

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

GOLDEN CRAB COMMITTEE

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, FL**

June 14, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Members:

David Cupka, Chair
Dr. Wilson Laney
Tom Swatzel

Mac Currin
Charlie Phillips
Jessica McCawley

Council Members:

Ben Hartig
Tom Burgess
Dr. Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
John Jolley

Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Lt. Robert Foos
Doug Haymans

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Dr. Brian Chevront
Kim Iverson
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Roger Pugliese
Andrea Grabman

Gregg Waugh
Mike Collins
Dr. Mike Errigo
John Carmichael
Anna Martin
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Phil Steele
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Andy Strelchek

Dr. Jack McGovern
Otha Easley
Bob Gill
Karen Raine

Other observers attached to the end of the document.

The Golden Crab Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, June 14, 2012, and was called to order at 3:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: We'll go ahead and convene the Golden Crab Committee Meeting. The first order of business is the approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing none, then the agenda is approved. Next is the approval of the March 2012 committee meeting minutes. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? Seeing none, then the minutes are approved. That brings us down to our next item which expression of interest in catch shares, and I'm going to ask Brian to walk us through that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: If you will remember in your March meeting after public hearing there was a discussion about wanting to determine the level of interest in pursuing a catch share program for golden crab. The council set up some parameters that they wanted us to follow. First they wanted us to look at each of the permit holders in the fishery of which there are 11 permits, and each permit was allowed to express its interest in the catch share as long as that permit had at least one pound of landings of golden crab in either 2008, 2009 and 2010.

At the time of the March meeting, 2010 was the terminal year that we had for landings for golden crab so we did not have 2011 landings available to us at the time. As a result of the criteria that you chose, five of the eleven permits qualified to participate in expressing their interest; six did not. All five of them were contacted and we got back from those five their interest and level of catch shares. Three of them were in favor of continuing the catch share program and two of them were not.

MR. CUPKA: Questions for Brian? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: So we had five permits that voted; how many unique individuals voted?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Four.

DR. CRABTREE: And what was the total in terms of the vote counted in terms of unique individuals?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Of unique individuals it was two and two.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions for Brian? Well, what we need to do before we go any further is we need to decide if this committee wants to recommend to the council to move ahead with Amendment 6 or not and then a couple of things. There are some actions in the amendment that don't pertain to catch shares, so we could even make a decision to move ahead with those if the committee decides not to move ahead with the catch share program. That's another issue that we would need to look at depending on which way you all want to go with this.

Also, if we make a decision to move ahead, one of the things that we've really had a lot of trouble with is the council members have not been really able to look at the catch history on

these things because of confidentiality. We did write a letter and got a response back from Sam Rauch indicating that in this particular instance that we could get permission to look at that data.

If we decide to move ahead you will have an opportunity to do that. You will have to sign a statement of confidentiality I guess before we can get it, but NMFS is prepared to hand out the forms we would need to sign as well as the information itself. If we do look at that we need to be very careful in our discussion that we don't disclose any confidential information. I don't know if Monica has anything she wants to say about that. Did you have anything that you want to add on that, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: If we get to that point, David, I can say a little bit more just to explain things.

MR. CUPKA: Okay. So, again at this point what we need to do is decide whether or not we're going to recommend moving ahead with the amendment or not. What is the pleasure of the committee? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: As most of you if not all of you are aware this is an issue that has been before this council for at least five years – I believe I'm correct – and perhaps even six. We've received a tremendous amount of input on it. It has been in development.

I mean it is almost analogous to the MPA development. It didn't take quite as long, but it has been a very deliberate and deliberative process. **I would speak in favor of moving forward with the amendment. There may be some tweaks that need to be done here, but that would be my preference.**

MR. CUPKA: Are you offering that in the form of a motion?

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I'll make that as a motion, David.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we have a motion by Mac; is there a second?

MR. HARTIG: I'll second it.

MR. CUPKA: Second by Ben. Discussion on the motion? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: First of all, Ben is not on the committee.

MR. CUPKA: Nice try, Ben. Charlie did second it. Tom.

MR. SWATZEL: Well, it seems pretty clear that there is not a significant majority support for pursuing a catch share program for the golden crab, so I'm going to vote against the motion.

MR. CUPKA: Just to remind people I guess, the committee members are Mac, Wilson, Jessica, Charlie and Tom and myself. Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I can't support this motion. I know that we have been working on this for a long time. I originally thought that this fishery was a good candidate for a catch share program, but I don't feel like the majority of the participants in the fishery support this program, and so I'm going to vote against this motion.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I think we're all torn with how to proceed with this. I seconded but I think it probably needs some tweaking. I also think that we will have a derby fishery if we don't do something. I think that is contrary to the public's interest in the resource; and so with that reasoning I'm going to support the motion knowing that there will be maybe a considerable amount of tweaking with it.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, but the only way we'll get to tweak is if we continue working on it. That is not to say that we're approving it. What we're really voting on here is whether or not to continue working on it and see if there are any changes that could be made to improve it. Also, like I say there are actions in this amendment which really don't pertain to catch shares. We've got four or five of the actions that probably could be separated. The only way to continue working on those would be to continue developing this, so that's kind of where we are. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: I guess as the Fish and Wildlife Service representative on the council, my first and primary responsibility in some respects is to the habitat and to the crabs themselves. That is not to say that I don't certainly consider the human dimension of things as well. I know one of the justifications for moving forward has been stated as habitat protection.

Charlie makes a good point I think about the derby fishery and not only the consequences that might have for gear conflicts and human interactions but also for habitat interaction. To the extent that establishing this program would afford additional protection to the habitat, I could support the motion.

Now, if there were some assurance that there would remain adequate protection for the habitat in the absence of a catch share program, I guess I could go either way on it. As far as I could tell from the materials that have been provided to us, it seems that there would be some potential additional measure of protection for the habitat, so I could support it from that perspective.

MR. CURRIN: And along those same lines, I think it is worth reminding the council that the golden crab fishermen who were most active in helping us designate those fishable areas in Coral HAPCs are the folks that are also supporting moving forward with this amendment. I express concern about the habitat and I'm not sure that we'd be that far along without their participation and assistance in that effort.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee but I want to echo what Mac just said. I don't think we would have had those deep sea coral HAPCs if it hadn't been for the support and cooperation that we received from those golden crab fishermen.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I was just going to say what I said at the previous meeting that I thought the council was on record saying that we weren't going to support catch shares unless we had an overwhelming majority of people that supported it, and I don't feel like we have that here. I

know about how we polled and I know about what we decided. I don't necessarily agree with the way that we polled. We got those additional letters. I took that into consideration, too, so like I said before I'm going to vote against it. I appreciate the habitat concerns but I wish that we could look at some other way to protect the habitat other than this catch shares program.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I don't know that we ever said overwhelming, and I think that is part of the problem that this council does not have a clear policy on catch shares, and it is something that irregardless of what we do here we might want to refer to our catch share committee to develop a clear statement on just what the council's policy is in regard to catch shares, but that is something for another time. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: One of the things that is significantly different in this case is when we have been entertaining going down the catch share path we've asked at the beginning of a program if there was support for it and we haven't got it. This is a different case. I don't think there was any question in my mind in the last four years as we were developing this that the majority of the participants in the fishery didn't want to go to a catch share program.

To me it was clear for the last four years that the majority of the fishermen wanted to move ahead with this program, so now we're being faced with a vote in the eleventh hour that is asking us to decide whether to go ahead with a program we've been developing for five years. That's the problem I have. I think the majority of the fishermen were clearly in favor of the program that started or we wouldn't have gone down the path to begin with.

We're here because that up front majority of fishermen who wanted it and now at the end we're at a hiatus where we've taken this vote at the end, which I had problems with to begin with. The other thing is what we should have done probably is when this came up, when we found that there were a number of people who weren't supportive of the catch shares is to bring everybody back to the table; is there anything we can do in tweaking these motions to help you support this plan that we have developed. I think we've kind of missed that opportunity, but it may not be all the way out the door. That's the way I feel about it.

MR. JOLLEY: I would reiterate some of what Ben has said. I have a real concern that the council is already bogged down in so many issues, and this thing has had plenty of planning behind it. My understanding when I first came on was that this thing was pretty well set up for catch shares. While I may not be the biggest proponent of that avenue, I think we need to move ahead because we've got so many other serious pressing issues to address. I'm leaning in that direction and I support Ben in that.

MR. CURRIN: David, just one more point, and I know last night Roy asked one of the golden crab fishermen who made a comment and had some questions about landings and whether he had seen a spike in landings, and his response was that he didn't anticipate any great increase in the number of landings.

