

**SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**JOINT SNAPPER GROUPER & DOLPHIN WAHOO COMMITTEES**

**Sawgrass Marriott**  
**Ponte Vedra Beach, FL**

**June 12, 2014**

**SUMMARY MINUTES**

**Snapper Grouper Committee:**

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chairman  
Mel Bell  
Dr. Roy Crabtree  
Ben Hartig  
Doug Haymans  
Anna Beckwith

Jessica McCawley, Vice-Chair  
Chris Conklin  
David Cupka  
Jack Cox  
Zack Bowen  
Charlie Phillips

**Dolphin Wahoo Committee:**

Anna Beckwith, Chair  
Zack Bowen  
Doug Haymans

John Jolley, Vice-Chair  
David Cupka

**Council Members:**

Lt. Morgan Fowler

Dr. Wilson Laney

**Council Staff:**

Bob Mahood  
Mike Collins  
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
Kim Iverson  
Julie O'Dell  
Myra Brouwer

Gregg Waugh  
John Carmichael  
Amber Von Harten  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
Roger Pugliese  
Dr. Brian Chevront

**Observers/Participants:**

Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith  
Tracy Dunn  
Leann Bosarge

Dr. Jack McGovern  
Phil Steele  
Dr. Nick Farmer  
Karen Antrim Raine

Additional Observers Attached

The Joint Dolphin Wahoo and Snapper Grouper Committees of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Sawgrass Marriott, Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida, June 12, 2014, and was called to order at 9:35 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Anna Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: I call the Joint Snapper Grouper and Dolphin Wahoo Committees to order. Are there any additions or changes to the agenda? I have one other item under other business if we have time. Seeing none; the agenda is approved. I don't know if any of you guys noticed, but the committee minutes for the March meeting were actually in the folder. They weren't attached. Does anyone have anyone have any comments on the meeting minutes from our last committee meeting? Seeing none; those are approved. Next on the agenda is the updates. Jack.

DR. McGOVERN: I will talk about the commercial landings. We have updated landings from the science center through June 8. Dolphin through June 8 are at 43 percent of the commercial quota; about 49 percent of the overall quota was met last year. Wahoo is at 27 percent of the quota; 94 percent of the quota was met last year. Dr. Farmer talked about the recreational dolphin and wahoo Monday. Recreational in 2013 was at 38 percent and recreational wahoo was at 27 percent.

MS. BECKWITH: Do you have the status for Amendment 5 for us?

DR. McGOVERN: Dolphin Wahoo 5; this revises the ABC estimates, ACL estimates and ACTs as well as a revision to the AMs and an update of the framework procedure. It increases the ACLs a little bit. The Notice of Availability for Dolphin Wahoo 5 published on February 28 and the comment period ended on March 29. The proposed rule published on March 14 and the comment period ended on April 14. The final rule published on Monday and the regulations will be effective on July 9.

MS. BECKWITH: Brian, would you like to take us through the Dolphin Wahoo AP Report.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm not going to go through the entire report from the AP at this point. What I have done is in the decision documents for the two amendments that we talked about at that AP; I've put the AP recommendations right into the decision documents. The recommendations for each action appear with that action; so I think as we get to the actions, we'll talk about those.

However, there were two other things that came up in the Dolphin Wahoo AP Meeting from last March that I would like to bring to your attention. The first is that the AP would like the council to consider to reduce the commercial trip limit or the recreational bag limit once 80 percent of the ACL is reached.

We haven't had an issue where the ACL has been exceeded for either species. I think maybe under the new ACLs that they're going to have starting on July 9; I don't think that would have happened in the last several years. However, there is some concern that in the future they would like to ensure that the fishery lasts all year long.

In a future Dolphin Wahoo Amendment, they would like the council to consider including an action that would reduce the commercial trip limit or the recreational bag limit once 80 percent of the respective ACLs has been reached. The other thing is once again they passed a motion that they would like for the council to consider allowing the charter sector to sell their catches of dolphin and wahoo.

The AP feels very strongly about this; and they have brought this up every time that they've met since I have been working with them in the last three years. I told them it is a motion they passed and I'll bring it back up at the council again; but it hasn't gotten much traction in the past. I'm dutifully doing what I said I would do.

MS. BECKWITH: And as much as I would like to have that discussion; I think we're going to save that for our next Dolphin Wahoo Meeting. I would like to take a little time at the next Dolphin Wahoo Committee Meeting just to broach the for-hire industry discussion; but I'll save that for another day. That takes us into Amendment 7.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, this is Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7 and Snapper Grouper Amendment 33. This is where the joint part of stuff really gets going. We've seen this several times. Remember, this is the amendment that the council is looking at bringing fillets from The Bahamas back into the U.S.

It is already currently allowed for snapper grouper species; and with snapper grouper, you can bring up to 60 pounds or 20 fish filleted back into the U.S. from The Bahamas. Currently you're not allowed to bring dolphin and wahoo fillets at all. Now, we've seen this amendment a couple of times.

One of the things that we're hoping to do today is go through some IPT recommendations as well as review the actions and alternatives that are in there and then hopefully, if you feel comfortable doing so, selecting some preferred alternatives. Then we need to get a recommendation from these committees regarding sending this amendment out for public hearings in August. That is sort of our goal for this amendment today.

The IPT has recommended a couple of wording changes for the purpose and need for the actions here. You can see it is highlighted here; and they simply really are grammatical and clarification. There is nothing in the recommendations of the IPT that change the intent of either the purpose or need. I would like for you to take a moment and read those and let me know what you think about it.

**MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I make a motion that we accept the IPT's recommended changes to purpose and need.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by Charlie. Is there any discussion?**

MR. HARTIG: One thing, Brian, as an economist – and I'm sure you can answer this pretty easily – what is the difference in the indirect economic benefits?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Direct economic benefits are the dollars, for example, that would be received. Indirect are some of the other associated economic benefits such as suppliers and things like that.

MS. BECKWITH: Any further discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, the first action in here has to do with exempting dolphin and wahoo harvested lawfully in The Bahamas from regulations that require them to be landed with head and fins intact. Here is some recommended language change that the IPT would have. One of the things we wanted to make very clear is that this applies only to the recreational sector as there is no commercial harvest of dolphin and dolphin by U.S. vessels allowed in Bahamian waters.

It doesn't prohibit commercial fishermen from going to The Bahamas and fishing recreationally; but what this means is they cannot bring those fish back to the U.S. and sell them. That becomes a Lacey Act violation, et cetera, but we wanted to make that very clear that these regulations are applicable to recreational fishing in The Bahamas regardless of who is doing it.

Then there are some recommended wording changes. The IPT is also concerned about having the wording "lawfully harvested in The Bahamas" there because that has specific meaning that when somebody is there fishing, that we are going to make sure that they're going to follow the Bahamian laws to get those fish even when they're back in the U.S. to make sure that they have followed them. That includes those cruising permits, fishing permits and a signed or a stamped and dated passport.

