

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

JOINT GOLDEN CRAB & DEEPWATER SHRIMP ADVISORY PANELS MEETING

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 15, 2008

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

Golden Crab AP:

William Whipple, Chair
Howard Rau, Jr.

Randy Manchester

Deepwater Shrimp AP:

Steven Wilson, Vice Chair
Tony Herring
Marilyn Solorzano

Laurilee Thompson
John Williams

Council Members:

Tony Iarocci
Lt. Brian Sullivan

John Wallace

Council Staff:

Roger Pugliese
Kate Quigley

Myra Brouwer
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Dr. Jack McGovern
Richard Vendetti
Dr. Mike Travis
Sarah Hagedorn
John Tibbetts
Sera Drevenak

Kate Michie
Dave Allison
Kate Wunderlich
Laurin Massengale
Dan Whittle

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval of Agenda.....3
Approval of January Joint Golden Crab and Deepwater Shrimp AP Meeting Minutes.....3
Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) and Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1.....3
Golden Crab AP Discussion of FEP and CEA14
Deepwater Shrimp AP Discussion of FEP and CEA.....30
Shrimp Amendment 742
Adjourn51

The Joint Meeting of the Golden Crab and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, Monday afternoon, September 15, 2008, and was called to order at 1:20 o'clock p.m. by Myra Brouwer.

Ms. Brouwer: Let's go ahead and get started and call to order this joint meeting of the Deepwater Shrimp and Golden Crab Advisory Panels. We are here just this afternoon to discuss topics related to the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment and Shrimp Amendment 7. We have Chairman Bill Whipple and Vice Chairman Steve Wilson who are going to conduct the meeting and I will be assisting as we go along and so I'm going to turn it over to Bill and Steve and they'll go ahead and approve the minutes from the January 2008 meeting.

Mr. Whipple: Are there any objections to approval of the minutes?

Ms. Thompson: I noticed where Marilyn is concerned in some cases her salutation is "Mr." and in some cases it's "Ms.". I know she's not a grouper and we probably ought to change all of them to "Ms.", because it gives the appearance that there's two different people, when in actuality it's one.

Mr. Whipple: Are there any further comments or questions? Without any objection, the minutes will be approved, as amended.

Mr. Wilson: Are there any objections for approving the minutes of the Deepwater AP Shrimp meeting? Without objections, the minutes are approved.

Mr. Whipple: Do we have any objections to approval of the agenda as presented? Hearing none, they are approved.

Mr. Wilson: Are there any objections from the Deepwater Shrimp AP Committee on approving of the agenda? No objections and the agenda is approved.

Ms. Brouwer: Just a couple of housekeeping issues. Make sure that you speak into the mic and you turn it on and you speak loudly, so that Joe can hear you. Go ahead and give your last name for the record when you speak. The first item on the agenda is going to be to review the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment and the Fishery Ecosystem Plan and Roger Pugliese is going to give you an overview of the alternatives that are included in the current version of the document, as well as an overview of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan.

Mr. Pugliese: With that, I want to make sure that everybody did get -- You have extra overviews and agendas and what I had distributed was the latest Section 4 and so if there's some references to that Section 4, which has some expanded discussions relative to impacts as we refine this document, but I wanted to make sure everybody did have the latest in hand so we could reference that as we're talking about specific action items or impacts identified within the document.

With that said, let me jump to the presentation. Today, I'll be discussing the Fishery Ecosystem Plan and the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1, presenting the status and the actions, and

what I also will run through are the biological effects, as identified within the plan. Later on, we will have Kate Quigley who will be coming. She's in the companion meeting, the council session that's going on right now, and she will present what's been identified as the economic impacts, based on the existing actions and sub-alternatives that have been developed.

What I'm going to focus on is a very basic overview of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, as well as the review of the alternatives included in the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment for the second round of public hearings. As you all know, the council had worked with the industry previously and worked with the advisors from the Habitat and Coral and Golden Crab and Deepwater Shrimp to come up with alternatives brought to the May public hearings.

Those alternatives were reviewed at the June council meeting and the council selected two out of the four areas for preferred alternatives. They have no preferred alternative under the existing HAPC designation, but they did select preferred alternatives for the golden crab allowable gear areas and allowable fishing areas, as well as the shrimp fishing access areas. They do not have a preferred alternative under the VMS for the golden crab fishery at this time.