That is contrary to the information that I've received from a couple of other people that participate. In fact they suggested that landings would be on the order of 1.5 million pounds. This is in a fishery that has operated well under 50 percent of the ACL. Who knows where that

is going to go in the future if and when we get an assessment for that. To me, assuming that is correct, there is a clear indication that the derby has begun, and it is one of things that I think was the rationale for moving forward with this to prevent that kind of activity.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I want to go back to something that Jessica said regarding the council's statement on pursuing catch shares in the future. The motion that the council made was that they were not going to pursue catch shares, but they specifically excluded golden crab and wreckfish in their motion. The council's intent at the time was to continue the development of catch share programs in golden crab and in wreckfish.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I recall that motion, Brian, but there have been other occasions where we've made statements about wanting to see a majority in it. Probably the best you can say about this situation is we're 50/50. I understand what Ben is saying and it's true that we have been working on this for four years, but we didn't choose all of the preferred alternatives on this until the last council meeting.

I think if you go back a year ago, this was a very rudimentary document at that point, so I'm not sure it's fair to expect people to have made up their mind about this so far in advance. Now, with respect to whether a derby fishery has developed, I think I've talked to all the golden crab guys who were at this meeting this week.

I have heard some say that it is already happening and they may go over a million and a half pounds this year, and I've heard others say they don't think that is going to happen. I did ask Andy to look into what we could find in terms of 2012 landings; and while they're only partial landings I think if you're interested Andy could give you a view on what seems to be happening.

Also, having talked to most of these guys, they have indicated to me they would be willing to sit down and have a meeting. I don't know if anybody's mind is going to change or not on it; but if what you want to do is make one more try to see if they couldn't work something out, I think there is a possibility of that.

Also, I agree with you, David, there are things in this amendment that are separate from the catch share and it might be worth asking them to take a look at that again, but they indicate that they would be willing to meet. If you're interested, Andy can give you what we do know what is happening with landings.

MR. STRELCHECK: I contacted the science center and asked for them to provide us as up to date of landings as they had available to them. They have landings through May. In looking at the landings data, it looks like probably April and May are not complete. If you just take the months of January through March, it is the highest level of landings in the last seven or eight years. That is just the period I looked at. I didn't look prior to then.

Certainly, we don't know what will be landed the rest of the year; but based on the catch rate over about the last eight to twelve months we'd project out close a million pounds, maybe a little bit less than that, maybe a little bit more than that. Talking with industry, it sounds like some fishermen have started fishing this year or the tail end of last year. It would probably be best to

talk with them directly to find out their actual activity levels and how those have changed or not changed in the most recent twelve months.

DR. LANEY: I guess a question for Roy and that is relative to the potential for getting people together to take another crack at developing a more robust consensus; is that something that we would have to wait to do until after we vote this motion up or down and move through the decision document or is that something that you would suggest be done before the council took any action, in which case I guess we could just table this until a time certain.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think in my view if we decide to convene these guys to take a look at it, that means we have decided to continue consideration of this. To me if you vote this down and say we're done with it, you still might want to convene them to look at the other parts to this; I don't know. I'm not on your committee, Wilson, so I guess you will have to figure out what to do with this motion.

MR. CURRIN: Roy makes some very good point. It would be very instructive I think to have these guys get together as soon as possible. To me it would be wonderful to be able to determine whether the opposition that we've heard about at our last meeting is a philosophical opposition, which I have strong feelings that it is – I don't know that – i.e.; that is, just a general opposition to catch shares in any fisheries and this idea or feeling that if one catch share ever gets put in, then, boy, that just starts the ball rolling down the hill and we're all doomed, they're coming into everything.

I don't believe that, but I would be interested in whether that is the basis or whether there is a general concern about the structure of this particular catch shares; i.e., whether they're allocation issues and share cap issues and things that the council could address with some advice from the fishermen to make it more acceptable. I see some value in these guys – getting them in a room and making sure if they're willing to do that.

DR. CRABTREE: I will say one thing. Regardless of procedurally how to do this in a motion, I've looked very carefully at the plan and I could support it with the current suite of preferred alternatives now. There are things about the plan that I would want to revisit and make changes. I think if what we're going to do is reconvene this panel and have them relook at this, we probably ought to have some discussion about things that we're concerned about. We ought to have them make sure they focus on the things we're concerned about and then, of course, we want to hear the things they're concerned about as well. I think if that is the decision to convene these guys, then we ought to talk about some of the concerns with the plan.

MR. CUPKA: I wonder really if we did have a meeting and they met, to me it seems like that wouldn't preclude us from moving on this motion. If we decide to continue with development, the first step would be to convene these guys and see what, if anything, could be worked out and give us some input on that. I don't see it being necessarily mutually exclusive. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, these preferred alternatives that are in the plan right now were developed without the council having access to confidential data. We've had some very general

discussions that as a result of that access some of these recommendations that are in the plan currently could change.

I hope that this committee will vote to move forward with the development of this plan. I like Roy's suggestions and Mac's suggestions; I would like to see these guys get back together and see if they can work out some of these issues. If this committee will move through this document today, with the access to the confidential information, it may well be that some of these preferred alternatives will change. I think we at least owe it to ourselves, having worked on this with a lot of very dedicated fishermen for so long, to at least try to see what we can do with the thing.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments? Okay, we're going to go ahead and take a vote then on this motion. The motion is to continue with the development of Amendment 6. I'll ask all those in favor to signify by raising your hand; opposed. Okay, the vote is three to two so the motion is approved.

I guess where we need to go from here then is to – well, obviously, we want this meeting to occur and we'll ask Brian to see if we can't arrange something on that, but it seems like the next step would be to look at this confidential information and maybe look that over for a few minutes before we go through the amendment itself and decide if we want to change any of the preferreds that are currently in there.

Again, this thing won't obviously get approved at this meeting, so we will have an opportunity to change the preferreds before we move ahead with it. Is there anyone that has an objection to that approach to move forward? Seeing none, then, Roy, I guess your people have that data that can be distributed?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, Jack is going to come around and hand you a disclosure form, which you're going to need to sign, and once you sign it Jack will give you a folder that contains a table or two and a figure. You can look at that and then we will have a discussion, but in the discussion you need to be very careful in what you say and make sure that you don't inadvertently divulge confidential data.

Confidential data would mean that you divulge an individual's landings in any fashion. Be careful when you talk about percentages and this and that because people may be able to calculate something out of that. It is going to be a little bit awkward but that is what we need to do. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And Roy discussed that very well with you. You should know what you're signing is a statement of non-disclosure and that is attached – you don't have it, but I will tell you what it is attached to. It is attached to a NOAA Administrative Order 216-100 for the protection of confidential fisheries statistics.

Council staff sign this probably routinely every year because they're allowed under the Magnuson Act to see confidential information. You are not as council members allowed to see confidential information under the normal circumstances, but your executive director requested

that in this case you be given access to confidential information and the Fisheries Service agreed with that.

You probably have seen the letter that got sent back to Bob Mahood stating that you would be allowed to see is. That is why we're asking you to sign the statement and then you will be given the confidential information. That information will be retrieved by the Fisheries Service at the end of this committee meeting and taken back because they're under an obligation, the Regional Administrator particularly, to protect the confidential nature of that information.

As best you can, please think about what you're going to say before you say it on the record once you've seen this information because you should try not to divulge the confidential information. I think that the way it is presented and not identifying any particular fisherman but just giving it in numbers, like Permit 1 and Permit 2 and Permit 3, which is not the number that is assigned by the Fisheries Service to that particular permit, but it is just for your consideration.

It is not identifying a specific individual. It is just allowing you to see landings which is something that is protected under the Magnuson Act as confidential information; so take your charge seriously and once you sign the form Jack will be giving you the information.

MR. BELL: If we're not on the committee, do you want to restrict us from access or are we just going to give it to everybody?

DR. CRABTREE: No, I think we're going to distribute this to all council members.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a question; this is the same form we sign for ACCSP for state agency folks, right?

DR. CRABTREE: I don't know; just sign it again, but I don't know if it is or isn't.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, if everyone will do that and then Jack will give us the folder and we'll take about ten minutes to look it over, and then we'll get back in session.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman, a question for you on the type of data – and maybe you said it and I didn't hear – is this special data and is there a source for that? On the form there is a column on the right-hand side.

MR. CUPKA: I think the only thing you need to do is sign that last page, up in the middle of the page where it says name, date and signature.

MR. CURRIN: We don't have to check boxes and all of that?

MR. CUPKA: I don't believe so.