MS. McCRAWLEY: In looking at this, I would say that based on our discussions with our law enforcement officers, that we're okay with these changes except the IPT recommendation that deletes "the vessel must have the stamped and dated passports and prove that the vessel passengers were in The Bahamas as well as the valid current Bahamian cruising and fishing permits on board the vessel." The reason our officers wanted that in there is they feel like it is still somewhat of a gray area for snapper grouper currently what is required; and there seems to be some debate about that. I think that it is more clear if we leave that language in there.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And that's fine. I just wanted to give the reasoning why the IPT thought perhaps it could be removed is because of the lawfully requirement. The IPT actually recommended that the council consider dropping Alternative 4 because lawfully permitted would include the passport.

However, in our discussions of this we also realized that law enforcement may like the reinforcement of specifically stating what it is that they need to have to lawfully harvest in The Bahamas and bring back to the U.S.

What that means, though, is that should The Bahamas change their requirements for lawfully fishing in The Bahamas, we will have to go back and change our regulations to whatever they change it to so that we're complementary. If we do this now and leave that language in, which

may be fine if that's what you want to do, just understand that should The Bahamas change their requirements in the future, we'll have to come back and address that issue again.

MS. McCAWLEY: Just to that point; we completely understand that language might need to be changed in future, but this is very important to FWC Law Enforcement that it is left in there and that Action 4 remains in the document.

MS. BECKWITH: Would you like to make a motion to that language.

**MS. McCAWLEY: I would like to make a motion to accept the IPT changes on Action 1 except the change that deletes the language in Alternative 2.**

**MS. BECKWITH: John seconds. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: I do want to mention that the Dolphin Wahoo AP recommended that the council select Alternative 2 of Action 1 as the preferred. The Snapper Grouper AP had no recommendation for Action 1 since this is a dolphin wahoo action. The SSC SEP basically saw no issues of concern with any of the actions or alternatives in this amendment. They really had no comments at all regarding this amendment.

**MS. McCAWLEY: I make a motion that we make Alternative 2 of Action 1 our preferred alternative.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Doug seconds. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Action 2 is to exempt dolphin and wahoo lawfully harvested from The Bahamas from the bag and possession limits in the U.S. Then the IPT recommended adding the language in the action to specifically state what that is. The vessels may possess on board two wahoo per person and ten dolphin per person for a maximum of 60 dolphin. Those are the U.S. possession limits.

Alternative 1, no action, reiterates again what that is. Alternative 2 is to exempt dolphin lawfully harvested in The Bahamas from regulations for bag limits. Alternative 3 is to exempt wahoo harvested lawfully in The Bahamas. The Dolphin Wahoo AP endorses Alternative 2 and 3 of Action 2 as preferred alternatives. The Snapper Grouper AP had no recommendations for Action 2.

**MS. McCAWLEY: I move that we accept the IPT wording changes for Action 2 and Alternative 3, only, the preferred.**

**MS. BECKWITH: John seconds. Discussion?**

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm thinking that only wahoo would need to be exempt from these Bahamian regulations because of the law bag limits. I think that 60 dolphin per vessel, which would be what is currently allowed, is actually adequate.

MS. BECKWITH: I guess my concern would be would that somehow encourage stopping while in transit to collect additional dolphin; because while you're in Bahamian waters, are you guys okay with the message that you're sending with that. Once you're in Bahamian waters, it is 18 fish and it doesn't matter; so by varying on that it doesn't send a message that somehow we're okay with more dolphin on the boat when they should be going directly from The Bahamas and hitting the dock.

MS. McCAWLEY: Well, ultimately, I would that we have folks abide by all the U.S. regulations; but I can see based on the public comment where I might be willing be give on the wahoo, but I would really not like to give on any of these other U.S. limits. I think once you start doing this, you're kind of getting the camel's nose under the tent and then people are asking for conch and they're asking for prohibited species; and it is just too difficult to enforce. That's what I have to say about that.

MR. JOLLEY: I will go with Jessica on that.

MR. PHILLIPS: For some reason I was thinking once they left The Bahamas, they couldn't stop to fish for anything.

MS. BECKWITH: They shouldn't the way it is written.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Madam Chair, if you don't mind, I would like to add something at this point. I believe somewhere in the Bahamian regulations it does state what you're allowed to bring into The Bahamas from elsewhere. It is very few fish that you can bring in before you obtain that cruising and fishing permit.

Once you have that cruising and fishing permit, you must abide by the Bahamian possession limits. Even if you've got a couple of fish that you've brought in from elsewhere, once you're in The Bahamas, that's the maximum number of fish that you can have regardless of where they came from once you have obtained the proper permits.

If somebody is coming back from The Bahamas into the U.S. and, as Charlie said, they can't stop to fish; they're going to be held to that 18-fish limit. That's just the way it is; so just to remind you, we split dolphin and wahoo out and made them separate alternatives specifically because of the issue that Jessica is bringing up; that the U.S. possession limit allows them to have greater possession than the Bahamian one does, but wahoo really is the one that is the problem.

DR. CRABTREE: And so how many wahoo could you bring in, then, under this?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Roy, bring into the U.S. EEZ?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if we exempt wahoo from regulations for bag limits in the U.S.; so then how many can they have; what is the Bahamian limit?

DR. CHEUVRONT: The Bahamian limit is they could have up to 18 fish of dolphin, wahoo, tunas or king mackerel, in any combination.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, I don't know if you have looked at this; so let's say a vessel comes in like that and hits the dock, a port sampler for the MRIP Program or from the FWC is there and does an inspection of them and they have all these wahoo on board; do they ask did you bring these in from The Bahamas and then not do the interview or do they do the interview? Does anyone know the answer to that?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I do not know the answer to that offhand.

DR. CRABTREE: We ought to find out because if they do go ahead with the interview; then those fish would be part of the MRIP Survey and they'll be counted against our ACL.

MS. McCAWLEY: Let me respond to a couple parts of that point. I thought there was also a question of whether or not someone could have multi-day bag limits, multi-day Bahamian bag limits; and I thought that the discussion the last time was that they could have at least two multi-day bag limits in The Bahamas?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Jessica, I don't think so. Everything says what you are allowed to have on the vessel. There is no mention of numbers of trips or day limits or anything.

MS. McCAWLEY: Okay; and then if I understand what Roy was asking about what type of questions FWC Law Enforcement is asking someone that comes to the dock; I do believe that they ask questions about were you in The Bahamas and let me see your passport. It is my understanding that they are asking those questions, especially if they board a vessel in transit that they believe has been in The Bahamas.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I think Roy's concern was about them getting included in MRIP and counting against the U.S. quota; and that was a question I just couldn't answer, so I don't know.

MS. McCAWLEY: I can't either.

