

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

GOLDEN CRAB COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, Florida**

JUNE 10, 2010

SUMMARY MINUTES

Golden Crab Committee:

David Cupka, Chairman
Dr. Wilson Laney
Tom Swatzel

Mac Currin
Charlie Phillips

Council Members:

Duane Harris
Dr. Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Rita Merritt
Doug Haymans

Robert Boyles
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig
Mark Robson
Lt. Brian Sullivan

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Kim Iverson
Kate Quigley
John Carmichael
Kari Fenske
Myra Brouwer

Gregg Waugh
Roger Pugliese
Rick DeVactor
Anna Martin
Dr. Julie Neer
Mike Collins

Observers/Participants:

Paul Raymond
Phil Steele
Bill Teehan
Monica Smit-Brunello

Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Karla Gore
Red Munden

The Golden Crab Committee of the Whole of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, June 10, 2010, and was called to order at 1:15 o'clock p.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first order of business will be approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. The second thing that is not on your agenda printout but it will be to approve the September 2009 committee meeting minutes. Are there any corrections or additions or deletions to the September 2009 committee meeting minutes? Seeing none, then those are approved.

This brings us down to Golden Crab Amendment 5, and we will ask staff to lead us through that document. At some point we're going to have to decide, too, about shifting part of that – I guess whether or not we're going to shift it to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment. Kate, do you want to start us through Amendment 5, and we will see where we want to go from there.

MS. QUIGLEY: Amendment 5 is Attachment 1, and we're on PDF Page 15. This is a listing of the alternatives being considered. We have four actions up front that deal with MSY, OFL, ABC and ACL for golden crab. Below that I have inserted several actions with regards to a proposed catch share program.

The Golden Crab AP, as you recall, met last year. They put together catch share actions that they would like to see considered and alternatives that they would like to see implemented. Those have been incorporated below. Staff has not gone through and fully incorporated them or added alternatives to compare the ones chosen by the Golden Crab AP; alternatives to compare with the ones that they came up with.

What I thought we could do is perhaps take a look at least at Action 1, 2, 3 and 4, which you see upon the screen. The SSC recommendations have been incorporated into the actions. You see that under Action 1, establish MSY for the golden crab fishery; Alternative 1, no action; Alternative 2, MSY of 5 million pounds; Alternative 3, MSY of 2.5 million pounds; Alternative 4, MSY between 400,000 and 600,000 pounds; Alternative 5, recommendation from the SSC.

The SSC did not recommend an MSY. They only made a recommendation for OFL and ABC. The MSY of 5 million pounds was something that the industry came up with, what they thought was probably out there. Alternative 3 is MSY equals 2.5 million pounds, and that is based on letter signed by NMFS that Gregg is going to give a little bit more detail on.

MR. WAUGH: This is the one that I mistakenly mentioned this morning when we were talking wreckfish. Alternative 4, the MSY of 400,000 to 600,000 pounds, is from the assessment that was done just based on catches in the South Florida area. What was done in the letter we got from Joe Powers was taking this number for the south and then looking at other research catch information, abundance information for the northern zone and coming up with a recommendation to use an MSY of 2.5 million pounds.

DR. CRABTREE: Did the SSC have that letter; did they review that?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, we presented the information to them, but they said the letter was too old and too outdated to consider.

DR. PONWITH: I would like to see that letter. I guess what I would like to do is an opportunity to go back and find out what the level of analysis was that underpinned that letter. I tried to do that earlier this week, and the tentative response that I got back was that it was not as the result of a rigorous analysis. Before I land on that, I would like to look into that further.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, other questions or comments? Well, why don't we finish going through at least these first four actions and then we'll go from there.

