

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL SESSION

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 16-17, 2010

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

David Cupka, Chair
Robert Boyles
Mark Robson
George Geiger
Ben Hartig
Lt. Brandon Fischer
Tom Swatzel
Doug Haymans

Dr. Brian Chevront, Vice-Chair
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Duane Harris
Mac Currin
Tom Burgess
Charlie Phillips
Vince O'Shea
Dr. Wilson Laney

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Rick DeVictor
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Anna Martin

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Kari Fenske
Kate Quigley
Roger Pugliese

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dr. Bob Shipp
Mike McShane
Dr. Doug Rader

Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Marcel Reichart
Dr. Tom Jamir
Rita Merritt

Additional Observers and Participants Attached

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman Duane Harris.....	3
Approval of Agenda.....	3
Approval of June 2010 Minutes.....	3
Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.....	3
Presentations.....	4
Public Comment Period.....	7
Spiny Lobster Committee Report.....	33
Mackerel Committee Report.....	34
Ecosystem-Based Management Committee Report.....	36
Law Enforcement Committee Report.....	37
Joint Executive/Finance Committee Report.....	39
SEDAR Committee Report.....	40
Golden Crab Committee Report.....	43
SOPPs Committee Report.....	43
Advisory Panel Selection Committee Report.....	45
Snapper Grouper Committee Report.....	47
Roll Call.....	60
Status Reports.....	61
Experimental Fishing Permit Report.....	63
NMFS SEFSC Status Reports.....	64
Agency and Liaison Reports.....	67
Upcoming Meetings.....	75
Other Business.....	75
Adjournment.....	76

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, Thursday afternoon, September 16, 2010, and was called to order at 1:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Duane Harris.

MR. HARRIS: I am going to call to order the September 2010 meeting of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. Welcome to everybody who is here. Council members, National Marine Fisheries Service, council staff, fishing public, honored guests, welcome to this meeting.

If you will give both the vice-chair and myself some latitude to move the agenda around as we need to do so; and if there is no objection to adopting the agenda with that caveat, then the agenda is approved.

The next item is the approval of the June 2010 meeting minutes. Any additions, corrections or deletions to those minutes? Seeing none, those minutes are approved. Let me just welcome Dr. Bob Shipp, liaison and chairman of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Bob, it's good to have you here today.

DR. SHIPP: Thank you, Duane; I've enjoyed it immensely; I love Charleston.

MR. HARRIS: And Lieutenant Brandon Fischer, welcome, we're glad to have you here representing the coast guard. Vince, it is always good to have you here representing the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Okay, Dr. Doug Rader, we're glad you're here, too.

The next item on the agenda is election of chairman and vice-chairman for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. Robert.

MR. BOYLES: I would like to make a motion that we elect David Michael Cupka as chairman for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MR. HARRIS: You have heard the motion; is there a second? Seconded by George Geiger. Are there other nominations for chairman of the council? George.

MR. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I move that we close the nominations and elect Chairman Cupka by unanimous consent.

MR. HARRIS: Is there any objection to that unanimous consent? David, congratulations, you are now the chairman of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you very much, I really appreciate that. It seems like I've been in this spot at least one other time if not more, but I look forward to working with each of you. We have a lot of challenges ahead of us and I hope we will move ahead to meet those and have a successful couple of years coming up. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Bob and let him do the vice-chairman election.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Chairman, I will let you do those honors.

MR. CUPKA: The floor is open for nominations for the vice-chairman. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: I'd like to nominate Dr. Brian Chevront from the great state of North Carolina as the vice-chairman of the South Atlantic Council.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we have a motion; is there a second? We have a second from Mr. Geiger.

MR. BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the nominations for vice-chair be closed and Dr. Chevront be elected as vice-chair by unanimous consent.

MR. CUPKA: Without objection, congratulations, Brian, you're vice-chair.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I don't know what all I've gotten myself into here, but I'm actually looking forward to doing this for the next couple of years and working more with the council and the staff, especially, as well as the rest of the council members. I appreciate the fact that my fellow council members have entrusted me with this great responsibility.

MR. CUPKA: We have some presentations, and I'm going to call on Duane to make several of these. Before we do, I want to make one myself. We've been very fortunate to have Duane as our chairman these past two years as we've struggled to implement some of the provisions of the Reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act and to deal with the issue of red snapper.

I've attended virtually every meeting of this council since it was formed in 1976, and I've been a voting member since 1992. I can only recall two other issues that rise to the level I think that we've have had to deal with on red snapper. The first of these was when this council was the lead council on the development of a five-council FMP for swordfish, and that was a lot of fun. The second time was when this council took action to ban the use of fish traps in the southeast, which as you can imagine was a little contentious itself at the time.

We have really been fortunate to have Duane. I can guarantee you that no one sitting at this table or no council member wanted to take the actions we had to take on red snapper, but a majority of us felt like we had to at the time based on the information we had. We have been real fortunate that Duane was in the position that he was in. He has done an outstanding job representing this council before the fishermen, not only the fishermen but all the stakeholders involved with the news media and even the U.S. Congress.

Duane, on behalf of the other council members, I want to thank you for your outstanding service and your leadership during these past two years. I want to present you with this small token of our appreciation for your service and your commitment and to thank you for a job well done.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you very much. If I could just take some personal time to say a few things, I appreciate those kind words, David. David and I have worked together for a lot of years both on the council and off of the council. There is not a better person to have serve as your vice-chairman than David Cupka. He was always there when I needed him and he is always willing to go to meetings that I either was not willing to go to or could not attend; and so for that, I appreciate that, David.

The last two years have been trying in a number of respects, but they have been trying to all of you on this council and all the staff. There were a lot of times when I kept you all really late at night and we started really early in the morning and sometimes you didn't get dinner. Usually at 10:30 at night it is a little bit too late to eat dinner.

I appreciate you and your willingness to work those long hours to get the work done that we were required to get done under the Reauthorized Act, so for that I really appreciate all the council members and a special word of thanks to Bob and the staff of the council. You look around the country – and I've had the opportunity to travel to the council chairmen's meetings and to see other councils in operation and in action, and nobody has a better staff and nobody has a better executive director than this council.

All of you, thank you very much for all your hard work during the last couple of years, and it has been hard work. I don't ever remember a time during my service on the council during these terms and previous terms when the workload has been as great as it has been these last couple of years, so I really appreciate that.

The National Marine Fisheries Service, the relationship we have with the Southeast Regional Office and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and all the folks within the agency has been outstanding. Roy, you and your folks are number one, too, and I really appreciate the job that you've done and the willingness to jump in there and serve as the IPT members side by side with the council staff to get the job done that has had to be done.

You know the job wouldn't have been done had we not had this kind of a working relationship with you and your folks, so I really appreciate that. To the members of the public, I think we have had some tough times recently. I think yesterday was a good example and last night was a good example of I think we're kind of coming together and realizing that we're all in this together. We're not enemies.

We've got a job to do under federal law. This federal law doesn't give us a lot of leeway on occasion. As long as we all understand each other and we all continue to try to work together, which is what I think is happening now more so than ever before, so I appreciate people like Bill Kelly and other folks within the audience from the fishing community. I really appreciate the working relationship that we have with all of you, so thank you very much.

With that, I'll simply stand up and make a presentation to the new chairman, David Cupka. David, for your distinguished service as vice-chairman of the council for the last two years, September 2008-September 2010, thank you very much. (Applause)

Lovely Rita, will you come forward. I've asked David for the honor of doing these other presentations because I just think it is my right, and he said it is okay. Rita, this is proudly presented by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to Rita Merritt for her distinguished service as a council member and outstanding contributions in the conservation and management of our nation's marine fisheries resources, 2004-2010. You have been a great council member and we're going to miss you. (Applause)

MS. MERRITT: Thank you, everybody, it has been real but not always really good. I don't miss the late nights, but I will miss our close relationships that we've all gotten here. We've all learned to respect each other and our different perspectives and our different ways of getting to the same conclusion, which is to try to save the resource and have a future for all of those who want to be a part of harvesting from the ocean. I just want you to know I think the world of you and you're all such hard-working people on the staff, too. It is a great staff to deal with. They just never say no. Thanks again.

MR. HARRIS: Dr. Doug Rader. We have been extremely fortunate to have Dr. Doug Rader chair our Habitat and Advisory Panel for 13 years, starting in 1997 and concluding this year. I'll tell you what; we've accomplished a tremendous amount on habitat issue because of his leadership as the chair of that advisory panel. Doug, we're going to miss you; we hate to see you go. You've been a great friend and thank you for all you've done. (Applause)

DR. RADER: Those of you that know me know for sure that I'll never pass up the chance to hog a microphone. I'll keep it short, mercifully. I was going to say that when Roger called me and said that we were going to do this in September in Charleston and that I didn't have to worry about making a reservation because we always seem to co-occur with hurricanes in Charleston in September. Lord knows the Atlantic tried with Igor out there churning towards Bermuda.

I'll keep it really short. I want to recognize the unbelievable teamwork that has gone into building America's best ecosystem-based management system in the U.S. Southeast. If we could just get some money out of Congress to help solve some of the data issues and other things, we could get the rest of the way there.

I do want to encourage you, as you move past the small distraction that Congress imposed with ACLs and AMs, to always think about the shared ecosystems that we all together cherish and that we all together work hard to manage and think about how every decision that you make fits into that broader agenda in the southeast.

It is actually my loss and not yours for me to move on because I absolutely loved working with old friends and new at every single meeting. I'll be hovering in the background lurking and trying to help in any way that I can. I know that you know that EDF remains present in the southeast and the Gulf, trying to knit those things together. I'm sure you all know Heather Paffe back in the back who is the leader of EDF's team in the Gulf and the South Atlantic and has taken up the torch from me and Dan Whittle very ably.

We look forward to many, many years of working together with fishermen, with managers, with scientists and with private citizens to make sure that this remains the best fisheries management system in the country. Thank you, Duane, and thank you, David. We look forward to many years of similar work in the future.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Doug. All of you know that we have a key staff person who has decided to jump ship and go to work for the National Marine Fisheries Service. That is the council's loss and their gain, but it is our gain as well because he will still be around helping the South Atlantic Council out with the issues that we still have to deal with. I told Bob I wanted

him to do this, but I just wanted you to know that we had a little roast the night for Rick. I just have one last thing to say before I turn it over to Bob and that is “reel down, Rick, reel down”.

MR. MAHOOD: Well, Rick, we gave you the big collage of pictures to put on your wall down in the southeast, so we got you something to put on your desk. We hope you will be able to utilize it and make sure they’ve got the temperature right and you know what time you need to be in the office in the morning. Congratulations, but we know where you are. (Applause)

MR. DeVICTOR: Just a quick thank you. I thank Bob and staff that I worked with and a special thanks to Gregg for – I can still remember when you told me “you’ll be taking over snapper grouper”. And, well, two species, that’s not bad at all; I can do that” (laughter), and my life has never been the same since, but you will know where I am so I’m just a phone call away. Thanks to everyone; I appreciate this. (Applause)

MR. CUPKA: Okay, that concludes the presentations. The next thing on the agenda is the public comment period in which we give the public an opportunity to comment on any items that are on our agenda or just any item related to fisheries that they’re interested in. I think we have asked people to sign up to speak. We have set aside an hour for this. We have about 15 or 20 so we’re not going to keep you to a certain time period, but we’d ask you not to run on forever. All right, the first person I have on my list this afternoon is Henry Feddern. Henry will be followed by Kerry Marhefka.

DR. FEDDERN: For anyone who doesn’t know me, my name is Henry Feddern. I have a doctorate in marine biology from the University of Miami. I have been in the marine life fishery for aquarium organisms for over 50 years. As a result, I can see the fisheries from both viewpoints, as a scientist and as a fisherman.

I want to bring the council members up to date on the gorgonian fishery. In the last SSC meeting the members, using a more practical method of characterizing small fisheries, characterized the gorgonian fishery as small. In terms of the individual species, I made some counts and was able to guess the catch rates of two species – these were *Pseudopterogorgia elizabethii* and *Muriceopsis flavida* – with a catch rate of 0.002 percent and 0.004 percent, respectively, of the standing stock in the Florida Keys alone.

In terms of overall species, the catch rate was one colony per half a million colonies present. As a result of this data and the new method of analyzing small fisheries, the SSC agreed to keep the gorgonian harvest at status quo. During the last council meeting, a member proposed that the gorgonian fishery ACL remain at 50,000. This could not be done at the time because the April SSC recommendation was below this. The council can now do this based on the last SSC recommendation.

The council is also considering giving management to Florida. This initially seemed like a good idea since it would unite the gorgonian fishery with the remainder of the marine life fishery. However, almost the entire fishery is within the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary. The Sanctuary allows the harvest of the current amount of substrate around the base of a gorgonian

because the regulation was grandfathered in. If the council transfers the gorgonian fishery to Florida, this regulation disappears.

Florida's request to the Sanctuary to retain the status quo on substrate will probably be rejected since the council cannot allow substrate harvest. Harvest without a little bit of substrate would result in injury to the gorgonians, thus defeating the purpose of harvest, which is to harvest healthy marine organisms for marine aquariums.

It may be possible for the council transfer the fishery together with its current regulations intact to Florida, but the council would have to get the Sanctuary to agree with this or to officially allowing the current regulation of substrate to continue. Myra and Mark have told me that the Sanctuary has agreed to continue the gorgonian substrate regulation unchanged.

In this case the marine life fishermen would be in favor of removing gorgonians from the Coral FMP and giving management authority to Florida. Thank you for allowing me to present my information, ideas, comments, concerns and suggestions to you and for incorporating these in your decisions. I wish all fishermen would do that. If they help you, you can help them. Thank you.

MS. KERRY MARHEFKA: My name is Kerry Marhefka. I am the wife of a commercial fisherman out of South Carolina, Mark Marhefka; and a former staff member for the council, for those of you don't know me. Really briefly, Mark is offshore. He just wanted to see if you guys would consider including in the Amendment 9 Regulation Amendment an option for a higher trip limit for vermilion snapper.

This morning I saw the highest limit I believe is a thousand pounds. He had asked me to come here asking for 2,000; but when I looked at the number of trips, it looks like 2,000 won't really extend the season that much longer, which is what we're looking for. If it's possible to look at a 1,500 pound trip limit for vermilion snapper and it might extend the season somewhat, that would be much appreciated.

Obviously, it's because we're looking to decrease the derby fishery. Once that fishery opens, after the first week or two there is a big price glut. It is a lot of uncertainty for us. When we catch that much fish at that time, we have to sell our fish on consignment, which means we don't know what we're going to get for our fish, and it means we have to wait longer for our money.

To the extent that we can extend the season and not have that derby fishery happening, we would really appreciate that. We do realize that it is beneficial to the bigger boats if there is no trip limit because they can take four to six guys, but most of us smaller boats really need to have this trip limit in there to extend the season. I know you guys have all this time on your hands and you're not doing anything; so to the extent that you can speed up the development and implementation of that amendment would be incredibly economically helpful for us for vermilion snapper. That's it.

MR. KELLY: Mr. Chairman and members of the council, Bill Kelly. I'm the executive director of the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen. For the record, I'd just like to say the

Florida Keys fishermen love Rita Merritt and we really appreciate her dedicated service to all of us over the years. I wanted to address you on a couple of issues. First, spiny lobster – a lot of this we submitted in writing, but I just wanted to make the point that the release mortality in the spiny lobster fishery through the use of undersized lobster as attractants is 10 percent, and that is the lowest in all of the managed fisheries under the council's jurisdiction.

Most of them average 20 to 30 percent. Also, the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute in the Keys has recently indicated in some of their reports that the escapement from these traps could be as high as 4.6 percent. They're finding these figures dating back as far as 1981, but they just had not been published prior to this.

With regard to lobster fishing, we are conducting experiments right now ongoing with experimental lobster traps to reduce their movement. We have examples now in sample traps that have reduced movement up to 80 percent. We're now testing them for their bycatch fishability and durability; and when we have that information calculated, I'll bring it to the council. Hopefully when you have a meeting a little bit closer to the Keys, I'll bring some of those traps. We will be able to display them and show that information to you.

I also want to talk to you about the accountability measures in Mackerel Amendment 18, which we sent to you back in May. We think we can really fine tune this to within as much as 10,000 pounds on a very high-yield fishery in the Southern Sub-zone Gill Net Fishery, but we need some cooperation from the councils.

We have asked the Gulf Council and we have asked you now formally to help us eliminate five latent permits in the gill net fishery because they represent up to 23 percent of the total harvest that could take place. If we can secure them and get them retired, then we can really fine tune the accountability measures as outlined and presented to you both in May and in comments that I just sent in for this meeting.

And then the third and final issue that I would like to address would be information that was supplied in the briefing books for you for this recent council session, and they have to do with Attachments 10, 11 and 12 on catch share programs. One of them was presented as being industry representative from the Florida Keys in particular and specifically a snapper grouper catch share program for Key Largo.

I happened to be at that meeting. There were a total of ten commercial fishermen and/or representatives there. Out of the ten, after we heard the presentation that was put on by the Environmental Defense Fund, eight of us said that we had no interest in this program, and we left the meeting. Two of these commercial fishermen stayed there and along with five Environmental Defense Fund representatives formulated the catch share program that was presented to you today.

I just want to remind the council that there are 1,272 saltwater products license holders in Monroe County; 1,033 restricted species holders, and 259 reef fish permit holders. These two fishermen are hardly indicative of the industry. I can't tell you how many calls I have received, Bob Jones and other people and said exactly what Mr. Swatzel said this morning – did we miss a

meeting, what is going on, is this an official council document? Now, this is a fact; I'm not making this up.

I want you to know that the two poster boys for the Environmental Defense Fund that helped put this package together that you saw today are both double reef fish permit holders. Again, I'm not making this up. They fish out of Key Largo. One of them has a jet ski screwed to the overhead of his boat to account for the second permit. The other one has a John Boat about 14 feet in length, aluminum, that is bolted to the top of his boat.

When they go out amberjack fishing – the limit is a thousand pounds, but for those two guys it's 2,000 pounds; so when they come back to the dock they have double the limit and all their buddies are all in early. Now, here is the part that is conjecture and maybe it defines that snapper grouper Key Largo catch share.

The guy that has got the jet ski on his roof has got room for two more, so he is going to buy himself a couple more permits and he will have four. But the guy with the John Boat is really thinking ahead because he can nest those John boats and he figures he can stack them about 15 or 20 high before his boat is going to roll over.

So what he is going to do is he is going to let the guy with the jet ski buy a couple more permits. Then he is going to buy up all the other guys and put them out of business. Now he is a shrewd thinker so what he is going to do is he is going to – now that everybody is out of work he is going to lease those John Boat shares to the guy with the three jet skis because he can't get anymore shares.

He is going to sit up on the top John Boat with his shareholders, which just happen to be from Environmental Defense Fund, and they're going to sit there and wait for a dividend that they're going to get by leasing those shares to the guy with the jet ski who has now hired all the people that were put out of work. That is your Key Largo catch share.

Now, I don't know how you will control the information that you get; but when you get things like this that are so totally misrepresentative of our industry, it really reflects badly on the council and it has a widespread impact throughout the fishing industry. I would urge you to do everything that you can to ensure the veracity of the information that you're getting so that we don't have issues like this in the future.

We're very willing as an industry to work with the council to develop programs that are beneficial to the fishery and to the industry. Quite frankly, we cannot tolerate this kind of misinformation that is so detrimental to the industry and so many livelihoods. Thank you very much.

MS. MERRITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. I'd like to start out apologizing that I wasn't here early enough to hear all of your deliberations. I'll make a few brief comments and then follow up in writing. I would like to address in retrospect Mr. Kelly's comment. I love the Florida Keys as well, but I hope they spread the love to Tom Burgess. Tom, I really respect you and hope that you have a good run with the council.

Okay, wreckfish, in the options paper that was in the briefing book, it has not been clarified as to what exactly defines an update to an ITQ Program versus a full redesigned which now becomes a brand new IFQ. I would like for the council to consider the recommendations by the wreckfish shareholders workgroup and that you not take action to completely redesign this IFQ; that you leave it pretty much alone and just bring it up to date with what Magnuson requires. There are a number of reasons for that.

Personally I think that there is enough on your plates trying to come into compliance with Magnuson than to have to go through a complete redesign at this time; and, particularly because there isn't an up-to-date assessment and there hasn't been for a very long period of time. It's only going to be I think two years before there will be one, and that I think will be the appropriate time to do a full redesign if required based on the assessment.

Here again I'm going to be a broken record regarding the SSC. This comes from many years of dealing with human relations and human resources work. I just am so disappointed that there is not enough emphasis given to the science behind socio-economic impacts. The science of behavior, the science of managing people's behavior as well as the management of fish does intertwine.

I know it is a hard science for people to understand, but it is one that can be managed by objectives that result in being able to measure productivity and quality. It is a science and I think it should get more attention when it comes to the SSC recommendations. Under catch shares, this morning Roy helped clarify something in my mind. When you were talking about the options paper, one of the items I thought should be in an option as a catch share would be a tagging program. I think, Roy, you thought that would be a true catch share program.

And along with a tagging program, maybe even there have been conversations about lotteries and auctions and that kind of thing, so that may be another item or three items to be added to the options for possible catch shares. The catch share program has always, to me, had a few flaws in it that I think need to be addressed.

I think if you're going to do it right, you need to clean house first on your permits. I've brought this up in the past. I think that permits should be handled with some sub-categories. Defining the true picture of permit holders has always been difficult for this council, and I've never really understood why because you either have a permit or you don't have a permit rather than having permits that may be inactive.

Lots of conversation has surrounded the word "professionalism", professionalizing the fisheries. Well, there are a lot of professions in the world that have licenses or permits, if you will. Very often they have inactive status or they have a status where they can be inactive for a variety of reasons for some period of time without losing it but being given credit for that period of time.

I think this would also help with not having to make decisions regarding what reasons are good and what reasons are not good. This pretty much puts it back on the fisherman to apply for an inactive status and just follow the regular reapplication for renewing a license but putting it under this different category.

I guess it is a little premature but there are two other items under catch shares that I would like to see addressed at some point that if a catch share program is being set up that you be wary of this problem that is occurring up in the northeast with choke species, to not set yourself up for that potential problem. Another one would be that you always have a dissolution plan. I haven't seen any having a dissolution plan. If you'll notice, this is one of the options for wreckfish at this point, that it be dissolved. Well, at least in that particular one how do you dissolve and what is the right thing to do to dissolve? Well, if you think about it in advance, then you don't have the problem if that does come up.

Under king mackerel, I heard last night a problem with data, and with king mackerel there always seems to have been a landings' problem of some kind, how it is counted, where it is counted and that sort of thing. I would encourage you to get that cleared up before you go much further. The AMs that are in place I think are good. It's a healthy fishery.

I think that doing an assessment as a higher priority is not really necessary when there are so many other fisheries that have some difficulties or are way past due on an assessment to be put first. Then finally on king mackerel, I do believe state by state is the way to go; and if not, to go regionally. At least in North Carolina we know what we're doing and we know how to manage it and we're ready to go forward. If the other states can't, then bundle them together.

And then just an administrative note; coming in as I am no longer on the council, I noticed it was difficult to follow the online audio without looking at the screen; and then when you look at the screen, if you get distracted even momentarily you lose – well, now what are they talking about, which particular motion is this related to?

I think just from an administrative standpoint, you see it happening even in this room when we're supposedly knowing what is going on, we lose track of which species are we talking about; so I would like to ask that when you do put motions on the screen, that you somehow identify exactly what species or item that you're talking about.