MS. BECKWITH: So is that something that you could touch base with your folks and have an answer for us at full council?

MS. McCAWLEY: I can try to have an answer by then.

DR. CRABTREE: You might want to touch base with Dave Van Voorhees or someone on the MRIP staff about that. Andy Strelcheck is going to be here later today and we could get him to check into it, if you'd like.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, we have a motion on the board. We can certainly vote on this; and if we change our mind later, we can do that, too, at full council. Is there any further discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; that motion carries. Oh, sorry, Roy, of course.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Action 3 has to do with require fillets of dolphin and wahoo and snapper grouper species brought into the U.S. EEZ lawfully harvested from The Bahamas to have the skin intact.

The IPT is recommending adding the language “lawfully harvested” to this action. Alternative 1 is that snapper grouper fillets possessed in the U.S. EEZ from The Bahamas are currently not required to have skin intact. You chose a preferred alternative at your last meeting in March. You chose Preferred Alternative 2 and Preferred Alternative 3. Alternative 2 would require snapper grouper fillets to have the skin intact. Preferred Alternative 3 would require dolphin and wahoo fillets brought in to have skin intact.

The Dolphin Wahoo AP recommends that the council select Alternatives 1 and 3 as the preferred alternatives. The reasoning behind recommending Alternative 1, no action, as the preferred alternative was that the AP decided that if a fish was legally harvested in The Bahamas, regardless of whether or not it is legal to harvest that species in the U.S. EEZ, it ought to be allowed.

I believe the issue came up like with Nassau grouper or something; that they thought if they could harvest them in The Bahamas, they should be allowed to bring them into the U.S. The Snapper Grouper AP recommends that the council select Alternatives 2 and 3 as their preferred alternatives.

I guess what the council needs to consider now is do you want to accept the recommended wording changes recommended by the IPT and do you want to reconsider your preferred alternatives for this action at this point.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I’ll just defer to the end. I was trying to get your attention for Action 2 so just catch me at the end. Because we’re focused on Action 3 right now, I’ll raise my hand later to address something in Action 2.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would like to keep the same preferreds that we have now. **I would make a motion to accept the IPT’s wording changes for Action 3.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by Charlie. Any discussion?**

DR. DUVAL: I appreciate what the Dolphin Wahoo AP said; but I disagree because I feel like it is just trying to establish or maintain a loophole that is there for harvest of species that are not lawful here in the U.S. EEZ. I don’t support the AP’s contention.

MS. BECKWITH: I agree wholeheartedly. Any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; that motion carries.**



DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 4 is one that you've looked at before. It is one that you added I believe in March that in addition to possessing valid Bahamian cruising and fishing permits; required stamped and dated passports to prove that the vessel passengers were in The Bahamas if the vessel is in possession of snapper and grouper fillets in the U.S. EEZ.

Alternative 1 basically requires vessels bring snapper grouper fillets into the U.S. EEZ from The Bahamas are required to have valid current Bahamian cruising and fishing permits on board the vessel. The current regulations do not say anything about requiring a stamped and dated passport. Alternative 2 would then add that "stamped and dated passport" language the requirements.

Now, the IPT – and we've had this discussion just a few moments ago – felt that this was a bit redundant because they would have to be lawfully harvested in The Bahamas; and if you're lawfully harvesting fish in The Bahamas, that means that you have the cruising and fishing permits and stamped and dated passports.

MS. McCRAWLEY: As I mentioned earlier, this is something that's important to our FWC Law Enforcement; so I would like to keep this action in there. **I would make a motion that we choose Alternative 2 as our preferred.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by John. Discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; the motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, one member of the IPT recommended that the council consider two additional actions. This is not a recommendation that is necessarily coming from the full IPT. However, the IPT agreed to bring this forward to the council for consideration. If you choose not to include these, they don't go to the considered but rejected appendix because they were never formally considered.

The first action has to do with snapper and grouper. Remember, one of the things that was the original intent of this amendment was to make things comparable between dolphin, wahoo and snapper grouper in bringing fillets back. As we got into it more, we realized that it was more complex than that.

Now what we're considering doing is only allowing two fillets per fish for dolphin and wahoo. This IPT member recommended that the council at least be given an opportunity to think about whether they wanted to have that same two fillets per fish recommendation for snapper grouper. However, there is a difference in the Bahamian regulations on snapper grouper than it is for dolphin and wahoo.

In the Bahamian regulations you're allowed to have either 60 pounds of fillets or 20 fish. In the dolphin and wahoo, because the grouping of species is so diverse – tunas, dolphin, kingfish and wahoo and all that – that go by poundage as opposed to numbers of fish is not as comparable. This action would allow the council to consider requiring only two fillets per fish of snapper grouper species as well. I'm bringing that forward to you to see whether you want to consider such an action.

MS. BECKWITH: I would like to hear some comments from law enforcement, if Tracy and Morgan have something to share.

MR. DUNN: This is kind of what concerned us because it does get very complex when you're trying to compensate for somebody else's regulations intermixing with our regulations in the EEZ. I understand what FWCC officers want and I'm not sure how Coast Guard views it; but again I'm totally against even trying to do this; people coming back into our EEZ.

When you go from EEZ into state waters, the state doesn't necessarily automatically accept your bag limit from the EEZ. They have possession limits and they say we're trying to protect our fishery in our waters so you will comply with the possession limits in our state waters. I think we should adopt the same thing when it comes to the Bahamian waters.

It is a lot easier for all the people that will have to come across this particular situation. I especially look at the poor petty officer on a coast guard cutter who has so many things to deal with, that this just gets way to complex. Somebody who does it consistently and they are in that area, possibly so, but there are too many opportunities here for too much confusion.

MS. BECKWITH: Given that position, if we're going to move forward with this, is there an alternative that is less awful to you?

MR. DUNN: I guess I will leave it up to Florida to decide that. I still stand on my comments and I don't want to add anything else. If Florida is comfortable with where they are; these are the two units that will be dealing with it more than my people.

LT. FOWLER: I really haven't much to add to that. As he said with the petty officer thing, if we can keep it as easy as possible, that's better for us, obviously. We have a lot of other things going on looking at vessels coming from The Bahamas.

MS. BECKWITH: So then would easier be fillets or poundage?

LT. FOWLER: Definitely fillets because we don't have a reliable way to weigh them at sea; and with the skin on.

MS. BECKWITH: Before I go to Jessica; John did you have any thoughts on this?

MR. JOLLEY: If we had 20 fish, we'd have 40 fillets. I'm not in favor of one fillet per package; that is not very practical. You might could argue two fillets per package; that's pretty easy for somebody to see, that there are two sides to the fish in each package. That's a little bit cumbersome for fishermen. Most people are bringing back more than one fillet in a package. We might have ten fillets in one package, a big ziplock.