Jumping backwards, I would like to touch on the Fishery Ecosystem Plan and you've heard of discussions with regard to this document. The Fishery Ecosystem Plan is a comprehensive view of the biological, social and economic information in the South Atlantic Region. It's intended to update and provide source information for essential fish habitat and essential fish habitat area of particular concern information and designations, future designations too.

In addition, it serves as a source document for this specific first Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment and future comprehensive amendments. The council is looking at really shifting gears and trying to go to one comprehensive amendment annually.

Therefore, the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, as it stands right now, is broken up into six volumes. The introduction and overview kind of give the scope of the South Atlantic system, really highlighting a lot of subsections in the individual volumes and it will be expanded probably significantly as the years continue for subsequent iterations of this document.

Fishery Ecosystem Volume 2 are the South Atlantic habitats and species. This drew heavily on the original South Atlantic habitat plan, descriptions of species and habitats. It brought in a lot of the other information that wasn't included on status and stock assessment information and even more refined information on habitats.

It also expanded the information beyond council areas. It includes highly migratory species information and includes anadromous catadromous species information, a lot of prey and forage species information. It's really trying to capture in context virtually all either the fisheries or the species that exist in the South Atlantic region and building what will be the first understanding of the comprehensive food web of our system.

With that, that moves us to Volume 3, which is the human and institutional environment. This specifies and identifies the fishing operation activities and other institutional activities and responsibilities in the South Atlantic region. It, again, goes beyond just council-managed species

and goes into not only the South Atlantic Council, but other councils that have a jurisdiction of species, such as bluefish, summer flounder, Mid-Atlantic areas that do have overlap into the South Atlantic region. It also, again, highlights highly migratory species and species managed by the states, as well as mainly through ASMFC, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

That brings us to Volume 4, which identifies the threats in ecosystem and recommendations. This, again, is going to be one of those volumes that will continue to evolve over time. Right now, it very specifically identifies a lot of the core information on habitat and threats to species and the recommendations relative to those. It does include the council's habitat policy statements that they developed to look at both fishing and non-fishing impacts, as well as addressing the essential fish habitat recommendations for the various habitats under council jurisdiction.

The South Atlantic research section, Volume 5, begins to give you a snapshot of all the existing or at least the significant existing research efforts in the South Atlantic region and is intended to go beyond that, to give you a snapshot of those systems, but also things say such as the fishery independent information, how you need to expand significant portions of the SEAMAP program or the MARMAP program, various programs that are collecting information that supplement understanding of habitats and understanding of stock assessments, and even getting to things such as more specific relevant activities, such as the expanding ocean observing systems and how that can provide more information to the fishery operations, to the fish habitat pelagic information, as well as being able to work on monitoring fishing vessels or monitoring fish movement patterns and how all that stuff can really give us even a more refined view of our system and also facilitate better operations of fisheries, as well as our understanding of the entire system and how even environmental considerations may be driving numbers of different fisheries in our system.

It also presents information on a collaboration we worked with the Southeast Aquatic Resource Partnership under a National Habitat Plan activity and has the opportunity to highlight some of the thresholds and targets for habitat conservation and recommendations, down to watersheds in our region. There's an opportunity to merge activities through the region on if that activity can provide restoration for areas that we consider essential fish habitat, then there is a vehicle to identify meeting some of these longer term goals and actually do something beyond just being a document that says we need to get to these places and having funding sources and having mechanisms. It tries to weave some of these programs into this discussion and into this system and, of course, our beyond belief references and appendices section is a significant area.

Moving on, I would like to -- As I mentioned, that document really is the information system, the source document, for this Comprehensive Amendment and really, we'll be developing and providing a lot more information as we go to a comprehensive amendment process.

The Comprehensive Amendment we're dealing with right now has a couple of different aspects to it. It has regulatory aspects as well as non-regulatory. The main regulatory aspects are to amend the Coral Fishery Management Plan and to establish deepwater coral habitat areas of particular concern, to look at amending the Coral FMP to create shrimp fishery access areas within those areas of particular concern, to amend the Coral Plan to create allowable golden crab

fishing areas within the HAPCs and to amend the Golden Crab Fishery Management Plan to require vessel monitoring. That's in support of the designations of the HAPCs as well as the establishment and monitoring of the allowable golden crab fishing areas.

The second non-regulatory aspect of the Comprehensive Amendment is the identification of spatial presentation of information on essential fish habitat. The council is mandated under the Magnuson Act to identify, describe, and to the degree we can, conserve and protect essential fish habitat and do what we can to identify non-fishing activities and protect it from those activities, too.