MS. QUIGLEY: Action 2 is establishing an OFL; Alternative 1, no action; Alternative 2, OFL equals Fmsy equals 0.7047; Alternative 3 OFL equals Fmsy equals 0.2055. Alternative 4, which is the SSC recommendation that 518,316 pounds, that is 65 percent – no, sorry, I'm getting a little ahead of myself – that is the OFL that they identified that was the median landings of ten years I believe from 1999-2009. It might have been 1998-2208, but, anyway, it was the median of ten years of landings. Then we have Alternative 5, the value for Fmsy obtained from the most recent SEDAR assessment. Action 3 is establishment of an ABC.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I'm afraid we're at a point where we have an OFL from the SSC, and we either have to send that back to the SSC and ask them to reconsider or go to the science center and ask them to overrule it. It is hard for me to see how we just choose another OFL. I think this is a case where I think it is a good idea to have Bonnie review the letter from Joe Powers. It may not be a rigorous analysis, but I don't consider what the SSC did to be a rigorous analysis, anyway.

I think Bonnie looking at that is a great idea. Then somehow we need to see what comes out of that; and if that gives us what we need or then we need to go back to the SSC and ask them to reconsider on this. I think we've got to have that or we're going to be on awfully shaky ground if we try to choose some other value.

MR. CUPKA: Well, Roy, you will recall we talked about trying to have an SSC meeting before our September meeting at look at a couple of these species that are data-poor species that we have a problem with, and golden crab is one of them. What my suggestion was going to be after we ran through this was to entertain a motion, first of all, to move these actions to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, but then to wait until we get feedback from the SSC at our September meeting.

You will notice as we get further into this document, that there is an awful lot of work that still needs to be done on this, and so it is not something that we have to do at this meeting. Certainly my intent at this point is to move these and then see what kind of feedback we get from the SSC, because golden crab is one of the species we're going to ask them to take another look at. I meant the Comprehensive ACL.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And could it be appropriate to ask – I mean, would the right, perhaps, avenue be ask the science center to look at some of the older information for golden crab, in particular that letter, and see sort of where it stands in terms of its reliability and whether or not it is the kind of information that we should use, because this issue of stuff becoming potentially a bit outdated is a question that comes up quite often.

MR. CUPKA: John, I don't know what the SSC received to look at the last time, but I know that these fishermen are reporting and we ought to be able to come up with some CPUE values, some size, the sorts of things that we suggested that they may want to take a look at other than just landing streams to get a better handle on the status of this stock.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That was one of the things the SSC suggested was the potential to look at CPUE. The other area that was discussed by them is the range of the stock and then the area over which the fishery is operating, because the point was made that the fishery may not be fully exploiting the full range of the stock and there could be a large area in which there is no effort, which obviously then would have an impact on what you think the relation is between the landings and the overall productivity.

The SSC left it as being just some preliminary evaluations of that and nothing that certainly necessarily approaches a full peer reviewable stock assessment, but just some evaluation of the percentage of area that is even exploited might give them greater confidence in perceiving this as a potentially developing fishery and being able to raise that limit.

MR. CUPKA: I do know some of the earlier estimates where they tried to estimate standing stock based on catch rates and all just looked at a portion of the area where these crabs are known to be distributed like just the southern zone or the southern middle zone. I don't think they ever considered the northern zone, which is a much larger area. All these things need to be considered when the SSC takes another look at this.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I guess, David, one other question on Action 2; it seems that it is mixing rates with the poundage, and I think OFL was intended to refer to a poundage level and not a rate versus OFL equals Fmsy. An option would be MFMT equals Fmsy, but OFL should be a poundage. It could be the yield at Fmsy equals 0.7407 and that would be an appropriate wording for it.

MR. WAUGH: Coming back to what we're going to get from the center, remember we asked for the existing assessment to be updated, and we were told that the resources weren't there to do it and it would have to get in the SEDAR queue. The SSC requested and we requested OFL values be provided to the SSC, and due to resource limitations they haven't been. If we're bringing the SSC together and the expectation is they're going to meet between now and our September meeting, then what exactly are we asking from the center and what are we going to get when. Is the intent to get it so the SSC has something new to look at when they meet?

MR. CUPKA: That would certainly be my desire and my hope. Bonnie, did you want to comment on that.