DR. CRABTREE: And I guess what we can do, David, is there are some legends and things in there and give folks a minute to read the legends and look at it; and then if anyone has questions about what you're looking at, you can ask Jack, Andy, or Brian and they can try to explain it.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, Brian is going to make some comments on the table.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, if you're looking at the table that has just numbers and things on it – well, there are actually three tables on there – the very first table shows that there are eleven permits. The columns on that table show each year from 1997 through 2011 and it shows how many pounds total were landed in that calendar year by that permit.

Now, understand that there are a couple of permits that are owned by more than one individual, and in some cases an individual owns more than one permit. If you go to Table 2, you will see that the far left-hand column is called “entity”; there are nine actual entities that have ownership or at least partial ownership in a golden crab permit. If you look at the maximum pounds, the next second column to the right it says “maximum pounds, 2008 through 2011”; so in that four-year period the numbers that you see in that column for that entity tells you how many pounds they landed maximum in that four-year period.

That is not a total across the years. It is the most number of pounds they landed in 2008, 2009 or 2010. It is only one year but it is the highest year. And then if you look, there are four boxes that come after that and what that tells you is those are your four alternatives that you have under consideration under Action 6, which is the share cap provision.

Your current preferred alternative is a 49 percent share cap; so looking under the 49 percent it shows what percentage of the total ACL that entity would receive under your preferred alternative at this point. That tells you the percent. Right next to the percent is the number of annual pounds that entity would receive under that alternative if that was to go into place.

Then the column that says “difference” is the difference between what they had landed – that highest year landings between 2008 and 2011 and what they would be allocated. Now, if you look down the difference columns and things and you see a number that is in parentheses, that means that is a decrease from their highest landings that had landed between 2008 and 2011.

If the number is not in parentheses, that shows you the increase. The way you can simply do that is if you look at the thing that says “annual pounds” and you subtract the maximum number of pounds that is in that second column from the annual pounds, that will give you the difference. That is what difference number comes from, so that is where you can end up with a positive or a negative number.

And then those four boxes then tells you under the four scenarios or the four alternatives that you currently have under Action 6, the share cap action, that tells you how many annual pounds each entity would be allotted under that scenario. Right now, remember this is with an ACL of 2 million pounds, which is what we currently have.

Table 3 is similar to what you have in Table 2 but it does a couple of “what ifs” scenarios; what if the ACL is reduced. We don't if that is going to happen. This is totally hypothetical. If the ACL was reduced to 1.5 million pounds, you see the same kind of information again given for each entity based on the different share caps; or if the ACL had been reduced in half, to a million

pounds, you would see how the distribution of annual pounds would go. Does anybody have any questions about what those tables represent?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That is very helpful, Brian; thank you for the discussion. I would note under the “what if”, which is Table 3, if the ACL was reduced, that would take action by the council to reduce the ACL at which point if you wanted to change the share cap allocation or something else that you wanted to change’ if you went ahead with Amendment 6 and if it was implemented, at some future date and time if the ACL was reduced you could also make tweaks and make changes to the catch share program.

MR. CUPKA: I think what you were trying to show, Brian, is if it was reduced, that there would be differential impacts across the permits or the entities or whatever. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: So, Brian, is there any reason to look at a “what if” if the ACL went up? I mean that would be possible, I suppose, wouldn’t it, once a new stock assessment is conducted?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Wilson, I think that right now until there is a stock assessment I’m not sure that there would be a change in the ACL, anyway. I think it is pretty much understood that if the ACL went up, then proportionally the share distribution would increase across the board for everybody, so it would be a positive gain for everyone. If it went down, as you can see in some of those scenarios some folks would have some pretty significant losses.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions for Brian. Brian, did you do the figure, also?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I did not do the figure, but I think what I can do is explain to you what is on here; and if I don’t do something right, Andy or Jack, I’m sure, will jump in and help correct me. If you look on the second drawing that has the bar graphs on it, the first figure refers to person one through nine.

What is called a person on here is the same thing as I called entity on mine. For each person there is a maximum of four bars. One bar is the average landings of 1997 to 2011; their average landings across all those years. The purple bar is the maximum landings from 1997 through 2011, which is the entire time series of the permit program.

Then the red bar is the maximum landings of the last four years, which is the most recent data that we have for folks, and then the blue bar shows the number of pounds that the person would be initially allocated, but I’m not sure – Andy, what alternative is the blue bar based on under six; is that the current preferred?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, that is the current preferred.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, so that is then based on the 49 percent share cap. The figure looks at the total annual golden crab landings from 1997 through 2011 relative to the 2012 annual catch limit. Basically what that is showing you is – and because these data are combined, I believe the data in Figure 2 are not confidential, isn’t that correct, because it is across all participants?

MR. STRELCHECK: Correct.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That is correct, so I can tell you then that if you're looking at this, we have a 2 million pound ACL that in no year between 1997 and 2011 has a million pounds even been landed. I believe the highest has been in the low 800,000 pounds. But as a weigh to try to help orient you to all this information, because I because there is a lot there, if you go back to the one that has all the tables and if you look at Table 1 you can see some definite patterns among the permits. You'll notice some permits had significant landings in early years and there are some that really had more landings in more recent years and a couple that had landings most every year as well as a couple of permits that had very little or no landings in most or all the years.

MR. CUPKA: Another thing, too, from that first figure I guess it indicates that in all cases the average landings are lower than the annual pounds that would be initially allocated, right?

DR. CHEUVRONT: That is correct, but I believe it is not the case that the annual pounds initially allocated would be higher than the maximum landings that they've had over the time series under consideration.

DR. CRABTREE: A couple of things that stand out to me and are bothersome to me; one, the share cap at 49 percent, so that is 980,000 pounds. You can see that the entire fishery in none of the years that you have has ever caught that much, so the share cap we're setting is above what the whole fishery catches and far above what any individual catches.

Now, in the document that is currently written I do not believe there is any rationale or certainly not sufficient rationale for the share cap and why that would be appropriate. To me it is exceptional that we would have a share cap that high. There are fisheries where we do have a share cap that high. Wreckfish is one and I believe tilefish in the Mid-Atlantic is one, but those are different cases because in those cases someone was actually catching that amount of fish.

What makes this fishery different is because they've never come really close to catching the total allowable catch. I think we have problems with the share cap, number one. Then the other thing is we have this long time series that we're using, 1997 through – I think it is through 2010 in the document that the allocation is based on.

But, as Brian pointed out, you have permits that have landings say only in the first half of that time series and then you have other permits that have ramped up in more recent years, but it produces some odd situations where you have permits that may not have had any landings at all in seven or eight years and yet are getting among the highest amount of allocation based on landings that occurred back in the 1990's and then you have some of the permits that have been active for the last five or six years or so who don't get enough allocation to even cover their recent landings.

What bothers me about that is that I think you need to have some rationale for why would you give the same credit, so to speak, to landings in the 1990's as you're going to give to landings in 2008 and 2009. Personally to me it would seem like we would give more credit to somebody

who is fishing in the last five years or so than we would to a permit that hasn't fished in a long time.

There may be good reasons for these but I think the problem with the program right now is we haven't articulated the reasons for these and that opens us up to some real vulnerabilities if we decide to move through with this program. Then the last is everybody does get more than what they've caught; but if you look at this, some get a lot more than what they've caught and others just get a little more than what they've caught. That is a little disturbing to me so I think it raises questions about equitability and those kinds of things that are admittedly very difficult issues to address.

MR. CUPKA: Again, that is part of the problem that when you don't have the data to look at and you're trying to pick preferreds and develop a program and you don't have the data you need to work with. That has been a problem throughout this whole process. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: I just had a question kind of pertaining to what Roy said, but now there are a couple of permits that obviously had landings in the nineties but really not any recent landings for the last seven years. Did those permits transfer to someone else; are they still with that individual; what is the status of that, Brian?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I don't know if I can say that without revealing confidentiality.

MR. MAHOOD: Okay.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Because it deals with individual characteristics which I don't think we can reveal.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roy, to your point, do you think we should do the same type allocation that we have done on a lot of other stuff and look at it from a point of using Boyles' Law? Do you think that would be a fair way to look at this?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I don't know, Charlie, because I don't know what Boyles' Law would result in if you did apply it. I believe the document has alternatives for different time periods and obviously if you used a time period that was more recent and didn't look at those older years, that would put more crabs in the hands of participants who are active now.

I think what you have to deal with is how much credit should a permit get for being in the fishery a long time and active early on, and that is tricky to say. Boyles' Law might smooth some of these things out. If you look at these scenarios with different share caps and lower share caps, as you bring the share cap down, if you bring it bring it down far enough, then it starts reducing the amount that some individuals get and then that gets redistributed among some of these other folks, and that tends to smooth it out some as well.