What we have is an internet mapping system that presents spatial presentations based on available information of everything from mangrove distribution habitat in Florida to seagrass distribution off of North Carolina to land use information that's trying to bring together not only the essential fish habitat information, but also how it relates to human use and other activities, to try to provide the best mechanism for conservation.

As part of a final rule, it was required that we were going to begin to need to spatially identify this. This document acknowledges the spatial presentation for all the managed species of the council and we even are including other spatial presentations, like essential habitat designations for highly migratory species occurs in there. While not presented in this document, it's identified within the IMS system.

The third aspect of the Comprehensive Amendment is the fact that it is galvanizing the council's commitment to move toward ecosystem-based management and facilitating the process to do it. Really what is going on is that ultimately the council is going to set up a process and we actually have already begun this process, a scoping process, where the issues will be raised at the end of the year and scoped in the following year, the beginning, in February or March. We would identify all the types of actions under a specific FMP or across multiple FMPs to address habitat, to address bycatch, to address multiple activities, to be able to look at how the implications between fisheries -- If you do this, are you going to have an increase in this fishery or if you do this, are you going to have a habitat impact on a different fishery? That opportunity would occur with that ability to look at what actions need to be done across FMPs.

We would go to public hearings within that year, with the intent that regulations would be essentially put together and effective, theoretically, the beginning of the next following year. We are in a trajectory to actually do that with probably -- You're really looking at maybe Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 3 or 4, by the time we get to the point to get a number of the existing FMP amendments through the process. Then the intent is to look at really trying to bring this overview and understanding together in a single CEA process.

This is just a quick snapshot of some of the spatial presentations on the IMS system. In this case off of North Carolina, the areas designated as an area of particular concern for dolphin and wahoo are the Ten-Fathom Ledge and Big Rock, very well known areas in those areas.

To a great degree, our emphasis on creation of essential fish habitat areas of particular concern are to address non-fishing activities. Where there is permit or policy activity, some of those very

significant habitats for fish and for fishery operations, you end up getting under the gun for oil and gas, for dredging, for wind farms, for whatever. The opportunity to address those and make sure that it's understood -- This at least will provide a vehicle from which that discussion can begin.

With that, I'll move directly into the regulatory section of the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment and really what everybody is here to discuss today, the actions addressing the largest area, the amendment of the coral reef and live hard bottom plan to establish deepwater coral HAPCs.

Action 1 under all our actions are usually no action or Alternative 1, I should say. Alternative 2 is to establish deepwater coral habitat areas of particular concern. In these deepwater coral habitat areas of particular concern, no person may use bottom longlines, trawls, which include both mid-water and bottom trawls, dredges, pots or traps if aboard a fishing vessel, anchor or anchor and chain or use of grapple and chain and possess any species regulated in the coral plan, as well as fish for golden crab in allowable golden crab fishing areas without an approved VMS.

The areas under consideration have a number of sub-alternatives that the council is considering. The sub-alternatives presented in the northern part of this area include the Cape Lookout Lophelia Bank C-HAPC, the Cape Fear Lophelia Habitat Area of Particular Concern, Sub-Alternative 2. Sub-Alternative 2C is the Stetson Reef, Savannah, East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace. It's the largest area and it encompasses the known deepwater habitat distribution from essentially off the Blake Plateau through the Miami Terrace.

Alternative 2D, the sub-alternative, is the establishment of the Pourtales Terrace Coral Habitat Area of Particular Concern. This is directly off the Florida Keys and the last one that was added to the list of potential areas of potential concern was Sub-Alternative 2E, which is the Blake Ridge Diapir Methane Seep Area of Particular Concern, a unique habitat that is -- This spatial area shows you off of east of that larger HAPC and east of the furthest east portion of off the Blake Plateau.

That moves us into Action 2, which is to amend the Coral and Coral Reef Live Bottom Plan to create allowable golden crab fishing areas within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries. Alternative 1 is no action, to not create these allowable golden crab fishing areas within the proposed HAPCs.

Preferred Sub-Alternative 2 is to create an allowable golden crab fishing area in the northern golden crab fishing zone within the proposed coral HAPC boundaries. You can see from this -- This is the designated area for the allowable golden crab fishing area.

The preferred Alternative 2B is to create allowable golden crab fishing area in the middle golden crab fishing zone with the proposed C-HAPC boundaries. In this Middle Zone, there are three sub-areas, A, B, and C, and this captures the traditional fishing operations within those different areas, while avoiding significant habitats throughout the area.