DR. PONWITH: Right. We're in the middle of an expedited red snapper benchmark right now; so in terms of being able to run a stock assessment on golden crab right now, I think the answer would be the same. But to go back and gather up data that could be used in the same sense as we're doing with the data poor, to use catch-per-unit effort or under other indices of abundance that could be used to guide the setting of OFL, I think is something that is doable.

If there are specific things that we should be looking for, having guidance on what those things are would be good. John mentioned looking at the areas that they're fishing right now versus what the potential range of the animals are – and I agree that could be valuable, but it is not clear to me how we would know the full range if it weren't for a fishery-independent sampling that would be actually measuring the full range of those animals, so I'm not sure how we would do that unless the fishery were in history were more disbursed.

MR. CARMICHAEL: There was some discussion at the SSC that alluded to the possibility of some information on the range of the species, and I'm not fully versed in what it was. It was sort of implied that there could be some information there.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I know in South Carolina we did some early work on this fishery and did some exploratory fishing, and Betty Wenner and Glenn Ulrich did some estimates on the standing stock based on some of that. We know there are crabs up there and we just need to pull that information together.

I would hope that by our September meeting, which is where we're going to concentrate on the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, that we would have some information back from the SSC so that we could incorporate that and take some action and move that amendment ahead, including golden crab information. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: I know those data are there, I think. I talked to Glenn when I was at Fort Johnson not too long ago and told him that these discussions would be coming up and inquired about his interest in possibly assisting the center and/or the council in that regard in terms of determining what the range of the animal was and what sort of data they had from other parts of the range. I think Glenn would definitely be interested in doing that.

MR. CUPKA: I wonder, too, John, if maybe you shouldn't have some discussion with Bonnie to make sure she knows what the SSC had available the last time or some of the things that we would like to have available before they meet this next time so that we could help direct some of that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think it would be my intention and we'll obviously do this through a formal request to the center and to look at the SSC minutes and some of the comments that were comment and some of the things they had suggested would be helpful to them. I think in doing this, we also have to consider the overall workload and what the priorities may be because we have been in some discussions with the group at Beaufort about getting started on the black sea bass update, which we would like to have done sometime this year, so this becomes another piece of work. If they think their ability of starting black sea bass here in the summer, if we need

to get this done by September that may bump black sea bass out to being done later. The timing of this could be pretty important towards its effect on other projects.

MR. CUPKA: Well, we need to bear in mind, too, that this ACL Amendment is under a timeline, too, that we need to try and meet. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: They did some golden crab with the University of Georgia out of Brunswick, too, in the early eighties, so they also should have some stuff.

MR. WAUGH: I think we have to be very sensitive to the workload in the southeast and particularly with the oil situation. When that comes around the corner, that is obviously going to impact people's schedule tremendously. I wonder if we can't think outside the box a little bit and maybe involve the Northeast Center because they've just recently done a red crab stock assessment; very similar life history characteristics to golden crab.

Maybe we could ship the data up there and let them do it, but we've got this 2011 deadline staring us in the face and we've got resource limitations down here. Maybe there is a potential for some help in another area.

MR. CUPKA: Well, that certainly would be worth looking into, but I'm sure they have some of the seem workload and time constraint problems that we're having, but we don't know that until we look into it.

MR. HARRIS: To that point, there are a lot of science centers – well, maybe not a lot, but there are a number of science centers, and some of these science centers are doing updates every year for every species, and it seems to me that it may not be the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, but certainly someone somewhere should be able to provide us information if the Southeast Center can't provide it for us.

I really get tired of hearing that we don't have enough – I know it is true that we don't have enough people, but yet congress has put these deadlines on these councils to do this stuff. You can't do it without data and you can't do it if somebody can't analyze the data and tell you where you are and where you need to go. We've got to think outside of the box and get it done in some way or else you're going to have some people move to the southeast, Bonnie, from other centers even if it is on a temporary basis to help us out of this jam.