Most of them are coming back iced but sometimes they come back frozen, especially for some of these boats that go for a long period of time. I'll throw that out there for you to think about. I would prefer to be able to bring back up to 40 fillets and put them in the packages the way we

see fit; and then if they have to be examined, they'll have to be defrosted and law enforcement would have to examine them.

MS. McCAWLEY: Okay, let me see if I can address all these things. Of these two actions that are being suggested by the IPT, the second action, which is part of what John was referring to about are the fish frozen, are they individually wrapped, how many fillets are in each package, I don't even think that we should consider this action at all.

I just think it is not realistic; it's difficult for the fishermen; it's difficult for law enforcement, especially the fresh or frozen. What if you meant for your items to be frozen and then they thawed out or vice versa; I just don't think we should consider that action at all.

That being said, the other action that the IPT is recommending where we would now be looking at the number of fillets for snapper or grouper, I think that this would make it easier for our law enforcement officers. When you're ready, I would make a motion that would bring this –Okay, then I will go ahead and make a motion that we bring the first action recommended by the IPT into the document.

**MS. BECKWITH: Second by John. Any discussion? The motion is to add the first IPT recommended action regarding fillets of snapper grouper species into the document. Is there any further discussion? Any opposition? One opposed; this motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: You haven't had any analysis of this action at this point; but would you want to consider choosing a preferred alternative at this point or do you want until you get some analysis and after it comes from public hearing?

**MS. McCAWLEY: So the public knows that we're serious about considering this, I'd move that we make Alternative 2 of the new action our preferred.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Second by Charlie. Any discussion? Any opposition? One opposed; the motion carries.** My thoughts on the second action is in my opinion if we're going to move in this direction, I think the onus is on the fishermen to wrap the fillets in a way that law enforcement can identify them. If law enforcement has trouble identifying the fillets, then that is on the fishermen and they should be penalized for that in whatever ways is appropriate time and whatnot. To me it's on the fishermen to make it easy for law enforcement to be able to count those fillets.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I guess what we need is either the committee to say that you do or do not want to consider this action and kind of make that explicit. It doesn't need to be necessarily in form of – if you make a motion to include it, that's fine; but you don't need to make a motion not to include it; but if somebody could specifically state how you want this action to be disposed of.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I'm not on your committee but just a clarifying question. I can't remember whether we ever discussed the fact that "skin" means with or without scales. The only reason I asked the question is because it occurs to me that for law enforcement identification purposes it might be easier to have the scales on them. When I'm filleting my fish,

if I'm leaving the skin on, I don't scale them because I'm going to usually skin it off when I get them one. I just wondered whether we'd had any discussion of that or not. I couldn't remember whether we had.

DR. DUVAL: We actually did have quite a bit of discussion. Chris brought this up when we were discussing things in snapper grouper at the last meeting and wondering if it meant scales on or scales off. I think there is actually quite a bit of discussion in the Snapper Grouper Committee minutes that I recall.

Ben had a lot of discussion about when you removed the scales and then you try to package the fish, it can get really soft. It just makes for a poorer product. I think we all agreed that it was fine to leave the scales off. It was fine to leave the scales off because it made for easier packing and freezing.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes; that's my recollection as well, that we had extensive discussion on that topic. I believe that you were talking about this other new action. If you want a motion, I can make one; but it is my suggestion that we do not add this additional alternative.

MS. BECKWITH: Is that the sense of the rest of the committee? Is there anyone that has a different view? Okay, let's move on. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, he was about to move into the additional action I guess; but I wanted to back real quick to Action 1, if that's okay. We talk the transit and we're consciously not adding anything about gear stowage and non-fishing condition, right? It is just they can't stop or fish?

MS. BECKWITH: That's what is in there right now.

MS. HAYMANS: Right; but I mean we're consciously not saying anything about gear? They can have rods and rod holders and they can be rigged and all that kind of good stuff? They just can't stop? Okay, I just wanted to make sure.

MS. BECKWITH: Any thoughts on that, Jessica?

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm fine either way. If you feel better about having the gear stowed, then we can certainly add that in there.

MR. JOLLEY: Well, the intent, of course, is not to have anybody fishing on the way back home; but there are emergency situations. There are all kinds of reasons why somebody might stop. You overheat an engine; you know, there are all kinds of things that can happen and often do. Somebody gets seasick; they're hanging over the side.

I suspect most of these boats are on radar, anyway. I don't know who is going to know if somebody stops for 15 minutes. I know if that's a problem; but it does happen and it will happen fairly frequently. Somebody has to go to the bathroom, they hang over side of the gunnel; I mean things like that; and we're glad to stop the boat for that.

MR. PHILLIPS: This is to a large part an unenforceable – this stuff is unenforceable. As John says, nobody is going to see if you stop for 15 minutes. You see a boat five miles away, you stow the rod inside the powerhouse or whatever you do. I don't see the point of – it is well intentioned; but I just don't see the point of adding more unenforceable rules to this. To Tracy's point, I don't know that we would have even gone down this path that started it if we had known how bad it was going to be with all the twists and turns; but we're here. But, no, I don't think I want to add anymore unenforceable rules to it.

MS. BECKWITH: Remember, we're going to public hearings with this and we'll take another hack at this; so given the time constraints that we have now, let's get what we have to say on the record and keep going. Zack.

MR. BOWEN: I'm just going to go on record again and say I'm totally against all of this. It is unenforceable. We've spent countless hours on this and I don't see any progress, much, and I'm just totally against this whole amendment.

MS. BECKWITH: We have progress; we're going to public hearings with the document.

MR. BOWEN: I'm still totally against it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just two quick things; one, if you did have some type of gear stowage, rod stowage or whatever while they were in transit, that would make it more similar to the in transit kind of restrictions you have in your regulations. That may help enforcement out whether they like they like this amendment or not.

The second question I had was back on Action 2, Brian, under Alternative 1; when I first read that I thought that was what allowed in The Bahamas. I would change this just so the current U.S. regulations are blank or something like that; because when I read that, I really did think that this was what you were allowed to have in The Bahamas.

Maybe the committee can give us editorial license again – well, I guess we already have that – to suggest additional changes. That is just confusing to me; so when you go out for public comment, I think individuals potentially could be confused.

MS. BECKWITH: Do we want to give staff some editorial license to add in some stowage of fishing gear?

**MS. McCAWLEY: Sure, Madam Chairman, I'll make that motion to give staff editorial license to add in stowage of gear while in transit language.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Second by Doug. Any additional discussion?** I saw Morgan nodding her head earlier; so I'm going to take that as an affirmative. John.

MR. JOLLEY: I wouldn't be too specific about storage because some of these boats are small. They may be in the gunnel on a rod rack but maybe not having the rods in the rod holder on the gunnel could be said.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, is there any additional discussion? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: We have a lot of stowage of gear-type language that we could provide to staff for them to look at.