Rather than just referencing an alternative, you might want to say, "Alternative 2 of the such and such". I know that's extra work, but it may help to keep people from being confused and oftentimes thinking that we've got something on the table that is related to something else. Thank you so much for your time and I look forward to continuing to work with you.

MR. RAU: My name is Howard Rau. I'm a golden crab fisherman and a member of the Golden Crab AP. I believe the golden crab fishery is now ready to move into a new level of management of catch shares. By instituting a LAP Program, I think a great deal of stability can be gained not only in the fishery but also in the marketplace.

It is can be looked at as a professionally run fishery with a sustainable product that will certainly make a good impression on today's consumers. This would allow golden crab fishermen to obtain higher prices for their crabs while supplying the end user with a quality item. Therefore, I would like to recommend that the council move forward with a catch share program for the golden crab fishery.

MR. KREBS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and congratulations on your new promotion there. My name is David Krebs. I am from the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic. I have a fish house in Sebastian, Florida as well as Destin, Florida. I am a quota holder in the Gulf. I am here under the invitation of some North and South Carolina friends that want me to express my appreciation that this council will continue to consider catch shares as a management option. We went through years of size limits, closed seasons and derby fishing in the Gulf before we got it right. The only other thing I would ask is that in any decision that you make in a catch share design is that you make sure you include a referendum so the stakeholders will have an opportunity to vote it up or down. That's it; thank you.

MR. FEX: I'm Kenneth Fex. I am on your advisory panel for snapper grouper. I attended a state meeting, the first one I ever did. Mac wasn't there that evening. It was a public scoping and there were a few comments made a couple of divers that brought up some controversy in our area. Some divers' effort shift come up our way, so I want to answer.

One diver stood up and he's like, well, our fishery is really clean, we have no bycatch, and all this and all that. Well, then, the next one got up and says, "Well, I think we need to keep bang sticks in our fishery because sharks come up and take our fish and then they come up after us, so we need to use it to protect ourselves."

Well, under a bycatch issue I thought predation was a problem, so I don't know which one is the bycatch, the fish or the shark that gets killed. I just wanted to bring that to your attention because divers stand by that like there is no bycatch. They did bring a big controversy for the local fishermen. They weren't really happy with them guys coming this way or whatever, but it seems like their landings were pretty high than normal for the local fishermen, especially since they're not familiar with the area.

I usually come to the council and speak of fairness. I looked at my federal logbook. I really wasn't offended when the longliners wanted an endorsement, and then all of a sudden the black sea bass guys wanted to keep trap tags where they could keep me out of the fishery. Well, neither one of them I can get into, but they can use bandit gear.

Well, now the divers, they have become pretty productive; and when I see now you're going to put a closed area off of Georgia and Florida and now you're going to allow them to be in that area but not me, so I think it is kind of unfair. You're about ready to close an area that I personally can't fish in and you're going to give all these other gear types all these specifications, and then you're going to mandate me a circle hook that is going to set me back on my catchability level. I didn't think that was very fair.

What I would suggest – and this is just a suggestion I think a lot of times – I think you might consider dropping that depth contour out to 120 out to 300 feet. The rationale; the council is looking to protect the red snapper. Well, red snapper don't have issues for barotrauma until 130. Well, that is outside the 120. Also, the black sea bass fishermen don't go traps past 110. Normal divers don't dive past 120 unless oxygen is changed.

I think you would get a lot more benefits if you went ahead and set the area out to 120 and allow no fishing unit. It would also be easier for enforcement and for the coast guard because they wouldn't have to figure out what boat was in there doing whatever. Another suggestion is pull your gear type.

Whether you want to dive for the trip or whether you wanted to longline, whatever you do, go ahead and specifics your gear type; so when you go fishing and you're going to go diving or you're going to go bottom fishing or you're going to longline or you go trapping, so that will be fair and it will be easier for the enforcement level. Also it would be good for recording because on this federal logbook you've checked in what you're going to do for the trip.

If you do both of them, sometimes it might be misreported. That will become an issue; because if you're going to do accountability measures – and divers claim they don't have no bycatch; black sea bass fishermen have less bycatch and that I have this great bycatch because of my hook and line, so I think out of all fairness I think you might want to suggest one of them ideas as an idea. I thank you for your time.

MR. BROWN: My name is Mark Brown. I'm from here in Charleston. Many of you know me. I own and operate a charter/headboat and I commercial fish, too. I'm here on two different issues. One, I'm also the vice-chair of the Recreational Fishing Alliance of South Carolina. I was asked to also deliver a message from the Recreational Fishing Alliance National. That is that the Recreational Fishing Alliance, which is a national organization located in almost every state in the nation, does not support catch shares and does not support sector separation. I was asked to deliver that message.

And then on a separate issue, as an individual fisherman here locally, I wanted to make some references to different things that I've heard over the last couple of days. One of them was what Rita had mentioned. When I sat through the meeting yesterday, I was having a hard time following a lot of the things just because of the references to the PDF documents and how everything was laid out.

It was hard for me to understand what you were talking about a lot of times, so it would be beneficial to the public and the people that are trying to follow online if it was a better reference to what you were discussing or talking about. Maybe that would keep my eyes from rolling around in my head when I was trying to follow you. It was difficult for a lot of people because I asked a lot of people about it, and it seemed like it was the same situation.

Another thing, too, is we discussed a couple of things at the Q&A yesterday. One of the things that I wanted to make a reference to was the barotrauma and the red snapper. I really feel like that more studies need to be done on that as soon as possible. I know that there are past studies that have been done on the issue with the release mortality. Even though we only produce in documents 11 percent of the recreational and commercial landings of red snapper, we had a banner year this year on them. We caught a lot of red snapper, a lot of big red snapper.

We vented all of them and let them go and all of them went back down. I watched all of them swim completely out of sight. For me to believe that there is a large percentage of those fish

dying, I just have a hard time believing that because, like I say, when those fish hit the water they went straight back down. I believe that there is a large percentage of those fish that are surviving.

I know that when we catch some of these fish, too, that they have large wounds on them sometimes. There can be fish that have humongous bites out of them or have some type of damage to the outside of them that I know some of it has to penetrate their insides, their internal organs. We catch those and it is all healed over and the fish look fine.

I'm thinking if they can survive either a big bite or a big gash in them, us venting them with a small venting tool and letting them go and watching them go down, there has got to be a large percentage of those fish that survive. I would ask the council to please look into recommending maybe some more barotrauma studies as soon as possible so we can kind of relieve the idea of whether or not there is a large release mortality or not. Also, I'm trying to understand the ACLs and how everything works with the dolphin and wahoo. I brought that up yesterday in the Q&A.

I think my biggest concern is that this falls into another issue with Magnuson-Stevens. We've got these ACLs and the AMs that were put into the Magnuson-Stevens and reducing the timeframe for everything to be met, and it is just another bullet that comes out of this document or out of this law that constantly comes back to haunt us, and it's forcing the hands of the regulators and the managers to have to do things in such a short period of time without good science and without good funding, without understanding what is going on with the fishery.

And it is hurting us, it is hurting us a whole; not just me but the northeast fishermen all the way down, and we need some relief. We need Magnuson to be – we need some adjustment to it, some more flexibility put into this law. That is why I joined the organization that I got involved with because they have political action people that are in Washington. They're lobbying up there on a daily basis, and we're trying to see if we can get some changes made. I hope that I can continue to work with the council on a close basis and be able to talk to you and understand what is going on, and maybe we can get through this and not see a lot of people hurt.

MR. SCHOOLCRAFT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to address the council here. At our last Mackerel Advisory Panel one of the issues that we discussed, which is in this options paper in Amendment 18, is the division of the quota into regions or states. I am still a high supporter of a state-by-state quota. That being said, regional would be my next choice on it.

I would like to add, though, for consideration of this part of my presentation to consider North Carolina in itself its own region. That would suit a state by – well, my state, our landings, let's put it that way, for what we're landing in a year's time. The precedence is there for these zones and sub-zones. Even in the Gulf, it was brought to my attention that you have these sub-zones that have been allocated certain parts of the king mackerel quota; and when they're reached, you shut down. The precedent to do that is there.

To deny North Carolina our ability because other states don't is not acceptable. We can do this and manage it really well. To that point, like I said, this was discussed in our AP meeting, and it is in the options paper, but it has not been removed. It is not in Appendix B on the back, so it's

still up for discussion. To my knowledge – at your June meeting it might have been started and talked about, but the meeting was adjourned and a real good discussion on this has not been done by the council to my knowledge and certainly it has not been represented back to the AP, which eventually it will.

North Carolina needs our own part of the quota. Some of the numbers and percentages that I have worked out, I'm going to have to lay off on representing because of the data discrepancies between this paper and what the National Marine Fisheries has put out. But what is not disputed on my part and what anybody on the council can see, they can go to North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries Website and pull up the commercial landings. It is by species and years and it goes all the way back to the seventies.

King mackerel-wise, I went back five years on my numbers, and this is North Carolina's numbers. In the last five years we've had a low of nine and a half million pounds – excuse me, 955,002 pounds of fish that was harvested in '03 and '04. The highest number of landings that we've had so far is a little over a million point two pounds. It is a substantial fishery and we're not asking for anything more to take away from any southern states, but we're asking to have this allocation, because it is our historical allocation.

Keep in mind that our season is a short season, four months, and that four months comes at the end of the fishing year. You have closures in your snapper grouper fisheries in January and February. I fish for king mackerel in Wrightsville Beach in January and February. Those guys are shut down. If we lose any part of the king mackerel fishery, which probably it would be in the latter part of the fishing year, it is going to be catastrophic for the guys down south, and that is not acceptable.

This issue needs to be addressed in Amendment 18 and I would appreciate this to be included in Amendment 18. If it is tabled and goes back, we stand to lose out; and like I say, that's just not acceptable. It is a shame that things are coming to this, but the bottom line is fisheries are changing. King mackerel has been managed really extremely well from the get-go, and I think it can be extremely managed well.

Take your time but get in the amendment what needs to be addressed in a real timely manner, and that is this division; you know, dividing the quota up. I would also say two or three years ago we started hearing about this divorce. I would like to see the council go back to that and have discussions on that. It seems like reading the minutes of the June meeting there was a lot of stuff talking about catch shares and a lot of issues that the South Atlantic was not included in or just not kept up to speed on.

I think the division – or, excuse me, the divorce in the two entities would be a lot easier to manage and a lot more productive on both ends. You know, understanding that some of the Gulf guys were looking at catch shares, that is not something that North Carolina wants, you know, and we're part of the South Atlantic. So, take these things into consideration. I would like to present some numbers, but, there again, the data is skewered, and I can't do that at this time. I've been assured that this will be fixed. There again, I would like to see this on Amendment 18, the issue of a state by state or a region. I appreciate your time and listening to my comments.

MR. HARTIG: Don't leave yet. What kind of effort shifts in the king mackerel fishery have you guys observed where you are over the last few years?

MR. SCHOOLCRAFT: The king mackerel fishery, it is not so much in North Carolina. It is the other states. I mean our bottom fishery has been relatively stable. I mean, the trip limits and all that have been – you know, you all have done something with trip limits, size limits, this, that and the other, so that has hurt us, but I can't honestly say I've seen a lot of effort shift from snapper grouper boats into king mackerel. It is all happening down below us. I mean, somebody said there are 1,700 permits out there, you know, around the Gulf. The only number that I have for sure – and this is a real old number – North Carolina holds about 119 of them. Now, I might be wrong on that. I have not searched that out. But compared to the southern states, our mackerel permits is really at the lower end of who holds mackerel permits in North Carolina.

MR. McKEON: Sean McKeon, North Carolina Fisheries Association. It is great to be in Charleston; it's a beautiful town. I am sure you would all think I was being sincere in that statement particularly when you have this kind of weather, my good friend from South Carolina. Coming into this room, I'm not sure you think I'm sincere if I say it is great to be here, but there are some people here that I haven't seen in a while I do miss, particularly my friend Joe here who transcribes our words.

I want to congratulate the new chairman and those that are taking new positions. Brian as vice-chairman from our state; I think that's great. With respect to the new appointment for North Carolina, I did want to address some concerns we had. I was very thankful that today I had an opportunity to talk to Tom just before lunch and let him know that my comments in no way are in any way disparaging on him in his new position. I was thankful I had the opportunity to congratulate him and wish him well and hope that we can work together.

But I wanted to address the process by which Rita Merritt was not reappointed. I'm sure most of you are very familiar with what occurred, but it does – if you will bear with me a couple of seconds to explain what happened. We had a decision for the first time ever in my knowledge and the knowledge of those that have looked into this where a sitting member seeking a third term on the council in good standing, with unanimous support from the state, the governor of North Carolina; the Marine Fisheries Commission of our state, unanimous, both sectors; the industry; two sitting senators, a republican and democrat senator; our congressional delegation, both the republican and a democrat – we had every single bit of possible that you could have according to the process laid out in Magnuson.

Commerce Secretary Locke, in a letter to Congressman Walter Jones, said this in part, “When making this council appointment, I carefully considered governor-produced preference, recommendations by regional staff of the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration and the endorsements of all three candidates received from members of Congress and the public, along with the qualifications of the nominees the governor recommended. Ultimately, I chose Tom Burgess, who I believe will bring a fresh perspective to the council.”

I'm sure he will bring a fresh perspective; he is a new person. But what I would like to say is I think the process has been so violated by what happened that each and every member from every

state should be very concerned when you do your due diligence, when you do the work that you're required to do, asked to do, a process by which you review these candidates and put them up there before the Secretary of Commerce absent some sort of disqualification or an unqualification or absent some malfeasance or something that would disqualify a candidate to be reappointed for a third term, I think all of us better consider that and understand that when the political winds shift – and they will as they always do – people better not come crying when the other side does the same thing. I think it is a travesty that happened and I wanted to come on record and be record as saying that.

And, again, for the sake of emphasis, this is in no way disparaging to Tom Burgess, and I again was very thankful I had the opportunity to talk to him about that. I think we have so politicized this process that the goodwill that is being spoken of and the good faith efforts that people are putting forward becomes more and more difficult when you do what you're asked to do, you do what you're required to do.

There are people in this room who sat idly by and watched it happen and/or participated in that event. I know who they are and I think it is shameful that they would violate the process like this and then come before you and ask for the process to work in their favor or that we must abide by the process. I appreciate you're letting me make those comments with respect. I also want to thank Rita Merritt. We really appreciated her service to us in North Carolina. She was I think very graceful and a credit to the council and a credit to the industry that she was here, and we feel very strongly that she represented us. And not just us; I think she was a credit to the council. I think she was someone who you could count on to be here and to have a very productive and good dialogue.

With respect to king mackerel, I would agree with everything that Kelly Schoolcraft said before me. We have another situation and it sometimes works this way that states are punished simply by geography and dates, and I think that you all understand that. If you could adjust or move in the direction of putting those regional and/or state quotas into Amendment 18 and have a very thorough discussion of that, whether it's changing the November 1 date or whether it is moving around, we would certainly like to see state-by-state quotas.

ASMFC did that for us on dogfish because they realized simply by geography we were being punished. The fish just weren't getting there; and the way it was divided at the time, North Carolina was being punished simply because of where we are geographically. I know you all understand that, and I would appreciate looking into those items as you move forward on Amendment 18.

A couple of quick comments; golden tilefish, it is burgeoning but becoming an important fishery in North Carolina for some of our guys. I was not here for the discussions on that, if there were any, but we'd certainly like to see an opening date of like March/April. As opposed to the current opening dates and/or any other suggested dates, an August date or anything else, we would like to see a March/April date. I think that would give more folks an ability to participate in that fishery.

I wanted to also say that – I forget his name and forgive me for that, but the fellow from the Keys Commercial Fishing Association, I wrote down “bravo” and “dittoes” to everything he said about how some of the Environmental Defense information makes its way into this council time and time again as Gospel.

It is not Gospel and I would hope that those of our organizations in the state and the bulk of the fishermen who are opposed to these have equal access regardless of the fact that we don’t have the resources that organization has to wine and dine and send people all over the country to promote what we consider a horrific idea at this point. Those are my comments and I appreciate you listening to them, and I thank you all. Again, congratulations to all of you who have new positions and, Duane, thank you for your service.

MR. O’SHEA: Mr. Chairman, I know this isn’t a debate, but just for a point of clarification we do not have state-by-state quotas at the commission for spiny dogfish. There was an action taken to set aside a quota specifically for North Carolina, but it did not address quotas for the other states. That is an issue that is currently under discussion at the commission. It is not a done deal at all. Thank you.

MR. GREEN: I’m Robert Green. I’ve been fishing for over 25 years. I have had king mackerel and snapper grouper permits since you started them. I own and operate the Big Daddy and I also own half of the CJR. The way things are right now when you open and close these seasons, you’re causing big spikes in supply which causes drops in prices. My biggest problem with that is when you get these drops in prices, you’re getting less money for your fish, which you devaluing the resource, so to me that’s a waste of the resource.

One of the ways I see to get around this is the catch share program. It will even out the supply and it will even out the market. It is basic supply-and-demand economics. I didn’t go to college and get a biology degree; I got a business degree. It is frustrating to see – and I understand you’ve got to make a lot of decisions and a lot of management decisions based solely on biology; but when you don’t take into consideration the economic side of it, that basically is wasting the resource when we don’t get the money we should for it.

In other words, if I’m getting a third of what I should for sea bass, like when it opened up in June, I’ve got three times last week what I got on the first fish I shipped to New York in June. That means I had to go catch three times as much fish to pay my bills and to make a living. I’ve been doing this an awful long time, and the prices I got back in June went back to when I first started; they were that low just from a glut of fish being on the market.

Ignoring the market side and the economic side of what we do is leading to a waste of our resource. The catch share program is one of the ways I see to even out that; I mean, to even out our supply and our markets to get us a – I mean, the way things are right now we do not have a stable business environment that we can operate in. We’re actually – you know, you don’t know what you’re going to get. Trip limits and all that from an accounting standpoint; trip limits are tying one hand behind your back and trying to do what we do.

The Environmental Defense Fund, they're pushing this catch share program. I was really against it but I kind of figured, you know, I've got a stake in this. I've been doing it so long, I'd better at least show up and be part of the process. I didn't whether I was against it; and I was actually kind of against it when I got there, but after talking to some of the guys from the Gulf and how it worked for them, I think that is a very viable and way to fix some of the things and the problems we have in the fisheries. It really hurts your feelings to get low prices when you think you ought to get more for your fish and you know your fish are worth more.

And then right before the quota is about to be met, the price goes up and you get a lot of money. I mean it's the same fish; we ought to get the same money. Ignoring the economic side of the business is basically wasting the resource. The environmental groups, I've never seen one that ever came up and worried about fishermen. They've always worried about fish. You know, it's like we're not part of the ecosystem or whatever, but we are.

It is disheartening to see the economics and the business side of this stuff being ignored and these management decisions being made without considering that. I understand you have got to deal with that and your decisions have to be made from a biological standpoint, but we really need to get back to not just worrying about fish but the whole fishing business. I mean, what is the point in saving a fishery when we're all out of business at the end of it?

South Carolina and North Carolina and everywhere that has a tourism business, everybody wants to eat fresh, local seafood. We've got competition from imports. I mean, you've already see what it has done to the shrimping business, and it's hard to find local shrimp to eat. Most everything is farm raised and imports now. You're basically going to run us all out of business if we can't make a living at it. There is no point in doing it if we can't pay our bills and make a living. What I'm asking for is basically the catch share program is a way or some means that is going to keep from having these gluts on the market and seeing my fish go out there and be worth less than they should be.

A lot of times we get portrayed especially by certain environmental groups is we go out there and just rape and pillage the ocean, but we're the last people that want to go catch the last fish. I want to go fishing next week, next year, five years down the road. Not only will we be better stewards of the source with a catch share program, I think it will work in the long run. I just want to voice my support for that. I just hope you make it a little bit more or take the economic side of the issues into consideration when you make some of your decisions now.

I can tell you I have to commend everybody, though. You all have got a lot of patience to sit through all this stuff. I sat through here the last couple of days and it was frustrating there just trying to keep up with what was going on. I understand those other people's problems with that. I appreciate your time and letting me give you my comments. Thank you.

MR. JONES: My name is Larry Jones. I'm a commercial fisherman from Murrells Inlet. I appreciate the council letting us come and voice our opinion. We've got to do something for the fish and the fishermen. We're in a dilemma now with all these regulations and derby fishing. The way I look at it we're throwing a lot of fish back on bycatch. When we run out of fish – I

mean, catching the fish, you're targeting one fish but you're still catching other fish that you've got to throw back. The mortality rate on them I know is down – I mean, way up.

I appreciate you all letting us come and voice it. I'm for a catch share program to try to cut down on the fish being thrown away and also trying to get to where we can fish year around instead of being cut off and not being able to fish. Like back in March of this year we got cut off and couldn't fish for a month and a half because we didn't have no B-liners, and you can't make it on triggers and amberjacks.

Then when the grouper opened, everybody targeted the grouper and then we was catching – we were still catching your B-liners and stuff and having to throw them back. It is just a lot of bycatch. If you get to fish year round with a catch share, I feel like that the price of the fish will stay at an equal balance, too, instead of up and down the way we're going right now. It is just like Bob said, we're probably going to get shut off, like I said, on the B-liners in the next week or two weeks at the most, probably.

Two or three weeks we were getting close to three dollars per pound for the B-liners and now we're getting two dollars a pound for B-liners because the market is flooded and we're fixing to get out of the season, and now everybody will go to targeting grouper. It needs something doing real bad to let us fish year round and to have something for the fishermen to live off of instead of going out there in a derby and catching them all at one time and having to stop fishing. I appreciate you letting us come and talk and voice our opinion.

MR. COX: Council members, thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Jack Cox. I'm a commercial fisherman from Morehead City. I have been doing so since 1982 and participate in snapper grouper and king mackerel. We're just at a time now where we've got to figure out where we're going to go next.

We know this style of managing fisheries is not working for any of us. We had a meeting back in June with several fishermen from our area. There are a lot of us that are interested in the catch share program. It has a lot of powerful tools in it that we could use to address accountability, to address extending our season so the local restaurants and the retail markets could have year-round fish.

At this time I want to say we're interested in it. Several of the fishermen that I wanted to bring to the table today had to continue to be out fishing due to the derby-style fishery and knowing that we're going to be done here in about three weeks. Keep in mind that we will be at the December meeting and those guys will be there to express some of the same feelings that I'm sharing with you today.

I just want to say that I think a catch share fishery addresses some accountability issues that are not addressed in the management style of fishery that we're doing here today. I understand that it will help rebuild the stocks. Right now what has happened is some of the fishermen will come to the fish house and they will offload half of their catch which will go through the logbook program.

The other half of their catch gets unaccounted for. It goes to the restaurants and gets sold for cash. There is absolutely no accountability in it. I talked to our enforcement guys about it and they said, "Look, we're stretched, we're doing all we can do, we don't know when the boats are docking and where they're docking. We can't be at all the places at the same time."

I understand that, especially where the budgets are being cut back. I think a VMS system would be fair and make our fishery very transparent. Before we could look at a catch share history, it is only fair that we do so with a referendum. I wouldn't even consider doing it without so, but a lot of fishermen are interested in it. They like a lot of what they see, they've been doing it for a long time, they've got a stake in the fishery.