MR. HARTIG: And, certainly, you just said what I've thinking for quite some time. Golden crab is going to be probably one of the few species that we may not be able to meet the timeline, and so be it. I mean, that is one the things that is going to happen. Based on the timelines, somebody has got to send a message that everything is not going to be attainable given the data and the problems in the southeast right now.

There have been a lot of things saying, well, the law is the law, but basically if you can't get it done, you can't get it done. I would make a motion that before – well, I'm going to hold off

because there may some more information coming out of what we get. The question I have is how is this going to work?

Is the staff going to bring all the information together for the science center? That is an important consideration because Charlie mentioned some data in Georgia. There is some other data floating around, I guess, from other studies that have been done on golden crab. How is that going to work? I want to make sure that all that data is considered before we get to September.

MR. CUPKA: Well, my understanding was that John was going to communicate in writing, I guess, to the Southeast Science Center indicating some of the things that they need for the SSC to look at before September and try and pull that together. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: A couple of points; it has not escaped that we're one of six fisheries science centers and that there are semi-permeable membranes between us. I absolutely have gone to headquarters in the face of the demands of the Reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act and asked for help. When I stacked up what it was going to take to meet these deadlines against the sets of hands we had to do it, the math didn't work out.

Those conversations influenced the resources that we got to bring on new stock assessment scientists and certainly influenced the resources that we got to conduct fishery-independent sampling in a more robust way in the South Atlantic. The catch is that we've gotten the resources, the recruitment announcements are out; but as you know when we get a new person in, we want to have them work in journeyman status until they can get their footing as a stock assessment scientist and on our team, and so there are certain lags.

Now, I have gone and talked about bringing a senior stock assessment scientist from another science center down here to help us, but the challenge in making that business case is that every single science center is struggling with the same suite of deadlines and different species, different ecosystems, but the same suite of deadlines. It has been very, very tough to make that case.

In terms of the acquisition of these data, I hear a hot mike that I'm going to get a letter. I will start working on pulling together what I can get my hands on within the science center. I would urge our colleagues in the states that if they have information they thought had utility, don't wait to be asked. Consider the discussion here as a queue to start pulling that information because if we wait for a letter to come and then we use that letter as the impetus to go to the states to acquire that information, it just throws more of a time lag in there.

Then we will see what we have comprehensively and how it can be used. Again, I will also look at the Joe Powers letter and the analysis, and again my preliminary understanding of that was that it was information that was forwarded but that it was somewhat ad hoc and not particularly repeatable. I'm going to groundtruth that to make sure.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it just seems to me where we are or the real question right now is what is the best available science we have right now? I've got an SSC report that has one sentence on

golden crab, median landings. Then we've got a memo from Joe Powers that I assume is longer and more detailed than that.

While it may have its limitations and it may not be as good as we would want, but the question that comes to me it seems like is that the best available science and information that we have at the time? That seems to me the immediate question. I'm all for getting other analysis and things done, but I just question that any of that is going to be available. I understand Ben's thoughts on that, but understand, Ben, my position

MR. HARTIG: No, I understand.

DR. CRABTREE: So I guess what I would come to is whether the Powers' letter is somewhat ad hoc and not as rigorous as we would like, is it still, though, the most detailed information we have right now? If it is, then I think we would be okay to move ahead with that at this point until we have something better to rely on. I guess that's something that the center would have to look at and tell us. The question is not really whether the analysis is as good as we would like it to be; it is based on what we have, is that the best information we've got right now.

MR. CUPKA; I agree with you, Roy, and I think if you go back and look at what Joe did, that does incorporate some of this earlier information on the distribution and whatnot that was alluded to earlier. Since then, it seems to me there is additional data available that maybe was not shared with the SSC in terms of – like I say, I know these fishermen report landings and effort and whatnot, so it seems like we could do a recent CPUE analysis or look at average size. They report on size of crabs. It's very similar to what we get in wreckfish in terms of CPUE and average size and whatnot, so I think they need to look at that, also, if we can get it together.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, two things; first of all, we all know that Bonnie's shop has three councils and ICCAT to deal with. I don't know how many stock assessment scientists she has in the southeast region, but you've got all these other regions that basically deal with one council. I don't know what the comparison with scientists in these other regions versus the southeast region, but I told Erick Schwaab on at least two occasions that he needed to take a serious look at where people are within NOAA Fisheries science centers and make some hard decisions, perhaps.