MS. BECKWITH: Fantastic! Is there any additional discussion? **Any opposition? Zack is opposed; this motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: You still have the other issue regarding Action 2 that Monica brought up about clarifying in the IPT language, which you accepted, but clarifying it further to make sure that in the description of the action it specifies that these are U.S. bag limits as they are in the action description.

MS. BECKWITH: Can you take that as direction?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Sure, we can do that. I just wanted to make sure that there was clarification on the part – okay, we have another action here that we're going to take care of. Okay, at this point it would be appropriate for the committee to make a recommendation to the council to send this amendment out for public hearings in August.

MR. CUPKA: Madam Chairman, I would so move that we recommend approving the modified document for DW Amendment 8 and Snapper Grouper Amendment 34 for public hearing.

MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by Jessica.

DR. CHEUVRONT: It is a typo here. It is actually Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7 and Snapper Grouper 33 on this one. I probably copied and pasted the language from the other one and neglected to change the amendment number. It is 33.

MS. BECKWITH: **So the motion reads recommend the modified draft of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 7 and Snapper Grouper Amendment 33 be sent out for public hearings in August of 2014. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: And just so you know, this is what the timing is for this amendment. We're going out for public hearings now in August. We're going to distribute copies of this amendment to the Mid-Atlantic Council and the New England Council for them to publicize and hold public hearings; because remember our management of dolphin and wahoo is for the entire Atlantic. The South Atlantic Council will review public input and we will revise the documents and take final action in September 2014.

I also wanted to add that we're going to be sending the public version of this document to Bahamian officials for them to review and give comment. We will ask them if they want to attend the September meeting to see if they want to make comments in person regarding this document before you take your final vote. Then assuming everything goes through and you

approve it in September, the document would be submitted for formal review by the end of October. The target date for regulations would be in place then by the summer season of 2015.

Moving right along is we have the second amendment to consider. This is more affectionately known as the Comprehensive AM Dolphin Allocation Amendment largely because this is an amendment for three different FMPs. This is Snapper Grouper 34, Dolphin Wahoo 8 and Golden Crab 9. When we get to Golden Crab later today, we will discuss it there.

We didn't include them in this because they're really included only in the one action; and I don't think it is going to be an issue; but we get there when we get there. The IPT has made some recommendations for modifications to the purpose and need. As you can see, the wording for the purpose and need just – the purpose is clarifying because we're talking about these three amendments. Then the need for the action is really much more clarification but required a fair amount of extensive rewriting to make this occur.

MS. BECKWITH: I just wanted to point out that in Regulatory Amendment 16 for the pots, the IPT had big problems with the phrase “minimize potential negative socio-economic impacts”. I preferred that language, but certainly the rest of the committee did not. In this amendment the IPT recommends that exact language, “preventing unnecessary negative socio-economic impacts”. I just wanted to point that out because, well, clearly, it is a bit of a pet peeve for me. Saying that, is there anyone that would like to approve the IPT language for the purpose and need or have any discussion on it? Ben.

**MR. HARTIG: I would move that we approve the IPT edits for the purpose and need.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Okay, including the “preventing unnecessary negative socio-economic impacts. Do we have a second; second by John. Is there any discussion on this? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Action 1 is the revision of accountability measures. You have seen this in various forms previously. Now, what we used to have under Alternative 1 is we had the list of what the current AMs for all the species were that were affected by this action. The IPT has come back with a recommendation that whole listing of the current AMs be taken out of Alternative 1 and put in a detailed section at the end of the action and alternatives; because when you included it all in there, the Alternative 1 language was about three or four pages long.

This was done to simplify and you can see that language at the end. There is a sentence that was added at the end of Alternative 1 that just describes that this falls under the discussion section at the end of the action. Alternative 2, you were looking at this for – I forget what species it was in snapper grouper yesterday. It is basically the same action.

Alternative 2 is for the commercial fishery; and it says that if the commercial ACL is exceeded under Subalternative 2A, the RA will publish notice to reduce the commercial ACL in the following season only if the species is overfished. Subalternative 2B is only if the total ACL – that is the commercial and recreational ACL together – is exceeded.

Subalternative 2C is only if the species is overfished and if the total ACL, commercial and recreational, exceeded. Alternative 3 is very similar to Alternative 2. Subalternative 3A requires paybacks only if the species is overfished; but the next sentence is added to each of the subalternatives for this alternative: “The length of the recreational season and recreational ACL will not be reduced if the Regional Administrator determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction is unnecessary.”

So 3A is only if the species overfished; 3B is only if the total ACL is exceeded; 3C is only if the species is overfished and the total ACL is exceeded. Alternative 4 is the language that would give the RA the ability to have in-season closures for a recreational fishery if it was felt that necessary. Subalternative 4A would do it only if the species is overfished; and 4B allows the RA to do it regardless of the stock status. You actually added this alternative to an action in one of your snapper grouper amendments yesterday.

DR. DUVAL: Blueline tilefish.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I believe it was blueline.

MS. BECKWITH: Do we need to approve that extra sentence in the language?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes; if you could just give us an indication on whether you all agree with that IPT language; and if you could choose preferred alternatives at this point, that would be great. Now, I do want to point out the Snapper Grouper AP recommended that the council select Alternatives 2C, 3C and 4B as the preferred alternatives.

The Golden Crab AP; their recommendation was slightly different. Remember, there is no recreational component of the golden crab fishery; so basically Alternative 2A or 2C is functionally equivalent for them. They were okay if the council chose either one of those alternatives as a preferred alternative. They had no comment on Alternatives 3 or 4.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, how about some direction for the IPT language changes and some preferreds. Jessica.

**MS. McCAWLEY: I would make a motion to accept the IPT changes for Action 1.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Action 1, Alternative 1.**

**DR. CHEUVRONT: You’re right; it is the alternative.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by John. Any discussion? Any opposition? That motion carries.** Okay, how about some alternatives so the public knows what we’re thinking. As Brian mentioned, Alternative 2C, 3C and 4B would keep us most consistent with our other FMPs at the moment. Jack.

MR. COX: I would say Alternative 2B. I believe that is right. I’m sorry, 2C.



MS. BECKWITH: So the Alternatives 2C, 3C and 4B would keep us most consistent with our other –

MR. COX: Yes; we're going to stay consistent, right.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Jack, let me put this up there and see if this is what you want.

MR. COX: It looks good to me.

MS. BECKWITH: Would you read the motion, Jack.

**MR. COX: Okay, select Alternatives 2C, 3C and 4B as preferred alternatives for Action 1.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by Doug. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: Action 2 is to revise the sector allocations for dolphin. The IPT did not have any suggested language changes for this alternative. The Dolphin Wahoo AP selected Alternative 4 as their preferred alternative at the March 2013 meeting and reaffirmed their choice of the preferred alternative at their March 2014 meeting.