They would like to be able to take their history and plug it into some kind of system and see what they would walk away with if they voted that way, so I would think that would be an important step before we can move forward with it. Also, if we do go that route, we would like to see a control date set back at July 2010 for the fresh people who have just gotten into it and have some history so we couldn't go back on anything.

In other words, we wouldn't get anything that is going on now and have it kind of solid for that. And then we have our issues with the recreational crowd as far as accountability. I can tell you that when I come through the no-wake zone and there are 20 or 30 recreational boats there that I know have been fishing the same grounds I have, the marine patrol will stop me nine out of ten times before they'll go stop that 50-foot boat who has been out snowy grouper fishing or any of the other boats.

I don't know how we're going to do it, but I think it's very important not only are we accountable but we look at those guys as well. As far as our sea bass fishery, we'd love to have our winter fishery back. If we could do the split season, half a season now and half the season starting maybe sometime in January, that would be very beneficial to us as our vermilion and gags are being caught up. I would just like to further say thank you, Rita, for the time that you've spent helping us. I've enjoyed working with you, and I'm looking forward to working with you as well, Tom. Thank you for your time.

MR. CONKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Council, for giving me the opportunity to sit down and speak with you today. My name is Chris Conklin. I represent 11 commercial bandit boats out of Murrells Inlet and Georgetown, none of which have John Boats or jet skis screwed to the top of them. Also, I'm speaking on behalf of most of my fishermen that are interested in a catch share program.

These here guys who, with all due respect, haven't been wined and dined by EDF. They're listening to me because I work at the fish house. They're listening to all these ideas that we're using from the EDF as a resource. We're bringing Gulf fishermen in to talk to these guys and we're exploring this. With reference to the options paper that is in the document, we came up with that and it's not just two fishermen from Florida that did it.

We had meetings in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and with Jack Cox in North Carolina. There is a synergy going with catch shares here. I believe that a well-designed catch share plan

can and will work in the snapper grouper fishery just as it has done in the Gulf. Some of the things that we have spoken about is a control date of July 2010. We want to also see a tool where our guys can plug in their catch history and see what their initial allocation will be, so they can decide whether or not to vote.

A referendum is not a requirement of a catch share, but it's definitely going to be better than to shove it down people's throats. The way things are going right now, I've got 35 fishermen four months out of the year borrowing the money from me, hanging around my store, doing stuff they don't need to be doing. I feel that a catch share is going to keep these guys on the water year round. It is going to professionalize the business, and we're going to have a consistent market.

It is not fair to us here in the South Atlantic that the fellows in the Gulf get to fish year round and are very happy with a catch share program and we have to be tied to the dock. We're thankful for the fishermen from the Gulf that come over and helped us. We're looking forward to working alongside of the council and getting more continued support from people who have got narrow minds to a catch share program. We're looking for anyone to be a part and come to our meetings to listen to what is going on. We want input from everyone so it is going to be a favored thing. Thank you very much.

MR. ANDREWS: My name is Matt Andrews. I'm a Gulf fisherman. I was asked here to talk about catch shares and my experience with them. Before catch shares we didn't really have much of a future in the Gulf, it didn't seem like, with the derbies and the quotas and getting shut off and low prices. Since catch shares have come into effect, I feel like I've got a future. I've got a business that was at best worth \$60,000, and now I have a business that's worth a quarter of a million dollars and I'll be able to sell it. I think you ought to take a really good, hard look at catch shares because for us it has worked in the Gulf. I mean, you can look at the snapper. We just got a bump in allocation this year, so it is something for you all to look at. Thank you for your time.

MS. FETHERSTON: Good afternoon; my name is Libby Fetherston. I'm here on behalf of the Ocean Conservancy. I wanted Duane Harris for your leadership and guidance and congratulate Dave Cupka and Brian Chevront. I look forward to working with you and the council in the coming year. I would also really like to extend our heartfelt thanks to the hard work that has been done on the annual catch limits amendment really this whole year; but between the last meeting and this meeting the work that you all did during that committee was impressive and moved swiftly, so thank you, Mac.

That is a lot of work that the staff did, the regional office, and the science center so we're impressed with the progress. I'm here just to make a brief recommendation that the council and the SEDAR Steering Committee consider adding an assessment for all data-poor species in the region to the 2011 queue. The Gulf SSC's species grouping; an ABC working group passed a motion that we recommended that the Gulf Council adopt, which read "schedule an evaluation workshop as a full SEDAR Procedural Workshop, including webinars and a review. We feel like that will give the SSC an opportunity to look at the data-poor species and fully evaluate OFLs and provide you with scientifically defensible ABCs.

These are busy times in the SEDAR assessment shop. We understand this will take time and resources away but find it to be a valuable thing to debate and consider as a council. We recommend that be done in 2011 to inform the discussion of annual catch limit implementation amendments. Thank you for your time and your work this week.

MR. HULL: Good afternoon. Thank you for allowing me to comment. My name is Jimmy Hull. I'm a fisherman from Ponce Inlet, Florida. I became involved in the management process with the belief that honest science and the stocks fishermen see in the harvest on the water can resemble each other. In these changing times in the management of our fisheries resources through the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the fishermen and all the stakeholders' involvement in the process is vital.

I appreciate all your efforts to include the fishermen in the management process starting with the stock assessment process and ending with potential limited participation programs. I especially thank you recently for the support of a black sea bass benchmark assessment. Magnuson-Stevens says we must use the best science available and benchmarks provide that opportunity.

On the subject of best available science and in regards to the yet completed SEDAR 24, I ask the council to find out why wasn't there a continuity run in SEDAR 24 with the previous models as a comparison to determine if any changes in advice are the result of new data or are caused by changes in the model itself. And, what are the SEDAR protocols for validating programs in assessments and what are the validating programs? I know that you don't have the results yet, but I think those are some of the things that need to be looked at when you do get the results. Thank you.

MS. McCOY: I'm Sherry McCoy from the Cape Canaveral Shrimp Company, and I'm also president of the Southeastern Fisheries Association. I appreciate being able to voice and go on record that the Southeastern Fisheries Association is opposed to any additional catch share programs for any species until complete stock assessments are accomplished and assessments reflect the true state of the stock.

We feel efforts should be made to keep as many active fishermen in the industry instead of reducing the fleet. When decisions are being made that have such a financial impact on fishermen and fish houses, these need to be based on current and accurate data that is indicative of the reality of the stock. The industry must be a part of the decisions that are being made and part of the fishery management plan.

Personally speaking, I feel there is a perception that a lot of the fishermen in Florida are in favor of catch shares. I have been to several meetings where the majority of the fishermen are not in favor of it. In fact, the council saw in Orlando I think it is probably safe to say that probably 95 percent of the public raised their hand against catch shares when we had the meeting in Orlando. There are several areas with catch shares that they're really concerned about, so we feel that moving forward these problems need to be looked at and addressed before you continue with the catch share agenda.

Speaking as a seafood dealer, we've worked hard to create a niche market for the local seafood in our area. We want people to continue to walk into our market and see our country-of-origin labels reading "Product of the United States of America", so we're asking to keep the U.S. fishermen on the water and let us keep our money in the United States.

MR. RUBY: My name is Matt Ruby. I'm from Little River, South Carolina. I'm in the bandit fishery. I would just like to say I think one of the things that I mostly dislike about the process, not just this one and in other ones, is it causes you to have to point fingers at people when you don't want to, and that's just something that I don't like to do. I was at the Orlando meeting and there was a majority in the room that was against catch shares, but the majority was king mackerel fishermen and recreational fishermen.

I know they say that they don't want catch shares and stuff like that because they put people out of business. Well, I'm not sure but I thought that I heard, when I was in the room, that they needed to get a thousand to maybe possibly 1,500 king mackerel permits out of their fishery, which is going to put people out of business.

I've heard about privatization of the fishery under catch shares. We've been a limited access fishery for a long time, and right now it is a two-for-one. That has been privatized for a long time and it is just going to continue to get worse if we can't get some stabilization. I just wanted to read a letter on behalf of some friends of mine down in the Keys:

"On behalf of Pete and Angie Boehm, Scott Baith, Matt Dedmon and Matt Matolis, we regret that we cannot be with you. The lobster season is in full swing. We want to reiterate how strongly we feel about catch share programs. 17B directly affects us. Once closure is in place, we will be unable to fish. Catch shares offers a viable solution. This summer Upper Keys fishermen worked together to bring forward some ideas for such a program.

"Many options are presented in trying to be fair to all fishermen. If approved to move forward, we, along with other affected fishermen, hope to be involved in the implementing and decision procedure that will shape our fishery. We would like to have our input incorporated into the December Amendment 21 Scoping Document. Finally, we would like to see a control date set for catch share programs established and also would like to see the council move forward as quickly as possible with catch shares to try to help stabilize this fishery." As trip limits and everything else has definitely been tried in other fisheries and has proven that it hasn't worked, I just don't want to see this fishery continue to do that for the next two to three I don't know how many years and to have to come back and start this all over again. Thank you.

MR. HUDSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is Rusty Hudson. I'm the president of Directed Sustainable Fisheries. I am also a member of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Marine Protected Area Advisory Panel for five years now; which having said that, we have never met. Fundamentally, when SEDAR 24 was getting ready to take place, there were numerous appointments from the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel that were made in order to try to help with the process with red snapper.

Unfortunately, most of those people on the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel were not from the region where the predominant amount of red snapper comes from, which is my backyard where my family has fished for the past century, the Greater Daytona Beach Area. With that said, there needs to be a process so that you have those people accounted for so that they show up to input, especially knowing the subject matter.

It was a problem with SEDAR 15 with one black grouper commercial fisherman at that process. With the SEDAR 24, we feel that the people that weren't able to show up, whether it was at the physical meetings or whether it was at the webinars – and, Bonnie, I do like the webinars a lot. I believe that when you start the process, two weeks before the data workshop ever occurs you should have a webinar with already some documentation available so that they can understand what they're getting ready to get into.

Unfortunately for us, when we came into the SEDAR 24 data workshop, there was all this information that we both had to find and plus have to become acquainted with at that time. For the stakeholders, that's a very big problem because of the fact that they're not familiar with it. Whenever we did finish that week, then we returned to our homes and then we started having to really delve further into the information. Then we had webinars that were put into place as an experiment for the first time for the SEDAR process.

Unfortunately we found that there were things that occurred at the data workshop that weren't able to be reconciled by webinar. Because they had not had the assessment workshop as they had for the previous eight years as a physical event for a week, we could not be able to look the analysts in the eyes or them us and be able to see if there was a comprehension factor or a block on understanding, and that's what we feel has occurred in this process.

We believe it was a mistake not having a physical assessment workshop, and so as a result there is going to be a lot more people showing up at your review workshop than was probably necessary. As a spokesman for both the king mackerel fishery as well as a lot of the snapper fishermen and grouper fishermen for the east coast fishery section, I find that there needs to be a step back to the older process of having the physical assessment workshop for anything.

The sea bass update, which I was also part of, which is potentially going to morph into a full benchmark, also had no physical meeting unlike the Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper Update that occurred last August. If you do agree in the October Steering Committee meeting to have the full benchmark for sea bass, then please make sure that you have the process with the three physical meetings; data workshop, assessment workshop and the review workshop, but also have the webinars proceed and follow those physical events because that way you're going to be able to have a better interchange of the experience of the fishermen and the knowledge of the scientists to be able to get on the same page.

With that said, most of our king mackerel fishermen, particularly in our area, and a lot of our snapper grouper as well as for-hire people are not real keen on catch shares; but if you wish to have us go down that road as far as listening to the presentations and participating in the debate, make sure that you do have a referendum even if it is with a one-pound minimum as far as when they do the vote.

I'm not real crazy about how the weighted votes went in the Gulf of Mexico because it favored certain high liners and it consolidated their power and position and their power worth a lot of money, and that minimized the participation as a result. So, again, think about the human factor here. Unfortunately when you all make your decisions, you don't have to pay the price; but when you do make those decisions, we do pay the price.

I'm watching the suffering financially of the for-hire sector and I'm watching the suffering of the commercial sector. When you do have your vote on your advisory panel participants, I'm hoping that you had some applicants from our area because we did not have the representation on your advisory panel. Going into 17A with your closed area, that sort of mimics in a time area factor a virtual potential to morph into an MPA.

Please convene your MPA more routinely, once a year. Last year when we had our King Mackerel Advisory Panel meeting, it was the first time in four years. I was encouraged when I heard that you're going to have a Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel meeting perhaps before February. So, all of that is important if you wish to hear our input. Tom, it was a pleasure speaking with you last night. I believe that you're going to be a good addition. Thank you, Rita, for all of your help for these last several years because all of you have been very good to try to listen and balance and to help us understand how to work with the council here. Thank you very much.

MR. JEFFREY AIKEN: Thank you, Council, for giving us this opportunity to make a statement. I'm a little ashamed to say this is my first attendance at this council meeting and the first time I've made public comment; so I guess accordingly I drew the short straw and had to follow Rusty. I do have to admit that I've learned an awful lot and it has increased my awareness about the daunting task that you folks have before you.

I think one of the most important things that I've – it is a confusion point for me. We always hear about best available science. We always talk about improving our data and we talk about fishermen involvement. But when I sat in the open forum in the Q&A yesterday, I was pleased to hear Dr. Ponwith request and almost reach out for a fishery-independent survey. I got to thinking about that and I said fishery-independent survey, and I had to ask myself who is going to do that, how can an independent survey be completed by somebody who knows nothing about fisheries?

I would compel the council and anybody who is working under the requirements of the Magnuson Act to think about recruiting fishermen to conduct surveys with independent observers. The other concept just doesn't make sense to me, and I hope that is the direction that will take. Just to summarize shortly, I support the comments of the other North Carolina folks, Kelly and Sean, and wanted to address the Mackerel Committee with one more bit of information about that. Again, I'm speaking of the changing of the regions so that we can protect the commercial fishermen, the king mackerel fishermen in North Carolina as we see more pressure being put on the fish south of us.

We don't want to take anything away from those folks, but we want to protect what we've historically got. I would add to their comments that I ran the numbers. I'm a seafood dealer

from Hatteras, North Carolina. I ran my numbers pretty easily and the fourth quarter, which is pretty much our king mackerel season, king mackerel represents about 60 percent of my sales; and if we were to be shut down in the fourth quarter, my business alone would lose 60 percent of its fourth quarter sales.

But when I looked at it from the perspective of the fishermen, I found that the fishermen involved in the king mackerel fishery, if they are unable to fish in that fourth quarter, will lose 60 percent of their annual sales. I wanted to put those numbers to record and just once again request that the Mackerel Committee give it urgent consideration. It is a catastrophic situation that we could find ourselves in this year. It could be these hurricanes are going to keep that from happening and hold it off so it's not quite so catastrophic, but things could change next year drastically. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Council Members, for allowing us all to have the opportunity to speak to you. Quickly, I'm Legare Smith. I'm a private sportfishing boat captain here locally. I've been fishing on charter, for-hire and commercial boats growing up around here for years. About five years ago I went and got my masters degree and have worked as an oceanographer for about five years, so I'm looking at this stuff from an educated standpoint and as a fisherman.

I originally got involved with the red snapper closure and started reading accounts about the comparison between this and some of the codfish fishery collapse up in the northeast and all those accounts where the fishermen were not catching any codfish anymore. When I was younger and working as a mate on charterboats here, we never caught red snapper; maybe one a summer. Now we catch them left and right, and I just have a hard time believing that fishery – that the stocks are just way off.

Similarly, I think the venting works for them. This past May I had some trips where I caught some of the biggest red snappers in my life and I had to move spots because that's all I was catching. We vented all the fish; and just like Mark Brown said, all of them you'd put in the water and they'd swim right off. The fishermen all complained about the data that we originally had for the stock assessment of the red snapper, and so you guys and the scientists went back and the models were changed and tweaked and then the numbers changed big time.

I just want us all to remember that they're just a model; and with the models I've worked with in oceanography, they're just an indication of what might be going on and it is far from the truth. A model is a good baseline for it, but for the models to change the numbers that much, it seems a little off to me; you can't believe them completely.

A comment about diving that the gentleman was talking about earlier; I've done a lot of diving over the years, both scientifically, commercially and recreationally. When you travel outside of the U.S. to the Bahamas, Bermuda, other places, you're not allowed powerheads on your spears. You're not allowed spearguns. You're not even allowed Hawaiian Slings. You're allowed pole spears and Hawaiian Slings, simple ways. I think from a fairness standpoint some restrictions should be placed on their equipment.

As a diver myself, it is so easy using powerheads that we don't use them anymore, my friends and I. Saying sharks are a nuisance to them, that's because they drop down and shoot more fish than their limit because they have enough people on the boat to spread a limit around. If you're down there shooting that many fish, yes, a shark is going to come and check you out. But if you go down there and are shooting with just a speargun and not a powerhead or even just a Hawaiian Sling or something, you can take all you need for dinner for the rest of the week and be able to get back to the surface.

Diving and spearfishing is so easy, it is crazy. You wouldn't believe it when you drop down and there is a reef full of gag groupers how easy it is. In fairness I think the fishermen are getting held back with what they need and making it tougher to go fishing, but I think we all are like, okay, if you've got to hold us back some, just let us keep fishing. I think that should be looked at the diving big time. It is something that other countries have looked at and completely outlawed.

Another comment on catch shares, I have been left, right, and not sure what I support. You talk to captains and folks from the Gulf who are in the catch share program and they like it, but that's because they still have a catch share. They still have a share in that catch. So, there needs to be some protection for the small guys, the guys that might get forced out of it. I mean, I would hate for catch shares to do to small farmers what agribusinesses did do farming in this country. There are no small farmers anymore.

I kind of believe in catch shares. I believe that they can help even out the pricing and get away from derby fishing and some stuff like that, but make sure there is some protection in there for the small guys, the guys that have been fishing all along and their whole life is passing permits down from generations, and they just have one boat. Don't let them get taken over by some big boat that buys ten permits. I think there should be a limit on the number of permits a boat can hold. Anyway, thanks for letting me speak and good luck with it. You guys have got a hard job.

MR. TONY AUSTIN: I'm a Yankee transplant. I've been fishing somewhere in the neighborhood of 55 years. I'm 75 years old. I've done quite a bit of it from longlining swordfish to deepwater lobstering. I ran a gill net boat one trip and swore I'd never touch another one. Done trawling out of Chatham; owned a sea scalloper for seven years. I've never seen a bigger mess than this group of people and this council has gotten itself into in the last 20 years by not paying attention of what was going on in the fishery.

I told you people 15 years ago that black sea bass had to be a limited access fishery. You didn't do anything about it. Now you've got so many people involved that there is no way you can cut that pie up and anybody gets a meal out of it. I just talked to a gentleman from South Carolina who spoke. He said last week he set five traps, worked five traps and had eleven boxes of bass that day with five traps. What in hell does anybody need 50 traps for? You've got to work the gear properly instead of leaving it all over the ocean. I fish 24.

On catch shares, I've got a boy working for me who fished out of Galveston for four years. The situation in the Gulf is that people who have got money now have more money, and the people who didn't have anything are out of the business. There were an awful lot of people put out of business by catch shares in the Gulf but it may be the only answer to what is going on in the

South Atlantic. The trap limits and numbers of traps and trip limits until catch shares are implemented makes sense if you're going to have a year-round fishery.

You're not going to have one – the black sea bass fishery is going to close down about 6th of next month. The number of boats involved in that fishery in these five states now, from Florida to North Carolina, is now double what it was in, say, '98 and '97. It's ridiculous. Nothing I say is going to change anything you do, but I did hear one comment up here that made a lot of sense. You need to have an access program in the computer where we can find out what our catch share will be based on our catch history and let people make up their minds whether they want to go with catch shares or not.

I mean, you're going to have one catch share for B-liners, another catch share for black sea bass, another catch share for grouper, another catch share for other species; is that how it's going to work? You've got to make up your minds. I don't fish anything but bass. Once in a while I get B-liners and grouper but not very often. That has got to be taken into consideration. As far as I know it hasn't been. Anyway, thanks.

MR. DAVID ALLISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. As you know, I usually don't prepare remarks. I just stand up and start talking, but today enough issues I felt needed to be touched on in behalf of Oceana that I wrote a couple of things up, so I hope you'll excuse my reading.

I am speaking on behalf of Oceana today. As many of you know, I've been working with the council system at all of the councils at different times for the last better than 30 years. This is reflecting a lot of that as well. These comments are reflecting a lot of that as well as some of the comments that have made in the last day or two.

I'd like to make special thanks to Duane, to George and to the council members and staff that have worked so hard to bring about the amazing results for the habitat protection in the South Atlantic. It has been really amazing, and the way we have been able to work with fishermen and that the council has reached out to work with fishermen has made the difference I think; not just the fishermen but with the marine conservation community.

A couple of issues particularly have been raised this week and then today. First on the pros and cons of management systems like ITQs or catch shares; most folks know I'm not a particular fan of ITQs or catch shares, but I can see the value in some of the fisheries like the golden crab fishery. It was really a key way of managing and protecting both the fishermen and the fisheries and the habitat there.

I just hope that folks that are on both sides or all sides of these proposals will trust that in almost all cases people are working in good faith. The meanness and anger is good for neither the fish nor the fishermen. On the appointment to the council, no one is ever going to doubt the value that Rita has brought to the council, to the fish and to the fishermen, but the Secretary of Commerce made it clear when he was appointed that we want new points of view and perspective on the councils, and he has moved to do that in several councils and not just this council.

I think he is hoping that Tom will bring that. It wasn't a matter of what he was leaving behind but more of a future of what he is trying to bring. Again, I hope that folks would look at these council changes and look at the efforts that are being made by the Department of Commerce with the assumption that it is in good faith. It doesn't make any sense to keep attacking, especially with unproductive paranoia and conspiracy theories. It doesn't benefit anyone for this to continue.

Likewise, the renewed allegations about marine conservation groups like Environmental Defense, OC and Oceana have finally jumped to shark. NRDC and ED have led fishery habitat management including coral protection in the South Atlantic, work that Oceana has worked with the past six years, and the fishermen affected by the deep sea coral protection areas are the ones to ask. Do the fishermen really try to demonize the organizations? Do the organizations; are they really trying to put fishermen out of business. That's just absurd!

Some of these arrangements, some of these agreements could never have been made without the work that the organizations, the fishermen and the managers all worked together on them. It was mentioned about the economics for the fishermen; and we've heard it a number of times, what about the economics of the fishermen, what about the economics and social issues? Come on; Environmental Defense has been working on virtually nothing other than the economics of the fishermen, trying to make this a sustainable fishery.

We don't all agree and I don't think the councils all agree on how it's being done, but it is just wrong to keep saying that the environmental groups don't care. Again, looking back at the arrangements made on the corals, looking back in the Gulf at the longline fishermen, these are efforts that were accomplished because of the collaboration among all the parties. It can't be a contest anymore with yes, no, right, wrong. It has to be how these things can be accomplished.

Finally, I'd like to have it on the record that we associate ourselves with the comments by Libby for Ocean Conservation on the council's work on ACLs and AMs. We don't think at Oceana that any of the councils are really able to comply completely with the rules under the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act, but I don't think there are any of the councils that can come forward after the work that you guys have done this week that would show there was anymore effort to bring as many resources as you could to make this happen. Oceana will continue to advocate for more research resources as most of you have asked for over time, and we will work for that in the future to provide with that support. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAEL MERRIFIELD: I'll just make a couple of comments on tilefish. One is that I think we should have a stock assessment before we do any allocations on tilefish. There seems to be a pretty healthy stock out there compared to what the quota is. I think we need to be careful with the control dates.