If we need to move more scientists from around the country to the southeast to get this work done, so be it. I'm sorry that the other councils are facing the same deadlines we're facing, but they've had the scientists and the support for a lot of years and we have not, and I think we all agree with that.

I mean, I agree with Roy that we're up against the deadline and we need to get the best science and use it and move forward. The other thing I would say is I thought – and maybe this is not exactly right – that yesterday we rejected the data-poor control rule that the SSC had come up with, which was used to provide this one sentence of information on golden crab, so where does that leave us with what the SSC has provided versus what perhaps Joe Powers' letter provides?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that leaves you with the possibility of selecting something else for the MSY and thus OFL if you presume OFL – OFL equals MSY. I guess the question is under Alternative 1 for MSY is no action; does that mean there is no MSY? I don't recall if there is an MSY in place for this plan.

MS. QUIGLEY: You are correct, an MSY was considered and then rejected. MSY of 4 to 12 million pounds was considered by the council; NMFS rejected it, and so on and so forth. There is no MSY at this time.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So you could have – you have the Powers' approach as one alternative for MSY and then you could follow along as you've done in something like ABC is 75 percent of OFL.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and then I think at some point we're going to have to revisit this with the SSC and ask them to reconsider all this. Part of my concern – and I'm looking through the minutes of the meeting now, and there is a statement like here, "Until you get better information, the law pretty much curbs you into keeping a precautionary approach." What I worry is they just came in and decided they were going to be really conservative.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments? Do you want to move along, Kate?

MS. QUIGLEY: I'm not sure it is all that useful to go through the remaining actions, but I'll just go through them quickly. Action 3 identifies the ABC; Alternative 1, no action; Alternative 2, ABC is 2 million pounds. That is kind of a small step-down from the 2.5 million that is noted in the Powers' memo.

I'm sorry, the 2 million pounds, where does that come from? It is a step-down I guess – yes, from the Powers' memo – then Alternative 3, ABC of 1.5 million pounds, another option based on the Powers' memo. Alternative 4 is the SSC's recommendation of 336,905 pounds. That is 65 percent of the OFL recommendation from the SSC. Then we've got Alternative 5, ABC of 4 to 4.5 million pounds based on the 5 million pounds requested by the industry.

Then we have Action 4, the ACL; basically just no action, ACL equals ABC and ACL equals something else less than the ABC. One thing we're thinking is you might want to think about moving Actions 1 through 4 to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment since the catch share program in this document is going to take a bit longer. We think that is probably the appropriate place for it to go.

MR. CUPKA: Well, that was certainly my intention was to take these first four actions and entertain a motion to move them to Comprehensive ACL Amendment and then see what kind of feedback we get from the SSC and consider taking action on these alternatives at our September meeting. Does anyone wish to offer a motion? Rita.

MS. MERRITT: Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that we move Actions 1 through 4 to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we have a motion; is there a second? Second by Ben. The motion is move Actions 1 through 4 to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment. Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved. Okay, the rest of the actions, as Kate indicated, deals with options or alternatives for setting up a catch share program for golden crabs.

If you have had an opportunity to look through this, you will notice that many of the actions have one or at the most two alternatives. Basically, most of the alternatives in there are ones that came out of our Golden Crab AP. Obviously, it is going to take some more work to further flesh these out. What we can do is either go through these and if anyone has any alternatives they would like to add, we can do that; or, we can ask staff to flesh this out a little more and go through them in September. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I just want to back up just a minute. Alternatives 1 through 4, since we kind of decided the data-poor ABC rule wasn't working; do we want to direct staff to take any of those alternatives out that were associated with that so they don't have to do the analysis on it?