But I think you would have to work through different allocation scenarios to see how it goes. It is true that it is very difficult to do that when you don't see what is happening, and I know that

has been one of the big problems we've had is no one has been able to see what actually happens if you do this.

DR. CHEUVRONT: There is one thing that I wanted to talk about; remember, the share cap is one thing that plays into this, but the initial allocation has two parts. The catch share policy that NMFS has out there describes the scenario that one of the things that you can do to get allocation to newer participants in a fishery is to have an equal distribution of shares across all the participants.

In this fishery what is proposed in the plan right now is that 25 percent of all the shares will be equally distributed amongst all of the permits. The remaining 75 percent is then distributed according to catch history. So really what you've got here are two elements that you can play with if we're going to be opening this up.

As far as I know the council has never considered anything other than that 25 percent equitable distribution among all the permits. The catch share policy does not dictate, as I recall, what that level of equitable distribution ought to be or give suggestions on that. I don't know how that number was chosen. It may have been chosen based on other catch share programs that exist. That is playing into all this as well.

MR. CUPKA: Let me just ask Monica if we start changing things like that, then we'd have to go back out to public hearing and whatnot, right, because it would be a new alternative that wouldn't be within the range we considered before because I don't think we considered a range. It was just a single value.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Brian, refresh my recollection, I'm a little embarrassed about this, but this was not a DEIS, correct; it was an environmental assessment?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, it was an EA.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So you have a little more flexibility in changing alternatives without needing to go out under NEPA, under the National Environmental Policy Act. If you as the council want to take it out for additional public hearings, that's fine. You'll also have a public comment period at council meetings. I think you've got some more flexibility built in there.

MR. CURRIN: It was to Roy's comments. I looked at the table again and in fact I did see one entity where there were some landings early on and no recent landings, but there is also an entity with – and I think you used the term large landings, Roy, and so that's what I focused on. In fact, they do have some landings in recent years but not nearly at the level of the landings in the early years.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And also remember some of the permits have changed hands over time, so the landings from early years and later years may not be by the current – they may have been by different owners of the permit.

MR. MAHOOD: As I recollect in the wreckfish program, when we did the initial allocation, 50 percent was divided equally among all participants or permit holders and 50 percent was done by catch history. I'm not sure how we ended up with 25/75 but I know it was discussed. That is certainly one way that kind of evens up the initial allocations is if you give a higher percentage equally to everybody.

DR. CRABTREE: That is an alternative in the document right now. Alternative 4 would distributed 50 percent equally and 50 percent among eligible participants. You have some alternatives in here that certainly would even things out some more.

MR. JOLLEY: I'm not on your committee, but what did you say the landings were, through May, was it?

MR. STRELCHECK: Through March of this year about 240,000 pounds. They're incomplete for April and May.

MR. JOLLEY: Well, we know they're going to be a lot higher.

MR. HARTIG: This really changes my whole concept of the plan, looking at these numbers. As I envision and look at how the catch shares were supposed to be developed taking into historic and recent participation – I mean the time series is fine with me. I'd just split it in half and do the two, one historical and one in the most recent, and see how that shakes out. That is what is done in most of these programs; you have a historical and a shorter timeframe and that is how we do it or it has been done in the past. This really throws a monkey wrench to me in the whole thing.

MR. CUPKA: How would the committee like to proceed with this?

MR. HARTIG: I'm not on your committee.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I know that. Are there anymore questions on the data? I guess we'll have to remember all this as we move ahead. Would the committee want to start going through the amendment at this time or maybe looking at some of the actions in there based on what you know now about some of these landings. Also, like I say, there are actions in there that shouldn't be a problem. They're separate from catch shares but they're in there. Do you want to lead us through the document? I guess you need to collect these back first or we hold on to them until the end of the committee meeting.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Sure, let's collect them at the end of the committee.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, the document we're going to be looking at is the decision document that is in your briefing book for golden crab. You have chosen preferred alternatives for all of the actions, and there are a couple of actions –

DR. CRABTREE: Brian, what is the tab number?

DR. CHEUVRONT: It just says DC, Decision Document, June 2012.

MR. CURRIN: You're talking about 2A.

DR. CHEUVRONT: David reminded me that one of the things that we had talked about at the March meeting was that the purpose and need was discussed at that time. The council reviewed those and actually modified them, but there are some unusual characteristics about a catch share program for particular fishery; one of which is that most the catch shares have been put in place in a fishery that is dealing with overcapacity or bycatch problems, a derby fishery.

We may be heading in that direction according to some of the things that we were hearing at this meeting. We don't know yet; we don't have the concrete information on that; and there is nothing in the FMP that indicates that those conditions are occurring. The NMFS Catch Share Policy describes some scenarios under which a catch share could be implemented.

By no means was it meant to be exhaustive but they mentioned things like overcapacity and bycatch. One of the reasons that they give for a reason why a council might want to consider a catch share and this particular program is because fishermen have come to them and asked for it. We have been working under the supposition in the past that this is why we were doing it, because the fishermen had come to the council and asked for it.

As a way to help clarify this in the purpose and need, because this is a different scenario, I actually looked at the purpose and need and came up with some suggested wording change that you might want to consider in the beginning of the document that describes the purpose and need. None of the bullet items for the purpose and need did I revise.

I showed you just as a starting point something that I had thought about was what is the reason behind why this catch share program is even being considered in the first place. I had suggested that the council might want to consider some verbiage similar to historic fishery participants came to the council and requested that a catch share program be established with the following purpose and need and replace the sentence that precedes what you have in there now.

It says, "The purpose and need of developing a Golden Crab Catch Share Program is to"; so basically what I did was just give some suggestion as to the reason why that this catch share program was being considered in the first place.

MR. CUPKA: Do we want to revise that part of the amendment and include some of this verbiage? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, David, I think that is appropriate. If we need a motion, I'll make it or we can just ask that the staff change it, but I would be happy to move that we accept the suggested change in language for the purpose and need, if you need it.

MR. CUPKA: We have a motion; is there a second? Second by Charlie. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: In fairness, somewhere in the document it probably ought to reflect that since that time when they came to us another segment of the fishery has come to us and asked us not to go forward with it. If you could go back to the purpose and need a minute, a couple of things that I haven't been able to draw the connection on.

One is number two, "Protect sensitive benthic habitat by ensuring fishery participants have a high level of knowledge of the fishery and its operation"; it is just not clear to me how the catch share results in a change in that from the current situation. The fact is the people in the fishery are the same people now as will be in the fishery in the catch share. While that is an admirable goal, it is not entirely clear to me how the catch share program necessarily furthers that goal. I think an explanation there –

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, I think this is in reference to the future. We know that is the case for current participants, but under the scenario that exists now anybody could get a permit. There is nothing to say that they have to have any experience or anything in the fishery to be able to get a permit.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, that's true, anyone could buy a permit, but under the catch share program anyone could buy a permit and buy allocation.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We need to look at that but I think that was considered and changed. Let's bring that up again when we go through the transferability thing. I can't recall the exact details off the top of my mind, but I thought we had tried to deal with that issue in the transferability action.

DR. CRABTREE: And some of these other ones, I can see how the flexibility for breakdowns and gear conflicts – I can see in the event that a derby fishery developed this would provide flexibility for that, so I can see that. I think you could probably build some safety at sea in this, but those are all things that are contingent upon the derby fishery developing.

So operating on the assumption that we're not likely to approve this and submit it to the secretary at this meeting, I think when we come back in September we'll have even more landings available for this year; and to the extent they do show that effort is ramping up and catches are going up, I think that would be useful to include in here as well.

MR. CUPKA: Well, obviously staff will work on this some. I don't want to get too far down in the weeds or we'll never get through this thing today. Ben, you had something?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I just had a question. Have you included in the purpose and need – and I was looking for it – the raw seawater systems and what it significantly changed in this fishery and why we're even thinking about entertaining this? That is probably one of the most important reasons in my mind why we're looking at the golden crab catch share program because of the change in the fishery in the recent years.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I think number five captures some of that because if you have a catch share program, participants are going to know that they have specific annual pounds allotted to them,

and they will be able to determine whether it is economically advantageous for them to have a refrigerated seawater system on board their vessel or not.

If a derby fishery was to develop and there was no catch share program, it would be hard for a participant in the fishery to know whether it would be economically feasible or to their advantage to put out the huge amount of money it takes to put one of those systems on board their vessel.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I just want to echo what Ben said. I thought that was a strong rationale and support for the idea of the catch share program, too; so to the extent where we can put that in and discuss it, I think that is an excellent idea.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, so noted. Do you want to go ahead and take us through these?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Mr. Chairman, you have a motion on the table right now.