The preferred Sub-Alternative 2C is to create the allowable golden crab fishing area in the

Southern Zone, golden crab fishing zone, and in this case, as I mentioned before, the proposal is for the Pourtales Terrace HAPC. It's only this furthest southern portion of the area that is being proposed as an allowable gear area and to a great degree, it has to do with operations right in line with these areas, the opportunity to set, plus it's been fished fairly heavily throughout that area, because, again, of the prevailing currents, the setting, the moving through that area.

This is to get a quick snapshot of habitat distribution relative to these different proposals. It does have everything from point information, coral distribution, to high-resolution imagery that is incorporated to areas that are interpreted -- Habitat distribution based on high-relief, as well as verification of some of the points of habitat.

This is a large database that was developed as a deepwater habitat information system, in cooperation with Florida Marine Research Institute, with all the deepwater researchers that have been involved in the process and coordinating through our Habitat and Coral Advisory Panels. This is, again, looking at habitat distribution relative to the proposals for the Middle Zone HAPC and again, the intent is to avoid major distributions of those areas while capturing the traditional fishing operations. This is for the Southern Zone area for the Golden Crab HAPC.

That moves us to Action 3, to amend the Coral FMP to create a shrimp fishery access area within the proposed Stetson Reef, Savannah, East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace C-HAPC. Under those HAPCs, the shrimp fishing area is the one that is associated with the largest and it's specifically with the sub-components of the bounds. The preferred alternative is to create the shrimp fishery access area within the Stetson Reef, Savannah, East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace C-HAPC where fishing with a shrimp trawl and/or shrimp possession is allowed by any vessel holding a rock shrimp limited access endorsement and equipped with an approved vessel monitoring system.

The shrimp fishery access area is located as follows. The western boundary is the western boundary of the C-HAPC. The northern boundary of the access area is latitude 30 degrees, 20 minutes north and the southern boundary is 26 degrees, 18 minutes, 56 north. From the northern boundary, extending southward to the latitude 27, 30 north, the eastern boundary is one nautical mile due east of the western boundary of the HAPC, except between latitudes 28 degrees, 20 minutes, 25 seconds north and 28 degrees, 8 minutes north and between latitudes 28 degrees, 30 minutes, 37 seconds north and 28 degrees, 14 minutes north, where shrimping is not allowed within the C-HAPC.

From the southern boundary, extending northward to the latitude 27 degrees, 30 minutes north and the eastern boundary is 1.5 nautical miles east of the western boundary of the HAPC, except between latitudes 27 degrees, 57 minutes, 6 seconds north and 26 degrees, 49 minutes, 58 seconds north, where shrimping is not allowed in the HAPC.

What this encompasses is an alternative that was brought to the council in comments. The council reviewed the public hearing information at the last council meeting, comments that were provided to the council, and evaluated the information on habitat, evaluated the information on fishing operations, and were provided a sub-alternative that they had identified as addressing fishing operations while maintaining the integrity of the Coral Habitat Area of Particular

Concern.

One of the first things the council did is they had indicated that there was not an intention to move the HAPC boundary itself, but to look at the opportunity to allow this, to provide for normal operations, plus provide for any of the issues of fishing on such a knife edge line in the various parts of the area, where gear may be moving into there or there may be drift into the area. The intent was to try to capture essentially both of those.

The area that's actually identified is the first portion of this area I had identified in the northern area. What else happened was that other significant habitats were identified within the HAPC boundaries and those were essentially cut out of these areas, to ensure that some of the most significant areas were not allowed to be trawled in.

What you ended up with is an Area 1 and Area 2, which are one mile, Area 3, which is one mile until you reach 27 degrees, 30 minutes. This becomes 1.5 miles from the western side of the HAPC boundary in and the Shrimp Access Area 4 is one-and-a-half miles down to the top of the Miami Terrace. At this point, the HAPC goes to 300 meters. Here, it's 400 meters all the way up along this bound.

In looking at this, some of the other information that was provided was looking at the distribution of VMS information between 2003 and 2007. National Marine Fisheries Service provided an updated analysis of if you looked at the fishing operations and then looked at a shift of the HAPC how many actual points identified in that information would be identified.