As we saw by the numbers where we set the control dates, this is going to affect a number of permits that are out there, people that allowed to fish or those that aren't being fished being allowed to be picked up by those that are currently fishing that might be cut out of the fishery. I don't understand why it takes over two years to get landings' data put in so that it can be used as part of the control so that we can get current fishermen that are out there today that are either

displaced because they were in another fishery and now are hardly into the tilefish fishery; why would we want to put them out of business.

Tilefish, like I said, it's a healthy fishery. In Florida it is economically – on the east coast it is very economically important the first few months of the year, and that's why we support the January open date. Especially now that there are so many other species that are not available during that period of time, that's the best feasible time for us to be harvesting that fish. I support the separate quotas and seasons for the longline versus the hook and line. I think that would be a good method of trying to bring back the hook-and-line fishery but also allowing the longline fishery to harvest when it is the best economic times for the longline fishery.

On another note I just want to say that there is a strong movement in this country towards being more aware of the source of the food that we're putting in our mouths these days; a lot of focus on local foods, locally provided foods. We imported over 40,000 tons of Pangasius last year of varying degrees of quality because we've probably inspected less than 2 percent of that amount of product that came in.

And yet how many restaurants do you walk into and you see Pangasius or you see Vietnamese catfish on the menu? We're eating it but we don't know what we're eating, so there is a strong movement towards becoming more aware of where our food source is coming from. I know that the National Standard 1 trumpets National Standard 8; but when we're looking at the social and economic impacts, it's not just the fishermen, the fish houses, the local fishing communities; it's our national food supply. As we shut down more and more fisheries, more and more product is coming in from out of the country. More of our money and more of our jobs are also going out of the country as well. Thank you very much.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Mike. I want to thank all of you for taking the time to make your comments today. It allowed us to go over time beyond our agenda, but I think it was important to give us the opportunity to hear from you and all of us really appreciate you sharing your thoughts and comments and concerns with us today. With that, we'll close the public portion of the meeting.

I want to make one announcement for the council members, and then we're going to take a ten-minute break and come back and start our committee reports. I just wanted to let the council members know that we haven't really taken any action so far this year to get any input from you on the various committees that you'd like to serve on; so if you want to make a change, just let me know how you feel about that.

I will tell you, though, that Duane has already indicated to me that in no way is he going to give up the chairmanship of the SOPPs; so if you had your eye on that one, you can forget it. Anyway, if any of you do have any thoughts on that, if you'll share them with me, we'll be glad to try and accommodate you as best we can. Let's take a ten-minute break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. CUPKA: If everyone will take their seat, we will go ahead and get started. We've got a lot of committee reports to go through. The first one is our Spiny Lobster Committee Report.

MR. ROBSON: The Spiny Lobster Committee met on September 13th, and I believe everybody on the council has received a copy of the summary report. I won't go into all of the details. You can refer to those in the report. I will go straight to the motions that were taken up by the committee. **The first motion was to approve some of the changes made by the Gulf Council to Action 3, basically taking Alternatives 3 and 6 out of the amendment into the rejected appendix and delete Option A in Alternatives 2, 4 and 5. Your document, by the way, will also include a listing of those alternatives for your reference.**

On behalf of the committee I so move to approve the Gulf Council's changes to Action 3, which would be move Alternative 3 and 6 to considered but rejected appendix and delete Option A in Alternatives 2, 4 and 5. Any objections? Show the motion carries.

The second motion was to move Alternative 2 – this would be for Action 4, the ABC Control Rule – Motion 2 was to move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected appendix. That was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Are there any objections to the motion? That motion carries.

The third motion related to the ACLs and the motion was to move Alternative 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. That was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Are there any objections to that motion? Motion approved. Motion Number 4, again dealing with ACLs, in Alternative 4, to remove the words "and gear type". That was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Are there any objections? Motion approved.

Dealing with annual catch targets, Motion Number 5 was to move Alternative 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. That was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Are there any comments? Any objections? The motion carries. Motion Number 6 was to remove again the language "and gear type" from Alternative 4. That was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any objections? The motion carries.

Dealing with the actions on accountability measures, Motion Number 7 was to move Option B and C of Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected category. That was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any objections to that motion? Motion carries. Dealing with Action 8, modifying the tailing requirements for Caribbean Spiny Lobster for vessels that obtain a tailing permit, Motion Number 8 was to move Alternative 4 to the considered but rejected appendix. That was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Are there any objections? The motion carries.

Motion Number 9 was to adopt Alternatives 3 and 5 as preferred alternatives for the action dealing with tailing requirements. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any objection to that motion? The motion carries. Under Action 11, allowing the public to

remove trap line buoys or otherwise make unfishable any spiny lobster gear found in the EEZ off Florida, Motion Number 10 was to make Alternative 1 our preferred alternative, and that is the no action alternative. That was approved by the Spiny Lobster Committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any objection to the motion? The motion carries.

Dealing with the same action on removal of trap lines and buoys, Motion 11 was to add an alternative to delegate to the state of Florida regulations regarding removal of trap lines, buoys, or otherwise making unfishable any spiny lobster gear. That was approved by the committee and on the behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection? The motion carries. In addition there was some guidance to staff for additional work on this amendment. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. CUPKA: We will move right into our next committee report, and that is the Mackerel Committee. Chairman Geiger, are you ready for your Mackerel Committee?

MR. GEIGER: Yes, sir, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Mackerel Committee met on September 13th in Charleston. The committee received a presentation by Gregg Waugh, council staff, who reviewed the actions from the Joint Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Mackerel Committees at the June 2010 meeting. The team has recommended that the South Atlantic Council move all management measures to a future amendment and focus on ACLs and AMs in Mackerel Amendment 18.

All management measures are now included in Appendix B. The South Atlantic Council should review all management measures and determine which should be addressed in Amendment 18 and which ones could be addressed in a future amendment. That was the primary action of the committee.

The committee reviewed the options paper for Amendment 18 and focused on Appendix B. The committee discussed the current workload and timing and decided to only include the management measures that were necessary to limit catches to the anticipated ACLs for Atlantic Migratory Group King Mackerel, Spanish mackerel and cobia. Ben Hartig asked about the timing for a future amendment or using the framework process to address some of the other items that have come under consideration for many years. The committee provided guidance as shown below.

The committee approved the following motions. **Motion Number 1 was to add prohibition of bag limit sales of Atlantic Migratory Group King and Spanish mackerel and cobia to Amendment 18 and also add cobia bag limits. That was approved by the South Atlantic Committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection to that action? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Motion 2; add actions to adjust Spanish mackerel bag limits and commercial trip limits. Approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. In addition, the committee provided the following guidance and made the following requests of staff.

They directed staff to request a review of the current mackerel framework and determine what actions can be taken. The current framework is shown on Page 2 of this report with the proposed modifications being considered in Amendment 18, and I would direct everybody to Page 2, Paragraph 5, modifying or implementing a review for a particular species. This would directly go to the question addressed by Mr. Hartig. Number 2, direct the staff to determine the Gulf Council's timing for working on the next mackerel amendment. That completes my report. Any questions. Mr. Chevront.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Looking over the report and some of the comment that we heard at the public comment period today, there was some discussion about the fact that in Appendix B there really wasn't a direct discussion of some issues that we took out in scoping that was in that options paper. That had to do with state-by-state quotas, regional quotas and the idea of having I guess as sort of a hybrid of those two, giving a historical percentage of the quota to North Carolina to monitor since North Carolina is the only state that could monitor a section of the quota on its own in a timely manner.

But then looking at – I realize that based on the decisions that were made regarding Amendment 18 and focusing on ACLs and management measures, that this may not be able to get into this amendment, which is too bad. That goes to the point that Ben had made during the committee meeting that we need to act on these actions quickly. It's not clear to me whether that framework action would work for these other things, but I want to make sure that we can get these other alternatives such as state-by-state or regional quotas included.

To that end I would like to make the following motion, if I may. I would like to make a motion to add alternatives to Appendix B of Amendment 18 to include allocation alternatives in the options paper that will consider state-by-state and regional allocations of the commercial Atlantic Group King Mackerel Quota.

MR. GEIGER: Okay, we have a motion to add alternatives to Appendix B of Amendment 18 to include allocation alternatives in the options paper that will consider state-by-state and regional mackerel quotas.

MR. CURRIN: Second.

MR. GEIGER: Second by Mr. Currin. Discussion. I guess I would ask Gregg to come forward, please, and apply this with regard to timing of Amendment 18 and the doability or the feasibility of moving forward.

MR. WAUGH: Well, right now if you're adding it to Appendix B, then that would just be included in the appendix for Amendment 18 and wouldn't be analyzed any further. I guess the intent would be that when we do another mackerel amendment – and the Gulf is talking about beginning working on one and looking at latent permits and we've got some issues addressing two-for-one permits that we could look at there. The intent I guess would be then to look at which items in this appendix we would like to address in that next amendment. Right now just putting it in Appendix B, we wouldn't analyze it in 18.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I wanted to clarify that. I just wanted to make sure that we're getting this back on the table because it had been inadvertently left out. I understand that our intent in Amendment 18 is to move it along, and I believe there was even some discussion about potentially moving some other actions.

Maybe I got that confused with Snapper Grouper Amendment 18, but the idea was that we wanted to move this mackerel amendment on quickly to take care of the ACLs and the AMs and all that so that we can meet the requirements of Magnuson. What I would like to do is to follow up with what Ben had suggested that we urgently do something to address some of the other issues in this fishery of which what I brought up was just some additional ones that we neglected to discuss earlier in the week, but I think they're all equally important that need to be addressed.

MR. GEIGER: Okay, any other discussion on the motion? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I don't want to throw a big monkey wrench in here. I know king mackerel is the most pressing species, but frankly they are on the back end of king mackerel and we are on the back end of Spanish. I don't see those mutually exclusive and basically I would like to see the same thing happen with Spanish. It doesn't have to be now but down the line.

MR. GEIGER: **Okay, any other discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** With that, Mr. Chairman, that completes my report.

MR. CUPKA: All right, that takes on to the Ecosystem-Based Management Committee. Dr. Chevront, are you ready for your committee report?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, Chairman Cupka, I am. The Ecosystem-Based Management Committee convened on Tuesday, September 14th. The committee received a report from the SSC Chair, Dr. Carolyn Belcher, and discussed changes to the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 2, including proposed EFH and EFH-HAPCs and provided guidance to staff. It provided guidance on actions pertaining to sargassum, reviewed and approved the Draft Estuarine and Marine Invasive Species Policies and received an update on SAFMC activities pertaining to ecosystem-based management in the region.

The committee made the following motions, and on behalf of the committee I would move that council request that the Southeast Fishery Science Center provide trends and SAFE reports annually by the September council meeting. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Regarding the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 2, to committee voted to withdraw Actions 1-5 and replace with an explanation. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. The next motion is the council's intent is that the 50,000 colonies apply to both state and federal waters. This is regarding coral harvest. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? We need to back up; that motion was withdrawn.

Moving on to the next motion, the motion is add an action to the document to specify that the 50,000 colony quota apply to both federal and state waters in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

The next motion was to remove octocorals from the Coral FMP with the intent to ask the state of Florida to assume management of octocorals. We then offered a substitute motion to restructure Action 7 to remove octocorals from the FMP. The substitute motion was then approved and that became the main motion. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

The next motion was to include Alternative 4 to prohibit the use of spearguns and hand spears as recommended by the IPT. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. The next motion; move Action 9 to the considered but rejected appendix. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Regarding sargassum, the committee requests that the IPT investigate additional actions including the possibility of designating sargassum as an ecosystem component under another FMP, perhaps dolphin and wahoo, and/or withdraw the Sargassum FMP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Regarding invasive species, we voted to approve the Estuarine Invasive Species Policy with guidance to staff to conduct the necessary edits. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. The next motion was to modify both the Estuarine and Marine Invasive Species Policies to strongly discourage use of non-native species in aquaculture. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

The final motion was to approve the Marine Invasive Species Policy with guidance to staff to conduct the necessary edits. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion of the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. And, finally, the committee gave guidance to staff to provide the Action Plan for the South Atlantic Alliance to the committee when available. Mr. Chairman, that ends my report.

MR. CUPKA: That brings us down to the Law Enforcement Committee; Chairman Geiger.

MR. GEIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I invite everybody to take a deep breath because we really got into this one and ran through it. Let's take our time and we'll just have an opportunity to think a little bit here. The Law Enforcement Committee met in Charleston on Tuesday, September 14th. Basically, we went through the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel Meeting Minutes, the summary of the meeting minutes that occurred August 10th and 11th.

Because of the excellent notes that Myra generated as a result of that meeting, we had a very, very detailed summary report. The meeting was basically just a encapsulation and a report to the committee as to what the Law Enforcement AP panel members discussed during their meeting. Again, I requested everybody go back to Attachment 1 at their leisure and look at it; and if there were any discussions or questions, we would have an opportunity here at Full Council to go into some more detail if anybody had any questions concerning the summary items.

One of the things that I would encourage everybody to do at your leisure, after this meeting, is to go back into the briefing book and take a look at the Predator Drone Report that was provided by the Coast Guard for the use of drone aircraft in fisheries enforcement. It is a very, very interesting. It is a complete briefing. It doesn't need to be presented to anybody. The PowerPoints I think speak for themselves and contain all the information necessary.

It's the next step and it is something that Mr. Currin and I were both very excited to listen and witness a very, very viable program. Does anybody have any questions or concerns about what was covered during that Law Enforcement Advisory Panel or need to discuss in anymore detail? **Okay, that said, then there was one motion that came out of our committee report, Mr. Chairman, and that motion was that staff was to write a letter on behalf of the council to request additional funding for JEA activities. That was approved by committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion of that request?**

I would anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that request would be a very positive request identifying the very positive aspects of the JEA and how that JEA works in the South Atlantic and how important it is to the states that participate in it, how much value we place in that JEA and how much more we could do if we have some more money. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Who is that letter to go to?

MR. GEIGER: I would address it to Alan Risenhoover.

MR. MAHOOD: Higher?

MR. GEIGER: Okay, Dr. Lubchenco. I think they would appreciate that request as well. There has been a motion. **Is there any other discussion? Seeing no other discussion, is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** That completes my report, Mr. Chairman, unless anybody has any questions.

MR. CUPKA: My intent now is to maybe skip down and take one or two of these other short committee reports until we come up to about 4:30 and then we can close the session for the briefing by Monica. I'm assuming you have something you want to brief us.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do have something briefly, but where you put me in the agenda doesn't matter to me; so if you want at some other point in the agenda, that's fine. I'm flexible.

MR. CUPKA: All right, are you prepared for the Joint Executive/Finance Committee?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. The Executive and Finance Committees met in joint session the afternoon of September 14, 2010, in Charleston, South Carolina. The minutes from the June 2010 Joint Executive/Finance Committee were approved. The committee received presentations on the following agenda items; one, status report on Calendar Year 2010 council budget.

Bob Mahood briefed the committee on the status of the 2010 budget. He indicated that expenditures for the year are below what would be expected and the projected balance is positive. Bob indicated that at this point the council is in good shape financially and will have adequate funding to accomplish the activities specified in the Activities Schedule during 2010 with a potential to carry funds forward into the second year of the council's five-year grant.

Two, report on additional SEDAR funding – Bob informed the committee members that \$300,000 will be provided to the South Atlantic Council by the National Marine Fisheries Service to supplement the SEDAR Program in the Gulf of Mexico. This is part of the funding package related to potential impacts on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council managed species from the oil discharge.

The funds will be used to hire an additional SEDAR coordinator for the Gulf area and to conduct additional stock assessments as needed in the future. There was a discussion about the use of webinars as part of the SEDAR process. Mr. Hartig explained how using webinars has affected fishermen's participation and indicated that he would like to see this addressed as the use of webinars is evaluated and modified in the future.

Three, discussed Mark Robson's letter to Bob Shipp – committee members discussed the August 13, 2010, letter from Mark Robson to Bob Shipp relative to management of spiny lobster, stone crab, octocoral and reef fish, including yellowtail snapper, mutton snapper and Nassau grouper. The issues related to spiny lobster and octocoral have been addressed in the Spiny Lobster and Ecosystem-Based Management Committees. Stone crab is exclusively a Gulf Council issue so no action was taken on those species.

Mark Robson explained that the purpose of the letter was to get clarification relative to Florida's and the council's management of these resources. Mr. Cupka indicated that the Gulf Council discussed the letter at their recent meeting but did not take any action as they were waiting for our council to take action first. Various management scenarios were discussed.

Subsequently the committee approved a motion to indicate to the state of Florida and the Gulf Council our willingness to assume management responsibility for yellowtail snapper, mutton snapper and Nassau grouper throughout their range. Four, discussed the timeliness of commercial and recreational quota monitoring.

Dr. Chevront had explained that he had requested this item be placed on the agenda after the June meeting where the National Marine Fisheries Service had presented information to the council on the mackerel quota monitoring program. Subsequent to that report he went back and looked at previous quota monitoring reports where he found disparities in the accuracy and timeliness of the reporting that concerned him.

He provided background on how this affected fishermen trying to determine how much of the quota was still available to be harvested. Dr. Ponwith explained how the quota monitoring program works and outlined the problems that contributed to the concerns that Dr. Chevront expressed.

The committee approved a motion to send a letter to Dr. Ponwith requesting that she come up with recommendations for resolving the current accuracy/timeliness problems by facilitating a meeting with the appropriate state agencies and other entities involved in quota monitoring efforts, including the ACCSP.

There was also a discussion about recreational quota monitoring in light of the mandates to establish ACLs and AMs. Dr. Ponwith indicated she will be participating in a conference call with the MRIP folks next week to address some of the same issues we were discussing at this meeting. She provided background on some of the other issues they will be discussing.

There was some committee discussion about the pros and cons of one-month versus two-month sampling waves and MRIP. This led to a discussion about the quality of the data versus the timeliness of the data. There were differing views on which should be the highest priority, accuracy or timeliness. It was agreed that accuracy was of the utmost importance. However, under certain circumstances timeliness of the data may take precedence.

I have two motions. **Motion Number 1 is indicate to the Gulf Council and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission our willingness to assume management responsibility for yellowtail snapper, mutton snapper and Nassau grouper throughout their range. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Without objection, that motion is approved.**

Motion Number 2 is to send a letter to Dr. Ponwith, Southeast Fishery Science Center, requesting that she consult with the appropriate state agencies and ACCSP to resolve the problems with timely reporting of quota-monitored species. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Mr. Chairman, that completes my joint Executive/Finance Committee Meeting Report.

MR. MAHOOD: The reason I used “discharge” is Dr. Ponwith said that is the appropriate term. It is not a spill; they didn’t spill it. They’re discharging it so that is the official word relative to the problem in the Gulf.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Duane. Duane, are you prepared to move ahead with your SEDAR Report.

MR. HARRIS: I can probably do one more. The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council’s SEDAR Committee met September 14, 2010, in Charleston, South Carolina. The committee discussed the following items; one, SEDAR activities. The committee appointed SSC representatives to the SEDAR Review Workshops for spiny lobster, Goliath grouper and red

snapper. Staff is allowed latitude to identify two SSC representatives who are able to attend from the four appointed.

The committee recommended that the steering committee the elevate assessment of black sea bass to a benchmark and approved terms of reference. Approval of participants and the schedule will be considered in December following steering committee consideration. Two, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Research Plan – the committee approved the 2011-1015 Research Plan.

Three, assessment prioritization and steering committee guidance – the committee approved the proposed assessment prioritization and timing plan for consideration at the steering committee. The committee discussed recent changes in the SEDAR process. Despite challenges that are expected in the early stages of any new process, using webinars for the assessment process in SEDAR 24 proved effective and efficient. Participation increased as desired.

The committee recommends attention be paid to future appointment to ensure industry and AP appointees actually participate. The committee advises that the scientific credibility of SEDAR workshops must be maintained. The nature and intent of public comment in a scientific process such as SEDAR must be thoroughly evaluated to ensure the process preserves a scientific validity.

The committee recommends addressing timeliness in the assessment process in considering future changes that will reduce the overall time requirement for assessment production. Recently added steps such as the pre-review that added considerable time to development are considered experimental at this point and should be thoroughly evaluated before becoming a permanent part of the program. The committee recommends adding a vermilion snapper update and golden crab benchmark to the 2012 assessment request.

Conflict of interest form; the committee approved the SEDAR appointee conflict of interest form with the following revisions. One, apply the form generally and not for each specific SEDAR project. Two, disclosures will expire after two years. Three, clarify that the form intends to provide consistency with existing council member, SSC, and AP disclosures.

I have a number of motions and I will go through those at this time. **On behalf of the committee I move to carefully analyze appointments of panelists to SEDAR workshops and webinars to ensure attendance. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Without objection, that motion is approved.**

On behalf of the committee I move to appoint Hoenig, Sedberry, Johnson, and Reichert to the Goliath Grouper and Spiny Lobster Review Panel. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Without objection, that motion is approved. On behalf of the committee I move to appoint Anne Lange as the Red Snapper Review Chair. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Without objection, that motion is approved.

On behalf of the committee I move to recommend that the steering committee elevate the black sea bass assessment to a benchmark, including data through 2010, and to be presented to the council by June 2012. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there objection to the motion? Without objection, that motion is approved.

On behalf of the committee I move to adopt the black sea bass terms of reference for the benchmark assessment. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. On behalf of the committee I move that sub-sampling of otoliths' procedure carried out within the Southeast Fishery Science Center be evaluated. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

On behalf of the committee I move to approve the 2011-2015 research prioritization plan. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. On behalf of the committee I move that the council direct the STC members to use the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's South Atlantic Prioritization Proposal as a guideline for decisions about stocks to be assessed. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

On behalf of the committee I move that the Council Chair, as a member of the SEDAR Steering Committee, has authority to act on behalf of the council at steering committee meetings. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there objection to the motion? Without objection, that motion is approved. Last motion; on behalf of the committee I move to accept the COI Disclosure Form with the suggested edits. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Mr. Chairman, that completes that report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, is this the appropriate place to make the motion that I was talking to John Carmichael about. Is this the appropriate place to do that?

MR. HARRIS: If it is related to the SEDAR Steering Committee, it is.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, sir. **It was move to consider convening a workshop to develop abundance indices for multiple species from the new independent monitoring efforts and to consider incorporating those indices into assessments through the update process when feasible. The idea for this is when we get our new longline survey, they can go ahead beforehand, before they get the numbers, figure out where it is going to fit in, and it could possibly – very possibly make the SEDAR process quicker and more streamlined. If they go ahead and fit it in, then maybe they could do an assessment instead of having a new data stream and be forced to do a benchmark later.**

MR. HARRIS: You have heard the motion and some discussion of the motion. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Mac. Further discussion? Make sure that's the motion that you put forth, Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think Myra had a copy of it. Well, I had John help me wordsmith it or actually John wordsmithed it where it would work.

MR. HARRIS: Is that it? Okay, further discussion of the motion? Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Mr. Chairman, it would be somewhat unorthodox to add a new data stream into a stock assessment under an update scenario. Typically when you add a brand new data stream into a stock assessment, that would trigger a benchmark.

DR. CRABTREE: I think the steering committee could have a discussion of how much can you bring in and a change in updates. I think we will talk about that and need to because there has been issues with that. If you were to ask the steering committee to look at the feasibility of this, Charlie, I could support this.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, with clarification, the motion is to ask the steering committee to look at this. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Anything we do here is just for our members to take forward to the steering committee to request. It's just like the going to the benchmark in black sea bass; that is a request to the steering committee.

