're having to adjust things.

I think the other concern expressed was that if people go to look at what harvest numbers have been, those are listed on a calendar year basis on websites, which can be confusing for folks when they're trying to determine how much of an ACL has been met or not met. I mean obviously on the Regional Office website those numbers are based on what the fishing year is, and so I think those were some of the concerns that were expressed. A follow-up, Ben?

MR. HARTIG: So you really need to weigh the biological impacts that you would get from changing your fishing season and then based on the data. If you get some significant biological impacts, then you may want to change the fishing year, even though it's going to cause some problems with the data collection. We've done it for a number of stocks. I mean we have a number of stocks that don't start on January 1.

MR. BELL: If I'm understanding this correctly, my concern would be, and I'm just thinking about the timing off of our state. I mean we could theoretically be closed down before we actually get into when our peak fishing is. I realize that may coincide with spawning and there are other ways to -- Which we didn't, but I mean if we could have dealt with reducing pressure at that time of year, as opposed to shutting it completely down, which could -- For us anyway, the timing is such that I could just see the bulk of the fishery being shut down right when it occurs, and then I know it moves up the coast and the timing is a little bit different as you get up to North Carolina. Maybe it's delayed a month or so, but I would have an issue with it, just potentially killing the whole fishery.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I was just thinking about the timing of you all taking final action and how much -- I'm sure more analysis would be needed to deal with this action in the amendment. It's scheduled to have a DEIS published at some point within the next couple of months. Aren't you scheduled to take final action, at the latest, in September, I think?

DR. DUVAL: I think it was originally supposed to be our next meeting, but, based on I think what you told us during committee, partially because of the review of the decision support tool by the SSC in April -- It sounded like, from our discussion in committee, that final approval wasn't going to be until September no matter what.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right, and that's what I was kind of thinking. There is a forty-five-day DEIS comment period. You all will receive those comments and so, anyway, the point, I guess, is, and maybe Gregg could speak to this or Myra, but adding this action in is going to slow this down a little bit, I would assume, and so my only concern is not the action itself, but the timing of everything, so that we can get it implemented, because we do have a statutory deadline on this amendment.

DR. DUVAL: I think it would be my suggestion, if this motion passes, that the action be structured to have alternatives that apply to either of the two stocks.

MR. WAUGH: If final approval is moved to September, that certainly gives us time to get the analyses done. It will delay it some, and I think what Monica is getting at is we would want to have this analysis done before the DEIS files. There will be some additional work, but, given that we've got until September, it seems like that should be enough time.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You have September for the council to take action, but for the DEIS -- You're factoring in also enough time, you think, to get the DEIS published and the comment period finished, because it's a forty-five-day public comment period?

MR. WAUGH: Right, and I mean we would be able to make this change, and, Myra, chime in if I'm not correct here, but we would be able to make this change and have that document revised, such that the DEIS could be filed, at our June meeting.

MS. BROUWER: One thing I would request, to just speed things up, is to give us a range of alternatives of what you would like to see analyzed as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: After listening to the public comment from the divers and what they see offshore, and I think it seems to be a significant stock of fish that aren't affected by divers, I am not so worried about trying to close it through a spawning season, especially with such a low ACL for commercial people up there, and so I'm not worried about that.

MR. CONKLIN: Let's keep in mind we had a long talk yesterday about protecting a highly overfished species or stock of cobia and protecting those in a spawning season. We pretty much decided that that wasn't going to be very feasible, and there is really no way to do that and have a fishery still. I couldn't support this, unless it was for a certain sector, like the recreational sector, spawning season, since they're not so accountable as the commercial guys are.

Like Charlie said, the ACL is so low and there's been a lot of comment, and just because the comment that we got on the record -- It doesn't mean we didn't have, from several people in this room, ten or fifteen minutes extra with those guys the other night telling us what's going on. I think that information is valuable, and I just don't see any continuity between fishing one species that we know is overfished highly while it's spawning, yet we have another one here that we don't exactly know what's going on, but we're getting good reports and we're going to protect it for spawning.

Once again, I brought up the points about the SMZ areas. You can't tell me that hogfish aren't going to be swimming around out there in the SMZ off of North Carolina. North Carolina has its own state trip limit on these things. The majority of commercial guys are not traveling to your state anymore. They're all yours, the hogfish. Leave us alone. Thank you.

MR. COX: I just think one of the most important things we can do as managers of the resource is to protect any kind of spawning season that we can do. I mean that's the first and foremost thing that we can do that will benefit everybody that we're here to represent. I think that we've gotten ourselves in trouble with the red grouper because we weren't proactive on that, and I don't want to see that happen with other species.

With hogfish, just listening to all the conversation we've had this week about it, I don't think that we know a whole lot about that stock, especially in the North Carolina area. I really like the idea of what Anna had suggested, about a smaller trip limit during the spawning season closure, with still some access to it, but I just wanted to throw that out there. I'm just always careful of how we interact with these fish, especially when we don't know a whole lot about them.

MR. HARTIG: When do you see the predominance of your hogfish landings in both North Carolina, Jack, and then South Carolina, Chris?

MR. COX: They start in May, May and June, to July. I mean they go all the way into the fall, but probably peak in the June-ish timeframe. I mean I can double-check that, or we can.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Once again, what this motion would be doing is just adding an action to the document so that we could consider a change in the fishing year. It's not actually choosing the fishing year, but it's just adding an action so that this can be considered. As we discussed a minute ago, I would see this as sub-alternatives, one for one region and one for the other region. Also, if we did choose to change the fishing year for the Florida Keys/East Florida stock, this is definitely helping to protect the spawning stock for hogfish in that region.

DR. CRABTREE: We have, in Action 11, a preferred alternative that makes the fishing season July through September, and so they're not going to be fishing -- The recreational guys, at least, aren't going to be fishing in the spawning season anyway. I am reading that right, aren't I, Myra? So we already have a closed season for a preferred that protects the spawning season.

DR. DUVAL: I think Jessica's rationale is -- The following motion, after we dispense with this one, actually modifies that preferred to be July through October. It just adds that second month of the wave.

DR. CRABTREE: That's what I'm -- I'm assuming, Jessica, your intent is to eliminate the closed season and replace it with a change in the fishing year. Is that what your strategy is?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No, my strategy would be to choose two preferred alternatives under Alternative 2. Choose Sub-Alternative 2c, July to September, and the sub-alternative of May to June, so that you would, a, have a spawning season closure, and, b, by the time that you got around to the May/June, you would know if there was additional quota available and you could open up for a second season after the spawning season if there was quota still available. I'm trying to make it so we do not leave quota on the table here.

DR. CRABTREE: With the recreational fishery and the variance around the estimates and the timing issues of it, it's going to be very difficult to know whether we're going to leave quota on the table or not going to leave quota on the table.

I guess I'm less concerned that we're going to leave some quota on the table here, and it just seems more straightforward, to me, if we want to protect spawning fish, to put a spawning season closure in place and don't fish during the spawning season. It looks to me like, at least in the southern end, the amount of quota we have is low enough that I don't think leaving quota on the table is going to be our problem down there. I think it's going to be the opposite, having very short seasons and worrying about going over.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I hear what you're saying, but, based on the not approved secret decision tool, it looks like we would be leaving quota on the table.

DR. DUVAL: All right, and I would like to wrap up this conversation. Can I please see a show of hands of the -- First of all, I'm assuming, Jessica, that your intent with this action is changing the fishing year for both sectors, correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, but I'm willing to make it so that this action would be structured so that there is a sub-alternative for each of the regions. Is that what you're asking me?

DR. DUVAL: No, I'm asking you about the sectors.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, correct, for commercial and recreational, yes.

DR. DUVAL: **Could I please see a show of hands of those in favor of this motion, five in favor; those opposed, six opposed. The motion fails.**

The next motion was to add Sub-Alternative 2d to Action 11 for a recreational season of July through October and select as a preferred, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 12, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Alternative 5 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next item of business was Amendment 41, which is mutton snapper. Staff reviewed the comments held from scoping meetings held in conjunction with the FWC. We made the following motions. **The first was to modify the purpose statement to remove “utilizing data through 2013” and accept the need statement as presented, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to accept the suggested edits to Action 1 and select Alternative 2 as a preferred, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 2 and select Alternative 3 as a preferred, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to accept the suggested edits to Action 3 and adopt Structure B for alternatives under Action 3, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I would like to make a substitute motion that we accept the Structure A for the alternatives.

DR. DUVAL: Charlie makes a substitute motion to accept the suggested edits and adopt Structure A. Is there a second to that motion? It's seconded by Jessica. This is just the shorter structure, where instead of having all of the verbiage in each of the alternatives, the verbiage is in the main part of the alternative and then you have sub-alternatives structured under there.

MR. HARTIG: What it does, it just substantially cuts down the amount of information that will be in the document. I mean not the information, but the amount of verbiage that will be in the document.

DR. DUVAL: Yes. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** The substitute now becomes the main motion. Any other discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

This is where it's going to get a little bit tricky, because there are a few preferreds that have been selected just based on that old structure, but you can see what the preferred alternative is, and so that should carry over into the edits that the IPT has to make.

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

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

MS. BROUWER: Just to clarify, for the record, that since you just approved that motion that we would carry through that structure to the rest of the actions in the document.

DR. DUVAL: The next motion was to select new Alternative 3, ACT equals 85 percent of the recreational ACL, as a preferred under Action 4, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.

MS. BROUWER: I was wondering if we could get some rationale, because this deviates from how you've selected to set the recreational ACT for other species. When we selected 85 percent of the recreational ACL for hogfish, the reason that was done was because the PSEs were so high for the Georgia/North Carolina stock that then you would have had to, the way the formula is written, select to set the recreational ACT at half of the recreational ACL, and that was the rationale for why that was done. I was wondering if we could get some discussion on the record for why we're choosing 85 percent of the recreational ACL for mutton snapper as well. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: I think there was a very small difference between the standard formula that we use for setting the ACT, which is the one minus the PSE times the ACL. I think those numbers were actually slightly lower, would have resulted in recreational ACTs that were slightly lower than the 85 percent of the recreational ACL, but I am going to ask Jessica, since I believe she made that motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We picked it because those numbers were slightly higher, and since the stock is not overfished or undergoing overfishing, we felt like that was a safe alternative.

DR. DUVAL: Does that help you out? Okay. Any other discussion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to move Sub-Alternatives 2c and 2e under Action 5 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to accept the suggested edits to Action 6, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Sub-Alternatives 3b and 3c to the Considered but Rejected Appendix, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stand approved.

The next motion was to add new sub-alternatives under Alternative 3 for no retention and three fish per person per day, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to accept the suggested edits to alternatives under Action 7, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to move Sub-Alternatives 3b, 3c, and 3d under Action 7 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add sub-alternatives for no retention and three fish per person per day to Alternative 3, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add an action to Amendment 41 to modify the mutton snapper minimum size limit, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add alternatives for seventeen-inches total length, eighteen-inches total length, nineteen-inches total length, and twenty-inches total length to the new action, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. Then I think there were some questions regarding the Sanctuary actions, and Jessica has some information for us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. There were a number of questions when we started talking about Western Dry Rocks about the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary process. I have a little bit more information I would like to provide on that. I got this information from Sean Morton.

Basically, the Sanctuary began their scoping phase in 2012, and, at this point in time, they are working to complete a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for public review. At this point, they have had over seventy public meetings. This included their working group meetings and this was also including a number of Sanctuary Advisory Council meetings.

The timeline at this point, they're already behind on the timeline, because they formed these workgroups which were not part of the original plan, but they hope to have a Draft Environmental Impact Statement released for public review in the fall of this year. At this point, the Sanctuary Advisory Council made over 200 recommendations that are being analyzed that would make changes to the existing zones, including management actions to address impacts from fishing, boating, diving, and vessel discharges.

Then there were also questions about could Sean Morton come and give a presentation, and so you guys might remember that in June of last year, and I believe we were in the Keys, we had talked about having both Sean Morton and Brian Carlstrom from Biscayne National Park both give presentations about the processes in both of those locations, but, due to the amount of the things that we were trying to consider during that council week, we were unable to see those presentations.

The Gulf Council did receive a presentation from Sean Morton at their June meeting in Key West. Sean said he is certainly willing to come back any time and give us an update and is willing to give a presentation. The next council meeting is in Florida, if you would like for him to come to that and talk about where the process is, or if you would like to wait until they actually have the Draft EIS out and then have him come back and talk about the specifics of the Draft EIS. He is certainly willing to come back at any time and discuss this.

The recommendations from their Sanctuary Advisory Council, or their SAC, are all available on their website. Also, there were some questions from Leann about whether there was a shrimping representative on these working groups or on the SAC. The current representatives for commercial fishing on their SAC are Justin Bruland and Jeff Cramer, both members of the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's Association, and they have not received any applications from a fisherman in the shrimp fishery during the entire advisory council member recruitment process, and so not in the last seven years have they received an application from someone in the shrimp industry to be a part of that panel.

MS. BOSARGE: Thank you for reaching out to him and getting that info for us. Beth Dieveney came and gave us a presentation in June, and we reached out to her then and said, look, these are important shrimp grounds and we see you don't have a shrimper on your panel. A lot of the issue is that those meetings are taking place down there in South Florida and, as you know, South Florida is very developed now.

The shrimp fleet that used to actually be ported out of Key West is not in Key West anymore, and so the fleet that's going down there is actually not housed in that area anymore, and we had a Shrimp AP meeting last week. One of the guys that has many boats that worked down there, and he's actually in Florida, but he's up the coast a ways, he didn't know anything about it.

I guess what I will try and do is reach out to them again and get them back to either an AP meeting or a council meeting, because the shrimpers weren't aware of what was going on down there, and I think it's important to have that discussion on the front-end, before you come out with a paper that says we've decided we're probably going to close this area. At that point, you don't get a lot of collaboration.

If you can have some discussion on the front-end and decide, then you keep the boxing gloves off and you can probably actually come to something that's somewhat amendable to both sides, and so we'll reach out to them again, and hopefully they will come back and talk to us and find a way to involve a shrimper on their panel. Thanks.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that extra information, Jessica, and I guess maybe, as Gregg and staff put together the agenda for the June council meeting, we can see if there's any space in there and get back with you and see if the timing still would be right or if it's something that we should wait on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, because September might actually be better, just because of the fact that maybe it's further along in the process and closer to the DEIS, but I think that he would be willing to come at any time.

DR. DUVAL: Great. Thank you. The next item item on our agenda, and that was it for mutton snapper, was the Oculina Experimental Closed Area Evaluation Report. **We made a motion that the next review of the Oculina Experimental Closed Area be in 2019, with the scope including science, size, configuration, and regulations and approval of the report, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.**

We have gotten advice from our General Counsel that because this is a final action that it's probably safer to go ahead and just have a roll call vote on this. It is obviously not something that

goes forward for secretarial review, but just to make sure we have dotted our I's and crossed our T's and don't have to go back and redo anything, we're going to go ahead and take a roll call vote on this, and so, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

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

MR. HARTIG: One thing. Mr. Hartig's vote was not on the record through the mic. The yes vote for Mr. Hartig is on the record now on the mic.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Ben. Get ready for your mics again, because the next topic was the system management plan for the deepwater marine protected areas. Chip Collier took us through that, and the action items are included in the system management plan to ensure that we achieve the goals and objectives and evaluate the metrics for management effectiveness of the marine protected areas.

The committee made the following motion, which is to approve the system management plan for Amendment 14 deepwater marine protected areas and timing for the review in 2021, with editorial changes approved by the Chair, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Again, because this is a final action, we will have a roll call vote.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: No.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **The motion passes with one no.**

DR. DUVAL: The next item on our agenda was Amendment 36, Spawning Special Management Zones, and we took the following motions. **The first was to approve the corrections to the size of Sub-Alternatives 2a, 3a, and 3b, Alternative 4, and Preferred Alternative 5 for Action 3, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the corrections to the size of Sub-Alternatives 2a, 2b, 2c, 2e, and 2f for Action 4, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the corrections to the size of Sub-Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c for Action 5, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the corrections to the size of Sub-Alternatives 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, and 3c for Action 6, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We did have some direction to staff to correct a few typos in some of the tables for the target species. **The next motion was to approve Snapper Grouper Amendment 36 for secretarial review and deem the 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 re-deem the codified text, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.** This is a roll call vote, as it is final action.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: No.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: No.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **The motion passes with two no's.**

DR. DUVAL: The next item of business was Amendment 43, which will respond to the red snapper stock assessment, and so we just reviewed data that staff put together to help inform future discussions on potential red snapper management measures, and we'll review the results of that stock assessment at our June meeting.

The next item of business was the results of ranking of actions for a fisheries seasonality/retention regulatory amendment, and so the options that we had discussed, in terms of the pathway that we could take, are shown below there and also were mailed around to everybody, along with the presentation that Amber gave to us when we were discussing this.