MR. CUPKA: Well, let me ask Gregg if that would be helpful. I guess what I thought we would do would be at September we would go through those and see if we want to delete any and get some input, but if we can would it be useful to you to delete some of these at this stage, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, it would help because our intent would be to flesh these out a little bit more before September; so if there are some that we aren't going to carry forward – and John mentioned two of them under Action 2; these OFLs that are just fishing mortality rates. But if there are some that we can delete, that would be helpful, yes.

MR. CUPKA: Well, do we want to go back through these real quick, then, and see if there are any other ones? Well, Alternative 5 is the recommendation from the SSC and I think we have rejected that at this point; but it may be when they come back in September with another recommendation, it may be something we would want to consider, so I'm not sure we ought to delete that at this point. I do agree on under Action 2, we need to get some quantitative values for those figures. Are there any other ones that you saw, Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I'm not good about picking them out; I'm just working on theory.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I don't see any that jump out unless Gregg has got any recommendations there. Well, maybe under Action 3, Alternative 4, that is one that we have rejected, so we could entertain a motion to take that out. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: So move, Mr. Chairman; that is, the motion is to remove Alternative 4 under Action 3.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, do we have a second? Second by Mr. Phillips. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any objection? Without objection, then, that motion is approved.

MR. HARRIS: Just a question; does that mean that we should remove Alternative 2 under Action 4?

MR. CUPKA: I was just looking at that. We may want to remove that value out of there, but we may want to leave the alternative where ACL equals ABC.

MR. HARRIS: Well, I would make a motion that we remove the 336,905 pounds from Action 4, Alternative 2, and just leave it as ACL equals ABC.

MR. CUPKA: Second by Ben Hartig. Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved. All right, that does bring us back down to the catch share program. Again, as I indicated we can either go through these, but it needs a lot more work done it.

In fact, this brings up another issue which we were going to bring up in Executive Session; and if you want to, Mr. Chairman, we can get into it now, and that is the fact that this is pretty much where it was back in September of last year. One reason why is because of the workload on the staff. As we begin to look at more and more catch share programs and things along those lines, at some point we're going to have to prioritize these things.

I know there is a lot of interest among the golden crab fishermen. They very much want to move ahead with this catch share program, probably more so than even the wreckfish fishermen are, but we've got so many things going on now that we need to decide where our staff is going to put their time. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, given the fact that we've got such a close working relationship with the golden crab fishermen and they have expressed strong support for a catch share program, I recommend that catch shares in the golden crab fishery be our number one priority for developing catch shares in the South Atlantic.

MR. CUPKA: Well, that is obviously the case, and also it might be a good test case for a catch share program. It is a small fishery. There a limited number of participants. There is no recreational component. Again, they're very interested in moving ahead with it. It might be a good one to use as a test case, so I would share that. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I agree; but before we go too far forward with catch shares, we may want to be able to have a good grasp of what the ABC actually is. You could theoretically give a small number of fishermen a catch that they couldn't possibly catch, so we might need to know kind of what the ABC would be before we got too far into catch shares.

MR. HARTIG: Point of order; did Duane make a motion?

MR. CUPKA: Not yet; we're still having discussion, but I think that he will. Well, those sorts of things I think can be considered, Charlie, as we move ahead. I hate to hold the thing up

waiting until we get to that point. I think we can adjust for that as we get into it. Other comments or discussion? Duane.

MR. HARRIS: I'll just make what I just said in the form of a motion and **that is to make golden crab catch shares as the number one priority for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council in developing a catch share program.**

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we have a motion by Chairman Harris; a second by Mr. Hartig. Is there any discussion on the motion?