MR. CUPKA: Is there any further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved. Obviously we won't be taking any final action at this meeting, but it would be helpful to staff to give them some direction on which actions you may have some concerns about and you may want to look at some different alternatives.

Let's go through those actions and now that you have had a chance to see the data, if there are some that gives you particular heartburn, then now would be the time to let staff know and hopefully we'll have some kind of meeting before the next council meeting to get some input back from the fishermen, too, on some of these. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, there are 15 actions in this amendment, but I think most of them we will be able to zip through pretty quickly. As I see it right now there are definitely three of them that we need to talk about, and I'll make sure we point those out as we go through. The first action is to establish criteria for a golden crab catch share program. Your current preferred alternative is to restrict eligibility to valid or renewable commercial golden crab permit holders. Eligibility for participation in this catch share program is defined as having a valid or renewable commercial golden crab permit as of the effective date of the final rule. Basically everybody who has got a permit would be in the catch share program; nobody gets excluded. Nobody wants to change any of that?

Okay, Action 2 is the initial apportionment of catch shares. This is something that you may want to discuss because your current preferred alternative is Alternative 5, distribute 25 percent of initial catch shares equally among eligible participants and distribute 75 percent of initial catch shares among eligible participants based on the aggregate annual golden crab landings from logbooks associated with their current permits during the time period 1997 through 2010. Now you've got several different other options here that you may want to give some direction to staff what you would like to consider.

MR. CURRIN: Brian, can you point me within the document itself, within the amendment, Attachment 2B, to the analysis regarding this action; what page does that begin on in the actual amendment.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Give me a second and let me pull that up.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, at some point; I just wanted to look at the impacts of the various alternatives here because they're not in the decision document.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Again, in the analysis that is in the amendment we have to be very careful because of confidentiality and how we can describe things.

MR. CURRIN: I think I found it; 120 it starts.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, that is correct; 120 is where the analysis begins. That's PDF Page 120. Are you saying you want to take the time to go through that analysis now?

MR. CURRIN: Well, I think the information I'm seeking is probably not in here because of the confidentiality, but it would be very informative I think to me in particular if I could have some assessment of that confidential data so I could see the distribution of the percentage of shares among the shareholders and how that sorted out; do you know what I mean?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Perhaps what we could do is go through these alternatives that you have now and like the tables that we worked up the share cap thing, we could work out potentially what the allocations would be of annual pounds based on the different alternatives that you have here. I don't know whether we'd have to request yet another opportunity to show you some confidential data, but I'm sure that could all be worked out by the next meeting.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, I had the same question and maybe Roy can address it.

DR. CRABTREE: No, I think if you change your preferred on these, you're going to want to see what does that do, so we'll get that together and we'll either look at that at the next council meeting. If you changed some preferreds today, it might be possible to work up what it does and have it for you tomorrow at full council; I don't know. I don't think you need to ask again.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You don't.

DR. CRABTREE: The understanding is until we're done with this document we're going to have access to looking at this so you can tell what the impact to your decisions on this is.

MR. CURRIN: And, David, I'm not interested at this point in changing the preferreds, but I'd like to have that information to consider to determine whether I'd like to offer a motion to change a preferred. I guess it will have to be done in the future, though.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, since I believe we're going to be looking some more options and the preferred is 25 percent of the initial catch shares and Alternative 4 is 50 percent of the

initial catch shares; would it be in order to have an alternative in there with like 35 percent for initial catch shares just so we'll have something to look at while we're looking at these ranges? That would give the participants that don't have a lot of landings, that would pick their initial shares up by close to probably 45 percent. It may go a long ways to helping everybody try to come to some kind of compromise.

MR. CUPKA: Well, we could certainly put that in there if you want to make that in the form of a motion.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I would make that in the form of a motion, and I think I would like to see the other 65 percent looked on the allocation of Boyles' Law.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, this is going to take a second to work out because you're asking for two different things. Just to make sure I get this right, you want to create one alternative that looks at 35 percent equal distribution among all permits.

MR. CUPKA: And the other 65 according to Boyles' Law.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think that makes sense but I'm open to any suggestions to this motion providing I get a second.

MR. CUPKA: Second by Wilson. Let's get the motion up there on the screen. **The motion before us to distribute 35 percent of the share allocation equally among all permit holders and distribute the remaining 65 percent using Boyles' Law for years 1997 through 2010.** That wasn't part of your original motion, the years, but is that all right with the maker of the motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

DR. LANEY: Well, just a question to clarify from Charlie, so, Charlie, by putting Boyles' Law in there for that remaining 65 percent, it somewhat complicates comparing it to the other alternatives, which didn't use Boyles' Law; did you think about that?

MR. PHILLIPS: Wilson, what I'm trying to do – and it may be too complicated to do, but my thought process was this is how we allocate a lot of other stuff, and it gives weight to the new and the historical. I'm trying to follow as closely as I can what we've done on other allocations. The only difference is what we're going to take off the top.

MR. CURRIN: Charlie, I tend to agree with Wilson; I think it complicates things unduly. If you look at what we've got, if you just drop the Boyles' Law stuff, we'd have a fairly regular progression of alternatives that I think would encompass the range of whatever this would result in. It is going to be probably halfway in between the 35 and the 25 and the 35 and the 50.

It is going to move one direction or the other depending on the distribution of the catch over those years. I think it is going to give you a different sort of look and it may not give you the

intended look at an intermediate sort of measure. I think it would be cleaner to take that Boyles' Law average out, but that is just my assessment and recommendation.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I'll take that as a friendly amendment.

DR. CHEUVRONT: So then how do we want to modify the motion? Are we going to withdraw the motion; is that what you're saying or what; take out the Boyles' Law part?

MR. CUPKA: Right.

MR. PHILLIPS: Whatever is simpler; I can withdraw the motion and just –

MR. CUPKA: We had a friendly amendment to just take out the Boyles' Law part. **Okay, the motion now reads distribute 35 percent of the share allocations equally among all permit holders and distribute the remaining 65 percent using historic landings for the years 1997 through 2010.** Is there further discussion on the motion? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, my intent is that this alternative mirror exactly the other two alternatives at 50 and 25, so to give the staff license to create that new alternative using the same language but just with a different value.

DR. CHEUVRONT: There is one thing, also, that I wanted to point out to you, at the March meeting – I'm going to go back up here and show you the Alternative 4, you'll see you have a 4A and a 4B – we had similar subalternatives for Alternative 5.

When that was chosen as the preferred, those subalternatives were taken out because it would have resulted in some participants getting zero allocation, and that was not the council's intent. The analysis hasn't been done for this here, but my guess is that it would end up with the result, so you might want to consider removing Subalternatives 4A and 4B, but that would be done in a separate motion, I believe.

DR. CRABTREE: And just for information, I think the way your preferred is laid out now everyone gets at least 46,000 –

DR. CHEUVRONT: About 44 or 45,000 pounds.

DR. CRABTREE: 44,000 pounds, so that is the 25 percent distributed evenly. If you went to 50 percent they would get 88,000 pounds at a minimum even if they have zero landings.

DR. CHEUVRONT: You still have a motion on the table right now.

MR. CUPKA: Any further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? **Seeing none, then that motion is approved.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Do you want to consider removing Subalternatives 4A and 4B. Especially we're going to do an analysis, I think it is pretty safe to bet that you're going to have some

permits that won't have any allocation if you leave 4A and 4B, and I think it is the intent of the council at this point to make sure that everybody has something.

MR. CURRIN: I'd make that motion, David, to remove the subalternatives under Alternative 4.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we have a motion; second by Charlie. Any discussion on the motion? **The motion reads remove subalternatives under Alternative 4 to the considered but rejected appendix. Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, I think that takes care of Action 2. Action 3 is to establish criteria and structure of an appeals process. What you've got is a lot of verbiage here. You've got a preferred Alternative 2.

MR. CUPKA: I don't think we need to go over that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, I don't think we need to redo that one.

MR. CUPKA: It's our standard appeals –

DR. CHEUVRONT: It is the standard one.

MR. CUPKA: – process so is there any desire on the part of the committee to change that? Okay, let's move ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Action 4 is establish criteria for transferability, and the preferred is shares or annual pounds can only be transferred to valid or renewable golden crab permit holders. Participants cannot possess shares or allocation without a valid or renewable golden crab permit.