There were three different options for us to consider: a seasonality amendment that would apply across both the commercial and recreational sectors, looking at adjusting the shallow-water grouper closure; a second option was to have two different amendments, one focused on recreational seasonality and retention actions and one focused on commercial seasonality and retention actions; and a third option just focused on a retention amendment across both sectors.

I think, in terms of how the committee might want to move forward, my suggestion might be that when we go through the Executive Finance Report that we could just look at timing there. I don't have any preferences, and however you all want to move forward. If people want to do two amendments, it would just be that they would be slightly offset, in terms of timing.

We do have a draft timing and task motion, which is: to prepare Amendment 36 for formal review, including the guidance to staff; prepare Amendment 37 for approval at the June 2016 council meeting; conduct as much of the analysis as possible on Amendment 41 and provide to FWC in late March or early April to refine their preferred alternatives; request Paul Rudershausen give the presentation on black sea bass pot selectivity to the Snapper Grouper AP at their April meeting; distribute the approved Oculina Review Report; distributed the approved system management plan for the Amendment 14 MPAs; distribute the approved system management plan for spawning SMZs; and prepare draft options with analyses for red snapper management for the June council meeting.

MS. BROUWER: Just clarification. Based on the discussions earlier, do you want to still try to approve Amendment 37 at the June meeting, or are we talking about preferably approving it in September?

DR. DUVAL: I think it would probably be September, just based on what Monica has said about timing, and so thank you for that. That change had made to the timing and task motion. Is there someone willing to make a motion to adopt the timing and task as presented?

MR. PHILLIPS: **Madam Chair, I make the motion that we accept the timing and task as presented.**

DR. DUVAL: It's seconded by Jessica. Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** The next committee report is Mackerel and Chairman Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: The Mackerel Committee met, adopted the agenda, approved the minutes, and had the normal status reports for commercial and recreational landings. The next item of business that came up was Amendment 26, king mackerel ACLs and stock boundary.

The first motion in that amendment was to approve the IPT's proposed changes to the purpose and need, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

The next motion was to change the preferred in Action 2.2 from Alternative 3 to Alternative 2, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

The next motion was to adopt Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative in Action 7, 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 select Alternative 1 as the preferred for Action 8, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

The next motion was to deselect Alternative 3 as the preferred and select Alternative 2 as the preferred in Action 9, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Where that leaves us, Kari, is we still need to resolve the trip limit situation, correct?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Yes, and that's Action 5. This would be Attachment 6, the Amendment 26 decision document, and it's page 22.

MR. HARTIG: The reason why we didn't go ahead with this action was because there was some discussion at a meeting in Salerno where we had the fishermen from the southern end, which are much different from the fishermen in the northern end, and they wanted to be assured that they could have a step-down in Season 1 from seventy-five to fifty fish, so that they could hope to keep the season open as long as possible.

That was the reason why we didn't look at this, and so, as we've discussed this internally, we can't craft a suite of options that allows that to be in there, because the analysis has not been done for that particular seventy-five to fifty-fish step-down, if I'm correct, Kari.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: That's correct. The scope of the analysis does include -- It would include an alternative that just sets seventy-five fish for Season 1, which is what Ericka brought up yesterday, but there's not an analysis that includes a step-down from seventy-five for all of Season 1 until 75 percent of the quota is met. Alternative 3 almost captured that, except that there is a fifty-fish limit for March, and then it goes back to seventy-five until there's a step-down.

MR. HARTIG: So, in lieu of that, Alternative 3 is really the only option that gets us as close as we can to what the fishermen wanted. I'm sure we're going to get some pushback from the fifty to possible seventy-five increase we could have had in March, but, functionally, that's the alternative we're going to have to have if we want this to move forward, and we do. If someone would be willing, under Action 5, to make Preferred Alternative 3 the preferred, that would work.

DR. DUVAL: Ben, my question is there are two -- There is Option 3a and 3b for a step-down to fifty fish.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and it would be Alternative 3, Option 3b. If 75 percent of the quota has been taken, the trip limit will be fifty fish. That's what the industry had talked about at that meeting in Salerno.

DR. DUVAL: I am certainly willing to make that motion. **I would move that under Action 5 that we select Alternative 3, Option 3b as a preferred.**

MR. HARTIG: Any more discussion? Second by Charlie. Any more discussion? If we get a lot of pushback on this from the fishermen and they want the seventy-five fish, possibly some time down the road we could look at a framework to --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know if this option that you want, and I'm going to let Ericka explain.

MS. BURGESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The council talked at it yesterday, and advice that was received from SERO staff and council staff is that it is within the scope of the document to add an alternative to this action for a trip limit of seventy-five fish during Season 1, and that would be in Alternative 5. You could select Alternative 5 and Alternative 4.

This alternative doesn't include a step-down, because that step-down wasn't analyzed. What I would advise the council to think about is, is it better to start off at seventy-five fish or start at fifty fish with a possible step-up to seventy-five?

MR. HARTIG: From the position of the fishermen, in Season 1, in the southern area of the fishery, they're very worried -- I mean that's the only season that has a closure projected, is Season 1, in either season. That's the problem that they're facing. They're facing a potential closure, and the analysis has been done in August of Season 1 for the very highest fishing landings we had. That's their concern, and there is really nothing to address that, unless you use Alternative 3 that has that step-down within in.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Could we ask Ira to come back to the table and discuss this a little bit?

MR. HARTIG: Sure. Absolutely. Ira does fish in that Southern Zone, and he is well acquainted with the fishermen in that area.

MR. LAKS: The majority of the fishermen want seventy-five fish in March, but there is concern from the fishermen in the Southern Zone that it could potentially shut down. Those fishermen really don't do anything with Spanish mackerel and king mackerel, and so they would be somewhat in fear of losing some days.

MR. HARTIG: Thanks, Ira. I am trying to make sure that we --

DR. DUVAL: This only deals with Season 1 and we would also need to select an alternative, something under Alternative 4, to set a trip limit for Season 2, correct?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and that straightens me out. With that, Michelle having clarified that, is there any more discussion on Alternative 3? **Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** We would need a motion to select for Season 2 in Alternative 4, and I'm looking at the -- The AP recommended 4a.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Yes, and I have, where it says "South Atlantic AP recommended" for Option 4a, I put it in the wrong place, but it includes both Number 1 and 2 as part of Option 4a. The South Atlantic AP recommended fifty fish for Season 2 and then Option 4a, beginning on February 1, and continuing through the end of February, if 70 percent or more of the Season 2 quota has been taken, the trip limit is fifty fish. If less than 70 percent of the Season 2 quota has been taken, the trip limit is seventy-five fish.

DR. DUVAL: **I move that we select Alternative 4, Option 4a as the preferred under Action 5.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle and second by Charlie. Discussion? This gives us what the AP had recommended for the step-downs in Season 2, and so we've got both seasons with the appropriate step-downs that the fishermen had requested, and so I think we're good. Any more discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Kari, I believe that winds up everything in 26?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I have one more. In Motion Number 4, in Action 8, now the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils have selected Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative, and so no action on the recreational/commercial allocations of Gulf king mackerel. I got in touch with Ryan at the Gulf staff and asked him if he thought the Gulf Council would want to move this to the Considered but Rejected, since both councils have selected no action, and he said yes, and so you may want to consider doing that, and you can have some input.

MS. BOSARGE: We had that very discussion at our last Gulf Council meeting, and we chose not to move it. I have received some calls since that meeting, and I think we'll have another discussion on that when we get to our next meeting. It might not change anything, but we're going to have another discussion about it, it sounds like.

MR. HARTIG: So where does that leave us? I mean we're forewarned.

DR. CRABTREE: I think our best -- I don't really see any reason to move it to Considered but Rejected. It's all been analyzed, and so I think just leave it alone.

MR. HARTIG: All right, and so that brings us to a draft motion to approve.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 26 for secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate and 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 re-deem the codified text.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle and second by Charlie. Any discussion on this motion? It's a roll call.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

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

MR. HARTIG: All right, and thank you, all. That brings us into the recreational season for cobia, and I'm going to go ahead and read a little bit of history into this, because of the nature of the beast in cobia. MRIP estimates indicated that the recreational landings for for Atlantic cobia in 2015 were 910,776 pounds, which exceeded the recreational ACL of 630,000 pounds.

The recreational accountability measure for Atlantic cobia is to shorten the subsequent season based on previous years' landings, in order to avoid another overage. On March 9, 2016, NMFS published a notice that the recreational season for 2016 would close on June 20, 2016.

Dr. Mike Larkin of SERO staff provided an overview of the analysis and process for selecting the closure date. Following, Council Deputy Director John Carmichael reviewed fishery information for Atlantic cobia to provide context for a discussion on next steps for cobia management to avoid exceeding the recreational ACL and to lengthen the recreational season in future years. The committee reviewed a list of potential options for a framework amendment and provided direction to staff to start work on that amendment.

The next options are the options that would be included for analysis in the framework amendment. **The first motion under cobia made by the committee was to direct staff to look at vessel limits for one, two, three, four, five, and six fish, 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 look at a combined vessel limit decrease with increased minimum size limit, 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 look at a one per person bag limit for cobia, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next motion was to look at combined bag limit options with increased minimum size limit, 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 direct staff to look at changing the start of the fishing year to May, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

The last motion under cobia was to explore modifying the accountability measures, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved. We do have a timing and task motion.

MR. COX: I was talking with my colleagues over here on the commercial cobia sector, and I would like to make a motion, if I could, please.

MR. HARTIG: Sure.

MR. COX: I think we have a feeling we know that we're going to get -- Last year, we got so close to the ACL. Here is the motion. **The motion is for the commercial cobia sector to continue to fish at two fish per person until 75 percent of the quota has been caught and then decrease the trip limit to one fish per person.**

MR. HARTIG: We've got a motion by Jack and a second by Anna.

MR. COX: I am prepared to give the rationale for it.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Jack. I would appreciate that.

MR. COX: Sure. As I said before, the last five years, we've met our ACL three times, and, in 2011, we went to 163 percent. Last year, we got to almost 90 percent, I think it was 89 percent, and I'm pretty sure we're going to see an increase in folks selling fish -- I think we're going to see an increase.

I think what's going to happen is a lot of people are going to be using licenses, and we're going to see a transfer of licenses from people that are not using them in the commercial sector, especially in North Carolina, to some of the recreational guys, who are therefore going to become some commercial cobia fishermen.

What I would like to do with that decrease is our snapper grouper guys will be fishing offshore and they will interact and they will catch one nice cobia during the season, a fifty or sixty-pounder, on their bottom fishing gear, just so that we don't run out of fish. I am hoping that something like this will help the season continue.

DR. DUVAL: Just one thing. I know that you mentioned in 2011 that it was 163 percent of the ACL or whatever. We didn't actually have an ACL for cobia until 2012. There was one that was set up, but because the amendment actually didn't become effective until 2012, we never actually had an ACL in 2011 for cobia, on either sector. That's just a -- I mean it's noted in the SERO quota monitoring reports, but the regulation for Amendment 18 didn't go into effect until 2012, and so we didn't have an ACL for cobia until then. That's just a clarification.

MR. COX: What you're saying is there's an error with the SERO website?

DR. DUVAL: I mean it just notes that it was 163 percent of the 2011 ACL, had an ACL been in place. There were ACLs in that amendment, but, because of the timing of it, it didn't go into place until 2012 and that's all, but I support this.

MR. HARTIG: That clarifies that for me. I was wondering about that as well.

MR. BREWER: Jack, we didn't have a lot of information presented to us in this meeting with regard to the commercial sector of cobia, but, with regard to the recreational, we did see data that showed that the average catch was less than one per person on the recreational side. Therefore, going to a one fish per person limit may not get you where you need to get, whereas, also, it looked like if you went to a vessel limit that that might have some advantages to it. Did you all give any thought -- I understand what you're doing. I mean you're just trying to get that season open as long as you can keep it open. Did you give any thought to doing a per vessel limit or trip limit, as opposed to a per person trip limit?

MR. COX: We didn't have a lot of discussion on it. I just know in the State of North Carolina, the way the regulations are set and it's very easy to transfer our North Carolina license around, that it just seems that this would satisfy what we're trying to do here. We had a brief talk about that. It's going to be really hard to tell. I mean when the regulation kicks in, really the cobia season, the peak of the season, we will already be through it, I think.

DR. DUVAL: Just to let everybody know, when we issued our proclamation lowering the bag limit, the recreational bag limit, to one fish in state waters, and that was effective February 27, I think, we also, on the commercial side, limited cobia to two per commercial fishing license holder, which is actually more restrictive than what it is in the regulation, where it just says two per person, no matter what.

In other words, I mean Jack is right. It is not difficult to buy a standard commercial fishing license on the open market in North Carolina, but by limiting it to someone who -- By limiting it to two per license holder, you ensure that if you're out commercial fishing that you just can't have three other people on your boat and say, well, these guys are my crew and they don't need licenses, but they can still have their two fish per person. Each person on that boat would have to have a commercial license.

Now, that said, there are lots of folks in North Carolina who have commercial licenses. Some of them are ten-years-old and some of them are three-years-old, and so you could move those fish to those people, but I did just want to let folks know that we had put that additional restriction in place.

MR. HARTIG: I would just say on the commercial sector, Chester, what this does is it actually gives us accountability measures, so we can try not to go over the allocation. If we step it down, it should be easy for NMFS to be able to monitor the landings, and so we should be able to stay within our allocation, and so I think it's a good thing.

MR. CONKLIN: For us, I mean the legitimate commercial fishery, it's basically just some additional fish that the snapper grouper guys can bring in if they catch them, and it's based on a per person thing, and so every boat might have a little different mix. You might have four guys or

three guys or two guys or one guy, but it would have the effect of cutting the harvest in half at that point, and so I mean I think that works.

MR. HARTIG: Any more discussion on this?

MR. PHILLIPS: The only thing that concerns me is if you get close to the end of the season and then you cut it in half. You could be leaving fish on the table, and so I'm inclined to vote against it just for that reason, because we just don't know. We have a very, very low ACL anyway for cobia.

DR. DUVAL: There were fish on the table this year, I think 4,000-pounds.

MR. HARTIG: There wouldn't have been in the year before, and we were over based on an ACL that we're putting in now -- That 163 percent was based on the ACL that we're going to put in, that was put in in the amendment for cobia?

DR. DUVAL: The 163 percent in 2011 was the ACL that would have been in place for 2011, but it wasn't in place for 2011. There actually wasn't an ACL then. It wasn't until 2012 that there were ACLs in place for cobia on either end.

DR. CRABTREE: Charlie is right. If that's what you do, you could get, two weeks before the end of the season, that 75 is caught and then you drop the bag limit down, even though they're clearly not going to be able to even catch what's out there, and so you might want to ask staff to put some dates in there that if you get past -- If you get close to the end of the season, this doesn't apply, to keep that from happening. I don't think we need to figure out what that date is now, but I think you could just ask staff to construct some alternatives around that.

MR. HARTIG: Do you understand Roy's concern? We do it with mackerel. We've got dates that we use. You know for the last month of the season, if X percent, 70 percent, hasn't been caught in the last month of the season, we increase the trip limit in that situation.

MR. COX: Could I get some guidance then, to help me maybe craft this motion, to where it will make sure that we do catch the ACL if the opportunity exists?

MR. HARTIG: I think Roy's direction to staff was good, to be able to add a date at which you review this and whether or not you want to drop the bag limit down. I think that's a good suggestion.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Just so I'm clear, what I'm thinking is there would be an action for a step-down and you would add options under there for dates after which it couldn't occur, and so the step-down could only occur January 1 through September 30 or something like that, but if 75 percent hasn't been caught for the last few months of the year, then there would not be a step-down? Is that what you're thinking?

MR. COX: It is. I mean you guys have more experience in this in mackerel than I've ever had with what we're trying to do here. I mean you guys do stuff like this all the time. I would say after September if we have not met 75 percent of the quota, then we can go back to the two fish per person. Does that sound right? We just don't go to the step-down.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, you just wouldn't go to the step-down. I think you can look at the landings and look at what has happened in the past to be able to get some idea of that date, the date that you may want to use to step down to guide that, based on landings in the past and based on the current ACL the commercial fishery is working under now, if you look at their landings in the past. Does that make sense, Kari?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: So we're thinking the options would be that the step-down could only occur through -- August 31 would be an option, or through September 30, in which case if they made it to let's say September or October or November and had not met 75 percent of the quota, you would not put a step-down in, to make sure that they could max it out, right?

MR. BOWEN: I don't want to add any more confusion, but I know we have a motion on the recreational side to go to a May 1 start date. Would we want to consider that for the commercial sector as well, a May 1 start date instead of a January 1 start date?

MR. COX: The reason that we wouldn't is because the recreational sector is actually targeting the fish and sight-casting to them. A lot of the commercial guys are in the deeper water and they're fishing on the bottom, and so when they bring those fish up, I think we would have more discard mortality.