With the existing HAPC boundary, there were only sixty-nine out of 7,400 points that were identified, or less than one percent. With a mile shift, it gets down to almost less than 0.8 and going up to two miles -- At somewhere in between, it essentially has eliminated virtually all the actual fishing operation points identified within the VMS system.

Now, industry representatives did follow up and provide actual trawl tracks in developing the alternative, which showed and reaffirmed some of this more significant fishing in here and that is what captured, essentially, extending that area to one-and-a-half miles in the southern portion or in that Area 4. This has, again, some of the habitat distribution relative to the different fishing operations within the area.

That moves us to Action 4, which is to amend the Golden Crab FMP to require vessel monitoring. At this time, as I mentioned, the council does not have a preferred alternative. This alternative would not require -- Alternative 1 is always no action, do not require VMS. Alternative 2 is to require use of a VMS, an approved vessel monitoring system, by vessels with a limited access golden crab permit and approved crustacean traps fishing for golden crab within the designated areas in the Stetson Miami Terrace HAPC and Pourtales HAPC, where fishing has occurred historically and does not impact deepwater coral. Alternative 3 is essentially just to require it for the industry, require use of an approved VMS by any vessel with a limited access golden crab permit.

This moves us into what I wanted to touch on at least, the biological effects of the different

actions under consideration. Action 1 is the establishment of the HAPCs and I want to highlight the impacts on the sub-alternatives, basically. The Cape Lookout Lophelia Bank C-HAPC would protect the known distribution of deepwater coral habitats occurring in the offshore waters off of North Carolina.

The areas in this area, because of the research that's done, were significantly smaller than some of the other areas, but they encompass pretty significant and unique habitat complexes. They differ somewhat from some of the species complexes and assemblages that are found in some of the southern areas.

The second area is the Cape Fear Lophelia Bank and that's pretty much the same thing. Both of those areas have a unique deepwater habitat and some of the same species occurring in terms of coral species, but you do have different fish assemblages and dependent species in those habitats.

Sub-Alternative 2 is the Stetson, Savannah, East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace, the largest of the HAPCs. That's over 23,000 square miles of area. The idea is that it's going to protect the largest area, encompassing a variety of deepwater habitats, varying from deepwater reef complexes occurring on the Blake Plateau to Lithoherms, with the vast network off coral pinnacles occurring off of Georgia through north Florida and the Miami Terrace habitats.

Protection of the Miami Terrace habitat is of particular importance, because it's been recently identified as areas of wreckfish aggregation and actually spawning locations on some of these areas that are identified as significant habitats.

The Sub-Alternative 2D, the Pourtales Terrace C-HAPC, will protect the most southern and some of the most dynamic of deepwater coral ecosystems. Some of the current systems you have going on through this area are pretty spectacular. Some of the relief and resolution in these areas and the dramatic changes in habitats are pretty stunning and they are some of the least actually mapped in some of that area. There needs to be significant mapping done in some of the deeper sections in there. Some of the problems with the currents also causes problems with research mapping and really looking in detail at some of those various habitats.

The conservation of the area is not only important to benthic species. As I mentioned, because of the nature of this high current regime, you have very significant, important habitats, dynamic currents for navigation, feeding, and migration throughout the area and so the importance of not only benthic, but also pelagic species in the area.

Sub-Alternative 2E is the Blake Ridge Diapir Methane Seep. As I mentioned, this is a fairly unique habitat, a more recently found habitat, like nowhere else in the region. In developing the proposal, one of the things that was identified is that being such a specific area and apparently it's validated in other places, where these types of methane habitats have been found, they are most likely going to have extremely unique genetic characteristics of the species occurring there. The implications of that in science are pretty significant.

This moves us into a broader view of the biological impacts. Each of the sub-alternatives intend to protect deepwater coral and live hard bottom habitat and maximize the likelihood that

essential fish habitat will be protected.

While we are promulgating the regulations through the coral, coral reef, and live hard bottom plan, we're also acknowledging the fact that many of these habitats are essential fish habitats for wreckfish, for golden crab, for royal red shrimp, for other species that are under council management that have been found in the northern areas, snowy grouper and other ones, but we're not using that as the regulatory tool. The regulatory tool is the Coral Fishery Management Plan.

Use of bottom tending gear and anchoring on top of coral, as most individuals know, can disrupt and destroy reef communities and in this case, the coral, coral reef, and live hard bottoms -- Since they're non-mobile habitats, they can't escape the stress and they're susceptible to pretty significant damage when fishing vessels deploy anchors, chains and grapples and thereby, the anchor prohibition within the regulatory structure.