The IPT has some recommended language change. At the last meeting we had suggested – you had put in “or renewable”, but to be consistent with other transfer procedures that exist for other southeast catch share programs they wanted to remove the word “renewable” because having those words in there could allow for maybe a little bit of shady transfers going back and forth of permits.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I would move accepting the IPT recommendation to remove the words “or renewable” from the text.

MR. CUPKA: Second by Mac. Discussion on the motion? **The motion is to accept the IPT recommendation to remove the phrase “or renewable” from the alternatives. Is there any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.** Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Brian, coming back to the question I asked earlier, when I read this it looks to me like anybody – I guess you have to be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident alien – can come in and buy a permit and buy allocation.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I was trying to remember what the details were when we were talking about it because I know this has been discussed before, and I couldn't remember what its inclusion was in here.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm not suggesting a change to the alternative or anything. I think it ought to probably be that way. It is just that one statement in the purpose and need that is still difficult for me to draw the connection.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 5 is to define quota share ownership caps. Right now your preferred is no person, including a corporation or other entity, may individually or collectively hold catch shares in excess of 49 percent of the total shares. This is the thing that you had said you wanted to talk about. That is your current preferred. I don't know how you want to handle that. One of the things that we do need is that whatever you choose in this Action 5 is it would be helpful that we get some really good rationale for your choice if you decide to change your preferred alternative.

MR. CURRIN: I would like to offer a motion change the preferred. I guess I have a question, Brian, as to whether my rationale might be disclosing confidential data. That is my concern and I don't want to get in the middle of that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I know what you're referring to, Mac.

MR. CURRIN: I can say that my support for the current preferred at 49 percent was based on an entity who was catching at some point that portion of the quota or the landings at least so that's a reasonable alternative to include. If you remember our discussion on that, I think everybody had a little bit of heartburn because I think we had an alternative that was 50 percent at one point, and that just seems like it is too much. It's almost a majority of the catch.

I guess 49 percent was a compromise in my mind to some degree, but we also had a very small fishery with very, very few active participants at the time. So with that understanding, it didn't concern me as much. I guess I would like to consider a lower share cap because I think that may be one of the sticking points that some of the folks who were not excited about catch shares in this fishery going through, it may make them feel a little bit differently about it.

I don't know that, but just because it may help move this thing along in the future, I'd go ahead and make the motion that we change our preferred to Alternative 4, which states that no person, including a corporation or other entity, may individually or collectively hold catch shares in excess of 35 percent of the total shares.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we have a motion and a second by Charlie. Discussion on the motion?

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm going to vote this motion partly because I would prefer Alternative 3, I believe it is; the one with 25 percent.

MR. CUPKA: Further discussion? **Okay, the motion is to change the preferred alternative to Alternative 4, which is a 35 percent share cap. All those in favor signify by raising your hand; opposed. Okay, four in favor and one against; the motion carries.** Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Where that leaves you is right now there is no one who has more than 35 percent in terms of what they would be allocated, so I guess part of your rationale now is you're lining this up with what the most anyone would get. Part of the problem we've had is why; why was 49 percent the right one; so now my question to you, okay, why is 35 percent appropriate? We need some record because this is a big deal. In talking to folks, this is one of the bigger deals in the amendment.

MR. CURRIN: So, Roy, I have a question for you then; why would 25 percent be an appropriate one, because it cuts somebody who is currently landing a level at the chosen percentage in that alternative? I mean, is that –

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I'm not saying that 35 percent isn't a good one and I'm not saying 25 percent is a better one. I'm saying we need to build a rationale for why. Now, if you look at the tables you have you can see 35 percent is 700,000 pounds, and so you can look in here and see what people are catching and you can tell is anybody going to be restricted by that to less than what they have been catching.

You can look at 25 percent, which is 500,000 pounds and you can look and see how that affects things. Mostly what those share caps do is it changes the amount of growth that any one individual is going to be able to have. The guys who have a lot of landings right now, if you bring that share cap down to 25 percent, they're not going to really have much room to grow their operation from where it is. I personally think 49 percent is too high.

Now, whether 35 percent is right, 25 percent is right, or even 30 percent is right, I don't have a strong opinion of that, but I think the key thing here is whether you choose 35, 25 or 30, whatever you choose, is articulated in a good, strong rationale for why you think that is appropriate. Maybe you don't develop all of that today.

I think we're going to convene this group and have them look at it and we can add to it; but before we vote this thing up, if we ever do, we're going to need to have a good reason behind it, because this is a fundamental part of the amendment, and we want to make sure that we aren't open to the charge that our decision is arbitrary and capricious. It has to have some solid, rational foundation.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Roy, I know you have raised that question before, so one of the things that I did since the March meeting was go around to the different catch share programs between the Mid-Atlantic and the Gulf and look at the rationale that they gave for the share caps that they had there.

One that I found that seemed to be kind of – that maybe you may all consider to be relevant to this fishery was the 49 percent share cap that currently exists in the Golden Tilefish IFQ Program in the Mid-Atlantic Council. They gave three reasons why they chose that. The first was the 49

percent share cap would keep a single entity from being able to control the market. Secondly, if the ACL goes down, the historic highliners might have to curtail their operations more so than recent participants, including down to levels below their previous historic landings. Third, one of the goals of their management plan was to make the fishery as productive as possible without going over the ACL.

The Mid-Atlantic Council decided that the historic participants were the ones who would probably be most likely to help achieve the goal of reaching the ACL because of their past records of higher landings.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that is all helpful. To me the key thing here is obviously we don't want anybody to have control over the fishery. You know what folks are catching. The question is what do you think is an appropriate amount of growth to allow an individual to have that is reasonable without allowing them to have what would seem to be an inequitable control over the fishery. Remember what someone gets in terms of more is less for the rest of these folks because there are 2 million pounds. But I think that is the key is what is a reasonable amount of growth to allow without allowing anyone to get an excessive amount of it.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and I think equally as important perhaps, Roy, is to look at the implications of a quota reduction or an ACL reduction in that, and, of course, the people that are near the share cap now would lose substantially more than other people that would be in at a lower level. I think that warrants some consideration as well.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on the committee but I think when we impose ACLs we have already capped growth in some form; and so just adding the catch shares into that is not necessarily inhibiting growth. It is the ACL itself when you can't grow beyond what the ACL is, so I don't know if that is that big of a concern.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if I could, Mr. Chairman, if you didn't have the catch share program, then, yes, someone's growth I guess is potentially limited by the ACL, but in this case they're limited by 35 percent of the ACL, so that is a different thing. In an unconstrained – except there is an ACL fishery, if you could fish much faster and more efficiently than somebody, you could potentially go out and catch up half the quota, I guess, but in this case that is taken off the table.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments? If not, we're going to move on to Action 6.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Action 6 is the use-it or lose-it policy that we have talked about. Currently your preferred alternative is that shares that remain inactive for three consecutive years will be revoked and redistributed proportionately among the remaining shareholders. Preferred Subalternative 4A says that inactive is defined as landings less than 20 percent of a shareholder's annual pounds allocated in sum over a three-year running average.

The IPT has some recommended wording change. For Alternatives 3 and 4, the IPT recommends revising the wording as follows; "Shares that remain inactive for three consecutive years will be revoked and proportionately redistributed among the remaining shareholders subject to share cap restrictions based on the amount of shares each holds immediately prior to

the redistribution.” The IPT does not recommend changing wording the subalternatives, and then there is also a clarification that the IPT would like to have.

MR. CUPKA: Is there a motion relative to their recommendation?

DR. LANEY: **Well, Mr. Chairman, I’ll move that we accept the IPT’s recommended wording change.**

MR. CUPKA: We have a motion; is there a second? Charlie. Discussion on the motion? The motion is to accept the IPT’s recommended wording change. This is for Action 6. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Brian, is the wording change proposed just for the preferred alternative or for 2, 3 and 4?

DR. CHEUVRONT: The IPT’s recommendation was for Alternatives 3 and 4, both.

MR. CUPKA: Further discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? **Seeing none, then that motion is approved.** Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: This was another one of the issues that came up in my discussions with some of the fishermen as problem with some of them. I guess there are some of them who switch in and out of different fisheries and may not fish for some period of time, and they were concerned about losing their allocation or chunks of it due to use-it or lose-it provision.

DR. CHEUVRONT: There was one other point that the IPT would like to have clarified here. There could be a scenario where more than one fishery participant could end up revoking shares in one year. What has not been discussed is that if a participant is having shares revoked and somebody else has shares revoked; do they get part of the redistribution of somebody else’s shares. The thought was that perhaps you were thinking that if somebody who is having shares revoked they did not get to participate in any redistribution that year, but the IPT would like to have some clarification from the council as to what you were thinking.