MR. HARTIG: All right. We've got a motion for the commercial cobia sector continuing to fish at two fish per person until 75 percent of the commercial ACL has been caught and then decrease to one fish per person. Any more discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** I believe that brings us to timing and task, Kari.

DR. DUVAL: **I would like to make a motion that we, and this might be part of the timing and tasks, and I think it would, but I would like for the council to send a letter to the ASMFC Policy Board requesting that they consider joint management of cobia.**

MR. HARTIG: Second by Zack. There is a motion and a second. Is there discussion? We had a lot of discussion during the committee meeting about why this might be the appropriate vehicle to manage cobia throughout its range, and so unless you want to rehash all of that.

MR. BELL: Just a question on how that works. It's kind of like with red drum, I guess. Jointly managed means that we would still have them in our plan and they would take them, and then maybe -- It's not quite like red drum.

DR. DUVAL: It's not, because there is no harvest of red drum allowed in the EEZ, but we have joint management of Spanish mackerel as an example.

MR. HARTIG: Any further discussion on this motion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

I believe that brings us to timing and tasks, but are there any other motions to come before we go to timing and tasks? All right, the timing and task motion. The motion would be to adopt the timing and tasks as presented. Are we going to alter this based on the ASMFC motion that Michelle made or not? Okay.

The motion would be to prepare Draft Amendment 26 for the Gulf Council meeting in April of 2016. The next item, Number 2, would be, upon approval by the Gulf Council, prepare Amendment 26 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce. Number 3 would be staff to develop actions and alternatives for the cobia framework amendment for committee review in 2016. Item 4 would be to draft a letter to the ASMFC Policy Board to consider joint management of Atlantic cobia. If someone would like to make that motion.

DR. DUVAL: **So moved.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle and second by Anna. Any discussion of this motion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** I believe that brings us to Other Business in the Mackerel Committee, and I believe Zack has an item under Other Business.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of motions here. **First, I would like to make a motion that we establish a March 11, 2016, control date for the for-hire sector for the headboats and charter boat vessels in the three fishery management plans of Coastal Migratory Pelagics, Snapper Grouper FMP, and the Dolphin Wahoo FMP, and that the permit must remain in the fishery and category in which they were last renewed.** If I can get a second, I will offer some rationale.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Zach, do you want March 11, because I had 10 in the --

MR. BOWEN: The reason I wanted -- This motion was going to be made yesterday and we didn't get to it, and so it's just the day that I made the motion.

MR. CONKLIN: I will second this for discussion.

MR. HARTIG: We've got a motion by Zack and a second by Chris. Is there discussion?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I'm not on the council, but I was kind of wondering the rationale for this, given that the recreational or for-hire industry only catches about half, particularly on dolphin and wahoo, half of its quota, and, second of all, I would also ask -- A lot of the boats to the Northeast, in the Mid-Atlantic, aren't familiar with they have to have a dolphin wahoo permit, and I just don't understand the rationale for that when you're only catching half of your ACL, and I was just wondering if the maker of the motion would explain a little more behind that, and, if so, could you also exempt the Mid-Atlantic region, if the council so chooses and votes to pass this, exempt the Mid-Atlantic area from this motion. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Zack, do you want to respond to Dewey?

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. The council has voted and passed two previous control dates, the first one in 1998 and the second one in 2007, and with the amendments that are forthcoming as far as the electronic mandatory reporting for charter boats and headboats, we have -- I just feel like it would aid in law enforcement and with limiting effort in the fishery, and not necessarily with dolphin wahoo.

I would be okay, as the maker of the motion, to exclude dolphin wahoo, because we aren't catching our ACL, but I feel it's imperative that we keep the coastal migratory pelagics in this and the snapper grouper in this.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I would thank the maker of the motion for that, excluding the dolphin wahoo, because I don't see the rationale when you're not catching your ACL. Why do you want to limit effort? I would appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. BOWEN: To that point, the reason I included the dolphin and wahoo in this motion is because we -- Just a few months ago, we established a control date for the commercial sector, and I was just trying to keep it continuous, but I'm okay with taking it out if other members of the council or the committee are not in favor of keeping it in.

MR. HARTIG: The one thing I would say about your concern, Dewey, is yes, the recreational allocation isn't being caught, but that is not specific to the for-hire. Yes, they are a part of it, but most of that allocation, I believe, is the allocation was based on primarily what the recreational fishery has caught. They are the biggest players in that fishery, and so I don't know if that makes any difference. I was just thinking about it.

MR. COX: I can understand what Zack is trying to do here. I've seen in our other permit processes, when you do this type of limitation on access with permits, that your compliance increases and your data flow gets better, and so I can understand it, but I'm sensitive to Dewey's point about the dolphin and the wahoo. I mean I get it.

MR. HARTIG: I'm going to go to Monica, but I don't -- I'm just going to go to Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The control date is really kind of a flag that's sent out there to the public that says, hey, if you're thinking about getting in this fishery, be aware that the council has established a date, which they may use or not use, if they're determining they want to go to limited access restrictions on the permits.

Some of what you all are talking -- I mean it's a good conversation, but if you decide to use this control date or not in the future when you go to limited access, or you discuss that, that's where you get into the eligibility criteria.

That's where you say, well, do we want to apply this? For example, you can decide right now you don't want to apply it to dolphin wahoo, but even if you do apply it now, the control date, that doesn't mean that you have to stick with that control date. It's just a date certain in time in which you've said we think that we're likely or we're considering taking further action on this and so we want to make the public aware that get into this fishery with caution after this date, because you're not guaranteed participation.

That said, if you do look at a limited access system, that's where you get into the eligibility criteria and the things that the Magnuson Act says you have to consider, like present participation in the fishery, historical fishing practices, economics, capability of vessels to engage in other fisheries, and that sort of thing, and some of the stuff that you're talking about, including like the permits must remain in the fishery and category in which they were last renewed.

I, personally, have never seen that in a control date. Maybe that's fine to put in there. I have just usually only seen a date certain for fisheries, and I have not seen -- This almost looks like an eligibility restriction, and that's something I think you would discuss a little further down the road. If you want to keep it in the motion, okay, and we can figure out if it's appropriate to put in there when we publish a control date, but, at any rate, just some things to think about for further down the road.

MR. BOWEN: Monica, the reason I included that in there was the main goal of this is to aid in law enforcement issues with the other amendments we have coming up, but also to limit effort. Right now, we don't differentiate the permits in the South Atlantic, whether it's a six-pack permit or a headboat permit.

When we renew our permits in the for-hire sector, we just check a box at the bottom, and there's two, six-pack or whether or not there's a COI. The reason I included that is, like I said, to try to limit effort. If this goes into place, a loophole could be, and I'm trying to eliminate that, but a loophole could be somebody going out and, instead of having a six-pack permit this time, they could go out and build or buy a sixty-man headboat and it would be the same permit. Instead of limiting effort, we just multiplied it ten-times, and so that's the reason I wanted to clarify that permits should remain how they were last renewed.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Another way to get at that though is if you do decide down the road to limit access, then you could say as of the control date that we want to look at how everybody's permits were characterized, whether they were a charter vessel or whatever. I mean you can look at it -- You can establish that kind of criteria to look at, and maybe Roy wants to speak to this, because they've done this in the Gulf and we can learn a lot from the lessons by which they've done in the Gulf, because there were repeated rules that had to be published to clarify some things, but, again, that can all be brought to you if and when you decide to consider limited access options.

MR. BOWEN: That was going to be my next motion, but I wanted this one to go first.

DR. CRABTREE: I think the way staff would structure the request for the control date is that the council is considering limited entry. In addition, the council is considering limiting the passenger capacity for existing permits to what's already in it, and I think that's what you're getting at.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir.

DR. CRABTREE: Then we decide what we do down the road. As for dolphin and wahoo, if you're fairly certain you're not going to look at doing this with dolphin and wahoo, okay, but if you have any thoughts that you might want to include dolphin and wahoo in it, I would put it in the control date now so that it's covered, but if you're pretty sure you don't want to do it, I think that's fine.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and, just to that point, I mean the coastal migratory pelagics permits go all the way to New York, or the fishery does in the plan, and so you would have the same considerations for that as well as dolphin wahoo.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to table any discussions of limited entry for the for-hire industry until the June meeting, where it could be an actual agenda item and people can be informed**

that this is a discussion this council is having. This is extremely unfair to not have the for-hire industry informed of this discussion and to not have them available to listen to our thoughts on this, and so if I can get a second.

DR. DUVAL: A motion to table is not debatable, I don't believe. There is no second required and it's just a motion to table and it's just up or down. In other words, everybody just needs to vote on whether or not to table.

MR. HARTIG: That's where I missed. I missed the motion to table. We need to put the motion up on the board. Anna, what was your motion?

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to table the discussion on any limited entry of the for-hire industry until June, when it can be an agenda item and people can be informed that we're going to be having this discussion, and so I move to table the discussion.**

DR. CRABTREE: A point of order. That's not a motion to table. That's a motion to postpone until a date certain, and a motion to postpone until a date certain is debatable, I believe.

DR. DUVAL: Her motion is to postpone, until the June council meeting, any discussion of limited entry until --

MR. BOWEN: Madam Chair, we already had a motion on the table.

MR. HARTIG: I know, but it depends what motion this is, in order -- The motion to table you can put in during a discussion on a motion that we're discussing, correct? A motion to postpone would be --

DR. DUVAL: That would be a substitute motion, and so it does require a second before any discussion.

MR. HARTIG: What I'm trying to do is make sure we do what Anna wants to do, and then, procedurally, do it the way we're supposed to do it.

DR. DUVAL: Right, and so Roy is correct. Because Anna put a date certain in there, it is not a motion to table. It is a motion to postpone. I think the other thing that I would say is, quite frankly, Zack's motion is about a control date. It's not about limited entry.

DR. CRABTREE: In fact, what Zack's motion is, it's notice to the public that we're going to have this discussion about whether to go to limited entry, and so, really, the control date is the way we notify the public that we're going to talk about this and they should be aware of that and pay attention. It doesn't mean we're going to do it, but it just means we're putting them on notice that we're going to talk about it, and we might.

DR. DUVAL: But you need a second to that substitute motion.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would have been happy with just to table it, knowing that we were going to come back, which would have probably been simpler, but if she needs a second for the substitute motion, I will make the second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and then I will --

MR. HARTIG: Withdraw that motion.

MS. BECKWITH: **I will withdraw that motion and put a motion to table the discussion.**

DR. DUVAL: A motion to table is not debatable and you don't need a second.

MR. HARTIG: **All those in favor of Anna's motion, signify by raising your hand, seven in favor; opposed, five opposed. The motion to table carries seven to five, based on what I think you had, Gregg.** That means we're done discussion of this today, and so a point of order. How do we -- We would need a motion to untable at a different time? How does that work?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, you have to have a motion to take it off the table, and it needs a two-thirds majority.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, we're getting loose on the rules of it. Motions to table are normally motions to table something until later in the meeting and things. What we should have done here, if we had done it appropriately, would have been vote down Zack's motion to begin with, but, at another meeting, I don't believe you need to have a motion to untable.

I think someone can simply make the motion again, because it's a new meeting, and the rules about the two-thirds majority and all are for motions to untable at the same meeting, and there's a lot of complicated things there, but, given this meeting is ending, I don't think those apply. At any rate, staff and Monica can research the rules of Roberts Rules of Order, but I believe a motion to table only applies at the meeting at hand, and when you come back, someone can remake this motion and you can vote it up. I have a lot of experience with tabling at the Gulf Council.

DR. DUVAL: Roy, I was only speaking from the experience that we follow at ASMFC, which has been that there have been tabled motions that have required a two-thirds majority vote to untable, but I am happy to defer to Monica and her expertise.

MR. BOWEN: I am confused. Anna, you all just -- Can you explain to me just what went on, because what I understood was limited entry that she was trying to vote to table, while my motion had nothing to do with limited entry. Are we going to kick the can down the road again?

MR. HARTIG: That's my interpretation. I just wonder when you get to take it up again and that was all I --

DR. DUVAL: I mean I just have to say that when the issue of a control date came up in dolphin wahoo a couple of meetings ago, there was no notice to the public that we were going to be talking about a control date, and so I'm a little upset with I think the precedent that's being set here.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, several moments ago, before Anna made the motion, I had wanted to ask this very same question. I wanted to do what we just did, but let's set a time certain to talk about it, rather than bringing this sort of topic up at 10:30 on Friday. It's extremely important, and whether I'm in favor of not of the action, I just think that -- I mean I've got guys

who fish out there who I've been pressing to get federal permits who don't have federal permits. This sort of discussion I hope is going to light their fire.

I know we don't always follow our control dates and we continue to roll control dates forward, and I understand that, but I just think that we need to find the time, and I don't know that we've got time at the June meeting to do that, but I would like to see us set a time certain where we discuss the topic.

MR. BREWER: I just want to say I agree. I don't think you need to be bringing up something like this, because if we don't pay attention to history, it turns around and bites us in the butt. We can look to the Gulf and see exactly what's going on here and what it has resulted in. Something like that is an extremely important discussion, and it needs to be -- The public needs to know that we're going to be talking about it and not just setting a control date, but what's really going on.

To bring it up now in Mackerel, when you're affecting dolphin and you're affecting snapper grouper by this thing, I just don't think you've given any kind of reasonable notice to the public of what's going on.

MR. BOWEN: For the record, Chester, I was instructed by our Chair -- Not instructed, but Gregg was aware of this and kind of advised me when to bring this up, and so it wasn't on me. I was open to bringing it up any time during this week. It does need to be talked about, and I feel like Anna's vote that just got passed, you're just kicking the can down the road, and this council has been notorious for that, and we're continuing to just keep pushing our problems and keep pushing it. My question is when is bad going to bad enough that we recognize we have problems in the fishery?

DR. CRABTREE: Let me suggest instead of having this discussion now -- I think what you need to do is ask Michelle to put on the agenda at a future meeting a discussion of limited entry in the for-hire sector. That way, it will be on the agenda and everybody will know it's coming. Then we can figure out what you want to do and have a discussion of control dates at that time.

MR. BOWEN: That was going to be my next motion.

MR. HARTIG: Let me get Zack and see what happens.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have another motion I would like to make, if I can. **I would like to direct staff to begin working on an amendment to establish a for-hire limited entry program in the following fisheries: coastal migratory pelagics, snapper grouper, and dolphin wahoo.** If I can get a second, I will offer some more rationale on that as well.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Zack. Do we have a second?

DR. CRABTREE: I will second for discussion.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: **As the seconder, Zack, can I ask that you modify your motion and change it to request that the Chairwoman schedule a discussion of limited entry for the for-hire permits in these fisheries at a -- I don't know if the June or September meeting.**

MR. BOWEN: **Yes, sir. That will be fine.**

DR. CRABTREE: I think we can all come into agreement on that one, probably.

MR. BOWEN: The question I have is now that this motion is on the table and the public is now aware that we're fixing to be in discussions, something tells me that the Permits Office is going to get a real big influx in applications over the next two or three months. That's the reason that I wanted to set a control date for today.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: If you recall, there have been times when we've, at a subsequent meeting, reached back in time and set a control date for earlier than that current council meeting discussion. Whether you want to do that or not is another thing. I think Michelle is right, and I think it was at the December meeting, or maybe the September meeting, and I'm not sure, in which you set a control date for the dolphin commercial sector essentially, the dolphin wahoo commercial sector, to June 30, because that was the closure date for the commercial ACL.

There are times in which you can reach back. You just have to build a record and rationale for that reason, and you will discuss that. You don't need to discuss it now, but you will discuss it at that time, whether you want to have it right now, that date you're discussing it, at the June meeting or whatever, or whether you think it's appropriate to reach back.

MR. BOWEN: To that point, Monica, in June, when we -- If this motion gets passed, when we go to discussing this, I sure would like to have some kind of analysis of what the Permit Office looks like now with the permits, the amount of permits, and what it looks like in June when we discuss it, and I would just about guarantee you that the number of permits is going to be through the roof. The applications and permits are going to be through the roof. Again, we're trying to limit effort.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am not so sure how much we really need to limit effort, and if there is an increase in people getting their permits, I would hope it would be a lot of people like Doug has talked about, that need to get their permits. They have been prosecuting some of these fisheries, and maybe on a very limited effort, but I would hope with this conversation that we've had that it's going to have people that need to have them go ahead and get them, and that's really what we want to do.

There's a lot of these recreational fisheries that aren't in trouble, and I talked to one of the guys on the advisory panel the other day and mentioned it to him, and he said, no, if you want to pay somebody to go recreational fishing, then great. We need to have the discussion and kind of set a course, but I don't see a problem. If you go get a permit and you don't have a business plan to make it work, it doesn't do you any good.

MR. BELL: I was just going to show you, if you were interested -- If you go back to 4 February, that's when the Fisheries Bulletin came out that announced the control date for the commercial sector of the dolphin wahoo in the Atlantic, and so you kind of see what happens, I guess, what

the Service does in terms of announcing it, and that's what we were kind of talking about. When that happens, that's sort of flare gun that goes up.