In addition, with the occurrence of coral pinnacles in the proposed C-HAPCs, the council has taken the precautionary approach of prohibiting the use of mid-water trawls. In the Pacific seamount fisheries, what was done is mid-water trawls were used with very heavy weights and drug up over the tops of the seamounts and essentially were used to capture large amounts of fish, but also destroyed virtually all the habitats on many of the seamount systems throughout the world.

To be proactive in ensuring that that doesn't occur on some habitats that are very similar -- Some of these pinnacles that we have are very similar to seamounts in other regions and the proposal is to include mid-water trawls into the prohibition.

This moves us into Action 2, which is the golden crab allowable gear areas. Alternative 1, again, is do not create allowable crab fishing areas within the proposed HAPCs. Essentially, all impact from the golden crab fishery, under this alternative, would be eliminated, but as the golden crab members have identified over a number of years, they're not intentionally trying to set on any types of habitats in the areas, plus the likelihood of loss of gear and safety issues is really -- The bottom line is that under a no action you eliminate all the potential impacts.

Sub-Alternative 2 creates an allowable golden crab fishing area in the northern golden crab zone and that's within the Stetson Miami Habitat Area of Particular Concern boundaries. This section was developed to avoid any potential impacts on deepwater habitat north of the 28 degrees north latitude. The sub-alternative is really to restrict the fishery to traditional grounds that do not impact habitat and will not compromise the Action 1 that's being proposed for the establishment of the HAPC itself.

The specific HAPC, as indicated earlier, is really intended to protect all the areas, from the Blake Plateau through the network, all the way into the Miami Terrace. This specific area captures especially those high pinnacle systems to the western side of the HAPC and the conservation of those, while allowing the fishery to maintain in the traditional grounds.

Sub-Alternative 2B creates an allowable fishing area in the Middle Zone, in the proposed Stetson

Miami Coral HAPC area. Now, this is the most significant fishing area for the industry at this time. This alternative includes three sub-areas, A, B, and C, as I indicated in the images earlier, and essentially identified those as the significant fishing grounds, where fishing operations would continue and would not impact deepwater habitat. This alternative will subsequently enhance the establishment, again, of establishing the Stetson Miami Habitat Area of Particular Concern.

Sub-Alternative 2C creates an allowable golden crab fishing area in the Southern Golden Crab Fishing Zone, within the proposed C-HAPC boundaries. This alternative provides, again, fishing in traditional grounds. As I indicated earlier, to a great degree this had to do with -- While fished heavily through there, a lot of the operations, given the current systems and structures, setting the trap lines and retrieving the trap lines, it would be very difficult not to move into this area, as well as it was part of the traditional grounds. The conservation of this area is not only important to the benthic species, as I mentioned earlier, but in creating the allowable gear areas, you're also ensuring protection of the rest of the HAPC.

This moves us into Action 3, which is the creation of the shrimp fishery access areas within the proposed Miami Reef, Stetson, East Florida Lithoherns, and the Miami Terrace. The biological impacts of this alternative would be positive, in that they would prohibit offshore of what is agreed to be the beginning of the deepwater ecosystem north of the Miami Terrace. The benefits of not allowing continued fishing in the areas were if habitat existed, the impact is limited.

Preferred Alternative 2 proposes the creation of the shrimp fishery access areas within the proposed Stetson Miami Coral Habitat Area of Particular Concern, where fishing with a shrimp trawl and/or shrimp possession is allowed by any vessel holding the rock shrimp limited access endorsement.

Creation of the four-part area would have positive biological effects, through limiting the fishery to traditional grounds or limiting operations to ensure that there's no expansion into known low-relief or high-relief deepwater habitats in the proposed Miami Terrace, the Stetson Miami Terrace HAPC.

The royal red shrimp fishery operates almost exclusively inshore of the 400-meter contour, which is the western boundary of the deepwater habitat distribution to be protected under the HAPC designations, north of the Miami Terrace. The National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center, as I indicated earlier, provided analysis that showed that between 2007 and 2003 the vessel operations, all points collected, there was less than 1 percent of all points collected. With establishment of the shrimp fishery access area, virtually all, except some outliers, are included into that area.