If you will remember, this action was originally a part of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5. It was pulled out of that amendment when the council was considering starting a comprehensive allocation amendment that was going to start last fall; but then you got into the visioning aspect for snapper grouper so you decided to delay that amendment; and we decided to put at least the dolphin allocation action into this amendment.

The first four alternatives that you see there are ones that have been hanging around since Amendment 5. Alternative 5; you added this I believe at the March meeting on recommendations of the IPT. However, your AP said that basically let's stick with Alternative 4. If you look at the table that is presented here, it shows the different percentages that would be added for Alternatives 1 through 4.

Actually I don't have Alternative 5 percentages on here; but they all come out to about that same 10 percent. I think one was 9 percent and the other two were actually 10 percent. The AP's reasoning for selecting Alternative 4 was that they really wanted the commercial allocation to be about 1.5 million pounds. It was explained to them that's fine as long as the ACL remains what it is now; but it could change in the future. However, they like the idea of let's just go ahead and set it now at this 10 percent, which would then allocate about 1.5 million pounds to the commercial sector; and then it would just go up and down as the ACL should change in the future.

MR. HAYMANS: A question for Brian; and this is just based on yesterday when we looked at the allocation for who knows what species. We did the average in the long term. Do we ever analyze the average in the long term here?

DR. CHEUVRONT: If you look here, this was based on the bowtie estimates and they go back to 1986.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, that's half back to '86.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes; half of it goes back to '86.

MR. HAYMANS: But yesterday we looked – I forget which species it was, but we did the long-term average.

DR. DUVAL: Let me just address that. It was snowy grouper; and that is a very special instance, Doug, because what we have is an updated stock assessment for snowy grouper. All we were doing was applying our new and updated landings' information to the existing allocation formula. We weren't changing the allocation formula at all.

All we were doing was applying the new assessment information, which includes the MRIP landings, and basically making the situation whole and including recreational Monroe County landings in there; because that's what the assessment does. The previous assessment did not include recreational Monroe County landings; so all we're doing is applying those updated numbers from Monroe County to the existing allocation that was determined in Amendment 15B.

MR. HAYMANS: I understand that, but that particular allocation for that species is based on the long term.

DR. DUVAL: Right.

MR. HAYMANS: Is that the only species where we do that; that pretty much the rest of them are all Boyles?

DR. DUVAL: I believe a couple of our other snapper grouper species have the allocations that were set prior to the Bowtie Law. Black sea bass was set prior to that; vermilion snapper was set prior to that. I can't tell you off the top of my head what series of years; but that was done prior to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment where we tried to address everything else that didn't already have an allocation.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there anyone that would like to pick a preferred alternative?

**MR. JOLLEY: I move that we pick Alternative 4 as our preferred.**

**MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by Doug.** Go ahead, Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Before I vote on this, I sure would like to see what the breakdown on the ACL is and what the different sectors – how close they're coming to it. Are we coming close to it on the commercial at 10 percent and are we coming close to it on the recreational? I'd like to see that breakdown.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I can address that. It's in the document, Charlie; but what I can tell you is that there was one year – and I think it was 2009 – that the commercial sector came pretty close to getting 1.5 million pounds of dolphin. The recreational sector has never come close to getting the current ACL, which is now what is going to be in Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5.

A lot of this environmentally affected. You really in recent years haven't had anything that has gotten close to either sector reaching its ACL even under the old ACL. They used to have that soft cap that was in place; and that is what the AP was trying to get the council to get back closer to. This is going to get them close to what they had under the soft cap.

It was agreed to by the AP that is pretty much what everybody wanted. If you'll remember when I was talking the Dolphin Wahoo AP Report earlier, the AP would like the council to consider reducing or establishing a trip limit and reducing the recreational bag limit if the sector reaches 80 percent of its ACL just to try to help make sure that they don't overshoot it in the future in case something should happen like the commercial sector got very close to hitting that soft cap I think in 2009. That's the only year that it was even close.

MR. PHILLIPS: And to that point; I've heard some of those arguments on the 13/87 and 90/10. If we would set something where both sectors have plenty of wiggle room should something change environmentally or fishing effort go up on one sector or the other; I get nervous when we set something where one sector is bumping up against it even it is three or four years ago when another sector has never come close.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And related to that, the reason dolphin and wahoo are not included in Action 1 is because Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5 put into place that reductions in the following fishing year would only occur if the total ACL was exceeded and if the fishery was deemed to be overfished. Should one sector accidentally go over its ACL, unless the fishery was declared to be overfished and the total ACL was exceeded, there is no penalty for a sector for exceeding its ACL at this point.

MR. PHILLIPS: And I understand that. I think the odds of the commercial sector going over with our reporting that we're going to have in place now is going to be pretty low or it should be very low.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there any additional discussion?

DR. CHEUVRONT: There is one point that I would like to add about this action. You'll notice all of the alternatives are based on annual landings and percentage of landings by the commercial and recreational sector. It is fine for now, but these numbers are going to get stale in the future. Now that you have ACLs in place, it is possible that one sector or the other could be constrained by its ACL in the future.

When you get to discussing allocations in the future, you might want to consider dolphin and wahoo and other species that have their allocation set by percentage of annual landings in certain years; because I can foresee five years down the road from now people are going to wonder why are these allocations based on landings that go through 2012 and now it is 2017 or whatever; or,

my goodness, 2019, and the data will be seven years old. I just wanted to put that out there. You may want to come back and revisit allocations again in the future if you're able to come up with some other method that will help you to get allocation decisions in the future. I just want to make sure you're all aware of that.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there any further discussion?

MR. HARTIG: Charlie, I see this as the adaptive management approach. The commercial is the process and would select something close to 1.5 million pounds for now. Given how the fishery has operated in the past, they're not going to reach that. Let's do this now; and if anything changes in the future, we can come back and readjust it. I think the adaptive management approach is good in this situation.

MR. JOLLEY: I was just going to remind the council that we're importing something like 17 million pounds of dolphin; so I wouldn't be against more room in the future for commercial fishermen to catch a few more fish.

DR. ERRIGO: I just want to give you guys an idea of the percentages that the sectors are catching of their ACLs on average over the last like five years or so. The commercial sector is catching on average like 80 to 85 percent of their portion of their ACL; whereas, the recreational sector is more like 50 to 55 percent of their ACL on average for the last five years.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And ACL is just going to be increased on July 9 as well for both sectors.

DR. ERRIGO: That was the old ACL.

MS. BECKWITH: **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; that motion carries.** Brian, I noticed on the previous page that we needed to clarify the intent for wreckfish. I think we skipped over that in Action 1.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Thank you for catching that; I had forgotten that. It would be good if the council would discuss that. Wreckfish is currently included in Action 1. However, there is an ITQ in place for wreckfish; and in effect that wreckfish is what constrains the commercial fishery. That ITQ has like payback provisions and all sorts of other things, I believe, in it.