The comments on that were due no later than 7 March, and that was Monday, and so I don't know what kind of comments were received from that, but that's -- If you want to see what the process looks like, if you go back and find that 4 February Bulletin, that would have been sort of the next thing that would have happened. It would have been announced that we were considering that, and that, of course, is the signal, sort of. It's just interesting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What I was going to say is in snapper grouper and in coastal migratory pelagics, I've looked at the number of permits, and the trend is down. Dolphin wahoo is the only one where it's up.

MR. BOWEN: Let's see if that trend continues until June.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: My whole reason for bringing, and I guess I started the can of worms here, per se, is that dolphin is caught up in the Northeast. There are a lot of boats up there, I would venture to say, the for-hire and recreational, that don't know that they have to have a permit. Our council just sent a letter to HMS requesting that they maybe add to their website or permit area that you have to have a dolphin wahoo permit if you're fishing for that species. It's more about education.

On the commercial side, I understand the limited entry. We are limited-entried out, but, on the recreational/for-hire, the only reason for bringing up the discussion -- I understand control dates too, but it's just a marker in stone, but I was just hoping that the council somehow would, further along, that the people that fish in the Northeast have to have permits for catching dolphin wahoo, given that this dolphin wahoo is managed by the South Atlantic Council. It's more of an educational tool to get better reporting and stuff like that, versus telling somebody you're not going to go fishing or here's this, especially when you look at the dolphin quota and the amount there. It's more of an educational tool than limited entry or any discussion like that, and so that's the reason for my bringing it up. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Is there anyone else who absolutely feels the need that they have to speak on this before we vote? **Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, which is to request the Council Chair add a discussion about limited entry for the for-hire permits in snapper grouper, coastal migratory pelagics, and dolphin wahoo to a future meeting's agenda, all those in favor of that motion, raise your hand, ten in favor; all those opposed, two opposed. The motion passes.**

Is there any other business to come before the Mackerel Committee? Seeing none, thank you, Michelle, and I will turn it back over to you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Chairman Hartig. We will next move into the Law Enforcement Committee report and Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Law Enforcement Committee met on March the 8th and covered the following items. The Law Enforcement Advisory Panel Summary Report, Colonel Chisholm Frampton, the AP Chair, delivered a report summarizing the discussions and

recommendations resulting from the March 7 and 8, 2016 meeting of the LEAP. I won't go through all of these, but just basically the report is attached, and so you can read, in detail, his report.

Then the only other very brief item that we had under Other Business was a little bit of a discussion on commercial operator cards, and we agreed that there would be some follow-up between now and the June meeting, and that was -- Monica basically agreed to kind of help put together a snapshot of what the operator card world looks like from council region to council region, and so we'll discuss that in June. There were no motions made. That concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mel. Next on the agenda is the Dolphin Wahoo Committee Report.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, and I would ask my Vice Chair to present the report on my behalf, since I'm sick, but apparently he's mad at me and has left the room. The Joint Dolphin Wahoo and Snapper Grouper Committee met on March 8 of 2016 and received updates of the status of the commercial and recreational landings for dolphin and wahoo species.

It was noted that in 2015, while the commercial sector was closed on June 30, 2015, because they had met their sector ACL, the recreational sector landings had increased by nearly two-million-pounds over their 2014 landings. The committee discussed the status of four recent dolphin wahoo amendments.

The committee then received a report on the history of how the current OY, ABC, and ACL were set for the dolphin fishery. This was followed by a discussion by the committee about whether OY should be the same for both the commercial and recreational sectors, and it was pointed out that the council can adjust the ACL or ACT to achieve conservation goals.

The committee discussed potential actions that could be in the Joint Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10/Snapper Grouper Amendment 44. The committee also discussed waiting until June 2016 to decide which items to consider including in the amendments and then send those amendments out for scoping in August of 2016.

The committee discussed dolphin bag limit sales by properly licensed for-hire permitted vessels and whether it should be included in a Dolphin Wahoo FMP amendment. The committee voted on the following motions as recommendations to the council.

Motion to consider a single ACL for dolphin and yellowtail snapper as an action for Dolphin Wahoo 10/Snapper Grouper Amendment 44. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

An additional motion was to consider, for scoping, gear type allocations for the commercial fishery for dolphin. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We do need someone to make the timing and task motion, which is on the board. The draft motion is in June the Dolphin Wahoo/Snapper Grouper Committee would like to see all of the items they approved for scoping at the March 2016 meeting, plus a listing of the other additional dolphin

management actions in the December 2015 white paper. Can I have someone make that motion, please?

MS. MCCAULEY: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: It's seconded by Doug. Is there any discussion on that motion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.** That concludes my report, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Anna. The next report is the Protected Resources Committee and Dr. Laney.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Protected Resources Committee met on March 7, 2016. The agenda was adopted and the minutes were approved. We had reports from Ms. Jennifer Lee with the Southeast Regional Office Protected Resources Division on the protected resource updates from their division, as well on the Northern Right Whale Critical Habitat Final Rule. The details are in the report.

We had a discussion of the ESA/MSA integration agreement, and I believe that we had deferred some wording, final wording, to the full council meeting, and I believe that Monica is prepared to address that, and/or Chip, and so I will turn it over to them for further discussion.

MR. COLLIER: Monica came up with two excellent options. The first option is to remove the part that was in question, and the part that was in question was "The council or council staff may request that the council staff be provided draft RPA/RPMs for internal review outside of council meetings", and so that could be potentially removed.

The other option is to keep it in there, but to make sure it is brought up at the next council meeting, and the language that Monica provided was: Any draft RPA/RPM so provided to the council will then be provided to the council at the next council meeting. We would leave that up to -- Or it looks like Monica might have something to say.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, that's fine, Chip. The reason I suggested that any draft RPAs or RPMs -- If you want to stay with this sentence, the reason I suggested that those draft RPAs or RPMs that would be provided to the council staff would then also be provided to the council at the next council meeting, and that's because this whole idea is to share those kinds of requirements, or draft requirements, in a biological opinion with the council, and that's fine, but the council is a public process, as you know, and once that's shared with the council, then it's also shared with other members of the public.

The sentence currently is: "The council or council staff may also request that council staff be provided draft RPAs or RPMs for internal review outside of council meetings." If you want to leave that in there, then I suggest -- Okay, but please add that any draft RPAs or RPMs so provided to council staff will then be provided to the council at the next council meeting. Then it stays -- The record is clear, and then you all are aware of it, and I think that's more within the policy directive, as provided by the Fisheries Service.

DR. LANEY: Having heard that, what is your pleasure on final wording?

DR. DUVAL: I'm fine with Monica's suggested modifications to that.

DR. LANEY: Do we need a motion, Madam Chairman, to incorporate that into the text then, or is direction to staff sufficient?

DR. DUVAL: I think direction to staff probably would be sufficient to just incorporate the revised wording from General Counsel.

DR. LANEY: Given that, that, I believe takes care of all of the changes to the document. Do we need any sort of a motion to approve the document for use? I see Gregg nodding in the affirmative, and so if I could ask my Vice Chair, Ms. McCawley, to make that motion, I would appreciate it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we approve the ESA MSA integration agreement.**

DR. LANEY: Do I have a second? Dr. Duval, are you seconding?

DR. DUVAL: I think Mr. Heymans was seconding. I was going to discuss.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Doug, for that second.

DR. DUVAL: Monica, would this also be a roll call vote? This is not any kind of secretarial review thing, but it is sort of a final approval.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's a great question. When in doubt, do a roll call vote. Why not?

MR. WAUGH: If there is no more discussion, we'll go ahead and vote. Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Sure.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Cox. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

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

DR. DUVAL: I'm going to suggest we take a quick break. Checkout is at noon.

DR. LANEY: Dr. Duval, I wasn't quite through with the report yet.

DR. DUVAL: Sorry about that, Wilson. Are you sure you're not done with that report?

DR. LANEY: That's quite all right, Madam Chairman. We had just one brief, little piece of it left. The remaining part was that we did provide updates on the Atlantic surgeon stock assessment. The full details of Max Appelman's report are in the written report. I do have a little bit of new information on red knot, and I will give that during my agency report. Other than that, there was no other business. There were no motions made, and there is no timing and task motion, Madam Chairman, and so that completes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Sorry to cut you short, Wilson. Let's take a quick break. Everybody can go grab their stuff and check out. We will come back and finish the other committee reports and the liaison reports. We have a presentation from David Alberg, who is the Superintendent of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary, as well.

DR. DUVAL: We're going to go ahead and get going. The next report is the SEDAR Committee meeting. The SEDAR Committee approved the schedule and made appointments for the Stock ID Workshop and the SEDAR 50 benchmark stock assessment, which is for blueline tilefish. We received status reports on SEDAR projects currently underway and suggested the SSC review of

candidate stocks for revision assessments incorporating impending MRIP updates be delayed until the October 2016 SSC meeting.

We had one motion, which was to appoint the following folks to the SEDAR Blueline Tilefish Stock ID Workshop: Jan McDowell, Tanya Darden, David Wyanski, Joey Ballenger, George Sedberry, Churchill Grimes, Marcel Reichert, Fred Serchuk, Myra Brouwer, Mike Errigo, John Boreman, Cynthia Jones, Tom Miller, and Jason Didden, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Now, we do need one more motion from the council with regard to the upcoming SEDAR 50 for blueline tilefish. We're in the process of trying to structure a joint assessment between the Northeast and Southeast Science Centers and to include Mid-Atlantic representation on that.

We had some discussion with the Mid-Atlantic folks last night, and we would just be looking for a motion from the committee to appoint to the SEDAR AP the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council appointees to SEDAR 50 for the data, assessment, and review panels. I think, just to make sure we're dotting our I's and crossing our T's in terms of those folks meeting FACA responsibilities and everything, and so if I could get someone to make that motion.

MR. HARTIG: I would move to appoint to the SEDAR AP the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council appointees to SEDAR 50, blueline tilefish, to the data, assessment, and review panels.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Ben and second by Chris. Is there discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. That concludes the report, unless there is any more business to come before the SEDAR Committee. The next committee report is Data Collection and Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: I'm going to do the report and then you're going to do the follow-up, or do you want to do that first? We had some unfinished business, and so we will go ahead and John has one piece that we missed yesterday at the end.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Attachment 10 was the Citizen Science Blueprint, and so this is a draft. It reflects what was discussed at the Citizen Science workshop, which I think by now most people have heard that that was quite a success. The feedback we received from participants was incredibly positive.

I think even folks who came in as a bit of skeptics, or a bit questioning what we were planning to do, learned a lot about what Citizen Science is about and what the council intends to do, and we just got an incredible list of recommendations from the folks and outstanding involvement from everyone who was there and willingness during that workshop to put strong recommendations on the table for what people within the region expect out of a Citizen Science project.

The next day, after the workshop, the organizing committee got together and came up with this overall blueprint, which lays out what a Citizen Science Program should look like. One of the things we stressed a lot during the workshop was the difference between just a project and this

overall program, and we noted that there's been a lot of projects through the years in this region that cross into what is kind of thought of as citizen science.

Sometimes within cooperative research, which is a little bit separate, but still does involve citizens, and some truly definitely fall within what's classically considered citizen science, but one of the problems with many of them is, by not dealing with some of the things which were themes in the workshop that are important to success of citizen science, in some cases, those past projects really haven't given the return that's desired.

Perhaps the data weren't collected in a scientifically-robust manner, and so they can't be used in say stock assessments or management evaluations, or those involved in it weren't -- They didn't take part in the design and development of it, and maybe they weren't as committed to getting the information as they could have been, and so their involvement isn't as strong, or they weren't given the training, or the outreach and follow-up wasn't there, or the availability of the information, once the project is done, is not there, and so it's on someone's computer in a report and no one can ever -- It's very difficult to access and use it.

Those were all things which were recognized as needing to be accomplished within a program, to ensure that you get the most that you can out of your projects. Everyone agreed that going out with something new like this, it's really important that you really have success upfront, and they also recognized, on the other hand, that it's going to be important to do a lot of pilots and learn how things go and you need to be willing to fail in some ways, early and often, but you also need to recognize what you really need to do to reduce those, so that when you're failing that you're actually learning a lot about what really is successful and what is necessary.

With all that in mind, we came up with this blueprint, and, in a way, that's just sort of saying why -- It seems a little bit complex and it has a lot of infrastructure that's associated with it, but that really is just reflecting what folks thought was necessary over the long term to get to a real successful program, which will give us successful projects.

There's a little bit about the identity. We talked some about having a brief name, and hopefully we can come up with something catchy that will work, but that's kind of a work in progress, but I do want to bring your attention to the mission statement and vision statement, and there was a lot of effort that went into these.

The mission statement as suggested as: Improving fisheries management through collaborative science. It's pretty straightforward and to the point. The vision statement was kind of creatively set up as an equation: More collaboration plus more data plus more trust equals better management.

There is some values about what the program will do, and then -- You know, we realize there's a need to define citizen science, because it means a lot of things to a lot of people, and so one of the early goals will be to define what citizen science means for us. I guess I will just pause there and see if there's any discussion of, in particular, the mission statement and vision. It looks like everyone is pretty satisfied with that. That's good.

The next were goals and objectives, and the plan here is we had general goals, and we think objectives will be worked on as these different groups come in and address them. The goals are:

to adopt and sustain a new approach; to increase the data available; to address research and management needs; ensure data collected are appropriate, relevant, reliable, accessible, timely, and useful; build partnerships for mutual learning and collaboration; enhance stewardship for the resources of the South Atlantic; foster active engagement and communication about processes, results, and impacts. These really reflect the feedback that the individuals at that workshop gave us.

The next big part is administration, and I think I will go here to this picture, which shows the vision for how this could operate. There is an oversight board, and this is large and it really gives all the people who want to have a voice in what citizen science does and how it's configured within the South Atlantic, it gives them an opportunity, and so it includes council folks and it includes state folks and it includes entities that we consider important partners, such as Sea Grant and ACCSP. It includes folks within the agency, and so it's broad and it's overarching and it gives a lot of voice to people to direct this.

It's much like at ACCSP and it's much like the Coordinating Council. Then, realizing that that was a large group and it can be hard for large groups to make operational decisions, we came up with this idea of an Operations Committee, sort of tailored off of what the existing Organizing Committee is like, that would handle more things day-to-day.

There is an Advisory Committee proposed, which would be composed of fishermen and such. That's proposed to give feedback at that level into the operations and oversight, and then there's this idea that was come up with as the A-Teams. These are, in a way, technical committees, but we're kind of trying to find some different language to distinguish this from infrastructure at the council or ACCSP or ASMFC.

We came up with the idea for A-Teams, and, at first, this was -- There is a lot of tasks that have to be done, and these guys were viewed as coming in and getting those done here. In some cases, they may stand, and in other cases, they may not. That's all decisions to be made over the long term.

These really reflect the things that are necessary for success: dealing with volunteers; handling data; managing projects and topics; addressing communication, outreach, and education; and finance. Those are the main programmatic areas and the main issues that are going to have to be addressed to really have a standing program that can support projects. Each one of those has a charge, which is all detailed as you go through these different graphics for each one of these. Are there any questions about the A-Teams and the concept there? I will keep moving on then.

The next area this gets into is partnerships, and that's certainly been an underlying theme of this throughout, and recognizing that the council is not going alone on this. You know reaching out to citizens and really doing something new, it's important to get everybody involved, those who can help collect data, help find volunteers, run the program, and everything else.

Some of the key partners identified, and we gave within here the list of what each partner could potentially contribute and how they would relate with this program, but it included: Sea Grant, the National Marine Fisheries Service, ACCSP, things like the Fisheries Information Networks, state agencies, the council, various non-governmental organizations, and the Cooperative Research Program.

I will highlight that, because one thing we've tried to do, especially as we recognize this needs some funding, is make sure that there is never any thought that somehow this replaces cooperative research in any way. This is totally a companion and directed toward filling, at this point, the many data gaps that we have in the region, and it's not in any way intended as a replacement to that or a place where we would be competing for funds, most importantly.

The focus of the groups are quite different, and I think it could be very symbiotic, in the long run, between what happens with cooperative research and citizen science. If you haven't read the Chairman's comments in the latest newsletter along these lines, I think you should, because she makes some really good points and sums it all up very nicely.

One of the important recommendations that was made was the need for paid staff, and we believe that it requires a full-time program manager for this, to get the infrastructure in place and get the A-Teams going and start getting some initial projects underway and pursue different funding opportunities. The council now is really looking for sources of that and has approached the agency. Also, we're looking at other opportunities where we could get funding.

In our instance, being if it comes to the council it needs to come through the agency, and so we're pursuing various directions for that, and it was brought up at the CCC Meeting and all the other councils were made aware, and the agency is well aware of what our intentions are and where we stand on this. We're hoping, at some point, to obviously be able to find funding so we can provide a staff person who can make all of this happen.