MR. CUPKA: I thought we had discussed that; and that was my understanding, that we didn’t want people who were getting part of their shares revoked to receive part of a redistribution from another.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, we just wanted to make sure that was clear, that was the council’s intent.

MR. CUPKA: Anyone else have any different thoughts on that? I see people shaking their head no. Okay, that takes us to Action 7.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 7 is the cost recovery plan. This is basically administrative on how the Service will go about recovering costs for participating in the fishery. We have preferred alternatives. I don’t think there is really much need to consider that any further unless you wanted to.

MR. CUPKA: Is there any desire on the part of the committee to change those? I see none so let's move ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Action 8 is to revise the boat length limit rule. This is one that is not specifically involved in the catch share program. Your current preferred alternative is to obtain a permit for the middle or southern zone via transfer, the documented overall length of the replacement vessel may not exceed the documented length overall of the aggregate documented lengths – that's actually a typo – of the replacement vessel by more than 35 percent.

MR. CUPKA: Any desire on the part of the committee to change our preferred on this action? I see none so we'll move ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 9, modify regulations on golden crab fishing zones; your preferred alternative currently is participants can use annual pounds in any zone for which they possess a permit.

MR. CUPKA: Everyone okay with that? Okay, let's move on.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 10 is modify the small vessel subzone restriction. Your preferred alternative eliminates the small vessel subzone within the southern zone that was originally established to protect against very large fishing vessels in the subzone.

MR. CUPKA: Is everyone okay with that?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 11 is to modify the one vessel one permit policy for golden crab. Basically what you're now saying is that the fishermen can put more than one permit if they have them for the different zones on the vessel at one time, and they could put up to three permits on the vessel, which basically allows them to fish in all zones if they have all three permits. I don't think that any operation at this point has permits for all three zones.

MR. CUPKA: Any desire to change our preferred on this one? Okay, let's move ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Number 12 is monitoring enforcement. This is to require all vessels engaged in the golden crab catch share program to be equipped with VMS. The equipment would be reimbursed by the NMFS OLE VMS Reimbursement Account if funding is available, but then all installation, maintenance and communication costs would be paid for by the shareholder, which is pretty standard for the VMS and catch share programs.

MR. CUPKA: Any desire to change the preferred on this action? I see none so we will move ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Action 13 is define annual pounds ownership caps. This is set the annual pounds – your preferred alternative is set the annual pounds cap equal to the corresponding share cap as defined in the quota share ownership caps action number five. Basically what this is, it says that your initial distribution of shares that you are not going to –

that is set as your share cap; so whatever you set in Action 5 becomes the overall cap, that nobody could ever exceed that until you change this action or something.

MR. CUPKA: Any desire to change this preferred on the part of the committee? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: No, Mr. Chairman, not at this point, but I think it is something that in future the committee might want to consider depending on how the overall share cap percentage ends up. It may be with the small number of participants, that someone participating in the fishery on a regular basis may not be able to fish one year and they may seek to transfer some of their quota or pounds to an entity that is fishing, and I'd hate to see them not be able to do that because that person was fishing at capacity. So just kind of a note for future consideration.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Mac. Other comments? Okay, let's move on to Action 14.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 14 is the annual pounds overage. This allows a vessel with remaining annual pounds may exceed by up to 20 percent of the shareholder's annual pounds remaining on the last fishing trip of the year. Shareholders who incur an overage will be required to pay back the annual pounds overage in the subsequent fishing year.

MR. CUPKA: Any desire to change our preferred on this one? Seeing none, we'll move ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And the final action is the approved landing sites. Your preferred alternative is to establish and approve landing sites for the golden crab catch share program. Your preferred subalternative is that the sites will be selected by the fishermen but must be approved by NMFS OLE in consultation with appropriate state law enforcement agency.

MR. CUPKA: What is the desire of the committee on this one? Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Just a suggestion, Mr. Chairman; I guess that is something that could be discussed with the permit holders once – if we're going to have a meeting, that would probably be on the agenda for that, I presume.

MR. CUPKA: Well, it could be; I think it has been discussed before.

DR. CHEUVRONT: It has been discussed with the AP before and they're in favor of this version of this action. Mr. Chairman, that's it for all the actions for this amendment.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, thank you, Brian. All right, where do we go from here? It looks like we need to convene a meeting of the permit holders to go over some of these actions that need to be readdressed. The staff needs to do a little more work on some of the wording on this amendment, and then it will come back to us in September. We need to try and schedule that meeting before our next council meeting if we can. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think in terms of scheduling, too, you ought to pay attention to when the Florida spiny lobster season opens because it may be difficult to get some of these folks once that happens.

MR. CUPKA: Good point; thank you, Roy. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: I just wanted to mention, Mr. Chairman, that one of the provisions in the plan is the release of female crabs, and I understand to some extent that maybe some of the smaller male crabs are being released. Now, from a biological perspective it would be nice to know what the survival rate is for those animals that are being released.

There is technology available now to be able to track animals like that using acoustic tag technology and VR-2 receivers. I have talked to some of the fishermen about the possibility of doing that kind of a study maybe in collaboration with some folks who already have receivers out there for other species. I would be happy to talk to any of the fishermen that would like to hear about that technology. We're using it on horseshoe crabs in the Mid-Atlantic. I think that would be a very useful technique.

Then the other comment I wanted to make was it would be nice to have an updated stock assessment for this species. To the extent we could work that into the schedule in the future, that would be desirable

MR. CUPKA: Okay, thank you, Wilson. Any other comments? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: While Jack is picking up the confidential information, I have a question for you, Brian. On Action 7, which is the cost recovery plan, in the actual wording of the preferred alternatives it talks about fees and how they're collected. Then there is a note at the bottom that collected fees shall not exceed 3 percent of the ex-vessel value. Is the actual fee percentage 3 percent?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Andy, can you help out with that one?

MR. STRELCHECK: The fee percentage is specified by the agency so it is not specified by the council. We're obligated to review it and determine if it is appropriate on an annual basis.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So it gets changed annually or it could get changed annually?

MR. STRELCHECK: Correct, it can be changed annually. If the administrative costs are less than 3 percent, then it should be reduced.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, is there any other business to come before the committee? Seeing none, then we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 o'clock p.m., June 14, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July 5, 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011 - 2012 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

David M. Cupka
P.O. Box 12753
Charleston, SC 29422
843/795-8591 (hm)
843/870-5495 (cell)
palmettobooks@bellsouth.net

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

~~**MEL BELL**
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. 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)
maccurrin@gmail.com

Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell St.
PO Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

LT Robert Foos
U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6768 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Robert.W.Foos@uscg.mil

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

John W. Jolley
4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/346-8426 (ph)
jolleyjw@yahoo.com

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

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

John V. O'Shea
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
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

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011-2012 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Robert Boyles
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Ben Hartig, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Chevront

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Tom Swatzel, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Red Munden Mid-Atlantic Council
New England Council Rep
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Duane Harris, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- Comp. Ecosystem-based
Amendment

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

✓ David Cupka, Chair
✓ Mac Currin
✓ Wilson Laney
✓ Jessica McCawley
✓ Charlie Phillips
✓ Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Tom Burgess
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

David Cupka, Chair
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Michelle Duval
Robert Foos
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Robert Foos
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Tom Burgess
Mac Currin
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Red Munden, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Duane Harris, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Robert Boyles
Robert Foos
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL

Robert Boyles, Chair
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Roy Crabtree, Chair
Robert Boyles
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR Committee

David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Vince O'Shea
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

✓ Assistant Public Information Officer

Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

✓ Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ Coral Reef Scientist

Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

✓ Fishery Biologist

Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

✓ Fisheries Social Scientist

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

✓ Staff Economist

Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

✓ Science and Statistics Program Manager

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Kari Fenske - kari.fenske@safmc.net

✓ Administrative Officer

Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary / Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

✓ Purchasing & Grants

Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

BONNIE POWWETH
PHIL STEELE
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
JACK MCGOVERN
BOB GILL
OTHA EASLEY
KAREN RAINE
ANDY STRELCHECK

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.

GOLDEN CRAB COMMITTEE MEETING
 June 14, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP

EMAIL ADDRESS

AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER

NAME & ORGANIZATION

<u>NAME & ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET</u> <u>CITY, STATE & ZIP</u>
Brad Whipple	508-269-2378	whipnz@hotmail.com	32120-9351
Pushing Progress	386-239-0948	DSF2009@aol.com	2515 W. Mini Dr Ft Pierce FL 32951
Kenney Fox	910-620-3847	KenneyFox@gmail.com	1365 69th St Orlando FL 32961
Joe Westermann	772-461-0494	GWESTER@verizon.com	168 Harris Dr. Sebastian FL 32958
David Stead	772-778-5336	Cstead@verizon.com	
Chad Engler	(561) 596-0821	rchad@bell.south.net	Fisheries@verizon.net
Howard Fox	954 612 3176	TAMPA, FL	CHS/SC
FRANK HELLES	GSAFF		
Kate Quigley			

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
 4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
 North Charleston, SC 29405
 843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866SAFMC-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.