MR. HARRIS: **Further discussion on the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Now, unless anybody else has anymore motions, I'm through.

MR. CUPKA: I'll go ahead and give a Golden Crab Committee report. It was very short. The Golden Crab Committee met briefly on September 16th and had a number of brief discussions. We discussed the SSC's golden crab ABC recommendation of 2 million pounds. We discussed briefly the results of the Golden Crab AP meeting and very briefly reviewed the Draft Amendment 5 actions and alternatives. Mac and I both had some comments that we were going to provide to Kate in regard to Draft Amendment 5.

The committee made no motions, so there were no motions to take any action on. We provided staff with the following guidance; to populate the Draft Amendment 5 with analyses of the actions and alternatives devised by the Golden Crab AP for a catch share program. That concludes my report unless there are any questions. Okay, seeing none, do you think you could do SOPPs, Duane?

MR. HARRIS: My SOPPS report you just heard.

MR. CUPKA: There is some consideration or thought to the idea that if we pressed on, that maybe we could finish up. I would ask the council's thoughts on this. I know that snapper grouper is not going to be a short committee report. AP Selection should be fairly short. Then we've got the status reports and agency reports and the briefing by Monica. What would be the desire of the council? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: David, with the consent of the council members, I think I can minimize the length of the snapper grouper report by grouping motions within the particular amendments; give the council members time to review those motions, if they would like – you all have a copy of the report – and then offer a motion to the council to approve all of those motions within that amendment.

For example, within the ACL Amendment we have several different FMPs that will be modified, but I would offer those motions that are concerned, for example, with dolphin and wahoo and those with snapper grouper and the various other plans within the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, if that is okay with everybody, and forego presenting each of the motions, all 94 of them. I would note that the Snapper Grouper Report, which you all have, has more pages than most of the other committees had motions. I don't know whether 94 is a record or not. Bob, I guess you're the keeper of that, but there is a whole lot of it.

MR. CUPKA: Does anyone have any objection to using that approach before we get back to the main question? It would save some time. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Mac, remember there was at one point in the discussion on Amendment 18 that I was asked to come back with some numbers, so we need to be careful. When we get to that point, I can alert you and let you know because I've got numbers. We can then discuss that real quickly and move on.

MR. CURRIN: Brian, that's fine, and I know Ben has got something else regarding golden tiles that I think under 18 he would like to bring to the council's attention.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, mine is golden tile as well.

MR. ROBSON: Maybe as a suggestion, since 18 is the amendment we were talking about possibly approving for public hearing, we could go through each of those motions for that amendment and then do the process you're talking about for all the others.

MR. CURRIN: If I might, I'll do it any way you guys feel comfortable doing it.

MR. HARRIS: I just urge the chairman not to get in the habit of doing what the past chairman did, and that is running us until late into the evening. I don't know how long this is going to take, but I had my hand slapped several times during the past year by certain folks. That is my feeling.

MR. MAHOOD: The only concern I had is I'm not sure if some fishermen might be coming back tomorrow to hear about snapper grouper. We have had the comment; and obviously we let everybody know that other than public comment periods we may change times. If we did everything right up to that and the reports, we'd be done before noon tomorrow.

MR. CUPKA: I think I would be inclined, based on the comments, to maybe at this point break and go into closed session for the litigation briefing and then we can reconvene at 8:30 in the morning and take up from there. I'm sure we're going to finish well in advance of noon by

doing that. It might be better than trying to rush through this. We will go ahead and recess for now, and we'll go into our closed session for our briefing by Monica. We will reconvene at 8:30 in the morning.

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, Friday morning, September 17, 2010, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: We'll go ahead and get started this morning and see if we can wrap this up. We going to start this morning and finish up our committee meeting reports, and I'm going to ask Mark if he would give us the AP Selection Committee Report.

MR. ROBSON: The AP Panel Selection Committee Meeting was held on September 16th. We were looking at applications to fill seats for the Coral AP; Habitat and Environmental Protection; the Information and Education AP; King and Spanish Mackerel; Law Enforcement; and the Snapper Grouper AP. We also took a look at additional applicants for the SEDAR Pool. These would be people that would be available for participation in future SEDAR stock assessments.

We also had a discussion of inactive advisory panels, and I'll get to the motions on those later. There was also a discussion about going ahead and providing for a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representative to be on the Information and Education and Law Enforcement APs. This would be an agency-type seat. The committee concurred with that and there was no motion necessary in that regard.

Also, before I get into the motions, this was something that staff had brought to my attention prior to the committee meeting and I was remiss in not remembering to bring it up. But along the lines of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representative, Roger had asked us about – apparently on the Habitat and Environmental Protection AP there has been some recent involvement and good expertise brought to that AP by members of the U.S. Navy. They're involved in a lot of activities and have some expertise that they could provide.

He had asked that the committee consider a similar type of appointment or representation by the U.S. Navy on future Habitat and Environmental Protection APs. I don't believe a motion is necessary, but this is something that we wanted to bring to the attention of the council. With your concurrence, he will proceed with that request. The Navy would have somebody in mind, and they would be able to appoint them to attend. There would be no cost to the council for that participation. If there is no objection to that, we can provide direction to staff to proceed with that. There were motions and I'll go through those now.

Motion number one – and this is for the Coral AP – was to reappoint Steve Ross and Andy Shephard to the Coral AP, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion or objection to that motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.

Motion number two was to create an ecosystem-modeling position on the Habitat AP – this would be more or less a new position or seat on that AP – and as part of that motion to allow Dr. Pat Halpin to transfer from the Coral AP to that newly created ecosystem-

modeling position on the Habitat AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Motion number three was to appoint John Cramer to the Coral AP. He would represent the commercial fisherman non-coral harvester seat on that AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Motion number four is to appoint John Dean to the Information and Education AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.

Motion number five is to appoint John “Brad” Stewart to the Mackerel AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion or objection to that motion? Seeing none, the motion passes. Motion number six; appoint Mark Rogers to the Law Enforcement AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Motion number seven is to appoint John Clark to the Law Enforcement AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any objection or discussion on the motion? Show the motion approved. We are moving on now to the Snapper Grouper AP and motion number eight is to reappoint Steve Amick, Scott Osborne and Mark Marhefka to the Snapper Grouper AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Motion number nine was to appoint Jim Atack to the Snapper Grouper AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, the motion is approved. Motion number ten is to re-advertise an open seat on the Spiny Lobster AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any objection to the motion? The motion is approved.

Motion number eleven was to appoint Jimmy Hull, Craig Andrews and John Barber to the SEDAR Pool. This is the pool for potential participation in future SEDARs. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection to the motion? That motion is approved.

These last two motions get to the issue of disbanding inactive APs or technical advisory groups. **Motion number twelve is to disband the Calico Scallop AP, Protected Resources AP and the Marine Protected Areas AP and to let all the members know that we appreciated their willingness to serve and thank them for their service. This action was discussed at the committee based on the fact that there had been no activity and it was determined that was the purpose for the motion. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection to the motion. Robert.**

MR. BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, in light of the comments that we heard from some of the public yesterday, I think it’s imperative that we make clear in coverage perhaps, Kim, of this action that we’re very explicit on why these actions were taken. This is not to say that these issues aren’t still perking, but it is really due to committee inactivity. I think it’s important that we’re explicit about that.

MR. ROBSON: Thank you, Robert, and again I think we all at the committee level had the understanding that if ever we needed to have these APs reconstituted, that would certainly be something we would do. Again on behalf of the committee I have moved. **Is there any other discussion or objection to that motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved.**

Similarly, the last motion I have I believe is motion thirteen, and that is to disband the Shrimp BRD Ad Hoc Group; the Shrimp Plan Development Team; and the Snapper Grouper Assessment Group; and thank the members for their service. This motion was made for the same reasons as the previous motion, due to the inactivity of these technical groups. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any objection or discussion of that motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. CUPKA: That brings us down to our final committee report. We saved the best for last. That's snapper grouper, and Mac is going to lead us through that. I think we're going to try something a little different this time because of the number of motions we have to deal with, but I'll let Mac go over the process with you and let you know what we're going to do and how we're going to handle it.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and we'll try to get through this. Once again, perhaps for the last time I'll have to rely on Rick to make sure that I don't forget anything. As I indicated yesterday, my intent on this is to briefly outline what the committee did. As we get to the motions regarding each of the alternatives or amendments or regulator actions, I would propose that we approve all of those motions.

Unless there is objection or discussion on any particular one, then I would suggest we approve all of the others in a single motion and then discuss any others that people might have concerns. I will allow you some time to look through those. There are a number of them on the Comprehensive ACL and on Amendment 18, so I will give the council time to look those over and make sure that you're comfortable with all the individual motions in there.

The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week and received an update from Kim Iverson on the Oculina. Carolyn Belcher was there from our SSC to answer questions regarding their report. Nick Farmer came up and reintroduced us to his model that we have become so familiar with and talked a little bit about how that might be used as we consider modifications to red snapper management as a result of SEDAR 24 in December.

The council decided that a regulatory amendment would be the best way to handle changes in red snapper management. We discussed what sorts of actions we would perhaps like to take and decided that a combination of the red snapper closure and the smallest possible spatial closure would be of prime concern; but it didn't look like, based on a preliminary assessment of the assessment, that there would be any harvest allowed. At least that is what it looks like to date.

We discussed and went through Amendment 18 with Kate – a number of motions, which we will get into shortly – as well as Amendment 20 on wreckfish with Kate, and there is perhaps a motion or two there as well. We went through in great detail the Comprehensive ACL Amendment and a number of motions there. Amendment 22, comprehensive catch shares, is

basically an outline of beginning the process of how that program might look in addition to other actions considering trip limits and the like.

Amendment 22 dealing with long-term red snapper management, we considered approaches that we might want to take and outlined a handful of those for staff to begin working on. Scoping meetings for that amendment will be held in January and February of 2011. We looked at Amendment 24 again, which contained black grouper and red grouper management measures. Black grouper we decided could be dealt with in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment because they're not overfished. Red grouper, however, is remaining in Amendment 24 and will require a rebuilding plan.

We talked about the Regulatory Amendment 9 dealing with potential trip limits for black sea bass, vermilion snapper, gag and greater amberjack. It previously had some sea turtle release gear changes in there as well, the committee moved the gear changes to the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 2, so they no longer remain in the regulatory amendment.

Under other business Comprehensive ACL Amendment had some modifications to the wreckfish bag limits, and Monica pointed out that non-wreckfish permit holders would not be able to retain their bag limit of fish caught. There are some measures in there dealing with potential recreational bag limits for wreckfish so we asked the staff to look at that and come up with some means of trying to make sure that if we do decide to allow the recreational harvest of wreckfish that they will in fact be allowed to possess them after that.

MR. CUPKA: If I may, before we get into your motions – I'm assuming that's the next part of your report – I'd like to just take a minute, if I may, to allow Robert to introduce my old boss when I was working with DNR, Mr. Mike McShane, who is chairman of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources Board, and to welcome him.

MR. McSHANE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I was glad to see a South Carolinian back in the chairman's seat. South Carolinians have never been bashful about trying to lead in anything that we can get our hands on. I see Tom, another representative here; it's good to see you. I'll be very brief. Thank you for allowing me for this. I now you've been here all week.

I feel like you; I've been in a natural resource state all week. I started my week in Winnipeg, Manitoba. I've been in Minneapolis, D.C., Columbia and now back home, finally, but welcome to my hometown. I know that many of you have been here for several occasions. In my eighth year as chairman of our DNR – and I think most people understand, that's about the sunset of my two-year commitment originally that is now into my eighth year.

You will probably not be back here during my time so thank you very much for the work you've done. The council has a great relationship with our state agency. We're proud of the leadership between David, Tom and Robert, and we appreciate the work. I know many times you get the same type of counsel from your constituents as I did yesterday on a deer management issue, so I appreciate very much what you do and welcome to have you back here in Charleston. Thank you, David.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Mike, we appreciate you coming by. I know from my experience and service on both the council and with DNR how interested you've been in the council process and how supportive you've been of that and we appreciate that, so thank you. Okay, Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, David. **The first motion from the committee is regarding red snapper management, and the motion on behalf of the committee is to utilize the regulatory amendment process to change the regulations in 17A based on the results of the stock assessment SEDAR 24. Any discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

I will give you a few minutes to look over the number of motions, 19 I believe if we subtract the ones that were withdrawn or failed. It's motions three through twenty-two regarding Amendment 18. It is all of the ones under the Amendment 18 Section except for Motions 4 and 14. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I just wanted to remind you, Mac, on Motion Number 8, during the committee meeting I was asked to go out and get some suggested numbers for analysis for the alternatives. I have done that; so when you're ready, I would be glad to make that.

MR. CURRIN: Then, Brian, if you don't mind and it's okay with the rest of the council, we will not consider in my motion for the others Motion 8, and we will discuss that after I presume we approve the others. I think Ben has something else on golden tile as well. Is everyone okay with the motions regarding Amendment 18 with the exception of the two that were withdrawn and Motion 8 that Brian just indicated he would like to discuss further? Everybody had enough time to go through them?

Anybody see anything that they think we need to readdress or to kick out and address later? **All right, if everybody has carefully considered all of those; then on behalf of the committee I would move that we approve all of the motions under Amendment 18 with the exception of 4, 8 and 14. Any discussion of the motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under Amendment 18 were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 3: Extend an invitation to the NEFMC and MAFMC to participate in future SAFMC meetings as a member of the Snapper Grouper Committee.

Motion 5: Request staff to work up alternatives to address northern expansion with the intent to; one, exempt commercial fishermen in the northern zone from sales prohibition; and, two, do not require a commercial permit in northern areas.

Motion 6: Direct staff to devise more specific alternatives for management measures protocol action and update northern data in the document.

Motion 7: Include new eligibility requirements based on finalized data.

Motion 9: Individuals that meet qualifying criteria for both hook-and-line and longline endorsements only receive one endorsement.

Motion 10: Move Alternative 7 under transferability of endorsements' action to the considered but rejected alternatives.

Motion 11: Add an alternative under Action 6 that prohibits longline fishing after 75 percent of the quota is taken.

Motion 12: Add an action that allocates commercial golden tilefish between longline and hook-and-line gear groups as; one, 75 percent longline, 25 percent hook and line; two, 85 percent longline, 15 percent hook and line; three, 90 percent longline, 10 percent hook and line.

Motion 13: Add alternatives under Action 7 to Alternatives 2-4 to add minimum poundage (average, aggregate, in one year) of 500, 1,000, 2,000, 5,000, 10,000.

Motion 15: Under Action 10, Alternative 6, change wording to be "require that commercial landings and catch/effort data be submitted in accordance with ACCSP standards, using the SAFIS System".

Motion 16: Move Alternative 3 to the considered by rejected section.

Motion 17: Under Action 11, Alternative 5, change wording to be "require that for-hire landings and catch/effort data be submitted in accordance with ACCSP standards, using the SAFIS System" and move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected section.

Motion 18: Remove Action 12 from Amendment 18.

Motion 19: Remove Action 13 from Amendment 18.

Motion 20: Include an action with alternatives for trip limits for the hook-and-line golden filefish fishery of 300 pounds, 400 pounds, 500 pounds (include conversion to number of fish).

Motion 21: Remove Actions 1 and 2, northern expansion and EFH actions, from Amendment 18 and put them into a new Amendment 18B.

Motion 22: Approve Amendment 18A for public hearings. Staff will add new actions and alternatives.)

MR. CURRIN: Now, Motion 8, Brian, you wanted to discuss that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, I'll just start off with a motion and then we can discuss as we need to. Currently we have a motion, Motion Number 8, that was to direct staff to devise alternatives to determine hook-and-line bycatch outside the endorsement requirement for golden tilefish. During the committee discussion, I was asked to try to come up with some

alternatives for the staff to analyze. I have checked with some fishermen and this is what I've come up so I could go ahead and make the motion that we move to direct staff to analyze alternatives of five, ten and fifteen fish for hook-and-line bycatch outside the endorsement requirement for golden tilefish.

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Brian and second by Ben. Discussion of that motion? Does everybody understand it, allow some bycatch for those folks who are involved in other fisheries that do not have or may not have the golden tilefish endorsements.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And just to make it clear, it's only for the hook-and-line fishery and no other gear.

MR. CURRIN: **Any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none, that motion is approved.** Brian, I presume that is to be incorporated with or to replace Motion 8.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That is correct; that was the intention.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you very much. The next amendment we considered was Amendment 20. There is only a single motion that came from the committee on that. **On behalf of the committee I move that we create a new action and alternatives to auction off shares belonging to deceased and uncontactable shareholders and/or allocate shares to a new entrant program. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** Yes, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So that was specific to just auction? I mean, does the staff have latitude to look at other options besides auctioning?

MR. CURRIN: I believe that was the intent. I don't thing there was specificity of only offering those through an auction; but somebody correct me, that's my recollection.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That was my recollection as well is it was broader than just an auction.

MR. CURRIN: It depends on how you read it I guess, but does say create new action and alternatives in the action. Well, it does say "to auction off shares". Yes, we probably need some clarification there if that is not the intent to solely offer those through an auction. David.

MR. CUPKA: Monica, I think there is an action in there with some alternatives that would allow those shares to be distributed to the other shareholders, so that would still be in there. This would just be a new action to consider doing something else with them, I believe.

MR. CURRIN: I think David is right, best I recall.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, we can work with that.

MR. CURRIN: **Okay, but the intent is to make sure that is not the only method of redistributing those. Any further discussion on that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.** The next is a series of motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment to modify the Snapper Grouper FMP. That is Motion 24 through to I believe 45; so if you would consider those, I'll give you a few minutes to look them over and make sure everybody is okay.

Everybody okay; do you see anything that needs to be modified? Just for everyone's comfort and increase your comfort level and the folks in the audience as well, all of the individual motions will be captured in the record. Joe has a list of those and when the minutes come out, the individual motions will be captured in the record. Everybody okay? **On behalf of the committee I would move that we approve Motions 24 through 45 under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment dealing with snapper grouper. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to snapper grouper were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 24: Committee recommends development or establishment of a policy whereby a species outside of the FMU is considered for inclusion.

Motion 25: Remove the species from the FMU that fall under "both" (EC designations and qualify for removal) designations.

Motion 26: Not remove mutton snapper from the Snapper Grouper FMU.

Motion 27: Staff to develop new alternatives based on table on Comprehensive ACL Amendment Page 178 (EC Analysis Table).

Motion 28: Remove Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 under Action 3 to the appendix.

Motion 29: Do not remove hoggish from the Snapper Grouper FMU.

Motion 30: Make Alternative 5 under Action 3 the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 31: Move Alternative 5 under Action 4 to the appendix.

Motion 32: Make Alternative 5 under Action 5 the council's preferred alternative for species that are not overfished and for which there is a P-star analysis.

Motion 33: Remove language referring to "three years rolling forward for future amendments" from all alternatives where it appears.

Motion 34: Add Alternatives 4 through 7 under Action 6 (allocations) for analysis.

Motion 35: Incorporate Dr. Farmer's recommendations under Action 7 (ACLS), Alternatives 1 through 4.

Motion 36: Move Action 8 (ACTS) under Action 9 (AMS).

Motion 37: Make Alternative 3B under 8 (ACTS) the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 38: Remove Actions 10-13 from the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Motion 39: Replace Action 14 with the discussion of the ABC provided by the SSC and the rationale for it.

Motion 40: Accept the IPT recommendations and replace Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 under Action 16 with new wording and that Alternative 2 be the preferred alternative.

Motion 41: Insert "equals OY" in Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 under Action 14 between "ACL" and "ABC".

Motion 42: Apply language in motion above throughout the document to specify OY.

Motion 43: Move Action 17 to the considered but rejected appendix.

Motion 44: Move commercial AM measures under Action 18 to the appendix and that the document reflects that the IFQ Program is the AM.

Motion 45: Move Alternative 5 under Action 18 to the appendix.)

MR. CURRIN: The section deals with the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP. That is Motion 46 through 65, with the exception of Motion 54 and 55, one of which was withdrawn and one of which failed. I will give you some time to look those over. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Mac, I was comparing Motion 65, realizing we had a very similar motion under the Ecosystem Committee, that Motion 65, which reads "create an action in the Comprehensive ACL to designate sargassum as an EC species," and Motion Number 8 under the Ecosystem Committee was "request that the IPT investigate additional actions, including the possibility of designating sargassum as an EC under another FMP such as dolphin and wahoo and/or withdrawing the Sargassum FMP." That motion was already passed, so is this a further modification of that? I didn't know if it was redundancy or if we wanted to deal with that or what.

MR. CURRIN: I think it is a redundancy. It actually places this action in the Comprehensive ACL under the dolphin and wahoo, so we have kind of taken the next step, I guess, as a result of the action of the Ecosystem Committee.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I just wanted to get a clarification on that because I remember that we had already had a sargassum motion.

MR. CURRIN: I don't think there is any conflict. It's probably something we didn't have to do, but I think it did place us step ahead because it is now already in the actions in the Comprehensive ACL under the Dolphin and Wahoo Plan. Everybody okay? **I would move, on behalf of the committee, that we approve Motions 46 through 65 with the exception of 54 and 55 in the Comprehensive ACL under the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP. Any discussion of the motion? Any objection to the motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to dolphin and wahoo were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 46: Remove Alternatives 2, 3 and 7 from Action 20.

Motion 47: Eliminate Action 21 from the document and incorporate specification of OY into Action 22.

Motion 48: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 23.

Motion 49: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 22.

Motion 50: Accept alternative, ABC equals ACL, under Action 22.

Motion 51: Accept the IPT's recommendations to restructure alternatives under Action 25 and add Option C (reduce the bag limit) under Alternative 6.

Motion 52: Select Alternative 6, Option C as the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 53: Select Alternative 2 under Action 25 as the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 56: Accept the IPT's recommendations under Action 27 to remove Alternatives 2 and 3 from the document and move Alternative 7 to the appendix.

Motion 57: Remove Action 28 and fold in discussion of OY into the ACL action.

Motion 58: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 30 and move Alternative 2 to the appendix.

Motion 59: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 29; replace Alternatives 2 and 3 with alternatives recommended by the IPT.

Motion 60: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 32; replace Alternatives 2 and 3 with alternatives suggested by the IPT.

Motion 61: Add Option C under Alternative 6 to reduce the bag limit as was done for dolphin.

Motion 62: Select Alternative 2 under Action 32 as the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 63: Select Option C under Alternative 6 for the recreational sector AM.

Motion 64: Select Alternative 4 under Action 32 as a preferred alternative for the recreational sector.

Motion 65: Create an action in the Comprehensive ACL to designate sargassum as an EC species and withdraw the Sargassum FMP; provide staff the latitude to figure out alternatives to prohibit harvest of sargassum.)

MR. CURRIN: Next is still under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment; Motion 66 through 71 regarding the Golden Crab FMP; if you would take a look at those and make sure you're comfortable. Everybody okay? **On behalf of the committee I would move approval of Motions 66 through 71 regarding the Golden Crab FMP. Discussion. Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to the Golden Crab FMP were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 66: Remove Actions 41 and 42 and place in considered but rejected appendix.

Motion 67: Make Alternative 2 (ABC equals 2 million pounds) the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 68: Remove Alternative 8 from Action 43.

Motion 69: Select Alternative 2 (ACL equals ABC) under Action 44 as the preferred alternative.