Alternative 3 is the creation of the six-mile buffer from the existing HAPC boundary. Essentially, it would change the boundary of the HAPC from where it exists now six miles in. This would have the greatest biological effect and impact on deepwater coral habitat. It would allow deepwater trawlers to fish in depths deeper than the traditional fishery has operated. The Habitat and Coral Advisory Panels and deepwater researchers have concluded the best scientific information indicates that deepwater coral ecosystems north of the Miami Terrace start at a depth

of 400 meters and in some cases, extend to the eastern bound of the U.S. EEZ.

This would allow trawling and use of other damaging gear, including bottom longlines, anchoring and grapples, up to six miles seaward of the proposed HAPC boundary. It would also allow trawling and use of other bottom tending gear in main golden crab habitat and fishing grounds which produced over 400,000 pounds in 2007 in that specific area.

This would also eliminate a significant part of the deepwater habitat from being considered important as an HAPC and that has other implications, all that litany I went into before about concern over essential fish habitat. It also addresses the ability to influence permit and policy reviews. Removing any of the area from HAPC designation would then provide any types of opportunity to consider impacts from non-fishing activities, from pipelines and gas exploration, oil exploration within the area.

Alternative 1 under the VMS -- The next action, Action 4, is establishment of VMS in the golden crab fishery. Alternative 1, or no action, could result in damage to bottom habitat and would not necessarily address the Coral FMP objectives by ensuring that there would be enforceable capabilities. Without requiring VMS, vessels could fish in areas which gear will impact deepwater coral habitats and damage could occur outside of the proposed golden crab fishing areas on extensive habitat in the C-HAPC conservation.

Alternative 2 would require the use of an approved vessel monitoring system in vessels with limited access golden crab permits and approved crustacean traps fishing for golden crab in the golden crab fishing areas in the Stetson Miami Terrace HAPC and the Pourtales Terrace HAPCs, where fishing has occurred historically. In doing that, this would not impact those habitats.

The majority of the golden crab fishery in the Northern and Middle Zone occurs in the two HAPCs. Therefore, if vessels fish accordingly, most habitat impacts are eliminated. If vessels fishing in the Southern Zone did not fish in the small portion of the Pourtales Terrace, they could fish unmonitored and potentially impact habitats throughout the proposed C-HAPC.

Alternative 3 would indirectly protect the greatest habitat, by requiring the use of an approved vessel monitoring system by any vessel fishing with a limited access permit in the South Atlantic area of jurisdiction. With all vessels monitored, there would be a greater likelihood of protecting deepwater habitat occurring in the Northern, Middle, and Southern Golden Crab Fishing Zones encompassed by the proposed deepwater habitat areas of particular concern.

That brings us to the completion timeline. The council is reviewing these documents to approve for the second round of public hearings in October and November of this year. We'll conduct those hearings and moving forward with looking at approval in December of 2008. With that, that concludes my brief summary of the actions and the considerations that are in the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment.

I apologize if I went on and on with this, but just trying to get a snapshot sometimes goes way far beyond what you need. Hopefully you've had a chance to look at some of the material and I'll essentially move that forward to our next discussion. Hopefully Kate is going to be able to

provide the economic impacts here. We're going to just double check and see what the timing -- I would like to have most of those discussions before we get into specific review of the actions.

If the chairs will bear with us, we're just going to double check and see if Kate is available from the other meeting, so that we can just continue on and get our information on the table and then hold the deliberations. I think that would probably be better.

Kate is still wrapped up in the other meeting. I think actually she's probably going to be able to break around -- It might be a little bit longer, twenty minutes or so. With that, I'll pass that on over to Bill and Steve and I think the first thing we have on is to have golden crab discussion. What we would like to do is have the individual APs have the discussion separately and be able to provide their recommendations as we go through this. We'll start off with Bill Whipple and I think we have some specific recommendations that you would like to provide.

Mr. Whipple: Myra, are you going to act as chair on this?

Ms. Brouwer: Bill, I would be happy to assist you conduct it and if you would like, I can put up the recommendations that the AP came up with. Would you like to start with that or do you have other items that need to be discussed prior to that?

Mr. Whipple: It could be that some of the other members here have some discussion they would like to present before that. If so, I'm not aware of it. Do either of you have any issues to put upfront first? In that case, Myra, we'll see what magic you did in getting these ready for the screen.

Ms. Brouwer: Can everybody see that or should I blow up the font a little bit more? Up on the screen are the recommendations that have been submitted by the representatives of the Golden Crab AP today and I'm going to let Bill walk through them and read them out loud for the record and then discuss them, as appropriate.