GOLDEN CRAB COMMITTEE MEETING
 June 14, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

P.O. BOX/STREET
 CITY, STATE & ZIP

EMAIL
 ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
 PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
 ORGANIZATION

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Tracy Yandle - EMDIY UNIV.	404-727-6314	TYandle@emdiy.edu	P.O. Box 2153 16311 W. Ellsworth Ave. Golden, CO 80401
Mik Merrifield	321-615-5228	mik@merrifield.com	1280 Oceanview Ave Maitland, FL 32850
Dale Beaumart-Age (Seafood Consumer)		beaumart@comcast.net	P.O. Box 2153 Supetee, FL 33468
Robert Palma (Fishermen's Family)		Teappa@gmail.com	P.O. Box 2153 Supetee, FL 33468
TERESA COPPA (Fisherman)		Teappa@gmail.com	
Tony Coppa	305-481-4081	TRANSPORT@edward.com	MALATON, FL
Justin Ireland		IRELAND@norman.com	
VINDA ALMIRALDA	305-619-0039		
Bill Kelly			

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.

GOLDEN CRAB COMMITTEE MEETING
June 14, 2012
Orlando, FL 32812

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP

Sensenbeck,
FL 32457

EMAIL
ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

<u>NAME & ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP</u>
Terry Gibson	772-285-7683	Terry.Gibson@northseelands.com	
Pam Gillespie - CCA	321-632-1776	Pam.gillespie	Deerle, FL Orlando FL.
Jeff Miller - CCA			
Brian Barski -			

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405
843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:17 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)	Webinar ID 764572314
Actual Start Date/Time Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Actual Duration (minutes) 306
Clicked Registration Link 160	Opened Invitation 27
Total Attended 37	

Session Details

Mehta,Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:56 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:14 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:04 PM EDT	109.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 69

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Presley,Ron	presleyr@bellsouth.net
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 14, 2012 05:08 PM EDT
City	Merritt Island
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 05:19 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:35 PM EDT	15.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Port-Minner,Samantha **sport-minner@oceanconservancy.org**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 01:50 PM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 06:15 PM EDT	209.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

linville,mike **whateversbitin03@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:48 AM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 04:49 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	157.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 80

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Latanich,Katie **cal7@duke.edu**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:17 PM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Jun 14, 2012 05:17 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:26 PM EDT	9.03
---------------------------	---------------------------	------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Stephen,Jessica **jessica.stephen@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:25 AM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Jun 14, 2012 02:52 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 04:39 PM EDT	107.08
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Travis,Michael mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 01:17 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:49 PM EDT	182.8

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

DeVictor,Rick rick.devictor@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 09:12 AM EDT

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:51 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 06:55 PM EDT	144.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Michie,Kate kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 11:04 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:50 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 03:54 PM EDT	63.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Eich,Anne Marie annemarie.eich@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 09:29 AM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:57 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:59 PM EDT	159.63

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

holiman,stephen **stephen.holiman@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:29 AM EDT

City st. petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 04:28 PM EDT	101.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 39

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

larsen,john **john@beachmarineservice.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:54 AM EDT

City port canaveral

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:05 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:49 PM EDT	163.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Gore, Karla karla.gore@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 11:16 AM EDT

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:33 PM EDT	167.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Beckwith, Anna anna@pamlicoguide.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:15 AM EDT

City morehead city

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:33 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:02 PM EDT	89.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 63

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Austin,Anthony **redress@ec.rr.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 02:24 AM EDT

City Hubert

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT Jun 14, 2012 07:53 PM EDT 307.03

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

OShaughnessy,Patrick **patrick.oshaughnessy@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:41 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT Jun 14, 2012 05:04 PM EDT 137.8

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

riley,rick **rileylr@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 06:34 PM EDT

City melbourne

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 06:35 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 06:41 PM EDT	6.18

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Clemens,Anik **anik.clemens@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 12, 2012 12:35 PM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:21 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 04:40 PM EDT	78.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Casey,P. paige.casey@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 12:37 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 06:00 PM EDT	96.53

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

sandorf,scott scott.sandorf@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 09:34 AM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:01 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 04:48 PM EDT	107.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Miller,Janet janet.l.miller@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 02:19 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:28 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 04:20 PM EDT	51.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 56

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

MacLauchlin,Bill billmac@charter.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:11 AM EDT

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:33 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 05:36 PM EDT	92.33

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 68

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

gillispie,dennis **dgledge@gmailo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 06:05 PM EDT

City fort pierce

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 06:06 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:00 PM EDT	54.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

laks,ira **captainira@att.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:47 AM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 05:17 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:53 PM EDT	155.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Napier, Toby tnapier@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:13 PM EDT

City Cocoa

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 07:14 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	38.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 38

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Turner, Jon turnerj1919@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 11:56 AM EDT

City Geneva

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 07:04 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	48.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Holland,Jack jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:58 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 02:49 PM EDT	2.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 48

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Takade-Heumacher,Helen htakade@edf.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 10:08 AM EDT

City Raleigh

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 03:30 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	254.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

c,mike **mec181@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 02:50 PM EDT

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 02:51 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	301.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

sergent,richard **richiebagman@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:39 PM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 05:41 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:53 PM EDT	132.2

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 52

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

prewitt jr,brian **bprewittjr@hotmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 04:16 PM EDT

City daytona

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 04:17 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	154.78

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 52

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Arrington,Albrey **albrey@fishrulesapp.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:31 PM EDT

City Jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 07:37 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:40 PM EDT	2.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

waltermire,robert aquahaulit@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:05 PM EDT

City sebastian

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 07:06 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	46.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Helmick,Emily emily.helmick@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:32 PM EDT

City Palm beach gardens

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 07:34 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	18.43

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

thompson,mary jean **mjthompson860@gmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 12:13 PM EDT

City titusville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 04:12 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	220.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Lelis,Ludi **llelis@tribune.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:11 PM EDT

City Orlando

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 05:11 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	160.55

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Purcell,Mark markpurcell310@hotmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:01 PM EDT

City Palm Bay

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 07:03 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	49.18

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

FARMER,NICK nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date May 25, 2012 10:59 AM EDT

City ST PETERSBURG

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
-----------	------------	--------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Lelis,Ludmilla **llelis@orlandosentinel.com**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 04:57 PM EDT

City Orlando

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Maclauchlin,Carol **carolmac@charter.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 10:22 AM EDT

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Baker,Scott **bakers@uncw.edu**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:56 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Fitzpatrick,Eric **eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:07 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Coggins,Lew **lew.coggins@noaa.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:46 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Simmons,Eric **eric.d.simmons@usps.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 11:52 AM EDT

City Oak Hill

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Larkin,Michael michael.larkin@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:39 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Vondruska,John john.vondruska@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:57 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

fenske,kari kari.fenske@samfc.net

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:21 AM EDT

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

BLACK,ED bigdog91360@aol.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 02:34 PM EDT

City FORT PIERCE

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Daniel,Louis **louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date May 25, 2012 02:03 PM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

finucane,sean **finuke@yahoo.com**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:55 PM EDT

City south daytona

State FL

Unsubscribed Bounce

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

burford,marcy **marcyburford@comcast.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 09:49 AM EDT

City stuart

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

C,Mike **mike.collins@safmc.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:32 AM EDT

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Jun 14, 2012 02:46 PM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 07:52 PM EDT	305.97
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

branstetter,steve **steve.branstetter@noaa.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:16 AM EDT

City St. Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Kellison,Todd **todd.kellison@noaa.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:23 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Williams,Erik **erik.williams@noaa.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 03:31 PM EDT

City MHC

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Sedberry,George **george.sedberry@noaa.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:28 AM EDT

City Savannah

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

gillispie,dennis **dgledge@gmail.com**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 06:02 PM EDT

City fort pierce

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

fenske,kari **kari.fenske@safmc.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 01:27 PM EDT

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Locke, Melissa

mlocke@edf.org

Attended No

Registration Date

Jun 13, 2012 10:32 AM EDT

City

Raleigh

State

NC

Unsubscribed

No

[In Session](#)

Join Time

Leave Time

In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.