What we would like for you to consider is how do you want to deal with commercial wreckfish? Now, remember, you've got golden crab in there, which is only a commercial species. Do you want this action to apply to wreckfish only recreationally or do you somehow want to modify things with commercial wreckfish to make it fit here, too? We just felt we needed to have that discussion.

DR. DUVAL: I would think that because wreckfish commercially is under an ITQ Program we could maintain that accountability measure of the ITQ Program being the AM. It doesn't seem logical to modify that at this point. I'm not certain then what you might change for the recreational sector. I know the existing accountability measure is in there; because most of the

alternatives that we have deal with if the commercial and recreational total sector ACL is exceeded, then X payback might occur.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, I think we could handle this. I think we just need clarification from the council how you want us to handle wreckfish. Monica, do you think it would be fine if we put in the description of the action, when we discuss it, that we could explain wreckfish – that the ITQ for wreckfish covers the commercial fishery and that this action only applies to the recreational component of wreckfish?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes; I think we can do that; and that is consistent with how we've handled all the ITQ Program in the Gulf. The ITQ Program is the accountability measures; and so I think we can except this out for the commercial sector. We can figure out that language.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes; and I don't think we necessarily need a motion. I think the discussion is good enough and just getting you to give direction to staff that is how you want wreckfish to be treated in this action. I think that would be sufficient.

MS. BECKWITH: I think that's the intent of the committee unless I hear otherwise. Intent it is.

DR. DUVAL: In Amendment 32 we added an action to address accountability measures for the deepwater complex in that amendment. However, those species are still included in this amendment; so we would need a motion from the committee to remove the deepwater species from consideration in Snapper Grouper Amendment 34. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I move we remove the deepwater snapper grouper species from Amendment 34.

**MS. BECKWITH: Jessica, is that second? Is there any discussion? The motion is to remove the deepwater snapper grouper species from Action 1 of Snapper Grouper Amendment 34. Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: I believe, Madam Chairman, the last thing that we have is we would need a motion recommending to the council to send this amendment out for public hearing in August.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm a little concerned about the allocation action. It doesn't seem to me the rationale is all that well developed. I don't see a lot of discussion so much about fair and equitable. In the purpose and need we say I guess the need is to base allocations on the best scientific information available.

I don't see that status quo is any more best available than the other ones; but there is not a lot in here that I find – I think the economic analysis concludes no one is catching it so it doesn't have much of an impact; but I'm not finding much here to explain really why we're doing it and why we're coming to where we were.

My experience has been these allocation things get a lot of scrutiny; so I think as this document progresses, we need to focus on going through fair and equitable and all those things we're

supposed to look at with allocations and explaining why your preferred alternative is fair and equitable and more so than the status quo allocation.

DR. DUVAL: Roy, I'll see if I can take a little bit of a shot at that. I think there was no real rationale provided in changing the original dolphin and wahoo allocation that was established in the original FMP. When the Comprehensive ACL Amendment was brought up, there were many concerns expressed by the Dolphin Wahoo AP that there was no clear rationale for making that change.

They were happy with the existing allocation that they had, really, and wanted to maintain that and did not feel that there was again sufficient rationale provided for applying the Bowtie Law to a species for which there had been an allocation formula already in place and that certainly wasn't done for other species such as black sea bass and vermilion snapper and some of the other ones that we've mentioned that already had allocations in place. I would just put that forth as some of the rationale that we heard from the advisory panel.

MR. PHILLIPS: And to that point, hopefully we'll have some comment from the longline sector on how this works for them short term and long term. That will, as it should, help us decide if this is where we want to stay or do we want to change it. Hopefully, we'll get some –

MS. BECKWITH: So do you want to make a motion to send this to public comment so they have that opportunity – I mean public hearings.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes; Madam Chair, I guess we can since this is not a motion; it is just direction to staff. Madam Chair, I'll make the motion to approve the Modified Draft Document Amendment 8/Snapper Grouper Amendment 34 –

MS. BECKWITH: Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 8/Snapper Grouper Amendment 34.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes; Amendment 9 for public hearings.

MS. BECKWITH: Seconded by John. **The motion reads approve the Modified Draft Dolphin Wahoo 8/Snapper Grouper 34 to be sent out for public hearings in August of 2014. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition?**

MR. HARTIG: I just had a question about the Wreckfish AMs. Those are good going forward? Okay, that's all.

**MS. BECKWITH: Any further discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: And, Madam Chairman, just to review the timeline of what we're expecting, this is now going to go out for public hearings presumably if it is approved at full council. This summer we'll distribute this amendment to the Mid-Atlantic and the New England Councils – again because dolphin and wahoo, our amendment covers the entire Atlantic – so that they can hold public hearings and provide comments back to us. We'll review the public hearing

comments, modify and approve all the actions in September 2014; and then what we're going to do is we'll bring back the full document to you in December so you can see the final document as it is ready to be submitted and for you vote to on submission for formal review in December 2014.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for all your work, Brian. Under other business I had one request. I would like to see a review of the utility of the Southeast Regional Operator Card for the dolphin wahoo. It my understanding that since the operator card for the Greater Atlantic Vessel Permit is free; most of our dolphin wahoo guys in the southeast, rather than paying that fifty dollar fee, are just going ahead and grabbing it from the northeast office.

I'm curious to see if the data is being utilized in any way and if there have been any cases made with that Southeast Operator Card, so we can review that and decide if it is still an appropriate requirement to have on our fishermen. I'll leave that up to staff to figure out kind of the best approach to that and an acceptable timeline to them.

DR. DUVAL: I would support that. I've received comments as well about the utility of that operator card; people sending it my way as well. I don't know if it's strictly a North Carolina concern. It is not; I'm seeing Ben shaking his head; so I fully support taking a look at that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Anna, if I could ask, could you send me an e-mail or something that outlines your points on that so we could hold onto it until the next – we get to another dolphin wahoo amendment and bring it back to the council and see if they want to take it up at that time.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there a way of seeing kind of a description of what it is currently – before we go the route of adding it to an amendment to consider removing it. The first step for our September meeting, if possible, is just to get a review from the Southeast Science Center and from NOAA just to see how the data is currently being used, if it is being used and if there have been any cases made utilizing this card. I think we need to know what it's doing now before we even decide if we want to pursue pushing it away. Jack.

MR. COX: When these cards first came out many years ago; I thought the intention was to – if the coast guard or boarding officer were to check a vessel, that the captain would have some form of identification because so many of them don't have a driver's license. If they have to get information from that person; that's what I thought the intent was, but can somebody clarify that and tell me what the intent with the operator card was?

MS. BECKWITH: Well, they should have their captain's license on the boat.

MR. COX: Not on the commercial boats; they don't have to have it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: We can get that information from the amendment and put it together and bring you back something in September, if that makes some sense.