In the meantime, we're continuing to look ahead. An Organizing Committee met last night over dinner, and a lot of discussion was where things stand on here and sort of what we can do while we're in this hoping-to-find-funding kind of mode. We believe that there are some kick-starter projects which could be done without requiring a lot of funding, while still maintaining the principles that we need to follow in terms of ensuring we have good data and a good system and keep people involved.

I think what we'll probably do is maybe try to hash some of those out and get some more people involved, and maybe at the June meeting -- Maybe we can have a little prospectus or proposal for each one of those projects, but we have some about maybe getting observers on headboats in a way, helping to analyze video data, perhaps getting some socioeconomic information from the recreational fishery. Another topic, which has always been at the forefront, is getting biological information on discarded fish. Those are kind of some working ideas that we're on right now. We're going to continue to pursue those, and I hope by June that maybe we've made some progress.

I guess a few things here to bring up. These were just some thoughts here at the end that came up during the workshop and really made for very good sound bites, in a way, but strong advice that crosses the whole project. As I mentioned, pilot projects are good; fail early and fail often; let the program evolve; and don't be afraid to try new things.

In some ways, we have modeled this after SEDAR in looking at cooperators and partnerships and things, and that certainly was a foundation of SEDAR from the very beginning. Try new things and see how it works out and be willing to be innovative. Be willing to try something and realize

if it doesn't work, but learn from it and figure out how to solve your problem in another way, at your next opportunity.

Outreach is critical and should be a component at each infrastructure level, and that's one of the big reasons for having staff, because that came through loud and clear from all of the fishermen. What seems to have made them most upset and dissatisfied in their involvement with citizen-science-type projects in the past is just not knowing what happened to the data and not seeing the data being used and not getting the training that they thought they needed.

The hierarchy is required, and interests and needs will vary broadly, and so that reflects the infrastructure that was put forth there. Consider how to foster matchmaking for project ideas with scientists needing data connected with citizens who can provide those data and citizens with ideas connected with scientists who can turn them into projects.

I guess, in this regard, we're hoping maybe we partner up with someone who is interested in developing apps or doing IT-type work, because we do think there's a lot of value added in terms of putting folks together and getting more out of things like CRP and other competitive grant programs by just aligning citizens and scientists in a much better and much more convenient for each other fashion, and, along that line, a web-oriented-type matchmaking platform which could do it. That is the end of the blueprint, and I think we'll open it up for any questions.

MR. COX: I will tell you that I'm looking forward to doing this kind of work post-council. I always enjoy engaging with the fishermen, and I've learned a lot about science and just getting out front and doing this kind of work. Just getting back to the document here, as we go through this, under Goals and Objectives, under Goal 2, where it says ensure data collected are appropriate, relevant, reliable, accessible, timely, and then it says "and useful", I was just wondering if we could strike through "useful" and maybe put "and used in management". I mean as we work on this and do these things, I think we'll want to probably use some of this stuff in our management style.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would certainly say that's what "useful" is intended to reflect, yes. Useful, but not in management, and, actually, one of the reasons it's useful, just useful, is because we recognize it's management, it's stock assessments, it's everything that we do, and we wanted to make sure that we didn't focus on either one or the other and suggested that the purpose of citizen science is for stock assessment or the purpose of citizen science is for management. The purpose of citizen science is to improve the overall data for all the councils' activities.

MR. BELL: Something to keep in mind too is that it's also -- In doing this, you're also building relationships and trust and confidence and a lot of other things that are beyond just the data itself, but it's a really great opportunity for folks to work together to a common goal, and so it's just kind of an unstated benefit, but it is.

DR. DUVAL: John, I don't know -- Like for the sake of efficiency, I wouldn't recommend that we go through and wordsmith anything. I mean if council members have suggested edits or modifications to the blueprint -- I mean I have to give a huge shout-out to staff for pulling this together in such a short period of time. I mean we had hoped to have professional assistance in pulling this together, and, unfortunately, the person got pretty ill and they were not able to attend,

and so I just want everybody to understand the huge load that John and Amber and Julia took on to get this pulled together for this council meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I was just thinking that, for the sake of efficiency, if folks have any edits or changes that they might could get those to staff. John, I don't know if this is something where you might need a motion at some point to approve this blueprint. I don't know if here or the next meeting. I don't know what your thoughts are on that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think, given the timing and how stretched we are for time at this meeting, if we decide that we need full approval of it, perhaps at the next meeting. I think now, a general expression of support, and maybe some guidance. As I mentioned, bringing forth some projects, and, perhaps, do you support us maybe trying to get some of these potential A-Teams together and work on objectives to fill in the goals over the next few months? I think that's something else that we could do without incurring any costs.

MR. BELL: For us, in between, I guess we would encourage everybody to make sure you take a careful look at this. If you have any interest in changes or something, we can feed that to John.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's a real interesting idea, and so I would like to work with you to make sure that things are done according to Hoyle, so to speak, and the Magnuson Act. Some of your appointments are done by the council and some are appointed by the Oversight Board. I'm not sure how that works with everything, and so I need to get involved at that point, and if I need to involve Commerce attorneys in terms of the funding and to make sure that you have a useful product that you can use for what you want to use, and so that means making sure we get the I's dotted and T's crossed in the beginning, for the legality of it all and figuring out where to put things and those sorts of things. At any rate, I will work with you on that.

MR. BELL: That would be great. I call that keeping us street-legal.

DR. PONWITH: I have been privileged to be involved in the planning for the workshop, and I can say that I'm very, very excited about this work unfolding and this program unfolding. I am a huge supporter of cooperative research. It has been a wonderful addition to the mechanisms available for conducting research, in collaboration with academics and certainly in collaboration with industry participants.

This is something completely different that will be a perfectly complementary addition to the tools we have to close those research gaps, those monitoring gaps, the science gaps, and I just am excited about this and look forward to seeing it unfold. I thank everybody for taking a very close read of the blueprint and see if this seems like a pathway that the council is interested in pursuing and the right way to pursue it, and certainly thank our counsel for looking at it to make sure that we can do it according to proper procedures.

MR. BELL: Great. Thanks, Bonnie, and I would, again, encourage everybody to take a look at it.

MR. WAUGH: We're continuing to pursue some funding. We put together a rough budget of approximately \$173,000 for a position, but it also allows us to hold some regional workshops, website materials, and data management. We're still in discussions with NMFS Headquarters about their ability to hopefully provide some or all of that funding. As I pointed out to you all,

they have indicated that they are collaborating with us, and so we continue to collaborate with them. It's going to be critical to get an additional position for this to move forward, and we're continuing to pursue that and we'll keep you all posted.

MR. BELL: Great. Thanks, Gregg. Any other questions for John or comments concerning citizen science? I think this is a great thing. Seeing none, then that was the last piece of our actual agenda from yesterday. Then I will go on to the actual report now.

The Data Committee received reports. We met on the 10th of March and received reports on bycatch monitoring and the commercial logbook pilot and logbook electronic reporting. The for-hire amendment was reviewed and demonstrations were provided by DNR. When it says "DNR" in Rhode Island, that's actually the program that was used up in Rhode Island, and it wasn't Rhode Island DNR. We can fix that. Anyway, on the actual applications that folks are using to collect data. There were five different motions made, and I will go through those.

The first motion was move to accept the IPT's recommended changes for the purpose and need. We've captured in the cases where we're documenting what the verbiage was. We have captured that in here. **That was approved by the committee, and, so on behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion of the motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

The second motion was move to accept the IPT's recommended changes for Action 1, Preferred Alternative 2. That was approved by the committee, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of the motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

The third motion was move to specify core data elements, and this will actually be amplified a little bit later in guidance to staff, but this was related to the data elements in the plan. That was approved by the committee. Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

Motion 4 was move, under Action 2, Alternative 2, to accept the IPT's recommended changes, and those are below. That was approved by the committee. Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

Motion Number 5 was move to delay final approval until at least September, and that would be the September meeting. Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.** Then we have a timing and task motion which someone would need to read, please.

DR. DUVAL: **I move to direct staff to develop an action to specify core data elements, including alternatives to enable future changes through framework, for consideration by the council in June, and to inform the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council of the delay in final approval.**

MR. BELL: Can I get a second? Second by Charlie. Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.** Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mel. I know that Dr. Ponwith has to leave us to go catch a flight, and so she had asked if she could do her report now.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. This coming week, next week, starting on Monday, we will be engaging in the fourth of a series of five program reviews at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Again, you will recall that these program reviews are harmonized across each of the six Fisheries Science Centers, to be able to look thematically each year at these key issues that touch each of the Science Centers and enable us to look across the findings to see if we see emergent issues.

This year's program review is on ecosystem and climate science. It will be held in Miami, the 14th through the 16th of March, next week, and if you Google the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and look right on the home page, dead-center in the middle of the page is a hot-link to the program review. All the meeting materials will be there, and so you can see the presentations and the background materials.

There is also a hot-link to be able to webinar in, and so if you're unable to attend in person, but have an interest in certain areas of the agenda, we will adhere to the timing of the agenda so that you can tap in and join us remotely. We think it's going to be a very interesting review, and we look for the feedback from our august panel of reviewers to help us strengthen those programs going forward.

One of the things that we will be discussing in this review is the Southeast Regional Action Plan for NOAA Fisheries Climate Science Strategy. If you recall, that strategy was released back in August, and one of the many actions that that national plan requested, or required, was a regional action plan for implementing climate science programs and activities within each of the regions.

We will be reviewing an action plan that we've prepared for the Gulf of Mexico at this meeting. We are preparing a similar action plan for the South Atlantic ecosystem and the U.S. Caribbean ecosystem as well, but looking at that action plan for the Gulf of Mexico will give you some pretty strong leading indicators of what is going to be in the draft South Atlantic plan.

Our goal is to get those reviewed using the Gulf of Mexico one. At the program review, we will get the other drafts up and ready and get them to the councils, to the states, to the interstate commissions, to give them a chance to see those and then ultimately fold feedback from that into a draft that goes out for public comment. The ultimate goal is to have the action plans prepared and ready to be used by the end of this fiscal year.

We talked a little bit in the past updates about the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem Program. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center is the U.S. -- I am the U.S. point of contact for that program. We have submitted the program documents that we talked about at the last meeting to the Global Environment Facility, who is the potential funder for this, and we are literally in the very last step of review on this.

I believe we could know by the end of this month whether the program is going to be funded. The good news is if it's funded that it's funded at a level of \$12.9-million. The bad news, as we've already discussed, is that the United States isn't an eligible recipient for that money, but the second

level of good news is it funds Mexico to collaborate with us on things that we think are important at a basin scale, to be able to do things that we couldn't have done otherwise.

One of the actions that's in that plan that's relevant to you is to conduct the very first joint stock assessment, U.S./Mexico, and we've narrowed that stock assessment down to either king mackerel or Spanish mackerel. This is a very big deal, because we -- If you take a look at stock assessment reports over the last X amount of time, every time we do an assessment we're constrained by the fact that we don't really know what's happening to those stocks south of the border.

They have made a commitment that if they're funded that all of the data they have available, and that's landings data, age composition data, life history data, will become available to us to use in that joint stock assessment, and so we are very excited about that. By our next meeting, I will be able to report to you whether this is a go or not.

We have been very active in our data shop doing some data system upgrades. First of all, we're working right now on the TIP system. This year, we're rebuilding the TIP system, which is used by the state and the federal partners to record dockside sampling information from commercial fisheries. This upgrade will allow us to expedite the data entry, the data loading, and increase our ability to do quality control and provide state and federal coordinators with access to the sampler data and sampler productivity metrics more readily.

This is the last of four major commercial data systems that we're updating, and that is the landings data, the vessel and catch and effort reports, and the size data, and the observer data. This is going to be a big help in making those data more available.

Once that's finished, what we intend to do is go to work on, as time and as resources are available, to writing the code that we need to automate summarization of those data, so that you can put in a query for the data and get those data in the format that you need and that meets our legal obligations for data confidentiality. This includes automating the production of statistics we need for SAFE reports, and so I know this is something near and dear to the South Atlantic Council's heart.

The trip ticket system review, the revised trip ticket review, system is up and running, and it was recently demonstrated to the State of Florida folks. What this system does is allow federal port agents to provide feedback to dealers about the quality of the data. If we see outliers or challenges that we see in some of their data, it allows them to go back and talk with them to address problems with the trip tickets. Right now, only the State of Florida is working on that, but we're certainly willing to expand that to use in the other states as they desire.

Some personnel updates, we are hoping to make a selection on a recruitment action to hire a survey statistician in the very, very near future. This scientist will focus on reviewing and revising sampling and survey designs for fishery-dependent data collections, and then also help with revising or reviewing our current data analysis procedures and give us better feedback on that. Again, this will strengthen our ability to provide data timely and according to best scientific practices.

We're also filling a management strategy evaluation lead position. This is an outcome from the stock assessment peer review we did a couple of years ago, and so we've put together a recruitment announcement, and that recruitment announcement will hit the streets soon, is what we're hearing

from Workforce Management. When that does hit the streets, we'll make sure that we broadcast that far and wide.

This is the kind of position whose job it will be to lead the simulation approaches to questions like what fishery-independent data collections should we be making our investments in, based on their relative contribution to improving the quality of stock assessments, or something that's near and dear to Ben's heart, and that is analyzing the relative contribution of age structures in these age-structured stock assessments and how should we be spreading those investments to get us the maximum possible benefits from those. Again, it's using simulation techniques to answer complex questions and help us spend our precious resources and our time more strategically. That's my report, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you very much, Bonnie. Are there any questions for Bonnie?

MR. HARTIG: One thing is thanks for the webinar access to the science thing. Is that relatively new? I mean I don't know that we did that originally, but --

DR. PONWITH: No, this is a new innovation to make that peer review, this program review, more accessible to a broader audience.

MR. HARTIG: Then the other thing is I've been thinking about some kind of logbook review, but then, when I thought about that, I'm probably thinking that that's taking place through the commercial electronic reporting venue, and so things will change, I would think somewhat, between what we do on paper and what we do online, and so I'm sure that's being accomplished through that.

DR. DUVAL: Any other questions for Dr. Ponwith? If not, thank you, Bonnie, and I definitely echo Ben's appreciation for the online access for the science review. That will allow me to attend next week, and I'm very much looking forward to that. We will jump back into our Committee Reports, and next up is AP Selection and Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Advisory Panel Selection Committee met on March 8, Tuesday. The committee reviewed applications for open seats on the following advisory panels: Golden Crab, Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management, King and Spanish Mackerel, Law Enforcement, Shrimp, Snapper Grouper, and the SEDAR Pool AP.

The committee received an overview of the NGO seats on species-specific advisory panels and determined the current approach for considering individuals that apply for open seats should continue. The committee also discussed having stakeholder representation on the Law Enforcement AP and the Information & Education AP and directed staff to develop options for consideration at the June meeting.

Mr. Bell, for your benefit, since you had other duties while this committee was meeting, as we looked through on both of those APs, we've got really great qualified people, and the concern though was that -- In Law Enforcement, you've got great people that are on there, but you don't have anybody who is directly involved in the fishery, and so the thought was that, for those two APs, we would ask staff to essentially develop options that we could take a look at in June,

probably adding one person to each AP, if funds allow, to bring those fishery-related people onto those APs.

We also discussed guidelines for advisory panel chairs and provided a recommendation for its limiting the time an individual may serve. In addition, the committee discussed modifying the name of the King and Spanish Mackerel AP to better reflect species managed under the Joint Coastal Migratory Pelagic Fishery Management Plan, including cobia, and provided recommendations.

Those two were we have situations that -- The guidebook currently calls for the chairperson to serve one-year, but we have AP panels that don't meet every year. They might meet once every three years, and so we thought that there might be some changes that needed to be made in the guidebook, and those are going to be reflected in a later motion.

Also, when you're talking about a King and Spanish Mackerel AP, you also have cobia falling within the purview of that advisory panel, and so the thought was to change the name to better reflect what was actually being discussed in that AP. With that, Madam Chair, I have sixteen motions to bring before the council.

Motion Number 1 is reappoint David Neilson and Howard Rau and appoint Tim McGurl to the Golden Crab AP. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 1 stands approved.

Motion Number 2 is appoint Tim Sartwell and David Bush to the Habitat AP. Any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 2 stands approved.

Motion Number 3 is appoint Scott Baker to the Information & Education AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, Motion 3 stands approved.

Motion 4 is appoint Greg Peralta to the Mackerel AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, Motion 4 stands approved.

Motion 5 is readvertise one NGO seat and three open seats on the Mackerel AP. We had a little glitch and the seats that were advertised as being open on the Mackerel AP, one of them was actually a dedicated NGO seat, and so it needed to be readvertised. Also, there was some discussion that was had with regard to wanting to get some more candidates with regard to the Mackerel AP; therefore, this motion. Motion 5, again, is readvertise one NGO seat and three open seats on the Mackerel AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition? Seeing none, Motion 5 stands approved.