Motion 70: Remove Action 45 from the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Motion 71: Select Alternatives 2 and 3 as the council's preferred alternatives under Action 46.)

MR. CURRIN: The next series of motions are Numbers 72 through 77 regarding the Sargassum FMP; if you would take a look at those and see if you're still comfortable with all those motions. **On behalf of the committee, then I would move approval of Motions 72 through 77 regarding the Sargassum Fishery Management Plan. Discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to the Sargassum FMP were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 72: Remove Action 34 from the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Motion 73: Remove Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 and 6 under Action 35.

Motion 74: Replace Alternative 5 to SSC's recommendation of ABC equals 12,800 pounds.

Motion 75: Remove Action 36 from the amendment.

Motion 76: Remove Alternatives 4 through 6 and place in appendix and change Alternative 3 to ACL equals 5,000 pounds.

Motion 77: Remove Action 38 from the amendment.)

MR. CURRIN: The next motion is regarding Amendment 21, the Comprehensive Catch Shares Amendment. **The motion on behalf of the committee is to include in Amendment 21 a discussion of regional quotas as a catch share program. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

The next motions are 79 and 80 under Amendment 22, Long-Term Red Snapper Management Measures. I would note that Motion 81, which is in your report, had failed. **On behalf of the committee I would move that approve Motions 79 and 80 under Amendment 22. Discussion of the motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under Amendment 22 were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 79: Add an alternative for endorsements to the options paper in Amendment 22.

Motion 80: Add alternatives for bag limits, size limits, gear and seasonal closures to the options paper.

MR. CURRIN: Amendment 24 regarding black and red grouper, as I indicated earlier in the report, Amendment 24 will now contain only actions regarding red grouper, and that is reflected in Motions 82 through 87; if you would take a look at those and see if you're okay with those. **On behalf of the committee I would move approval of Motions 82 through 87 under Amendment 24. Any discussion?** Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have a question on Motion 87, which is remove language specifying "three-year rolling average" from the entire Amendment 24 document. If you look at Motion 85, it talks about removing that language from the allocation discussion. I'm not sure whether – I just want to make sure that on Motion 87, when you're removing the "three-year rolling average" from the entire Amendment 24 document, that is what you intended, including if you – you know, frequently you've looked at a three-year rolling average in terms of comparing landings with the amount of ACL to come to the conclusion as to whether the amount of harvest is going to be reached or not – just if you're all clear that won't be in the amendment.

MR. CURRIN: I think this is specific to some verbiage which occurred even in a previous amendment that the IPT recommended we take out. If you remember the discussion, Ben raised the issue that it has to do with allocations; and if we let that three-year average – adjusting it by 50 percent of the most recent catches and 50 percent historical, at some point if you let that run long enough you're going to end up potentially with all the allocation in one sector or the other.

That is not the intent I believe as we discussed and that is the attempt to take that language out. We could have done it under the previous motion, as we did in an earlier amendment for the entire document; but I think 85, we did it for a specific action. We could have and probably should have done it for the entire document in that one motion, but there was another place where the verbiage occurred later in the document, and that is what Motion 87 attempted to do.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I agree and I thought you were specifically discussing the three-year rolling average, removing that as it applied to any kind of allocation kinds of options or alternatives.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and I see your point because we did, with the recreational accountability measures, have selected as preferred alternatives which start out with one year but then utilize the three-year averages to determine whether accountability measures need to be implemented.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, you said it more artfully but that was my point is that you may want to still retain that in there.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, there is no intention of taking that out by this motion. I think that's pretty clear to the staff, and it is certainly the intent of the committee, I believe. **Everybody okay? Any further discussion of the motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under Amendment 24 were approved by the SAFMC Council: Motion 82: Move black grouper from Amendment 24 to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Motion 83: Select Alternative 4B under jurisdictional allocations action as the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 84: Move Alternatives 2 and 3 from the jurisdictional allocation action to the appendix.

Motion 85: Remove language specifying "3-year rolling average" from Alternatives in 2E and 3E (sector allocations).

Motion 86: Select Alternative 4 as the council's preferred alternative under the red grouper rebuilding schedule action.

Motion 87: Remove language specifying "3-year rolling average" from the entire Amendment 24 document.)

MR. CURRIN: I believe the last motions are under the Regulatory Amendment 5 dealing with black sea bass, vermilion snapper, gag and greater amberjack trip limits. Again, there is a motion to remove sea turtle gear changes out of that regulatory amendment that is reflected in the motions. Those are Motions 88 through 94, with the exception of 91 and 92, one of which failed and one that was withdrawn; if you would take look at those and make sure you're comfortable.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, Kerry Marhefka came up yesterday and she requested that we add an alternative to consider I think a 2,500 pound trip limit for vermilion snapper.

MS. MARHEFKA: It was 1,500.

MR. HARRIS: It was 1,500; okay, thank you. It's not in here, I don't believe. At the proper time I would like to move to do that.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, Duane, if we would go ahead and consider these motions first and then I'll recognize you to offer another motion. **All right, on behalf of the committee, then I would move approval of Motion 88, 89, 90, 93 and 94 under the Regulatory Amendment 9 Section. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.**

(Whereupon, the following motions under Regulatory Amendment 9 were approved by the SAFMC Council: Motion 88: Add trip limit of 2,500 pounds to Alternative 2 under Regulatory Amendment 9, Action 1.

Motion 89: Move Alternative 3 (Action 1) to the considered but rejected appendix.

Motion 90: Add a sub-alternative under Alternative 4 to analyze the pot fishery would close when 50,000 pounds is left and then reopen on January 1.

Motion 93: Add alternatives to analyze 2,000 and 2,500 pound per trip limits for greater amberjack for vessels making multi-day trips north of Cape Canaveral.

Motion 94: Move action to modify sea turtle release gear requirements to the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment.)

MR. HARRIS: **Mr. Chairman, I would move that we add to one of the alternatives consideration of a 1,500 pound daily trip limit for vermilion snapper.**

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Duane; second by Robert. Discussion on that motion? I think this is not much different than we did in one of the motions we just approved where we extended the upper end of the trip limits for another species. I think it was perhaps black sea bass; I can't recall. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I want to be careful about some of the wording we have here. What Duane just said was a daily trip limit, but I think in the regulatory amendment we actually just say "trip limit" because we have been defining this in terms of trips and not days.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, Brian is correct. I should have just said "trip limit" and not "daily trip limits", so if you would allow me just to delete the word "daily" from that motion.

MR. CURRIN: I think Myra was way ahead of you; she never wrote "daily" down. Any further discussion of that motion? The motion is to add an alternative to consider a 1,500 pound trip

limit for vermilion snapper. **Is there any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** Mr. Chairman, unless there are other questions about the Snapper Grouper Committee Report or the 94 motions that we just considered, that ends my report.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I think Ben has an issue that he wanted to bring up.

MR. CURRIN: I'm sorry, Ben; I thought you were going to bring that up under 18.

MR. HARTIG: Well, you went right along and I didn't want to break your concentration. I knew we could get it at the end. The item I have is in the golden crab endorsement options.

MR. CURRIN: Golden crab or tile?

MR. HARTIG: Golden tile – it has been a long week. All of the options are between two valid snapper grouper permit holders. A case could arise where a snapper grouper permit can be transferred one to one between immediate family members, and I don't know how that would work if you wanted to transfer the endorsement with it at that time. I may be making something that is not a problem and I just wanted to have it discussed on the record and see what the rest of the council wanted to consider.

MR. CURRIN: No, it's a good point. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Ben brought this up to me and I thought it was a good point, and I thought maybe the document would need to discuss that as well. You couldn't transfer an endorsement to someone who wasn't a snapper grouper permit holder; but it would seem to me that if you were transferring a snapper grouper permit one to one to a family member and it had an endorsement, we can theorize that the permit and endorsement – the permit would be transferred first and then the endorsement because the endorsement doesn't endorse anything except a permit.

So, really, it seems to me that it would be part and parcel and it would be transferred pretty simultaneously. I think in terms of the permit transfer with the endorsement, I don't think that would be an issue, but I'm going to think about it some more. We should put a discussion in the document about that. I think that might be helpful.

MR. CURRIN: Is that sufficient for staff to make sure that we capture that somewhere at least for discussion and consideration, if it turns out to be a problem? Clear on that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's probably good to remind the public that this doesn't open up any requirements currently in place about the transfer requirements for the snapper grouper permit; be it two for one or one for one or any of that.

MR. CURRIN: I just want to make sure that if it is an issue, that we're not prohibiting something that makes sense to allow. Anything else? Mr. Chairman, that ends my report.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Mac, good work, and we appreciate your efforts to streamline some of that. Nearly a hundred motions is a lot of motions to go through individually. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's just really for a general discussion. We have a number of amendments in the hopper now and we have this regulatory amendment. I was wondering if maybe there might be some discussion from council members as to what you see as a priority in terms of getting things done and when and what the priority I guess for you all would be about finishing the regulatory amendment and bringing it back. It's probably good for staff and for me to know just when you expect to see it again or when you would like to take final action.

MR. HARTIG: The problem arises is when you statutory deadlines for a number of the other amendments. We really don't have a whole lot of say into what priority we would put on a regulatory amendment when you statutory deadlines for the other amendments. We're kind of behind the eight-ball on that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, sure, but I mean there are some things that are out there that – I believe 18A and 18B, I don't know that they have any statutory deadlines tied to them. Maybe you could just have a discussion as to when you would like to see these trip limits implemented and give us some sort of idea on a timeframe basis just so staff knows where to put their efforts, I do, too.

MR. CUPKA: Obviously, the ones that have statutory deadlines ought to be our first priority, but, you're right, there are some that don't have any statutory deadlines. Personally I would tend to give a little bit more emphasis after the ones that do have a statutory deadline is to the regulatory amendment maybe before some of the others, but that is just my personal comment.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I was going to say the same thing. Part of the reason why we wanted to put these actions into a regulatory amendment is because we wanted to get them done as quickly as possible. Obviously, we have the Magnuson-required actions that we have to take care of first, so I think really the regulatory amendment is the next priority.

MR. CURRIN: I would agree; that is something that is extremely important to the fishermen. We've heard time and time again how the early closures are greatly affecting them.

MR. CUPKA: All right, before we get in agency reports, it has been pointed out to that we failed to take a roll call when we started this council. I guess Duane was in such a hurry to turn it over that he forgot to do that. We do need to do that for the record and for the minutes; so if we can start here with Ben and we'll just go around the table.

MR. HARTIG: Ben Hartig, Florida.

DR. LANEY: Wilson Laney, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. SWATZEL: Tom Swatzel, South Carolina.

MR. CURRIN: Mac Currin, North Carolina.

MR. GEIGER: George Geiger, Florida.

MR. HARRIS: Duane Harris, Georgia.

MR. HAYMANS: Doug Haymans, Georgia.

MR. PHILLIPS: Charlie Phillips, Georgia.

MR. ROBSON: Mark Robson, Florida.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Brian Chevront, North Carolina.

MR. CUPKA: David Cupka, South Carolina.

MR. MAHOOD: Bob Mahood, council staff.

MS. BROUWER: Myra Brouwer, council staff.

MR. BOYLES: Robert Boyles, South Carolina.

MR. BURGESS: Tom Burgess, North Carolina.

DR. McGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.

DR. CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.

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

DR. PONWITH: Bonnie Ponwith, NOAA Fisheries Service.

LT. FISCHER: Lieutenant Brandon Fischer, U.S. Coast Guard.

DR. SHIPP: Bob Shipp, Gulf Council.

MR. CUPKA: We can let the record reflect that Vince was present through Thursday and Red Munden. All right, agency reports; the first item on the agenda is status reports from our Regional Administrator. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, just a few things that I'll go over. We sent a quota report out to everyone. It was e-mailed so you should have it. You will notice that we have modified it somewhat to show when quotas were caught in previous years. That was in response to I think a request that Louis Daniel sent out.

Take a look at that; and if you have any comments on the format or suggestions, get in touch with Jack and let him know. Mackerel; we had some discussions about mackerel landings earlier. Mackerel has been recently added to the quota monitoring system, and the science center

is working on updating the landings. I believe one of the problems is that the document – which number was that one?

DR. McGOVERN: Eighteen.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that some of the numbers in the table in Amendment 18 may be incorrect, and that's why it didn't match up with the quota monitoring proposal, but we'll look at that. Just as a heads up, we got information this week on the vermilion snapper and black sea bass commercial quotas. We're projecting that those will be met in October, so we'll probably be putting out some announcements on that in the near future.

Amendment 17A, we published the Notice of Availability on July 29th. The proposed rule published on August 13th. The comment period will end on September 27th for both of them. The secretary will make the decision of approval/disapproval on October the 27th. We expect to have the final rule effective sometime around December 1st. We have so far gotten about 70 comments in on the Notice of Availability.

The Notice of Availability on Amendment 17B will publish sometime next week. The approval decision on that will be due in December sometime. I also wanted to let you know that we have reinitiated consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act on a couple of fisheries. One is the shrimp trawl fishery in the southeastern U.S., Gulf and South Atlantic. That is a result of a number of things.

One, there have been substantial changes in the shrimp fishery over the past several years; and, two, of course, is the impact of the oil spill on the Gulf with turtles. We have had high numbers of strandings in the Gulf. There have some oil turtles recovered. We will be looking at all of those things.

One thing we are going to be looking at is skimmer trawls. One thing that has become apparent in the Gulf is that we're having difficulties in terms of compliance with the tow-time restrictions in skimmer trawls. Skimmer trawls right now are exempted from the TED regulations that they're required to limit tow times to one hour or less, and we've had compliance problems with that. One thing we may be looking at is the potential requirement of TEDs in skimmer trawls at some point down the road.

We've also reinitiated consultation in the sawfish portion of the fishery, looking at sawfish catches and takes in shrimp trawls. We have exceeded the incidental take allowance for sawfish in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and so we will be looking at that. I believe the Gulf Council is working with the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Management Foundation to try and hold a sawfish workshop with the shrimp industry to look at possible ways to reduce bycatch in shrimp trawls. I don't know that those dates have finalized, but we were at one point at least talking about some time in early November.

Then just a little bit of an update on the oil spill. I'm you're all aware that the well has been capped for some time; and so over the past several weeks we've been sampling areas for reopening. We have now reopened about half of the closed area at its largest. We are continuing

to sample fish and shellfish. They go through a series of sensory tests as well as chemical tests. If all of the sampling in an area tests clean, we then have a protocol that we've set up with FDA, the decisions are all made with FDA concurrence. After we complete sampling of areas, we can then come in and reopen them.

We have reopened now – the southern-most area was the first area that was reopened. We have reopened some areas off Western Louisiana. We have reopened all of the nearshore areas in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. We're continuing to sample and make progress on that. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Roy. Before we get into any questions, Roy, I just want to add that I did talk to Judy Jamison at the last Gulf Council meeting after there was discussion about this sawfish workshop. It is my understanding that our council will also be invited to participate in that since the biological opinion – and the shrimp fishery, of course, is a South Atlantic issue as well, so we should be receiving an invitation or an opportunity to participate in that workshop ourselves. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I had a question, Roy, and I don't know if you even know this, but have they had areas where they sampled and they couldn't reopen?

DR. CRABTREE: No, not at this point. There have been a couple of fish that failed the testing. There was one early on that I think was a snapper. That was before we were starting reopening. There was another one that I believe was an escolar. When that happened, those areas were not opened at that time; and we went back in after some time had passed and resampled again.

I guess in a sense they have; but out of thousands of animals that we have tested so far there have only been a couple that failed the sensory test. I believe those that failed the sensory test passed the chemical test, and so there may have been some issues with the condition of the product. We have found that things, for example, like blue crab, you have to almost get them to the sensory testers alive because they don't hold up any period of time and you can't freeze them. But it's amazing that of all the samples we've tested, we've found problems with so few.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions or comments for Roy? Roy, I think we did have an agenda item here to review and make recommendations to you on an EFP request from the Gulf and South Atlantic Foundation; is that correct?

DR. CRABTREE: I believe we do. Jack, do you want to do this?

MR. CUPKA: It is behind Attachment 2 in our council tab.

DR. MCGOVERN: Mr. Chairman, the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation has requested an exempted fishing permit. They have cooperative research funding to continue an observer program on snapper grouper commercial hook-and-line vessels in the South Atlantic. The observers would collect information on total catch, effort and discards.

The intent of their project is to enhance the data that are used in stock assessments. In order that they verify that species are being correctly identified, they would like to be able to retain up to 500 specimens outside the size and seasonal regulations. These specimens would be retained only for scientific purposes and would not be sold commercially.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Jack; any questions for Jack? If not, I would entertain a motion regarding a recommendation to the Regional Administrator. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: I would recommend approval of the EFP.

MR. CUPKA: We have a motion by Mac; a second by George. Discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion is approved. All right, that brings us down to the Southeast Fishery Science Center Report. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: I would like to begin by talking a little bit about our stock assessment improvement activities, including the activities under the additional funding we got under the Expand Annual Stock Assessment Budget Line. First, we have got a fishery-independent cruise that we planned aboard a NOAA vessel. Originally we intended that cruise to take place on the Pisces.

The Pisces has been detailed to do deepwater oil detection cruises near the wellhead, and so we are shifting that effort on to the NOAA vessel, the Nancy Foster. That work will be able to be conducted as planned, just on a different platform. Leg One in fact departed this week and is expected to run through the 25th of this month. It will focus on the use of fish trap and in conjunction with video cameras.

This is one of the recommendations of the workshop that was held last November to be able to calibrate those two methodologies against one another to result in a more robust fishery-dependent sampling gear. In addition to that, in the nights we're going to be running multi-beam and split-beam sample transects, and that will be to further delineate a suitable habitat for samples. That's a critical effort in refining the precision and the natural variance of those catches.

The enhancements we've made to the MARMAP sampling, the MARMAP season is wrapping up right now, and I believe that the end count is that they're finishing with above the average or expected number of days at sea of sampling, so that was a very successful year. We also enhanced the MARMAP sampling by the addition of another contracted vessel. We used the Research Vessel Savannah.

The Savannah has completed 15 of 29 days at sea and has retrieved 190 traps. Each of these were outfitted with video cameras in conjunction with the traps. The data have not been analyzed at this point, but as soon as that is done we'll give you an indication of that pairing is working. The goal is to use the remaining days at sea between now and October; one trip off the coast of Georgia and other one off the coast of Northern Florida.

The Red Snapper Longline Project, we've got two contract vessels lined up. One is completely outfitted and ready to go and in fact would have departed but they're keeping a close eye on these weather systems that have kicked up some water out there. The other one will be fully outfitted and ready to go quite soon.

This has been a very good partnership with the fishing industry in terms of the input that they have provided and encouragement they have provided to get this work done. Again, this is the one where we will be doing the transects cross-shelf from shallower waters to the deeper waters over the shelf break to test the hypothesis that the size composition is different in those heavier fished shallow waters than the deeper waters.

In terms of staffing, we have hired one new stock assessment scientist and plan to start in January. A second offer has been made and I would anticipate a response from that job offer occurring today, if it hasn't already. We've got a third position that we're going to re-recruit for. We will be submitting that paperwork in December; holding it open as long as we can in the hopes of getting applicants that are coming through stock assessment programs in this new crop graduating in December.

I'll be certain to forward that recruitment announcement to the council for dissemination again. In the meantime if you have awareness of good candidates, to let them know that we'll be recruiting again. In terms of the headboat update, the logbook collections continue to be ongoing and are on target. The completion date for the data entry for the 2010 is on track and possibly will be early this year.

As you know, we've been involved with a electronic logbook program through MRIP, and this has been a pilot program off the South Atlantic coast using eight vessels; two from North Carolina, two from South Carolina, one from Georgia and three from Florida. This pilot project is expected to conclude this October, after which an analysis of the results of this and some conclusions will be drawn.

I should be in a position to report on that at the next meeting. In addition, Dr. Crabtree and I have a meeting planned with the MRIP group and we'll be able to talk with them about what the next steps for electronic logbook reporting would be for the for-hire or for the headboat sampling program. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Bonnie; questions or comments for Bonnie? Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Bonnie, we all have announcements out to hire people out there. I was interested; at what grade level or pay band level are you starting the stock assessment scientists?

DR. PONWITH: We are recruiting at Pay Band Three and also Pay Band Four. A Pay Band Three position, just for context, would be an early career, recent graduate, PhD, through a PhD with some considerable experience. A Pay Band Four would be a PhD that has a proven track record working within this discipline. We will be recruiting at both of those. My expectation is we also will be recruiting to two career paths. One would be a research fishery biologist as well as also looking at biological statisticians.

MR. CURRIN: Bonnie, North Carolina is looking for a stock assessment person, too, and we have trouble competing. For just my edification, can you give me a salary range for your Pay Band Three and Pay Band Four?

DR. PONWITH: I would have to look that up.

MR. MAHOOD: Bonnie, I've got it right here. The pay band is a little bit different than the GS schedule. We're on the pay banding on the council now. A three equates to a GS 11 or 12, and then it goes up through the non-supervisory positions; starting at about 57 up to as high as 89 unless you become a supervisory. Pay band four starts at 81 and goes up to 125.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, and, David, I had one more. Bonnie, I was talking to Tom yesterday about the electronic logbook reporting. I asked him if depth was a requirement on that, and I believe you indicated that it was not. That is very disappointing. We've got a new system potentially going up.

We are all well aware of the need for depth information from the headboats and from the for-hire sector as well. What is the rationale or reason for not including that on the electronic logbook that is being experimented with now? I guess as a second question; are there plans to make sure that we start recording depth at least in this new program if it goes forward?

DR. PONWITH: I can only surmise that with the onset of the electronic logbook program they wanted to control the types of inputs that they were getting so that the experiment would be looking at just the difference in reporting. I concur with you that anytime we make any change, adding depth that the fish were caught would be one of the best additions to that form.

I'll certainly carry that forward when we go to our meeting with MRIP. Note that this was just a pilot so it was a subset of the total vessels there, but I will take that under advisement; and for any further pilots of absolutely if they consider converting the full headboat fleet to electronic reporting, to take advantage of that change and to add that field in. It's a good point.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just a thought; Bonnie, after you do your longline survey, are you all going to look at possibly hiring some commercial boats to do traps surveys like MARMAP to kind of give you some extra options?

DR. PONWITH: What I think we'd like to do is take a look at the results that we have gotten from this year and use the results from these comparisons of the video traps, the additional geographic expansion, and use that as a means of locking in the ideal configuration for the spatial and temporal coverage. Once those decisions are made, the actual platform type would be the second-tier decision. I would certainly believe that the use of commercial and headboat vessels as a platform would be on the table on that point.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions or comments for Bonnie? Seeing none, thank you, Bonnie. That brings us down to our agency and liaison reports. I'm just going to start on my left and go around the table. I will start with Dr. Shipp. Bob, do you have any good news for us from the Gulf Council?

DR. SHIPP: I'll just give you two or three highlights of what is going on in the Gulf. One is the situation with gag grouper is dire. There is going to be an adjustment to the assessment, but the quota next year, both recreational and commercial, is going to be very, very much reduced. Amberjack is staying open a little bit longer this year than earlier anticipated as a result of the reduced effort from the oil spill.

Finally, I guess the most interesting highlight is that the red snapper quota, only about a third of it was actually taken because of the oil spill reduced effort, so this fall the council voted to ask NMFS to reopen red snapper Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays from October 1st to November 22nd. That was greeted with glee along the northern Gulf coast. We're still waiting formal word from Washington, but we anticipate that will happen. Roy may even have an update on that. Those are the highlights from the Gulf.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Bob, and we appreciate your being here this week and look forward to continue working with you and the Gulf Council.