MR. WAUGH: The original intent of that was to aid in law enforcement. We had problems with captains that repeatedly violated regulations and they would jump from vessel to vessel to

vessel. It was a way at getting at the problem captains and not necessarily the vessel owner; but to get right at the captains.

MR. COX: Then that to me seems like something that we should keep in place because a lot of these captains, like I said, don't have a form of identification and a lot of them are running boats and jump from boat to boat; and if it is being utilized. I've had one for many years and I've never been asked for it when boarded by the coast guard, but it seems like they would need some form of a picture identification.

MS. BECKWITH: Jack, do you have the southeast one that you're paying the fifty bucks for or are you getting it from the northeast office?

MR. COX: Initially I had a southeast one that I paid for; but now I've started getting them from the northeast office because it's free.

MS. BECKWITH: So you just made my point; so the problem is we need to review the southeast operator card and see if that's still being utilized. It seems to me that most of our guys are getting it from the northeast office. The ones that don't know that it is free up there are being penalized with that fifty dollar fee when we accept the Northeast Office Operator Card. Is there any other business? Okay, we're done.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 o'clock a.m., June 12, 2014.)

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By:  
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.  
July 10, 2014



# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

## 2013 - 2014 Council Membership

### COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

#### Ben Hartig

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

### VICE-CHAIRMAN

#### Dr. Michelle Duval

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

---

#### Robert E. Beal

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

#### Mel Bell

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

#### Anna Beckwith

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

#### Zack Bowen

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

#### Chris Conklin

P.O. Box 972  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
843/543-3833  
conklincc@gmail.com

#### Jack Cox

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

#### Dr. Roy Crabtree

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

#### David M. Cupka

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

#### LT Morgan Fowler

U.S. Coast Guard  
510 SW 11<sup>th</sup> Court  
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315  
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

#### Doug Haymans

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

#### John W. Jolley

4925 Pine Tree Drive  
Boynton Beach, FL 33436  
561/732-4530 (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 McCawley

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

#### Charles Phillips

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

MONICA SMITH-BAUNELLO  
PHIL STEELE  
JACK MCGOVERN  
BONNIE POWITH  
TRACY DUNN  
NICK FARMER  
LEANN BOSARGE  
KAREN ANTRIM RAINE

### **SNAPPER GROUPE**

- ✓Michelle Duval, Chair
  - ✓Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
  - ✓Anna Beckwith
  - ✓Mel Bell
  - ✓Zack Bowen
  - ✓Chris Conklin
  - ✓Jack Cox
  - ✓Roy Crabtree
  - ✓David Cupka
  - ✓Ben Hartig
  - ✓Doug Haymans
  - ✓Charlie Phillips
- Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate/Dewey  
Hemilright  
Staff contact:  
Myra Brouwer / Brian Cheuvront

### **SOPPs**

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
LT Morgan Fowler  
Doug Haymans  
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

### **SPINY LOBSTER**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair  
Jack Cox  
Roy Crabtree  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

## 2013-2014 Committees

### ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair  
Chris Conklin  
Jack Cox  
Ben Hartig  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

### CATCH SHARES

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Zack Bowen  
Chris Conklin  
Jack Cox  
Doug Haymans  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact:  
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Chevront

### DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair  
Jack Cox  
Roy Crabtree  
Michelle Duval  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

### DOLPHIN WAHOO

✓ Anna Beckwith, Chair  
✓ John Jolley, Vice-Chair  
✓ Zack Bowen  
✓ David Cupka  
✓ Doug Haymans  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate  
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

### ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
Michelle Duval  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP  
Anna Martin- CEBA

### EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair  
David Cupka  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

### GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair  
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair  
Roy Crabtree  
John Jolley  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

### HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wilson Laney, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
LT Morgan Fowler  
Doug Haymans  
John Jolley  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese  
Anna Martin- Coral

### HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

David Cupka, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Zack Bowen  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

### INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Anna Beckwith, Chair  
Mel Bell  
Zack Bowen  
Chris Conklin  
LT Morgan Fowler  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

### KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair  
David Cupka, Vice-Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Mel Bell  
Zack Bowen  
Jack Cox  
Roy Crabtree  
Michelle Duval  
Doug Haymans  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate  
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

### LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair  
Chris Conklin  
Jack Cox  
LT Morgan Fowler  
Ben Hartig  
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

### PERSONNEL

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Michelle Duval – Vice Chair  
Mel Bell  
David Cupka  
Ben Hartig  
Charlie Phillips  
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

### PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair  
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Michelle Duval  
LT Morgan Fowler  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

### SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair  
Mel Bell  
Roy Crabtree  
Doug Haymans  
John Jolley  
Wilson Laney  
Staff contact: John Carmichael

### SEDAR

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Zack Bowen  
Jack Cox  
Michelle Duval  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: John Carmichael

### SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair  
Mel Bell  
Roy Crabtree  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Anna Martin

(Continued)

# 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

## Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten  
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

## Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese  
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

## Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer  
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

## Fishery Biologist

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

## Fisheries Social Scientist

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

## Staff Economist

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

## Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael  
john.carmichael@safmc.net

## SEDAR Coordinators

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

## Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins  
mike.collins@safmc.net

## Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher  
deb.buscher@safmc.net

## Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya  
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

## Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell  
julie.odell@safmc.net

# PLEASE SIGN IN

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting  
Jt. Dolphin Wahoo and Snapper Grouper Committee:  
Thursday, June 12, 2014

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:	EMAIL ADDRESS:	MAILING ADDRESS:
Leda Dumme		LDumme@pvmsta.org	
Emily Helmick		ehelmick@pvmsta.org	
ERIC JOHNSON		eric.johnson@unf.edu	
Susan Stump	912-222-9206	SusanStump@att.net	SSI GA
Dick Brake	910-599-5245	dbrakes@gmail.com	
Ken Stump	TO/F/NET 202-390-4520	kstump@oceansh.org	
Ruby Hudson	ECFS 386-239-0948	DSF2009@aol.com	32120-9351
MaryKate Sweeney	732 762 8651	MK.Sweeney@unf.edu	
Jacob Calvitti	UNF 609 <sup>477</sup> 9866	Jacob.Calvitti@UNM.edu	
Yshua McCoy	321 960-4885		

# PLEASE SIGN IN

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

**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting**  
**Jt. Dolphin Wahoo and Snapper Grouper Committee:**  
Thursday, June 12, 2014

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:    AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:    EMAIL ADDRESS:    MAILING ADDRESS:

Joe Klostermann    772-461-2499    GREXJFK@comcast.net    34949

Bill Keen/FKAEA    305-619-0039    FKAEA1@Hotmail.Com

GLEB BROGAN    508 545 0942    GBROGAN@OCEANA.ORG    4 Portland Dr  
Weyland, MA 01778

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