Motion 6 is appoint Dave Forcinito to the Mackerel AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 6 stands approved.

Motion Number 7 is appoint Ryan Howard to the Mackerel AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 7 stands approved.

Motion Number 8 is appoint Michael Freeman to the Law Enforcement AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?

MR. BELL: That's fine. To your point earlier, we had discussion over there about exactly what you were talking in, about bringing in some technical expertise from the fisheries and all, and they discussed that, and I think it's reflected in the report. They think that would be good in some capacity, and so it's just working out options and how to do it.

MR. BREWER: We did the right thing.

MR. BELL: Yes, you did, because it made sense, from a standpoint of sort of technical expertise in there that could look at things from the other side. Thank you.

MR. BREWER: Any further discussion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 8 stands approved.**

Motion Number 9 is reappoint Fred Dockery and Richard Vendetti to the Shrimp AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition? Seeing none, Motion 9 stands approved.

Motion Number 10 is reappoint Robert Johnson and appoint Manny Herrera to the Snapper Grouper AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 10 stands approved.

Motion 11 is appoint Deidra Jeffcoat to the Snapper Grouper AP and readvertise a Georgia open seat. There was a desire to, at least with regard to Georgia, to balance representation better between commercial and recreational, and there was not an available person, I guess you would say, to sit in what was -- It is an open seat, but there was a desire to put a commercial person in there, and, for that reason, the motion was made to readvertise that seat. **With regard to Motion 11, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition? Seeing none, Motion 11 stands approved.**

Motion Number 12 is appoint Dewey Hemilright to the SEDAR Pool AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 12 stands approved.

Motion 13 is appoint Terri Beideman to the SEDAR Pool AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition? Seeing none, Motion 13 stands approved.

Motion 14, we have already discussed, but it's have staff develop options to allow for fishing representation on the Law Enforcement AP and the Information & Education AP. Hopefully staff will bring this back to us in June.

DR. MACLAUCHLIN: If it pleases the council, we may be addressing the AP selection again in September. Would it be okay if we were to modify that so that we could address this during the September meeting, or would you prefer to keep it in June?

MR. BELL: Under options, they were thinking of all kinds of options, and so that's a good approach, in terms of the LEAP.

MR. BREWER: Would you like it in June or would you like it in September? My thinking is if they come back to us something that we can deal with in June, and then maybe we can appoint the people in September, which is where we're going to be doing appointments again anyway.

MR. BELL: There was some discussion of maybe trying to get them together again before June or something. I know Gregg had mentioned that, and so it might work out just fine for June.

MR. BREWER: If it doesn't, we can always roll it to September, if it's not in place. With regard to Motion 14, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Seeing none, is there anyone opposed to the motion? Seeing none, Motion 14 stands approved.**

Motion 15 is the Chair of the AP may serve as Chair for a period of three years, with the option for reappointment. The operative word there is "may". **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, Motion 15 stands approved.**

Motion 16 is change the name of the King and Spanish Mackerel AP to the Coastal Migratory Pelagics AP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, any objection to this motion? Seeing none, Motion 16 stands approved.** Madam Chair, that concludes our report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Chester. The next report is Executive Finance. The Executive Finance Committee met on March 9. We adopted the agenda and the minutes of the December 2015 meeting were approved. We went through the status of Council Year 2015 Budget Expenditures, as well as a draft activity schedule for 2016. Mike Collins gave us an overview of that.

We then next talked about the status of the Council Year 2016 Budget. Gregg provided an overview of the information that we had received at the Council Coordinating Committee meeting regarding funding levels. We are just waiting for the spend plan to be approved, and so we will see a draft budget in June.

We next went over the Council Follow-Up and 2016 priorities, and Dr. Brian Chevront gave the committee an overview of that. Those were approved in December of 2015, and then the final page of that follow-up shows the council's approved priorities for the current year, and we discussed and provided the following guidance. The Allocation Amendment is Dolphin Amendment 10/Snapper Grouper Amendment 44 to look at an allocation tool to allow for in-season allocation shifts, non-permanent allocation shifts.

Golden tilefish and gray triggerfish, to use the abbreviated framework process to update the catch level recommendations and bring this to the June council meeting for final action. We will be receiving those stock assessments in June, and we'll discuss the size limit in June, after receiving the stock assessment results, and try to find a vehicle if we need to make a change to that.

We next discussed standards and procedures for participating in council webinar meetings, and staff hadn't had an opportunity to work on this, and so we will see something on that in June. We received an update on the Council Coordination Committee meeting from Gregg, as well as links to the agenda and materials that are online.

Then, in Other Business, Brian requested guidance from the committee on staff making changes to no action alternatives in all of our amendments, which we agreed to. Gregg reviewed the current council-approved process for the New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils to participate in fishery management plans impacting their areas and reviewed the voting seats that each council has on our various committees, and we agreed that the current process allows for sufficient opportunity for input and no changes were really necessary.

Gregg then reviewed the council staff activities and the major items that staff had worked on from January through early March and we'll be receiving a similar report like that at every council meeting, so that we can provide some feedback. We had a few motions.

The first one was that the council send a letter to Eileen Sobeck, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, indicating the need for funding to the Southeast Regional Office and Southeast Fisheries Science Center to implement headboat, charter vessel, and commercial electronic reporting, and requesting clarification on how much of the \$7-million funds for electronic monitoring and reporting will be available for work in the South Atlantic Council's area, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was for the council to send a letter to Alan Risenhoover, Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, commenting on the Catch Share Program Review Guidance, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to allow staff to modify Alternative 1, no action, for all actions in all amendments as necessary to reflect the true status quo without requiring council approval for each change, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The last thing, as I indicated earlier, that I just wanted us to consider was a choice of amendment approaches for an amendment coming out of the visioning document. We reviewed what those options were, a seasonality amendment considering the shallow-water grouper closure, a second option was having two separate amendments, one dealing with recreational seasonality and retention issues and one dealing with commercial seasonality and retention issues, and a final option is just looking at a retention amendment that would only deal with aggregate bag limits and trip limits, but across both sectors.

I was just wondering if I could get kind of a straw-poll of hands of who would support just a seasonality amendment versus just a retention amendment versus two amendments. I think we can ask staff to look at the amendment slots that are available in that spreadsheet, and if the desire of the council is to look at two amendments, they can simply -- We can come back in June and look at where and how those might be scheduled out.

Who would be more amenable to just Option 1, a seasonality amendment, looking at the shallow-water grouper closure? Just raise your hand. What about two amendments looking at a recreational amendment and a commercial amendment that would consider both seasonality and retention issues? I see a couple of folks with hands raised. What about Option 3, just looking at a retention amendment that would consider retention issues across both sectors? I am seeing heads nodding, but not necessarily full agreement. Does anybody have any thoughts that they would like to share on how to do this?

MR. BELL: Let me just make sure I understood where you were going with this through the options. I mean in terms of the staff availability to handle this stuff, are we thinking like we've got some room for one amendment and so let's just pick which one of these we would really like to move with, as opposed to trying to throw in two right now, which would really overload staff?

DR. DUVAL: It's not that we couldn't do two separate amendments. It's just that they might be offset a little bit in their scheduling. Brian is pulling up the spreadsheet that you all have in the Executive Finance tab. It's Attachment 4b, council priorities, where you can see what available slots there are for different staff members.

There is actually, under Myra's available slots, there are four quarters blocked off for a fisheries seasonality/retention amendment. The purpose here was to discuss how you might want to go about doing that. We went through all the ranking stuff in Snapper Grouper and we talked about three different options. That's what we just reviewed right here, and so I guess what I would like to get from the council is how would you like to move forward?

Do you want to select one approach, a single seasonality amendment or a single retention amendment? Would you want to do an amendment for each sector considering both types of issues? Those were those options that were displayed up there that we saw at the end of the Snapper Grouper Committee Report as well.

Brian has indicated that if we wanted to do two amendments that they would be just offset by six-months, and so you could choose -- For instance, if you wanted to do an amendment looking at the shallow-water grouper closure, which is a seasonality thing, and you wanted to do a retention amendment that would look at both bag limits and trip limits, you could do both. They would just be offset in time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: My vote would be for Option 1 and 3, understanding that they would be offset by six-months, and I don't have a preference for which one of those comes first and which one comes second.

MR. BOWEN: I am going to go on record and say that I urge the members of this council to really address the problem that is causing this whole deal, and that's effort and figuring out how to address that problem with seasonal closures. I was just really disappointed that we went through the visioning process that we did and what came out as Option 1 was the -- In our polling, or however we did it, that the four-month seasonal grouper closure was at the top of the list. I feel like that if we addressed that and take away one of those months, it's just going to be brought back on another month. Again, I would urge the council to really think about what's driving the problems in our recreational fishery, and that's effort, and so I am all for a seasonality amendment. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am 1, 3, and maybe 3, I would lean a little heavier towards that. I am skeptical about splitting the amendments up between recreational and commercial. I like looking at everything as a whole.

DR. DUVAL: Anybody else?

MR. CONKLIN: Since you're wanting input from the whole council, I agree with Charlie. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you. If that's the general consensus, that folks are interested in separate seasonality and retention amendments, it would be good to get a motion to direct staff to maybe look at how to schedule those and what types of items might be in the range of items that might be included in each.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we direct staff to look at a seasonality and a retention amendment, separately.**

DR. DUVAL: It's seconded by Charlie. Discussion?

MR. BOWEN: If we do separate amendments, do we need also now to decide, since there's going to be six-months in between the two different amendments, do we need to decide which amendment we would prefer to go with first, whether it be seasonality or retention? Do we need to decide that now?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Zack, in thinking about this, if the seasonality issue is primarily the shallow-water grouper closure that people are concerned about, I think what we need to do is take some time to figure out if we could get this done in a year or so, which is generally what we're planning on for amendments these days, and what is the best timing to make sure that gets done, so that it can be sent to SERO for secretarial approval and get it done so that there is not a huge lag time between the approval time before it actually affects the regulations.

I guess what I'm asking is perhaps the best way to do it -- Since you've already asked us to figure out what could be in those two amendments, let us also work on the timing, and maybe at June we come back and tell you what the staff recommendation might be to get this done so that the timing works out best for affecting regulations. It's not really clear in my mind at this point what's most advantageous to the fisheries and those participants in the fisheries in terms of which should go first.

DR. DUVAL: I will just remind folks that right now, if you look at that spreadsheet with the scheduling, we're not even scheduled to start taking this up until September, and so we're just kind of doing the pre-planning for this, and so there is still opportunity to think about it.

MR. HAYMANS: Just so it doesn't catch you by surprise, I am going to vote no to the motion, only because I think it's almost impossible to separate discussions of seasonality and retention as we work through these. I mean I would much prefer to see a single discussion on these, and so I'm going to vote no, but I don't want to catch you by surprise.

DR. DUVAL: No worries.

MR. BOWEN: In that seasonality, what would be the seasonality amendment, could I ask for a looking at the, as I've tried to mention before, the recreational actual fishing season, with a start date and end date, along with the shallow-water grouper spawning closure?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I don't see why not.

MR. BOWEN: I would like to go on record and ask for that. Thank you. I mean if we hunted ducks year-round, there would be no ducks left.

DR. DUVAL: We will note that as direction to staff. How about that?

MR. BOWEN: Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Considering Doug's views, and I don't know how Jessica would feel about it, but is it possible to have staff look at both options, whether separate or combined, so when we look at it in June we can figure out which path might work best?

DR. DUVAL: I think we can ask staff to consider whether it would be more efficient to consider those items all together or in two separate documents. Any more discussion? **Is there any objection to the motion, beyond Doug? The motion passes with one objection.**

We are finished with Executive Finance, and now I would like to call Mr. David Alberg, the Superintendent of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary, up to the table for a presentation on that proposed Sanctuary expansion.

MR. ALBERG: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Dave Alberg, and I'm the Superintendent with the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary, and I've been asked to come to speak to you today about a proposal that NOAA issued on January 8 of this year to begin a review of the boundaries of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary. I want to give you a brief presentation here on the proposal and where we stand and, if we've got a few minutes, take any questions that you may have.

As you know, the Monitor Sanctuary was the first sanctuary established in the country, in 1975, off the coast of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. The sanctuary is managed through the Sanctuaries Act under the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, and it is one of only two sites in our system which was designated specifically for the protection of maritime heritage resources. In this case, it was the wreck of the USS Monitor, the Civil War ironclad lost in 1862.

She was famous for her battle at Hampton Roads, Virginia, on March 9, 1862, the first time that two iron warships met, and they fought to a draw between the Monitor and the CSS Virginia, and then was lost later that same year off of Cape Hatteras with sixteen of her crew going down, but the significance of this ship is, of course, that it changed naval warfare forever, and it's certainly important not only to the nation and the role that it played in our history, but also in the role that it played in the evolution of naval ship design for every navy in the world.

We have worked for forty-one years at the Monitor to interpret the story of this shipwreck in the work of the Sanctuary Program, with our primary partner being the Mariners Museum in Newport News, Virginia. In 1998, we began a selective recovery of portions of the shipwreck.

Approximately 200-tons of the shipwreck were recovered, the revolving gun turret, which is the iconic piece that is so important to this story, the two Dahlgren guns, the engine, and about 1,500 other pieces, which were brought up to the Mariners Museum and are currently in conservation.

That was done because we recognized that although this site serves as a war grave off of Cape Hatteras and is important to the nation's larger history, it's also very remote, seventeen-miles off the coast of Hatteras. At 235-feet of depth, very few people are going to be able to get to it, and so the question was how can NOAA, in essence, bring the shipwreck out of the water, both physically and virtually, to tell and share the story with a larger number of people?

So we have done that, not just through the Mariners Museum, but through partnerships with other entities through North Carolina. This is one example of a Monitor Trail System that has been established from Brooklyn, New York, down to Beaufort, North Carolina, with new sites coming online.

In 2013, we laid to rest the two Monitor sailors who were recovered in the turret in 2002. They had been in a facility with the military called JPAC in Hawaii for about a decade, and we worked closely with the Secretary of the Navy and the Department of Veterans Affairs to lay these two men to rest in Arlington, and there are some images of that.

Just specifically within the State of North Carolina, we have provided almost \$2.7-million since 2000 for education and outreach efforts at the Graveyard of the Atlantic Museum and a number of other state facilities and educational facilities, to help tell the story and support the local economies and the heritage tourism of the areas. This is a panel exhibit that's going in at the North Carolina Aquarium on Roanoke Island.

With this Monitor Trail System, it also includes an online video companion that can be got through our website that provides little ten-minute stories about various history topics, from the Monitor to World War II. I am giving you these examples because I think they underscore the purpose and the goal of the possible expansion of the Monitor site, community education and working with local universities that are involved with various research topics off the coast, and also working with the dive community.

This is an example of a program that we have developed called ANCHOR, which is Appreciating the Nation's Cultural Heritage and Ocean Resources, which focuses on the dive community to help promote an ethic of "leave only bubbles and take only pictures", and also to help garner greater support and appreciation for the heritage resources.

We have also done a lot of work beyond just preserving the Monitor, in terms of looking at other shipwreck stories off of North Carolina over the last -- Really over the last ten years. It's been focused on a number of different areas that deal with North Carolina maritime heritage, but one story in particular has really come to the surface, and that's the story and the role that North Carolina played in World War II in the Battle of the Atlantic and the U-boat wars that took place off the coast.

This story is unique in the nation. This battlefield that exists off of North Carolina, with the exception of Pearl Harbor, is the only place in the United States, the Continental United States, where the Second World War came home to the U.S. It includes four German U-boats. It includes

about eighty-nine other shipwrecks, both U.S. military vessels and others, that were lost during this war.

It happens in this place for a number of reasons that are certainly familiar to fishermen, the confluence and number of significant oceanic currents, the Gulf Stream and the Labrador Current, the closeness that the Continental Shelf comes to eastern North Carolina, and the shipping routes that would move through there not only during the Second World War, but historically for hundreds of years, hugging the coastline, and then, in the Second World War, launching off from Cape Hatteras, as they went on to supply the war effort in Europe.

The U-boats liked to operate here, because it was the southernmost point that they could operate without the fear of bioluminescent plankton and algae being stirred up during the evenings as they operated, and it also allowed them security that they could get into deep water fairly quickly, and so, for all these reasons, you get a significant collection of shipwrecks right here in this area.

This is a density model that was done to show the number of shipwrecks related to this conflict that exist in this area, and, as we have studied this over the last ten years, and these are some of the statistics of the losses that were suffered off the coast of North Carolina, we have become more and more moved by the fact that this story is unique to this area and it is also a story that has been lost, in great measure, to many people beyond coastal North Carolina. Most people don't know this story when you get out of that area.

In fact, one of the local fishermen in Hatteras said to us that the fact that most people don't know about this is a testament to the effort of the War Department in 1942 to keep this story quiet, and so we have spent this last seven or eight years doing a comprehensive World War II shipwreck inventory of the ships off of coastal North Carolina.