DR. SHIPP: I apologize for my informal attire. At the Gulf we have shed coats and ties forever. I would urge you to contemplate that for yourselves.

MR. CUPKA: All right, continuing along, Brandon, do you have some comments from the Coast Guard?

LT. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, as I'm sure everyone as knows, it has been a challenging summer for the Coast Guard as it has for all our agencies that have been having to respond to Deepwater Horizon and meeting the resource demands for that on top of doing their normal missions around the country or their states. I do have some numbers here for you as we close out the year.

I heard an interesting statistic the other day that when you add up the manpower and the aircraft and the boats and all the equipment and everything that has rotated out to Deepwater Horizon, something like 80 percent of the Coast Guard has at some point rotated in or out of that area. It's very close and it's pretty analogous to looking at the response we did to Katrina, which lasted a few weeks, and this is something that is going on and on and on and on in terms of our response, so keep that in mind as we go through some of these numbers here.

With our fiscal year closing out in about two weeks, this should be pretty close to our final numbers. Our total cutter hours for the year are standing at 6,590. That is actually up significantly from last year at 4,816. Our aircraft hours are about the same; 49 hours as opposed to 51 last year. Our small boat hours – this all in pursuit of the LMR mission – are 993 hours. That's down significantly from 1,263 from last year.

Our total boardings in the year are down. We had 649 living marine resource boardings completed during the year; down from 872 last year. That's reporting 17 significant violations including three foreign fishing vessels EEZ incursions detected and intercepted. In addition, it has been kind of a summer of change also in my realm over at the Southeast Fisheries Training Center.

All the training centers in the Coast Guard, as of – well, we’re still waiting on the official message to come out, but more or less it’s kind of de facto begun to shift over to – instead of working for our districts, who traditionally have been our customers – we report up the same chain of command as the people that we trained – we now have all come underneath a new Force Readiness Command that has been set up for the Coast Guard.

It’s a centralized training system. I’ve heard that about 98 percent of all the Coast Guard’s training – that’s everything from helicopters to cooking to fisheries law enforcement – is all underneath one roof. I think in the long run it’s going to – in the short term not a lot of changes come from it. It hasn’t really interrupted our operations or any of our customer service to District VII.

In the long run I think it’s going to provide better service and support. They have full-time GS staff to do nothing but training and curriculum development and curriculum design. We’re already seeing some of the benefits of that. They have much better trainers and mockups. They’ve got big full-sized shrimp boats and bandits rigs, the longliners and all kinds of things that are much better than our wooden box that we play in for our mockups. I think in the long run we should see a better-quality law enforcement officer, better trained and more knowledgeable folks coming out of our program. That pretty concludes my report. Does anyone have any questions?

MR. CUPKA: Okay, thank you, Brandon, we appreciate that. Bonnie, do you have anything else to add?

DR. PONWITH: No, thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I don’t have anything to add.

MR. CUPKA: Roy, you’ve covered everything you wanted to cover? All right, we’ll get some state reports. Robert.

MR. BOYLES: Given the fact that I was the messenger of doom and gloom back in June, I’m going to try to be a sunny guy this morning and say that we are doing the best we can with what we’ve got. The agency is anticipating further budget reductions as we move into Fiscal Year 2012. It continues to have some significant impact on our operations.

I’ll give you an example. Our entire shellfish section retired in June; 120-plus years of experience. Thank God, we’ve got industrious and hard-working and passionate people working for us. We will continue to do the best we can. We are working on some exciting projects regarding status reports and trends reports for state resources.

Something we are going to be rolling out here as quickly as we can given our staff limitations is a publicly accessible state of the resources for about 18 or 20 species; designed really to give the public a view of kind in layman’s terms of almost a shareholders report or a stock holders report

on the status of some of the resources that are under our management and stewardship. We're really excited about that.

We ended our first year with what I guess I would call as close to a universal accounting of South Carolina saltwater recreational anglers on June 30th. Last year sold about 208,000 saltwater recreational fishing licenses. This, of course, was done in response to the Magnuson requirements for a federal saltwater angling registry.

We are in the process of processing a Memorandum of Agreement with the Fisheries Service to exempt our anglers from that saltwater angler registry. We're really excited about that. We're just working on a lot of different things. I know our MARMAP crew has been out working with science center staff to enhance our fishery-independent sampling in the South Atlantic. Again, we're anticipating another 20 or 25 percent budget cut coming for next year. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Robert; any questions for Robert? Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll ask Robert, but somebody else may know the answer. If our state has not signed the MOU with NOAA Fisheries yet; does that mean we need to go ahead and register for the angler registry even if we have a – I have a lifetime license for North Carolina. My understanding is North Carolina's anglers will be covered at some point, but I just wondered if they haven't signed the MOU yet; do we still need to go ahead and register.

MR. BOYLES: I'll answer from our perspective, Wilson. I think the Service is processing these MOUs as they can. I'm not sure that there is any requirement for folks in North Carolina because North Carolina has a license to be on that federal registry. I know that there are some states – I believe I saw press release – and, of course, defer to folks from the Service, but I know there are people on that registry from other states.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions? Mark.

MR. ROBSON: No, but just to clarify, the NOAA Fisheries Service provided a written letter, whatever you want to call it, basically stating in the case of Florida that we were an exempted state – they considered us an exempted state because of implementing a shoreline license and that the MOU would just be a follow-along process as time permitted. We're working through an MOU process right now, but we have been declared an exempted state from the federal registry, and I imagine that is the case for the other states.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Mark. All right, Brian, North Carolina.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Like all the other states, we're having our fair share of budget woes. We're looking at potentially up to another 20 percent loss of appropriations this year, which for us now means loss of programs and additional personnel. I don't think we're using aircraft anymore. We haven't gotten as bad as South Carolina and lost an entire section yet, but it is not good.

I mean we have marine patrol officers out doing observers on gill net trips looking for sea turtles now because we can't afford to hire observers otherwise to do that to stay in compliance and try to keep the gill net fisheries open as a result of our late unpleasantness regarding sea turtles in North Carolina, but it is being resolved and we're working through it and we're doing okay with that.

A lot of you may realize or remember that just before Labor Day Hurricane Earl came by the North Carolina coast. We survived that pretty well except we had another bout with tires washing up on Bogue Banks. We had between six and ten thousand tires wash up on Thursday night before Labor Day weekend, so marine fisheries staff spent Friday and half a day Saturday on Labor Day weekend picking up tires. Thanks to the citizens of North Carolina, many of them actually pitched in and on vacation helped pick up tires off of Bogue Banks. I have a question, Bob; did those tires get put out there when you were in charge in North Carolina?

MR. MAHOOD: No, we put out our fair share in Georgia, but they were all done by the time I got to North Carolina.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Well, it's an odd occurrence. We can't ever predict when this is going to occur, and it seems to happen every couple of years. We're hoping that we're getting near the end of the tires washing up on our beaches. It was an experiment that went horribly, horribly wrong and we're still paying the price for that. These tires went out I think in the seventies and into the early eighties; and so thirty years later we're still paying the price. Other than that, that's it.

MR. MAHOOD: Tell them why we were putting them out.

MR. CUPKA: I have to tell you that we put our fair share out in South Carolina back in the seventies, too. I hold my breath every time there is a storm, but so far we haven't had any come up. I don't know what we did differently and maybe we're just lucky. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, the old people sitting around the table know why we put them out and maybe the younger people in the audience don't. This was a twofold effort; one, to get rid of old tires; and, two, to build artificial reefs. We would actually take a tire as the base, fill it with concrete with rebar sticking out of it, thread other tires onto it, turn the rebar over at the top, carry it out on barges and dump it and it made a nice relief area out in the wide-open sand. It worked well until the rebar started rusting and the tires fell apart and the storms blew them up on the beaches. It was ill-conceived but it served its purpose at the time.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, let me add to that. The first rebar that went in the concrete just went straight down in the concrete. Well, go figure! We didn't have an "L" in the bottom of it so it just came right out and the tires all came off and washed up. But, you know, after the first set of reefs that we built, the next tires had this "L"-shaped bend in the rebar, and they never came apart. Those tires are still out there and working well. The rubber is disintegrating, but the rebar is still in place; never rust.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, that was our lesson for today.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, in the Gulf – and Dr. Shipp can attest to this – they didn't bother taking the tires off the car. They just drove right off.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, Mark, do you want to give us Florida's report.

MR. ROBSON: I learn something at every one of these meetings. I, too, had heard the stories in Florida. We had the same problem with tires and they continued to wash ashore after years and years. It was the same good intentions but bad outcome. We think that when you introduce tires to the saltwater environment, they begin to reproduce and that's why they're still turning up. We're looking into that.

To follow up a little bit on some of Roy's good information about the Gulf oil spill, I know there has been so much interest in it, and, of course, the Fish and Wildlife Commission in Florida has been heavily engaged in that whole mess. We had, at the peak, about 300 personnel from the agency actively involved in different aspects of the oil spill, from reconnaissance to GIS mapping to wildlife and fisheries management issues. We had about a 200 square mile area closed off of Escambia County, which is Pensacola, of state waters at one point, because of oil, to fishing. All of that water has been reopened.

The good thing – and Roy mentioned about the sampling and testing that has been done as a result of the spill – out of bad can come good, and I think one of the things that we learned at both state and federal level, all the Gulf states and the federal managers as well was that we really didn't have adequate laboratory capacity to test seafood and fish for oil contamination on a scale of testing that would be needed to restore and reopen some of these areas to fishing.

I think a lot of effort was made by both the NOAA Fisheries Service and FDA to increase that laboratory capacity, and it really did help to speed up the process of getting waters reopened once we were able to do the testing. Hopefully, that laboratory capacity will remain in place and even some of Gulf states have now put place some state laboratory capacity to have a standard, consistent mechanism for testing fish and invertebrates for oil contamination.

This is just some Florida numbers just to give everybody an idea. Generally, Gulf-wide 9.6 million feet of sorbent boom was deployed in the Gulf to try to respond to the spill. There was 691,000 feet of floating boom deployed; and 34.7 million gallons of an oil/water mix had been recovered throughout the course of the spill either from skimming or other types of vacuuming type operations.

There has been a lot of discussion about the impact or use of dispersants in the spill. There was a large amount; 1.8 million gallons of dispersant has been applied either under the water or at the surface to try to deal with this spill. Of course, that has raised a lot of concerns in the past as we've gone through the process.

However, I think a lot of us working on this issue have recognized that it potentially was a necessary evil. We have found that it did help to break up the spill in a lot of ways and allow for the natural microbial action and the natural weathering to take place on the oil spill and probably helped to minimize the impact along the coast and shorelines and marshes.

There was an awful lot of impact. There are still a lot of areas closed to fishing, of course, and we're trying to get them reopened. I know Roy has mentioned that. Again, I think the thing that came to me as a result of this whole process was I think in a lot of ways the Gulf states and the states and federal managers improved some lines of communication, and there was a lot of good communication going on throughout the process as a result of this oil spill. That's really all I wanted to reported, Mr. Chairman, and that concludes my report from Florida.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Mark; any questions for Mark? Okay, seeing none, then we will move to Georgia.

MR. HAYMANS: Just echoing the other states' budget concerns, CRD is now at an all-time high of a 52 percent reduction since 2008; expecting 2012 to be the worse year with our last two state-funded programs on the chopping block or at least offered on the chopping block. I got an interesting e-mail this morning in that our newly minted commissioner of all of two years is resigning as of the end of October and will be moving on to the chair of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce.

We expected something like that to happen with a change in governors coming up in January, but it may be a little bit sooner than we expected, so that is going to be an interesting next few months for us, anyway. With respect to the oil spill, we spent significant amounts of time preparing for the tarball invasion that none of us expected to happen except for the general public. One thing it did show us is that we have plenty of the – you know, our area contingency plan as well as all of CRD's plans all revolve around that tanker leaking in the Savannah River or the Brunswick area, but we had never planned for this large-scale, on-shore onslaught of oil from offshore, so it did allow us to put a plan in process to deal with that sort of issue. So from Georgia's perspective, I guess that was one significant outcome.

If you have problems reaching any of us at CRD within the next couple of months, we're in the third phase of a four-phase renovation of our building. It has finally gotten to fisheries. Over the next three weeks Spud and I and several others will be switching offices, computers, telephones and all that kind of good stuff, but hopefully by the end of the year that will be wrapped up. Just so just be patient if you're trying to get to us.

I guess the final thing I'll mention is it wasn't a council-related activity; it was a commission-related activity, but it sort of falls in line with everything that we do here, and that is just the increased amount of – I'm calling it federal-mandated pushback that we're receiving. I know this is because of the political world that we live in now, but we had our first-ever fishery regulatory request kicked back on us this past month.

It dealt with shad, of all things. At our board meeting we followed immediately behind the Environmental Protection Division's presentation where they were having mandated changes with greenhouse gases. Unfortunately, we came along with shad – and it's required of the commission as well as the Endangered Species Act – and I think the board had heard enough, and so somehow over – you know, as I'm in my learning process, but I think it's going to become more and more of an issue as we go along. Any sort of advice that you guys have to

offer as we move along on how to deal with your local boards or your state agencies and how you deal with federal mandates would be appreciated. I think that concludes my report.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Doug; any questions for Doug. Seeing none, then we'll move on down the table to Wilson.

DR. LANEY: I think everybody has my written report and I'll just mention a few things that are going on – a lot of stuff going on. The Albemarle/Pamlico National Estuary Program is moving to an ecosystem-based management approach. It has created a transition team to do that. We're working pretty closely with Dr. Carl Hershner at the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences, who is kind of guiding us through that process. We have a team that's working on that. The Policy Board has approved it so it's going to be interesting to watch that take shape.

The Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge is working closely with the Nature Conservancy to begin some experiments with regard to adaptation to sea level rise. That Refuge is one that is going to be tremendously affected by sea level rise. A large portion of it will basically go underwater if all the predicted increases occur. We are working with the Nature Conservancy there to try and create a more resilient forest as well as to construct oyster reefs offshore and see if that won't have some positive impacts.

I gave you the update on the American Eel Listing Petition that we received April 30, 2010. Our Northeast Region has the lead for that. We still haven't allocated any funding for preparation of a 90-day response on that, so we have been served with a Notice of Intent to sue on that one. I mentioned to some of you that we've started surveying for Atlantic sturgeon on the Roanoke River. NOAA provided a Section VI Grant to – it was collaborative grant, actually, between Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina.

In North Carolina Dr. Joe Hightower I think was the recipient of that grant. For years we know that we've been getting reproduction in the Albemarle/Roanoke System and getting lots of age zero and age one Atlantic sturgeon in the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries fishery-independent gill net survey for striped bass.

We still haven't figured out where they're spawning so this year we decided we would try some fall sampling just to see if we couldn't turn some up. I'm pleased to report that earlier this week, on the 14th of September, the Wildlife Resources Commission crew and the Division of Marine Fisheries crew along with NC State folks and USGS folks spotted a couple of very large Atlantic sturgeon at Weldon, North Carolina, which is kind of the beginning of the rapids. I'm going to be going with a crew on September 28th and hope to get my hands on one of them. I think the plan is to put transmitters in those and see if we can't track them to the spawning grounds.

The Center for Biological Diversity filed a petition with the Service for 404 species. Most of them are aquatic. A lot of them are in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, so again I've provided the information there if you're interested in that. We're beginning to work on the 2011 Cooperative Winter Tagging Cruise, which hopefully will be conducted again next January.

The Service was also very intensively involved in the Mississippi Canyon Oil Discharge Response. I spent two weeks sitting in Homer, Louisiana, in the BP Operations Center there, mostly flying a computer. I did get out to see the bird rehab facility up at Hammond and it was a very interesting experience, so talk to me offline some time.

We still have over 300 Fish and Wildlife Service employees down there. Most of them are involved in recon and recovery. A lot of the folks are working with the cleanup crews that are on national wildlife refuges and national parks and just trying to make sure that those cleanup activities leave the habitat as intact as possible.

I put the latest graph in the update with regard to how many eels we're passing at Roanoke Rapids Dam now. Up through August 25th, the total is approaching 300,000 eels, which is way more than any of us ever dreamed that we would be able to capture and pass at that facility. We're in the process of doing efficiency experiments there to see how well they find the entrance to those eelways and then how well they manage to climb to the top once they get into the system.

That's a very interesting process and operation and I would encourage any of you that are in the neighborhood who want to tour the eelways we can certainly work with Dominion Generation and arrange that for you. A lot of other stuff going on, but those are the highlights. I think I have provided a whole lot of information in the written report, links to websites and so forth and so on. If you have any questions, once you look that over, I'll be happy to try and answer them.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Wilson; questions for Wilson? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I have a quick one. Georgia received 140-something brown pelicans that got released in CRD. How many of those have made it back to the Gulf coast? When they took off, they headed southwest.

DR. LANEY: I have no idea, Doug. I know that we banded all of those birds. Dr. Heidi Stout I think was the one that was running the whole bird operation. Some of them also got painted. I know there was a lot of debate about that, but they were trying to find some way that they could put a mark on that was readily visible beyond just the bands that they were using.

I think some of them had some bright – there was a lot of debate about the color to use on the beak, but I think they wound up using a day-glow green of something like that. I haven't heard. The information about the birds was just updated yesterday on the Service Website or the day before yesterday, so you may check the Service Website and see. I haven't gotten direct reports.

I know that while I was there, there was a proposal to put transmitters on a good many of them so we could not only get band returns but also track them via satellite. There was some concern about that because of the fact that a lot of birds were juvenile birds and they have pretty high mortality rate, anyway.

As you might well imagine, there was a lot of concern I guess about putting transmitters out there because they're pretty expensive on a cohort of birds that is going to have a high mortality

rate, anyway. I'm not exactly sure what wound up happening to that proposal. I think it may have been approved in some way, shape or form, but hopefully there will be information coming out on that.

MR. CUPKA: All right, before I ask for other business, Robert.

MR. BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a brief comment regarding ASMFC at the appropriate time.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, you can bring it up when we get to other business. I was going to ask Bob to quickly go over the upcoming meetings before I ask for other business.

MR. MAHOOD: We've got a fairly busy fall coming up. We have the Spiny Lobster Update at the end of this month down in Key West. I think we have some council members involved in that. The SEDAR Steering Committee will be meeting in Charleston October 5-7. Then the following week is the SEDAR 24 Red Snapper Review Workshop in Savannah, Georgia.

We also will be hosting the National SSC Meeting in Charleston this year. That is a meeting of all of the SSC chairmen, vice-chairman, and I think one or two others, John, that we allow each council to send to that meeting. They address a number of issues relative to the new mandates of the SSCs. This will be the third one. It has been very productive and we look forward to hosting that meeting.

The Gulf Council meets the week of the 25th of October, and Chairman Dave Cupka will be attending that meeting. In the first week of November, the week of the 8th our SSC will be meeting in Charleston. Then the following week we've got the SEDAR 23 Review Workshop in Key West. We've got a Spiny Lobster Review – is 23 spiny lobster, John, or is it –

MR. CARMICHAEL: Spiny lobster is an update.

MR. MAHOOD: Okay, is an update, and that's also in Key West. That brings us to the week of December 6th where the council will be meeting in beautiful downtown New Bern, North Carolina. I think I'll just stop there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, any questions for Bob about upcoming meetings? There are a number of them going this fall. All right, that will bring us down to other business. Robert.

MR. BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, Vince asked me to pass on his regards and his appreciation for the hospitality that the council afforded this week. A couple of items; just to note the summer meeting summary of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission was included in your briefing packet.

I would like to point that the state of South Carolina is hosting the 69th Annual Meeting of the commission at the Francis Marion Hotel here in downtown Charleston November 7-11. I think it probably runs concurrent with the SSC meeting, but I certainly would like to extend an invitation for any of you to join us. All the meetings are open to the public. I'm looking forward to a nice

productive week at a beautiful time of year here in Charleston. If you guys are so inclined, we would love to have you join us. Thank you.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Robert. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I wanted to ask if you could consider convening the Shrimp Committee at the December meeting to talk about sawfish takes – we should have had the workshop by then – and what steps the council might be interesting in taking.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, the council staff can work that into our agenda for our December meeting.

MR. HARTIG: During the public comment we received at least one comment that the control date in snapper grouper was getting old, and I think Roy said, yes, it was probably was. I think it's 2004. Also, the Gulf Council is considering in mackerel looking at latent permits. Based on those two concerns, I've got a motion that we implement a control date of September 17, 2010, for the snapper grouper and king and Spanish mackerel fisheries. I make that as a motion.

MS. BROUWER: Ben, I'm sorry, could you repeat your motion for me, please?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, implement a control date of September 17, 2010, for the snapper grouper and the king and Spanish mackerel fisheries.

MR. CUPKA: Again, we have a motion; is there a second to Ben's motion. We have a second by Mac. Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion is approved. Anything else, Ben? Are there any other business items? Seeing none, then I wish everyone a safe trip home and we'll see you in downtown New Bern, North Carolina, in December if not before. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 o'clock a.m., September 17, 2010.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
September 28, 2010

INDEX OF MOTIONS APPROVED BY COUNCIL

SPINY LOBSTER COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 33: Motion to approve the Gulf Council's changes to Action 3, which would be move Alternative 3 and 6 to considered but rejected appendix and delete Option A in Alternatives 2, 4 and 5. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion to move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion to move Alternative 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion in Alternative 4 to remove the words "and gear type". Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion to move Alternative 3 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion to remove "and gear type" from Alternative 4. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion to move Options B and C of Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected category. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion to move Alternative 4 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 34: Motion to adopt Alternatives 3 and 5 as preferred alternatives for the action dealing with tailing requirements. Motion carried on Page 34.

PAGE 34: Motion to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative. Motion carried on Page 34.

PAGE 34: Motion to add an alternative to delegate to the state of Florida regulations regarding removal of trap lines, buoys, or otherwise making unfishable any spiny lobster gear. Motion carried on Page 34.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 34: Motion to add prohibition of bag limit sales of Atlantic Migratory Group King and Spanish mackerel and cobia to Amendment 18 and also add cobia bag limits. Motion carried on Page 34.

PAGE 34: Motion to add actions to adjust Spanish mackerel bag limits and commercial trip limits. Motion carried on Page 35.

PAGE 35: Motion to add alternatives to Appendix B of Amendment 18 to include allocation alternatives in the options paper that will consider state-by-state and regional allocations of the commercial Atlantic Group King Mackerel Quota. Motion carried on Page 36.

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 36: Motion that council request that the Southeast Fishery Science Center provide trends and SAFE reports annually by the September council meeting. Is there any discussion on the motion? Motion carried on Page 36.

PAGE 36: Motion to withdraw Actions 1-5 in the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 2 and replace with an explanation. Motion carried on Page 36.

PAGE 37: Motion to add an action to the document to specify that the 50,000 colony quota apply to both federal and state waters in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to restructure Action 7 to remove octocorals from the FMP. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to include Alternative 4 to prohibit the use of spearguns and hand spears as recommended by the IPT. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to move Action 9 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion that the IPT investigate additional actions including the possibility of designating sargassum as an ecosystem component under another FMP, perhaps dolphin and wahoo, and/or withdraw the Sargassum FMP. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to approve the Estuarine Invasive Species Policy with guidance to staff to conduct the necessary edits. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to modify both the Estuarine and Marine Invasive Species Policies to strongly discourage use of non-native species in aquaculture. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to approve the Marine Invasive Species Policy with guidance to staff to conduct the necessary edits. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 38: Motion that staff write a letter on behalf of the council to request additional funding for JEA activities. Motion carried on Page 38.