MR. HARTIG: Well, we're making this a priority for not a whole lot of fishermen, but the importance of this is that the technology developed by the fishery now has opened up the fishery to a much broader distributional range and market. That is going to invite more interest in this fishery as we're already seeing with several boats already trying to get into this fishery. The timing is good to do this now.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I agree with you. All of you should have received a letter from Bill Whipple and Howard Rou indicating some of the problems and needs and all, and so I think that we need to move ahead with this if we can. Further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, **then that motion is approved.** Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: It seems to me, though, it is contingent upon us coming up with something for an OFL other than what we had from the SSC. Unless that goes up sharply, the thought that the fishery is going to expand, it's just not. We'll have to see how that plays out, I suppose.

MR. CUPKA: Well, we discussed that before with the fishermen. Obviously, that's the first thing we need to do; because if we don't get that changed somehow, then the whole thing I think becomes moot in some ways. We're aware of that, Roy, and that is the number one thing we need to do. Mr. Chairman, as I say, the others have to do with the catch share program.

There is not a whole lot there. We could do one of two things. Like I say, we can either go through these and see if anybody wants to add anything, or we could direct staff to further flesh this out and bring it back to us at our September meeting. In the interest of time I might suggest maybe you want to do the same approach. It is up to the rest of the committee.

MR. HARRIS: Well, if it is okay with the rest of the council, that would be what I would recommend as well. We're behind schedule on the agenda and we need to move ahead with other agenda items. If we can flesh this out and bring it back to the council in September; do I see any objection to doing that? Anybody that really wants to move ahead? Okay, are you through, then, David?

MR. CUPKA: That completes our committee action, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 o'clock p.m., June 10, 2020.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July 5, 2010

- - -

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

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

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

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

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)
georgegeiger@bellsouth.net

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

Rita G. Merritt
38 Pelican Drive
Wrightsville Beach, NC 28480
910/256-3197 (ph); 910/256-3689 (f)
miridon@ec.rr.com

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

PAUL RAYMOND

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

Spud Woodward *DONA HAYMAN*
Director, 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)
Spud.woodward@dnr.state.ga.us

Lt. Brian Sullivan
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)
Brian.A.Sullivan@uscg.mil

Tom Swatzel
P.O. Box 1311
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/222-7456 (ph)
tom@swatzel.com

KATE MICHIE

JACK MCGOVERAN

PAUL STEELE

BONNIE POWWITA

BILL TEEHAN

KALA GORE

MONICA-SMIT BAUNELD

REG MUNDEN

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2009 – 2010 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Mark Robson, Chair
Robert Boyles
Brian Chevront
Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Tom Swatzel, Chair
Robert Boyles
Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Rita Merritt
Charlie Phillips
Red Munden Mid-Atlantic Council
New England Council Rep
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Brian Chevront, Chair
Spud Woodward, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Rita Merritt
Charlie Phillips
Mark Robson
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Myra Brouwer- Comp. Ecosystem-
based Amendment

EXECUTIVE

Duane Harris, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Robert Boyles
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

FINANCE

David Cupka, Chair
Mark Robson, Vice-Chair
Brian Chevront
Duane Harris
Mac Currin
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair
Mac Currin
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

Mark Robson, Chair
Robert Boyles
Wilson Laney
Rita Merritt
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Myra Brouwer- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

David Cupka, Chair
Rita Merritt, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Duane Harris
Mark Robson
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

George Geiger, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
Duane Harris
Ben Hartig
Rita Merritt
Charlie Phillips
Mark Robson
Tom Swatzel
Ron Smith, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Jack Travelstead, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LAW ENFORCEMENT

George Geiger, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Robert Boyles
Duane Harris
Ben Hartig
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

CATCH SHARES

Rita Merritt, Chair
Robert Boyles
David Cupka
George Geiger
Ben Hartig
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Spud Woodward
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kate Quigley

PERSONNEL

Robert Boyles, Chair
David Cupka
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Roy Crabtree, Chair
Robert Boyles
Brian Chevront
Mark Robson
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR Committee

Duane Harris, Chair
George Geiger, Vice-Chair
Brian Chevront
David Cupka
Ben Hartig
Vince O'Shea
Mark Robson
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: John Carmichael

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

Fishery Biologist

Kari Fenske
kari.fenske@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Dale Theiling - dale.theiling@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