Twelve of them have been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, which involves the state and a number of other people. It's a publicly-vetted process that assures that they have met the criteria and eligibility for nomination, and we found a number of important shipwrecks. This is a multibeam image of the U-576, which was found two-years ago sitting in about 800-feet of water off of Cape Hatteras. It is the fourth U-boat that was lost.

Our program, as do all the sanctuaries, has an advisory council, and our advisory council voted, in February of 2013, when we released the final management plan for the Monitor -- One of the action plans that was in that management plan that exists now was an action plan to begin looking at expansion. It didn't say that we would do it, but it simply said that we would explore it.

To that end, we formed a working group on expansion and asked them to develop a series of recommendations on how NOAA could approach expansion if we were to go forward. Again, this was not a statement that we would definitely do it, but the action plan said that we would look at that, and this is a timeline since 2008 about the development of the current management plan and how the action plans were pulled together and the role of the working group.

In June of 2014, our working group of the advisory council made four recommendations, which I will walk through here in a moment. They presented those to the advisory council, and in October of last year, the Advisory Council of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary voted to unanimously

forward those to NOAA for consideration. On January 8, as I said earlier, of this year, we began the public scoping process, which we are currently in, on expansion.

The four models that they sent to us, and, again, I am going to walk through these, and I want to start by saying that, although they called these models, I would really encourage you to think about these in terms of conceptual approaches. They do not represent specific geographic areas. They're not tied to specific lines of latitude and longitude areas, even particular shipwrecks, but they represent four different conceptual approaches that NOAA might take.

This first one that they presented to us, Model A, uses an approach similar to the way the Monitor has been managed for forty-years, a single dot placed around a shipwreck. We refer to it as the pepperoni-pizza model. What number of pepperonis get put on this would be determined later on, through the development of a draft management plan and a draft DEIS, after reviewing the public comments, but it represents sort of an expansion of the way we manage Monitor currently.

The second model is a larger, more traditional sanctuary box. You will see two colors there. The purple area represents state waters. The violet color, the pinker color, represents federal waters, and the inclusion of state waters is, again, not a -- That would only be done if there was support from the State of North Carolina, but it is represented on this model. Again, a more traditional model with specific boundaries, and then everything within that box is then managed under the Sanctuaries Act.

The third model was sort of an amalgam of the two. You can, again, see the state waters there in purple, but the green area represents, using the Sanctuary Advisory Council working group's terms, sort of a study area, but it uses the approach from Model A, that we only protect those shipwrecks that have a pepperoni on them, the little circles, and the advantage to this is that if another historic resource were found, and if it met whatever criteria were to be developed through the DEIS and the management plan, that you could add protections to that new shipwreck easily, but the areas in green don't change in terms of regulatory action in any way, other than the areas that have a dot on them.

Then the last model, conceptual approach, that was presented to us were smaller areas, each focusing on a different thematic area, collections of World War I shipwrecks, collections of World War II shipwrecks, and collections of perhaps Civil War blockade runners.

To be clear, the working group did not advocate for any one model over another, and they acknowledged openly that there may be other approaches, and one approach always, as NOAA goes through this, is the do-nothing alternative, where we leave the Monitor exactly as it is, but these models were presented to us for consideration.

They are what went out in the Federal Register during scoping, and I wanted to talk, because I know we've just finished a series of public scoping meetings in North Carolina and Washington, and comments, as I said, will be collected through next week, March 18, although we intend to work with the council as we go forward in the development of our draft documents, but this is really what this is about.

I know that, again, there is concern about anything dealing with greater federal control over waters and where that may impact fishermen in local communities, but, for us, this is not about restricting fishing or restricting fishing activities.

It's about heritage and how we can, the Sanctuary Program, and the work that the Monitor Sanctuary has done and the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, how we can elevate and promote this important heritage that we all are a part of onto the national level, elevate the names of those 1,600 men that were lost during the Second World War and share these stories with others, and I believe it can be done in a way that can strengthen local economies and strengthen local heritage tourism and have very little impact, if any, on the fishing activities that are off of North Carolina.

Obviously the public comments that we've received already will be very important, and we'll be looking at those, and as then begin, over the course of about the next year, to develop a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, draft management plan, and a preferred alternative, and we will continue to keep the council informed.

If we develop any recommended regulatory actions, obviously we would be working with the council on that, but, at this point, I can say that nobody within our working group, nobody within the advisory council, and certainly nobody within our office, has been advocating for anything that would negatively impact fishermen, and, in fact, I think this also represents an opportunity to look at the regulations that currently exist within the one-mile area of the Monitor Sanctuary and perhaps revise those regulations, soften them up I guess might be a better way to say it.

There is some language in there that was developed in 1975 that probably just doesn't make sense, and I think this is an opportunity to take another look at that as well, but, to that point, the assumption has been made that whatever regulations currently apply at the Monitor would then be applied to whatever larger area would be recommended, and that is not the case.

This is an opportunity to relook at all those regulations and say, hey, does this make sense, what we did in 1975? For shipwrecks that have been dove and fished for many, many decades, I don't think that, in many cases -- The concern, for us, is the removal of artifacts. That's what we want to stop.

I know I've dumped a whole lot of information on you here today. I am available at the office in Newport News, Virginia, if there are any further questions, either as individuals or as the council. Please let me know, and, as I said, this is just our first round of public scoping comments. As we develop our final documents, we will go back out for another round of public hearings, once NOAA has developed a recommendation, but, between now and the 18th of March, if there any comments, please feel free to submit them. Dr. Duval, with that, if you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, David. Are there questions for David? I will just let folks know that I did go to the scoping meeting in Beaufort and presented some comments on behalf of the council, namely requesting that we have some representation on the Sanctuary Advisory Council, and, also, the regulations do indicate that the council has the first opportunity to, I guess, develop any fishing regulations within the sanctuary, should they be needed.

David, I was just going to ask if you could just review what the existing regulations are in the Monitor that impact fishing. I believe it's you can't drift over the Monitor and you have to be under power. I think that's --

MR. ALBERG: Yes, ma'am. Again, the regulations that were developed in 1975 were developed with the mindset of how do we protect this historic shipwreck. The first one that might impact fishing is that trawling through the sanctuary is prohibited, for obvious reasons, that it would damage the shipwreck.

There was some other language that was put in there at the time. One in particular that you -- Fishing is encouraged. In fact, we put a data buoy out there to provide fishermen with subsurface current information and weather information. We encourage people to fish out there, but in the current sanctuary is a prohibition on drifting without power through the sanctuary.

Again, the idea was that if anybody is out in the sanctuary and they don't have power on, the concern in 1975 was that they're probably trying to get down to the wreck, and the concern was the removal of artifacts. That regulation still exists. You have to be in power. You don't have to be in gear, but you have to be out there in power. That doesn't make sense to me, and I think that's one of the things that we would like to take a look at through this process, but hook and line fishing is totally allowed, and I think that when we look at any potential expanded area, as I know everyone in this room would agree, the loss of even trawl gear is not anything a fisherman wants to do.

The fishermen off of Hatteras, both commercial and recreational and sport fishermen, know these wrecks probably better than we do, in terms of bottom hangs and their location, and, in fact, we've worked very closely with a number of these fishermen to get the locations and do our research work.

I think that promoting good communication as to where these wrecks are is the most effective way, and promoting the history, to preventing people from doing any damage. I don't think that we really have a concern about trawl fishing in this area, and I think the bottom fishing with a bottom jig and hook and line doesn't pose a threat to these wrecks, and the fishing community has been good stewards of them for many, many years. Those are the current regulations, and I think, again, if there are any proposed regulations that will be recommended through the development of our documents, we would be working with you through that process.

MR. BELL: Thanks, David. That was a great presentation. You kind of covered on some of it. I was curious about what was restricted on the Monitor, and then -- So each one of those potential wrecks is unique, I guess, in terms of its established use, perhaps, by fishermen to date. I know one of the things we ran into years ago off of South Carolina, when we tried to establish a special management zone around an existing wreck, and we were going to prohibit certain types of fishing activities, was -- Back then, NOAA GC advised us that, since there had been established fishing for decades on this area, that we weren't able to do that, but I realize this is a slightly different thing. I mean we were actually trying to prohibit certain fishing types of activities, but I would assume -- Would diving be restricted then on all of these?

MR. ALBERG: No, absolutely not, and, again, we're at a point where we haven't even developed our actual recommendations. I don't have anything to present to you today as to what we're recommending, but I can say that these have been -- These dive locations have been really

important to the local community, and there is no advantage, that I can see, nor any that anybody we've worked with, to limiting access to any of these sites, with one exception, that being the Monitor itself.

I think that there are reasons, and our advisory council agreed, to maintain the current dive permitting system at the Monitor, that one shipwreck, but these other shipwrecks have been dove and continue to be dove, and I think they should be visited by folks, fishermen, divers, and other people, and I don't think that a permitting system is -- There's an advantage to that, but I think that, again, as I said earlier, our concern has been the removal of artifacts from some of these gravesites and from the historic shipwrecks.

As much as it's been about looking at what protections we can offer them, I think, really, most of our thinking has been about what can the Sanctuary Program bring to the table in terms of promoting these shipwrecks. An example that I've given is the National Park Service. If you think of Manassas or Gettysburg, although a component of their action is resource protection, in terms of keeping people from metal detecting and removing things off these battlefields, the vast majority of what those Park Service units do is interpret the landscape and interpret the hallowed ground that lies there and the story of what took place there, and I think that the Sanctuary Program and the work that Monitor has done for more than forty-years uniquely positions us to do the same thing on an underwater battlefield in a way that doesn't impact negatively people, but actually brings a lot to the table in terms of, as I said, heritage tourism and economic development.

MR. BOWEN: Is there currently a no-anchoring provision there, and, if not, I would encourage that provision, but you didn't mention that when we were talking about the current regulations and damaging of the --

MR. ALBERG: At Monitor, there is currently a no-anchoring prohibition. One of the opportunities that has come up a number of times, through our scoping and over the last few years, is people have looked to the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary off of Alpena, Michigan and Lake Huron, as a good example of the fifteen sites within the sanctuary system -- Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary repeatedly has come up as a good example, because there is no permitting required, in terms of getting to the wrecks.

There are no restrictions on fishing. The only restriction there, the big one, is, again, don't take things off of these shipwrecks. What Thunder Bay has done, proactively, is they have implemented, as has the Florida Keys and a number of the other sites, a buoy system or a mooring system for boaters that want to get out to these sites, scuba divers and others.

Obviously the environment off of Cape Hatteras is very different than Lake Huron or off the Florida Keys, but what we have begun to toss around, and there need to be a number of engineering studies done, is perhaps a bottom mooring fore and aft of some of these wrecks.

The way Thunder Bay has done their mooring is that it puts the pressure on the government to protect these wrecks. If you arrive at a wreck within the sanctuary, in Thunder Bay, and there is no mooring ball there, or the mooring balls are occupied, you are allowed to tie into the wreck, as you've done. It doesn't give you the right to damage the wreck. You need to know what you're doing, but the pressure then is on the government to get more of these moorings out there.

I think, in the same way, if we were to implement a mooring system on some of them and begin to do that, we would use a similar requirement, that if the mooring system is there, use it. If there is no mooring system there, tie into the wreck, but do so in a way that -- Make sure you know what you're doing, because sometimes that anchoring can be more damaging than anything else, and I think it's important to know, not only from a cultural resource management perspective, but also from -- Because these wrecks, many times, represent the only real hard bottom off of Cape Hatteras, they're also really important for fish stocks and as artificial reefs. That's a long-winded answer to your question, but I think there is an opportunity to do some really great things in terms of anchoring.

MR. BOWEN: I appreciate the long-winded answer, and that was a great presentation. I was very excited to see it. It was pretty interesting to me. Thank you.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a comment. Thank you for your presentation. I find it very interesting that you're here on this island giving the presentation. I've had a chance to talk to some folks, and maybe some folks who have read the history of this island, but it was the fear of U-boats off the coast during World War II that drove the millionaires off this island, or caused them to give it up and the state to buy it, and so just a neat tie-in.

MR. ALBERG: Yes, that's excellent. Thank you very much.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, David, very much for coming down here. Are there any other questions? Do you all know how to reach David? His contact information is in the presentation, and it's been emailed around to everybody. Thank you and safe travels. The next item on our agenda is the Agency and Liaison Reports. I am going to start over on my left with Jessica, and then we'll move around the horseshoe that way.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I only have three or four items. The amendment, and I can't remember its number, that removed various reef fish species from the --

DR. DUVAL: 35.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and from federal management, our commission is taking up those species, and it's talking about extending the regulations. We'll be doing that at our April commission meeting, which is April 13 and 14 in Jupiter, and you might remember this is for species in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic. The Gulf species were pulled out a couple of years ago.

We also held a snook symposium on January 13, which means that we're going to start looking at some changes for snook regulations. We are doing a big outreach effort right now on redfish, to look at some possible changes in the northern portion of the state for redfish, and then I also have, if anybody is interested, some copies of the most recent *Guy Harvey Magazine*. This particular issue of the *Guy Harvey Magazine* is about the FWC. If you're interested, I have a few copies here, and that concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Jessica. Any questions for Jessica? Moving down to the Regional Office and Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I will just mention one thing, and I think most of you saw it this morning, but we've announced that we're going to have a series of scoping hearings to talk about the possible requirement of TEDs in skimmer trawls, and those will be in North Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama in April.

DR. DUVAL: Any questions for Roy? Seeing none, we will work our way around to this end of the table and Mel.

MR. BELL: Thank you, and I don't really have a lot. I mentioned the cobia bill that we have. It's so close to being done. Basically, the House and the Senate both passed the same bill. One needs to basically be -- One version needs to be ratified, and then the Governor signs it and we were hoping to have our cobia protection for state waters in place before May. That's still our goal.

I would just like to thank Roy and the folks at the Regional Office for the TED compliance that we discussed at the Law Enforcement AP. I appreciate the kind of changes to the policy, or working the policy a little bit better. We're much more comfortable about how that could all work out, in terms of our fishery and all, and so thank you for that. I don't really have anything else.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Mel. Moving on to Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Madam Chair. We are at day thirty-four of our legislature yesterday, with six days left in a forty-day session. I had hoped to be able to report that we were going to have a seafood dealer license at this point, which would help improve our reporting in the State of Georgia, but politics is politics and we'll know over the next six days whether we will have that license in place or not.

A couple of brief deployments coming up. I was querying staff as to exact dates on those, and we haven't gotten there yet. Along those lines, we are one step closer to the Navy TACTS towers off the coast of Georgia being ours. All we're waiting for now is the deployment plan for the approach and the time, and those will be some beautiful new assets to our offshore reef complex.

I guess, finally, I hope you had an enjoyable time in Georgia, and we look forward to hosting this again. I hope you guys enjoy Jekyll, because that's where I'm asking Mike to bring it back to. That's it.

DR. DUVAL: Two thumbs-up. Thanks, Doug. Dewey, our Mid-Atlantic Council liaison.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman. In the Mid, we're working on quite a few things. One of them is the summer flounder amendment. Another one is unmanaged forage fish species. We're working on also looking at some electronic logbook reporting for the charter/for-hire, and also for the commercial, some expanded programs to look at that.

Even though we don't have five-day meetings like you all do here and a wide variety of species to manage and different things -- Our meetings are three days, but I have enjoyed the time here and thank you for allowing me to come participate.

DR. DUVAL: We have definitely appreciated you being here, Dewey. I think all of our liaisons add a lot to the discussion, and it's always good to get different perspectives, and, in particular,

your input is so important, given that we have fishery management plans that extend up into the Mid-Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction, and so we definitely thank you for that. Dr. Laney.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. On the red knot, I did get with our red knot folks, and I am going to report that the critical habitat will not be coming out anytime soon. They're still working on a draft report, and they hope to have it published, and I am supposed to emphasize hope, by the end of this fiscal year, which would be at the end of September.

I will mention a couple other things. Robbie Maxwell, who is with Louisiana Department of Fish and Wildlife, is trying to put together an American eel working group in the Gulf of Mexico. I briefed our Florida council contingent about that, and also our Gulf Council liaison, and so hopefully that will materialize. When we were doing the status review on that species, we had a difficult time finding a whole lot of information about American eels in the Gulf of Mexico or points south, and so hopefully that will result in some data that may give us more information on American eels there.

Then a couple other things I will mention is actually today, I think, the Nature Conservancy is hosting a science experts meeting, a forum, on marine life and Mid-Atlantic regional planning in Baltimore. I let Dewey know about that, rather late, like today, and obviously he and I were unable to attend that meeting, but hopefully we will get information regarding what they discussed and any sort of recommendations that come out of it.