JOINT EXECUTIVE/FINANCE COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 40: Motion to indicate to the Gulf Council and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission our willingness to assume management responsibility for yellowtail snapper, mutton snapper and Nassau grouper throughout their range. Motion carried on Page 40.

PAGE 40: Motion to send a letter to Dr. Ponwith, Southeast Fishery Science Center, requesting that she consult with the appropriate state agencies and ACCSP to resolve the problems with timely reporting of quota-monitored species. Motion carried on Page 40.

SEDAR COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 41: Motion to carefully analyze appointments of panelists to SEDAR workshops and webinars to ensure attendance. Motion carried on Page 41.

PAGE 41: Motion to appoint Hoenig, Sedberry, Johnson, and Reichert to the Goliath Grouper and Spiny Lobster Review Panel. Motion carried on Page 41.

PAGE 41: Motion to appoint Anne Lange as the Red Snapper Review Chair. Motion carried on Page 41.

PAGE 42: Motion to recommend that the steering committee elevate the black sea bass assessment to a benchmark, including data through 2010, and to be presented to the council by June 2012. Motion carried on Page 42.

PAGE 42: Motion to adopt the black sea bass terms of reference for the benchmark assessment. Motion carried on Page 42.

PAGE 42: Motion that sub-sampling of otoliths' procedure carried out within the Southeast Fishery Science Center be evaluated. Motion carried on Page 42.

PAGE 42: Motion to approve the 2011-2015 research prioritization plan. Motion carried on Page 42.

PAGE 42: Motion that the council direct the STC members to use the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's South Atlantic Prioritization Proposal as a guideline for decisions about stocks to be assessed. Motion carried on Page 42.

PAGE 42: Motion that the Council Chair, as a member of the SEDAR Steering Committee, has authority to act on behalf of the council at steering committee meetings. Motion carried on Page 42.

PAGE 42: Motion to accept the COI Disclosure Form with the suggested edits. Motion carried on Page 42.

PAGE 42: Motion to consider convening a workshop to develop abundance indices for multiple species from the new independent monitoring efforts and to consider incorporating those indices into assessments through the update process when feasible. Motion carried on Page 43.

AP SELECTION COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 45: Motion to reappoint Steve Ross and Andy Shephard to the Coral AP. Motion carried on Page 45.

PAGE 45: Motion to create an ecosystem-modeling position on the Habitat AP and to transfer Dr. Pat Halpin from the Coral AP to the newly created position on the Habitat AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to appoint John Cramer to the Coral AP to represent the commercial fisherman non-coral harvester seat on the AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to appoint John Dean to the Information and Education AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to appoint John "Brad" Stewart to the Mackerel AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to appoint Mark Rogers to the Law Enforcement AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to appoint John Clark to the Law Enforcement AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to reappoint Steve Amick, Scott Osborne and Mark Marhefka to the Snapper Grouper AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to appoint Jim Atack to the Snapper Grouper AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to re-advertise an open seat on the Spiny Lobster AP. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to appoint Jimmy Hull, Craig Andrews and John Barber to the SEDAR Pool. Motion carried on Page 46.

PAGE 46: Motion to disband the Calico Scallop AP, Protected Resources AP and the Marine Protected Areas AP and to let all the members know that we appreciated their willingness to serve and thank them for their service. Motion carried on Page 47.

PAGE 47: Motion to disband the Shrimp BRD Ad Hoc Group; the Shrimp Plan Development Team; and the Snapper Grouper Assessment Group; and thank the members for their service. Motion carried on Page 47.

SNAPPER GROUPEL COMMITTEE MOTIONS

PAGE 49: Motion to utilize the regulatory amendment process to change the regulations in 17A based on the results of the Stock Assessment SEDAR 24. Motion carried on Page 49.

AMENDMENT 18 MOTIONS

PAGE 49: Motion to approve all of the motions under Amendment 18 with the exception of 4, 8 and 14. Motion carried on Page 49. (Whereupon, the following motions under Amendment 18 were approved by the SAFMC Council: Motion 3: Extend an invitation to the NEFMC and MAFMC to participate in future SAFMC meetings as a member of the Snapper Grouper Committee.

Motion 5: Request staff to work up alternatives to address northern expansion with the intent to; one, exempt commercial fishermen in the northern zone from sales prohibition; and, two, do not require a commercial permit in northern areas.

Motion 6: Direct staff to devise more specific alternatives for management measures protocol action and update northern data in the document.

Motion 7: Include new eligibility requirements based on finalized data.

Motion 9: Individuals that meet qualifying criteria for both hook-and-line and longline endorsements only receive one endorsement.

Motion 10: Move Alternative 7 under transferability of endorsements' action to the considered but rejected alternatives.

Motion 11: Add an alternative under Action 6 that prohibits longline fishing after 75 percent of the quota is taken.

Motion 12: Add an action that allocates commercial golden tilefish between longline and hook-and-line gear groups as; one, 75 percent longline, 25 percent hook and line; two, 85 percent longline, 15 percent hook and line; three, 90 percent longline, 10 percent hook and line.

Motion 13: Add alternatives under Action 7 to Alternatives 2-4 to add minimum poundage (average, aggregate, in one year) of 500, 1,000, 2,000, 5,000, 10,000.

Motion 15: Under Action 10, Alternative 6, change wording to be "require that commercial landings and catch/effort data be submitted in accordance with ACCSP standards, using the SAFIS System".

Motion 16: Move Alternative 3 to the considered by rejected section.

Motion 17: Under Action 11, Alternative 5, change wording to be “require that for-hire landings and catch/effort data be submitted in accordance with ACCSP standards, using the SAFIS System” and move Alternative 2 to the considered but rejected section.

Motion 18: Remove Action 12 from Amendment 18. Motion 19: Remove Action 13 from Amendment 18.

Motion 20: Include an action with alternatives for trip limits for the hook-and-line golden filefish fishery of 300 pounds, 400 pounds, 500 pounds (include conversion to number of fish).

Motion 21: Remove Actions 1 and 2, northern expansion and EFH actions, from Amendment 18 and put them into a new Amendment 18B.

Motion 22: Approve Amendment 18A for public hearings. Staff will add new actions and alternatives.)

PAGE 50: Motion to direct staff to analyze alternatives of five, ten and fifteen fish for hook-and-line bycatch outside the endorsement requirement for golden tilefish. Motion carried on Page 51.

AMENDMENT 20 MOTIONS

PAGE 51: Under Amendment 20, motion to create a new action and alternatives to auction off shares belonging to deceased and uncontactable shareholders and/or allocate shares to a new entrant program. Motion carried on Page 51.

COMPREHENSIVE ACL AMENDMENT MOTIONS

SNAPPER GROUPEL ACTIONS

PAGE 52: Motion to approve Motions 24 through 45 under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment dealing with snapper grouper. Motion carried on Page 52. (Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to snapper grouper were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 24: Committee recommends development or establishment of a policy whereby a species outside of the FMU is considered for inclusion.

Motion 25: Remove the species from the FMU that fall under “both” (EC designations and qualify for removal) designations.

Motion 26: Not remove mutton snapper from the Snapper Grouper FMU.

Motion 27: Staff to develop new alternatives based on table on Comprehensive ACL Amendment Page 178 (EC Analysis Table).

Motion 28: Remove Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 under Action 3 to the appendix. Motion 29: Do not remove hoggish from the Snapper Grouper FMU.

Motion 30: Make Alternative 5 under Action 3 the council's preferred alternative. Motion 31: Move Alternative 5 under Action 4 to the appendix.

Motion 32: Make Alternative 5 under Action 5 the council's preferred alternative for species that are not overfished and for which there is a P-star analysis.

Motion 33: Remove language referring to "three years rolling forward for future amendments" from all alternatives where it appears. Motion 34: Add Alternatives 4 through 7 under Action 6 (allocations) for analysis.

Motion 35: Incorporate Dr. Farmer's recommendations under Action 7 (ACLS), Alternatives 1 through 4. Motion 36: Move Action 8 (ACTS) under Action 9 (AMS).

Motion 37: Make Alternative 3B under 8 (ACTS) the council's preferred alternative. Motion 38: Remove Actions 10-13 from the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Motion 39: Replace Action 14 with the discussion of the ABC provided by the SSC and the rationale for it.

Motion 40: Accept the IPT recommendations and replace Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 under Action 14 with new wording and that Alternative 2 be the preferred alternative.

Motion 41: Insert "equals OY" in Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 under Action 14 between "ACL" and "ABC". Motion 42: Apply language in motion above throughout the document to specify OY.

Motion 43: Move Action 17 to the considered but rejected appendix. Motion 44: Move commercial AM measures under Action 18 to the appendix and that the document reflects that the IFQ Program is the AM.

Motion 45: Move Alternative 5 under Action 18 to the appendix.)

DOLPHIN/WAHOO ACTIONS – COMPREHENSIVE ACL AMENDMENT

PAGE 53: Motion to approve Motions 46 through 65 with the exception of 54 and 55 in the Comprehensive ACL under the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP. Motion carried on Page 54.

(Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to dolphin and wahoo were approved by the SAFMC Council:

Motion 46: Remove Alternatives 2, 3 and 7 from Action 20. Motion 47: Eliminate Action 21 from the document and incorporate specification of OY into Action 22.

Motion 48: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 23. Motion 49: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 22.

Motion 50: Accept alternative, ABC equals ACL, under Action 22. Motion 51: Accept the IPT's recommendations to restructure alternatives under Action 25 and add Option C (reduce the bag limit) under Alternative 6.

Motion 52: Select Alternative 6, Option C as the council's preferred alternative. Motion 53: Select Alternative 2 under Action 25 as the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 56: Accept the IPT's recommendations under Action 27 to remove Alternatives 2 and 3 from the document and move Alternative 7 to the appendix.

Motion 57: Remove Action 28 and fold in discussion of OY into the ACL action. Motion 58: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 30 and move Alternative 2 to the appendix.

Motion 59: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 29; replace Alternatives 2 and 3 with alternatives recommended by the IPT.

Motion 60: Accept the IPT's recommendations for Action 32; replace Alternatives 2 and 3 with alternatives suggested by the IPT.

Motion 61: Add Option C under Alternative 6 to reduce the bag limit as was done for dolphin.

Motion 62: Select Alternative 2 under Action 32 as the council's preferred alternative. Motion 63: Select Option C under Alternative 6 for the recreational sector AM.

Motion 64: Select Alternative 4 under Action 32 as a preferred alternative for the recreational sector.

Motion 65: Create an action in the Comprehensive ACL to designate sargassum as an EC species and withdraw the Sargassum FMP; provide staff the latitude to figure out alternatives to prohibit harvest of sargassum.)

GOLDEN CRAB ACTIONS – COMPREHENSIVE ACL AMENDMENT

PAGE 55: Motion to approve Motions 66 through 71 regarding the Golden Crab FMP. Motion carried on Page 55.

(Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to the Golden Crab FMP were approved by the SAFMC Council: : Motion 66: Remove Actions 41 and 42 and place in considered but rejected appendix.

Motion 67: Make Alternative 2 (ABC equals 2 million pounds) the council's preferred alternative. Motion 68: Remove Alternative 8 from Action 43.

Motion 69: Select Alternative 2 (ACL equals ABC) under Action 44 as the preferred alternative.

Motion 70: Remove Action 45 from the Comprehensive ACL Amendment. Motion 71: Select Alternatives 2 and 3 as the council's preferred alternatives under Action 46.)

SARGASSUM ACTIONS – COMPREHENSIVE ACL AMENDMENT

PAGE 55: Motion to approve Motions 72 through 77 regarding the Sargassum Fishery Management Plan. Motion carried on Page 55.

(Whereupon, the following motions under the Comprehensive ACL Amendment pertaining to the Sargassum FMP were approved by the SAFMC Council: Motion 72: Remove Action 34 from the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Motion 73: Remove Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 and 6 under Action 35. Motion 74: Replace Alternative 5 to SSC's recommendation of ABC equals 12,800 pounds.

Motion 75: Remove Action 36 from the amendment. Motion 76: Remove Alternatives 4 through 6 and place in appendix and change Alternative 3 to ACL equals 5,000 pounds. Motion 77: Remove Action 38 from the amendment.

AMENDMENT 21 MOTION

PAGE 56: Motion to include in Amendment 21 a discussion of regional quotas as a catch share program. Motion carried on Page 56.

AMENDMENT 22

PAGE 56: Motion to approve Motions 79 and 80 under Amendment 22. Motion carried on Page 56.

(Whereupon, the following motions under Amendment 22 were approved by the SAFMC Council: Motion 79: Add an alternative for endorsements to the options paper in Amendment 22. Motion 80: Add alternatives for bag limits, size limits, gear and seasonal closures to the options paper.

AMENDMENT 24

PAGE 56: Motion to approve Motions 82 through 87 under Amendment 24. Motion carried on Page 57.

(Whereupon, the following motions under Amendment 24 were approved by the SAFMC Council: Motion 82: Move black grouper from Amendment 24 to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Motion 83: Select Alternative 4B under jurisdictional allocations action as the council's preferred alternative.

Motion 84: Move Alternatives 2 and 3 from the jurisdictional allocation action to the appendix.

Motion 85: Remove language specifying "3-year rolling average" from Alternatives in 2E and 3E (sector allocations).

Motion 86: Select Alternative 4 as the council's preferred alternative under the red grouper rebuilding schedule action.

Motion 87: Remove language specifying "3-year rolling average" from the entire Amendment 24 document.

REGULATORY AMENDMENT 9

PAGE 58: Motion to approve Motions 88, 89, 90, 93 and 94 under the Regulatory Amendment 9 Section. Motion carried on Page 58.

(Whereupon, the following motions under Regulatory Amendment 9 were approved by the SAFMC Council: Motion 88: Add trip limit of 2,500 pounds to Alternative 2 under Regulatory Amendment 9, Action 1.

Motion 89: Move Alternative 3 (Action 1) to the considered but rejected appendix.

Motion 90: Add a sub-alternative under Alternative 4 to analyze the pot fishery would close when 50,000 pounds is left and then reopen on January 1.

Motion 93: Add alternatives to analyze 2,000 and 2,500 pound per trip limits for greater amberjack for vessels making multi-day trips north of Cape Canaveral.

Motion 94: Move action to modify sea turtle release gear requirements to the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment.)

PAGE 58: Motion to add to one of the alternatives consideration of a 1,500 pound trip limit for vermilion snapper. Motion carried on Page 58.

PAGE 64: Motion to recommend approval of the EFP from the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation. Motion carried on Page 64.

PAGE 76: Motion to implement a control date of September 17, 2010, for the snapper grouper and the king and Spanish mackerel fisheries. Motion carried on Page 76.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2009 - 2010 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

✓ **Charles Duane Harris**
105 Demere Retreat Lane
St. Simons Island, GA 31522
912/638-9430 (ph)
seageorg@bellsouth.net

COUNCIL VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

✓ **Robert H. Boyles, Jr.**
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9304 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
boylesr@dnr.sc.gov

✓ **Tom Burgess**
P.O. Box 33
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460
910/327-3528
tburgess@embarqmail.com

✓ **Dr. Brian Chevront**
N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries
P.O. Box 769 (3441 Arendell St.)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 Ext. 8015 (ph)
252/726-6187
brian.chevront@ncdenr.gov

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

✓ **Benjamin M. "Mac" Currin**
801 Westwood Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607
919/881-0049 (ph)
mcurrin1@bellsouth.net

✓ **George J. Geiger**
566 Ponoka Street
Sebastian, FL 32958
772/388-3183 (ph)
georgejgeiger@bellsouth.net

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

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

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

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

✓ **Lt. Richard Mach**
U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6781 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Richard.A.Mach@uscg.mil

✓ **John V. O'Shea**
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1444 Eye Street, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/289-6400 (ph); 202/289-6051 (f)
voshea@asmfc.org

✓ **Charles Phillips**
Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-3149 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

✓ **Mark Robson**
Director, Division of Marine Fisheries
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
620 S. Meridian Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847(f)
mark.robson@myfwc.com

✓ **Tom Swatzel**
P.O. Box 1311
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/222-7456 (ph)
tom@swatzel.com

MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
JACK MCGOVERN
MARCEL REICHAERT
BOB SHEAP
TOM JAMIER
LT. BRANDON FISHER

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

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

Deputy Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Staff Economist

✓ Kathryn (Kate) Quigley
kate.quigley@safmc.net

Cultural Anthropologist

Open Position

Environmental Impact Scientist

✓ Rick DeVictor
richard.devictor@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Outreach Assistant

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

✓ Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Kari Fenske – kari.fenske@safmc.net

Coral Reef Biologist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@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/Adm. Assistant

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

SEDAR/ Staff Administrative Assistant

Rachael Lindsay
rachael.lindsay@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

Council Session
Charleston, SC
Friday, September 17, 2010

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP

FRANK HELIUS GSAFFI 813 286 8390

TAMPA, FL

Sera Devenak (Pew) 910-685-5705

Bolivia, NC

Megan Westmeyer 843-5798502

100 Aquarium Wharf Char 29401

Liza Dunmore 305-393-0934

Key Largo FL

Eileen Daugherty IEDF

Charleston, SC

Michelle Owen EDF 919 ⁹²³ 0774

Sarasota FL

Holly Binns (Pew) 850-322-7845

Tallahassee, FL 32303

Ernest Muhammad

Matt Ruby 843-962-4734

Little River SC, 29566

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

**Council Session
Charleston, SC
Thursday, September 16, 2010**

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP

Mark Brown	843-881-9735	3642 Pandora Dr. Mt. Pleasant SC
Megan Weltmeyer	843-579-8502	100 Aquarium Wharf Char 29401
Michelle Owen	919-923-0774	Sarasota FL 34234
Eileen Daugherty	EDOF	Charleston, SC
KELLY SCHOOLCRAFT	252-995-4029	FRISCO, NC
Jeff Aiken	252-473-0304	Hatteras, NC
Sean McKee		NCFA
Legare Smith	843-345-6779	1470 Goblet Ave Mt. Pleasant SC 29464
Math Ruby	843-962-4734	4449 Lakeside Dr Little River SC. 29566

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

Council Session
Charleston, SC
Thursday, September 16, 2010

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP

Chris Conklin / CTC
seven seas seafood 843 543 3833

578 Myloware MI SC 29576

LARRY JONES / JHL Fighting 803 767 5164

2325 TAYLOR RD CAYLE SC 29033

Robert Green / Big Daddy
F/V 843 450 2728

5455 Huntington Marsh Rd Murrells Inlet SC 29576

Rusty Johnson / JF 386-239-0948

PO Box 9351 Daytona Beach, FL 32120
-9351

Robert Cardin 772-370-4163

Fort Pierce FL

DAVE ALLISON OCEANA 202-833-3900

1350 CONNELLTICUT Ave #500
WA DC 20036

Sarah Fangman / NOAA/
ONMS 912-598-2428

10 Ocean Science Circle, Sav. GA 31411

FRANK HELLES GSAPRI 213 286 8390

TAMPA, FL

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



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC	DATE OF MEETING September 16, 2010
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) HENRY FEDDERN	TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE) 305-852-5459
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) 156 DOVE AVE, TAVERNIER, FL 33070	
EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE) hunter@terranova.net	
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE) FF Florida Marine Life Association	
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC	DATE OF MEETING September 16, 2010
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Kerry Marhefka	TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE) 843-452-7352
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) 1676 Culpepper Cir.	
EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE) Chs. SC 29407	
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)	
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Bill Kelly

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

305-619-0039

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

PO Box 501404 Maitland, FL 33050

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

FRCFEA3@hotmail.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Rita Merritt

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

910/256-3197

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

Merritt.Don@EC.PR.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

HOWARD PAW

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

954-612-3176

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1673 NE 36th St OAKLAND PK FL 33334

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

raw@bellsouth.net

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

DAVID Krebs

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

850-654-7779

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

712 PAPER DR DESTIN FL 32541

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

DAKFISH@hotmail.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

ARIEL SEAFOODS

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)



YES



NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) <p style="text-align: center;">Charleston, SC</p>		DATE OF MEETING <p style="text-align: center;">September 16, 2010</p>
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Kenneth Fea</i></p>		TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) <p style="text-align: center;"><i>902 W York St Oak Island NC</i></p>		
EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)		
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)		
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC	DATE OF MEETING September 16, 2010
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) MARK BROWN	TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE) 843-881-9735
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) 3642 PANDORA DR. Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466	
EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE) Capt. markbrown @ comcast.net	
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE) RFA-SC	
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

KELLY SCHOONCRAFT

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

252-995-4029

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

P.O. Box 242 FRISCO, NC 27936

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

KHNTRITYM@EMBARQMAIL.COM

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

SEAN MCKEON

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

NCFEA

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)



YES



NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Robert H Green

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843651-9698

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

5455 Huntington Marsh Rd Murrells Inlet SC

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Adventure Partners Inc.

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

LARRY JONES

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

803 767 5164

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

2325 TAYLOR RD. CAYCE SC 29033

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

J & C FISHING INC.

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

JACK COX

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

121 BUENA VISTA DR Newport NC 28570

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

dayboat@ec.rr.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

~~WATER FRONT INDUSTRIES~~

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

CHRISTOPHER C. CONKLIN

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-543-3833

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

548 Mary Lou Ave MI SC 29576

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

conklincc@gmail.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

CTC Seafood / Seven Seas Seafood / South Atlantic Fisheries Assoc

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)



YES



NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

MATTHEW ANDREWS

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

339 Bayshore Drive Miraville Fla 32578

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

Restless146464@yahoo.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

FV/ Restless II

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)



YES



NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Lidny Felhersten

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

Ocean Conservancy, Inc

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

OC

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Jimmy Hull

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC	DATE OF MEETING September 16, 2010
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Sheryllanne McCoy	TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE) 321-960-1663
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) PO Box 269 Cape Canaveral, Fl. 32920	321-868-0500
EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE) sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE) Cape Canaveral Shrimp Co, Wild Ocean Sea Food Market Southeastern Fisheries Association	
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Matt Ruby

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-902-4784

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

4449 Lakeside dr Little River SC. 29564

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC	DATE OF MEETING September 16, 2010
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Rusty Hudson	TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE) 386-239-0948
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) PO Box 9351 Daytona Bch, FL 32120-9351	
EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE) DSF2009@aol.com	
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE) Directed Sustainable Fisheries, Inc.	
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Jeffrey K. Aiken

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

252-473-0304

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

P.O. Box 515

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

aikenj5@gmail.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Jeffreys Seafood - NC dealer

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)



YES



NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Legare Smith

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-345-6779

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1470 Goble + Ave Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

oceanlegare@gmail.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)



YES



NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

John Austin

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

276 Goose Creek Rd

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

Rebecca@ec.fish.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC	DATE OF MEETING September 16, 2010
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) DAVID ALLISON	TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE) 202 - 833-3900
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) 1350 Connecticut Ave NW #500	
EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE) dallison@oceana.org	
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE) Oceana	
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Mike Merrifield

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

321-615-5228

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

688 S. Park Ave Titusville, FL 32796

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

mikem@wildoceanmarket.com

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Cape Canaveral Shrimps

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)



YES



NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Public Comment - Agenda Items

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

September 16, 2010

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Eileen Dougherty

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

919-601-8868

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

EMAIL ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

EOP

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

YES

NO