Then, the last thing I will mention is that the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Geological Survey are going to host a workshop focused on Atlantic and shortnose sturgeon. This is going to be held in Shepherdstown, West Virginia on the 16th through the 18th or 19th of May, to discuss and exchange information and foster collaboration among Atlantic and shortnose sturgeon researchers. Right now, I'm planning on attending that, and hopefully Michael Loeffler from your staff may also attend, along with other folks that are working on both species of sturgeon on the east coast, and so that should be an interesting meeting and maybe we can report back at some future date, and that concludes my report, but I see a hand raised, Madam Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: For either Dewey or Wilson, on that forage species, are they changing, with climate change, their migratory patterns as well? Do either of you know?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Some of them, like, for instance, the -- We don't have the croakers that migrate down further south, as we used to. We don't have the bluefish doing that, and so you're seeing some migratory shift in patterns, but some of the main focus things right now for the unmanaged forage fish is we're looking at which species and trying to get a -- Like, for instance, right now, we catch, commercially and recreationally, the ribbon fish, and that was one that was maybe looked about putting on there, and also harvest fish that they catch in pound nets and in the sounds.

They're at the infant stages of kind of teasing out the ones and keeping the footprint and not to look for making more harvest or potential for that, and so just kind of looking at teasing out the ones that we're fishing now, that are known. There's a lot of them that are not known, and so they are seeing some migratory patterns change in a few different species of the fish.

DR. LANEY: Being with regard to offshore, Roger Rulifson at East Carolina and I have a graduate student, Jillian Osborne, who is currently analyzing all of our data from the whole twenty-six-year cruise time series. I have some draft things that hopefully I will be able to share in the future, once we get those finalized, but, from an -- I can't remember, and I don't think she has run the data on what we would normally call the forage species, specifically alewives and blueback herring and American shad and hickory shad.

She has done the analysis for Atlantic sturgeon and for striped bass, and for the striped bass, again, the distribution appears to be shifting further north and further offshore. This year, we had to go all the way to Maryland to find striped bass during the trawling portion of the cruise.

Then, by the time the hook and line trips began, and I will say parenthetically here that Dr. Duval participated in one of our hook and line trips and I understand single-handedly tagged 221 of 225 striped bass that were captured, although her right arm in that regard was Charlton Goodwin, who was actually pulling the fish out of the tanks and then tossing them overboard after they got tagged, and so Charlton did the heavy lifting and Michelle did the cutting with the scalpel.

They definitely are shifting further north and further offshore, and is that related to temperature or is that related to shifting prey distribution? We don't have the data on the prey distribution. We do have the data on the temperature, and Jillian has looked at that and all the other factors, and so hopefully we are -- Roger and I are currently encouraging her to please finish her Masters, so we can get that out in the published literature. She took a new job with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, and so, as always seems to be the case when you have a new job and you're trying to finish up your degree, it's a real challenge, but hopefully we'll be able to report back to you in the future on that.

DR. DUVAL: Don't everybody run away just yet, because we do have a few items under Other Business, but I will just say that, in terms of a North Carolina liaison report, that my big news, as probably everybody knows, is that Dr. Daniel stepped down from his position as Director. He is still employed with the agency. Colonel Jim Kelley, who has been our Law Enforcement Advisory Panel representative, is currently the Acting Director, and I think the department and the governor are looking to fill that position as soon as possible, and so that is my liaison report.

Then we had, under Other Business, we had Spiny Lobster Review Panel and Advisory Panel Meeting. Kari is going to cover that. Dewey wanted to discuss access to fishing areas during seismic testing, and Kim had sent around a document that the North Carolina Coastal Federation has put together regarding seismic surveys, and then Kim wanted to give an update on the Marine Resource Education Program.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I just wanted to let you all know the Spiny Lobster Review Panel will be convened on March 28 via webinar, and that agenda and webinar registration information is in the briefing book. It's also on the website, if you want to listen in.

Then the Gulf Council is coordinating a joint advisory panel meeting of both Spiny Lobster Advisory Panels in Key Largo. That is April 25, and the agenda and briefing book materials are being put together, and the AP is going to review spiny lobsters that have exceeded the ACL and ACT in recent years and discuss some potential management recommendations for the councils.

DR. DUVAL: Any questions for Kari?

MR. HARTIG: Not a question, but the only thing I would say is, if possible in the future, if we could schedule a day between the AP meetings. I can't go to the -- There is no way I can make it work to go to the Snapper Grouper, and I am definitely going to Lobster, since it hasn't been held in so long and it's a joint meeting, and I would like to hear what all those fishermen have to say about what's going on.

DR. DUVAL: Good point. Thank you. Dewey, you wanted to talk about access to fishing areas during seismic testing, and, like I said, everyone should have received via email this several page PDF.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I just don't know how many folks are following this. It was presented to our council a few times, and I've been following it as a fisherman, up and down the coast. I just wanted to pass this along, kind of an FYI. From my stance, as a commercial fisherman, I'm looking at the access to the ocean, and it appears to, which I can't get answers from, that it could be very limited at certain times here.

This paper that's put out here is a little kind of FYI to people, to folks up and down the coast who fish, with some questions asked and also four potential seismic testing boats, or entities there, that have applied for permits, or are in the stages of the permits being -- Getting the permits to do the seismic testing, let alone not even discussion of what the potential effect could be on the marine environment or the animals or the pilot whales or that.

That's something that is kind of above my pay grade. I am looking at access to the ocean, which is one thing, and the second thing is what's going to happen with the fish? Is there going to be something happen to the fish?

Something else that's kind of interesting is I serve on the Pilot Whale Take Reduction Team, and we had a meeting in December. As a member of that team and also as a fisherman, I am held to a very high standard of reaching a potential biological take reduction for pilot whale interactions, and a 12/0 or 16/0 or 18/0 hook in a pilot whale, left in there, is considered a serious injury, and that's a take, which I just tend to believe different, but that's beside the point.

In our industry, in the pelagic longline, I'm held to a standard that could shut me down and take me out of the ocean and take my livelihood away, and, on the other standard, the seismic testers, they're held to a standard that's kind of almost like there is no standard. It's nothing cut and dried. It's kind of like a wavy standard could be possible and, to me, there's just a problem with that.

One sector is held to this standard of 275, and we're trying to reduce our PBR down and different things, and the other side that's looking to use the ocean that we have unknowns about, or don't really know, is going to get access. If any of this area here that your people in your states or fishermen, recreational or commercial, are fishing this area, they probably had better pay attention, because a few of us probably are not going to get access to the ocean, given the gear that we fish and the methodology, and so it's just kind of an FYI. Here is the four maps, and if you have any questions, I would ask that you contact Ladd Bayliss with the Coastal Federation, and there it is. If anybody has got any questions, I can -- I don't know much, but it's about access to the ocean.

DR. DUVAL: Those maps are -- I mean, for folks who haven't seen them, the proposed survey areas span all four South Atlantic states, and so it's pretty extensive.

DR. LANEY: No question, but thanks to Dewey for bringing that to our attention, and I did go ahead and send it to Roger Pugliese and to Lisa Havel, who is the Habitat Coordinator for ASMFC. It is being distributed to all of the Habitat AP members and to the ASMFC Habitat Committee members as well, and both of those bodies are meeting in May, and so it's on the agenda for discussion at both of the habitat groups.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Wilson, for passing that along.

MR. BELL: Dewey, just so you know, this has come up before us before, and, back when South Carolina, as well as other states, was looking -- Our Office of Coastal Resource Management was commenting on it based on compliance with different coastal zone management policies, but Roger was really instrumental on our staff in terms of -- We sat down with our folks and provided them a sense of where the habitats were and what the fish were and what our concerns were related to potential impact on just the fish themselves and all, and so we've kind of indirectly weighed in on this in terms of the data that's out there, but I share your concerns in terms of -- We didn't even really get into what happens when you start restricting people from access. We were kind of basing it on concerns about the resource itself.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I have that concern, but my first concern is access to that ocean, and I just don't see the upper agencies -- Where is the attention this is getting? I mean it's like I'm held to this standard of interacting with a pilot whale or something, and why doesn't everybody else have to be held even as close as accountable? Is it because they've got more money? I just bring this awareness up, and I just hope our industry is going to be able to have access to the ocean during this time, because it is -- When you look at this here in a nutshell, the projects and the different things, it's a lot of area and it's a lot of time and it's a lot of not conducive to pelagic longline fishing. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Dewey. The last update we have is from Kim on the Marine Resource Education Program.

MS. IVERSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to note that the MREP selections have been made for the Marine Resource Education Program. The science workshop is scheduled for April 19th through 21st in St. Petersburg. It will be at the Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, and the management workshop will be October the 4th through the 6th in Tampa.

Mark Brown will be your council representative at MREP this year. I'm looking forward to having Mark participate. I did want to note that Ben Hartig has agreed to be the principal for the MREP program, along with David Webb, who is a recreational angler and member of our Habitat Advisory Panel and part of our plan team membership.

I also wanted to point out to the council, and just a note that I will have a complete report at the June meeting, when we have a little bit more time, and a full overview with your numbers and summaries, but, as we looked around the Citizen Science Workshop and as you looked around the meeting room this week, Ira Lax, who is our Mackerel Advisory Panel Chair; Robert Olsen, who gave you an update on the South Carolina DNR's electronic reporting and is also a member of our

Mackerel Advisory Panel; Deidre Jeffcoat, who was just appointed to our Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel and is also on the MREP Steering Committee; and Dave Snyder, who was here earlier at our meeting this week and serves on our Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel -- I think it would be safe to say that all of them have become involved in the management process as a direct result of the Marine Resource Education Program in the Southeast.

I would thank you for your continued support as part of the visioning project for the continued support for MREP, and I would invite anyone that's interested to please let Gregg and Michelle know if you want sign up for next year to participate. Each council is given one seat at the workshops each year as part of the program. I will have a full update with numbers and summaries in June. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Kim. Any questions for Kim?

MR. HARTIG: Not a question, but just a comment. When you're talking about the realm of participation, we've got Ira in the back of the room. I mean he goes to his first AP meeting and becomes Chair of the AP panel. He comes to our Citizen Science and now he's going to Congress for citizen science, and so it's amazing what people have gotten involved with in such a short period of time.

The other thing I would say is I am going to attend the MREP science module this time. I am going to be an observer. I am not taking a slot. The reason I'm going to go is I would like to become a moderator in that, and I would like to see how the presentations go and, for me, it would be fun for me to be a moderator of that portion of that program, and so I'm going to see how they do it and then possibly do the moderator in the future.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I attended this past February, in January and February, the one that was put on in the Mid-Atlantic, and you know a lot of times when we get into fishery management and the fishermen attend the meetings -- You know you thought you knew a lot more than you did, and I would recommend it to anybody who is getting in it, or is in it, or some of the ones that think they know a lot more and talk a lot more and they really don't, to see exactly how it works.

I mean I think that would be awesome, especially if you've got magazine writers or people who just like to talk a lot. They actually see what's going on. It might not -- You know, this is the way it works, this is the way it should work, and then there's another part of it, the management or the politics of it, that we don't have a lot of -- The politics, I don't have a lot of control over, but I would recommend people going and attending, fishermen, because it was -- I mean I knew most of it, but it was still good and the different people you met there and talking in discussions, and so I would highly recommend it. If you've got a chance to participate, please do.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that, Dewey. We definitely appreciate it. I don't think I've ever heard anyone have a negative reaction, having attended an MREP workshop. It's always been positive, regardless of what region of the country it's been in. Any other business to come before the council?

MR. WAUGH: Let me just touch on meetings. You've got the calendar in there, but there are a few meetings that aren't on the calendar that got scheduled. The Spiny Lobster Review Panel that Kari had some information in the briefing book on, that's being done via webinar on March 28.

The Joint Spiny Lobster AP will be April 25, and then the Snapper Grouper AP is meeting April 26 and 27. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: All right. Anything else? If not, thank you all for your hard work this meeting. I definitely appreciate it, and I will see everybody in June. Safe travels. Thank you to the State of Georgia for a beautiful place to meet.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned on March 11, 2016.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
March 17, 2016

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

VICE-CHAIR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

✓ Chris Conklin
P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/543-3833
conklinsafmc@gmail.com

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

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

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

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

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

✓ Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
919/515-5019 (ph)
919/515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

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

✓ LTJG Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
tara.c.pray@uscg.mil

Deirdre Warner-Kramer
Office of Marine Conservation
OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W.
Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
202/647-3228 (ph); 202/736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

ERIKA BURGESS
DR. BONNIE POWITH
KARLA GORE
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
LEANN BOSARGE
DEWEY HENDRIGHT
IRA LAKS
DAVID ALBERG

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@safmc.net

Staff Economist

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

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: March 2016

Meeting Location: Jekyll Island, GA

Issue: OCULINA EXPERIMENTAL CLOSED AREA EVALUATION REPORT

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MR. HARTIG	✓		
DR. DUVAL	✓		
MS. BECKWITH	✓		
MR. BELL	✓		
MR. BOWEN	✓		
MR. BREWER	✓		
MR. BROWN	✓		
MR. CONKLIN	✓		
MR. COX	✓		
DR. CRABTREE	✓		
MR. HAYMANS	✓		
MS. MCCAWLEY	✓		
MR. PHILLIPS	✓		

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: March 2016

Meeting Location: Jekyll Island, GA

Issue: SYSTEM MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR MARINE PROTECTED AREAS (MP

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MR. HARTIG	✓		
DR. DUVAL	✓		
MS. BECKWITH	✓		
MR. BELL	✓		
MR. BOWEN		✓	
MR. BREWER	✓		
MR. BROWN	✓		
MR. CONKLIN	✓		
MR. COX	✓		
DR. CRABTREE	✓		
MR. HAYMANS	✓		
MS. MCCAWLEY	✓		
MR. PHILLIPS	✓		

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: March 2016

Meeting Location: Jekyll Island, GA

Issue: SG AMENDMENT 36 (SPAWNING SMZS)

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MR. HARTIG	✓		
DR. DUVAL	✓		
MS. BECKWITH	✓		
MR. BELL	✓		
MR. BOWEN		✓	
MR. BREWER	✓		
MR. BROWN	✓		
MR. CONKLIN		✓	
MR. COX	✓		
DR. CRABTREE	✓		
MR. HAYMANS	✓		
MS. MCCAWLEY	✓		
MR. PHILLIPS	✓		

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: March 2016

Meeting Location: Jekyll Island, GA

Issue: CMP AMENDMENT 26

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MR. HARTIG	✓		
DR. DUVAL	✓		
MS. BECKWITH	✓		
MR. BELL	✓		
MR. BOWEN	✓		
MR. BREWER	✓		
MR. BROWN	✓		
MR. CONKLIN	✓		
MR. COX	✓		
DR. CRABTREE	✓		
MR. HAYMANS	✓		
MS. MCCAWLEY	✓		
MR. PHILLIPS	✓		

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: March 2016

Meeting Location: Jekyll Island, GA

Issue:

ESA/MSA INTEGRATION AGREEMENT

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MR. HARTIG	✓		
DR. DUVAL	✓		
MS. BECKWITH	✓		
MR. BELL	✓		
MR. BOWEN	✓		
MR. BREWER	✓		
MR. BROWN	✓		
MR. CONKLIN	✓		
MR. COX	.		
DR. CRABTREE	✓		
MR. HAYMANS	✓		
MS. MCCAWLEY	✓		
MR. PHILLIPS	✓		



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Southeast Regional Office

263 13th Avenue South

St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5505

<http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov>

F/SER2:JCM

3/11/2016

Mr. Gregg T. Waugh, Executive Director
South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405

Dear Mr. Waugh:

I am appointing Ms. Karla Gore to serve as my official designee on the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council on March 11, 2016.

Sincerely,

Roy E. Crabtree, Ph.D.
Regional Administrator





**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council –
March 2016 Council Meeting
Jekyll Island, GA**

Date: Friday, March 11, 2016

Council Session

PLEASE SIGN IN -

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

Name:	Mailing Address/E-mail: <i>(If your information is currently on file, please check the box.)</i>	How do you participate in South Atlantic fisheries? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>	
Bob Connor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe
Leda Dunmore	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe
Lora Clarke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe
Dean Foster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe
Krista Shipley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe
	<input type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe

**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
Charleston, SC 29405**

FRI 11 MAR 16

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Alvarado	Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noaa.gov
Bademan	Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Ballenger	Joey	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Fangman	Sarah	sarah.fangman@noaa.gov
Fluech	Bryan	fluech@uga.edu
Gray	Jefferson	jeff.gray@noaa.gov
Hadley	John	john.hadley@ncdenr.gov
Hudson	Russell	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Kiene	William	William.Kiene@noaa.gov
Knowlton	Ksthy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Mahood	Bob	rmahood@mindspring.com
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Morton	Sean	sean.morton@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Sassorossi	William	william.sassorossi@noaa.gov
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov
Smith	Kimberly	ksmiyh@graypape.com
Stafford	Pete	spstafford@gmail.com
Takade-		
Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Ticco	Paul	paul.ticco@noaa.gov
bohne	reed	reed.bohne@noaa.gov

holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
rindone	ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcouncil.org