Mr. Whipple: We have a total of five recommendations. Nothing there is startling new. They're either largely refinements of recommendations that we've made before or an attempt to make some emphasis, as we see it, of the importance of a few of the ones that are up here.

Ms. Brouwer: I'll go ahead and read the first recommendation from the Golden Crab AP. The recommendation reads: Additional area in the Northern Zone should be added to the Coral Habitat Area of Particular Concern Allowable Fishing Zone for golden crabbers as soon as continuing research indicates such areas are appropriate.

Mr. Whipple: It may not be general knowledge, but we certainly are the fishery, I think, that is most deeply affected by the establishment of the C-HAPC. All of our traditional areas of fishing are within the proposed area and so having the ability to fish anywhere, really, depends on the willingness of the council to allow us to continue doing so.

As you might imagine, there's certain restrictions that have come with that, in terms of all of the discussion that's gone along. One of the things that we have agreed on is that as research

unfolds, especially in the Northern Zone, which would allow us to fish there without doing damage, we would be allowed to do so. This is a request that we follow that agreement. Any discussion or comments on that one?

Mr. Rau: I would just like to say that before the C-HAPC did -- Before we started talking about this thing, I had future plans to move into the Northern Zone and set up another operation up there, but as things look right now, it's not looking too good. What I'm saying is as soon as we can get this information the better.

Mr. Whipple: I think we could also make the case, which we did in general -- We could establish specifics that much of these areas could be construed, properly, as part of our traditional area. It's not where we as individuals have necessarily been fishing, even though, as Howard suggested, we certainly had plans, before this disruption came along, but in the past there have been fishing efforts in that northern zone that have resulted in some commercial activity.

It's not immense, but nonetheless, it took place and a lot of people wanted to fish there. In fact, one person in particular felt that the real concentration of abundant golden crabs was in the bight around the Carolinas, which would mean that fishing would take place there. We understand the situation, but if ever in the light of a dawning sun there's an opportunity to go in there, we want to.

Ms. Brouwer: I'm going to move on to Recommendation Number 2. Are there any objections to Recommendation Number 1 from the Golden Crab AP? There's no objections to that recommendation and I'm moving on to Recommendation Number 2 and that recommendation reads: The council, in collaboration with participants in the golden crab fishery, should explore management mechanisms for protecting the fishery from excess expansion. I'll let Bill Whipple, again, lead the discussion on that.

Mr. Whipple: This is a small fishery with -- As you can understand from this whole fact of the proposed C-HAPC, it's going to have not much room for expansion anyway. In order to have a situation where, as so often occurs for various reasons, there's overcapitalization and everybody suffers and everything suffers, including ultimately the crabs, or whatever the species might be, we want to take some preemptive action to try to -- This fishery has been a model fishery for getting regulations in place and getting real cooperation with the council from the very beginning and we would like to maintain that.

One of the obvious ways to do it would be to develop, as suggested, some kind of management mechanisms, whatever they might be, to help protect that before it gets overrun with problems. Any comments on that?

Mr. Pugliese: Bill, one of the avenues that the council has been looking at and a new opportunity is looking at limited access privilege programs and I think there had been discussion about golden crab, since you have permit limitations, you have area limitations, and then now we'll have potentially these golden crab fishing areas, all the makings of the opportunity to allow the industry to really structure and have a privilege permit system and I think the record was pretty

clear that in building these collaboratively with you that there was a commitment, understanding that you had acknowledged that pretty much the fishing effort in those areas is what is existing now and it could not take a lot more expansion and so that reaffirmation of that, but the opportunity to look at creating possibly a limited access privilege system for the golden crab fishery I think is there and there's interest. Would you say that there would be interest in the industry in pursuing that?

Mr. Rau: Isn't golden crab a limited access fishery?

Mr. Pugliese: It doesn't fix the numbers. You don't have an absolute, where those are the only people involved. In a limited access privilege program, you have a fixed number of participants in the fishery and you determine exactly how those things are allocated between the different participants. It's different than just having limited to this portion of the zone or limited to this portion of the zone. There's still some play in between the type of limited access program you have now and what would be a limited access privilege program or some type of a true limited access system. It would tie those production levels -- You could potentially tie the production levels to individuals or to areas. It ends up becoming an industry guiding on how to make it happen.

Mr. Rau: How do you do that? How do you go about doing all this?

Mr. Pugliese: You have to work with the industry and come up with alternatives on how to do this and it would be an amendment to the coral plan to establish a program like that. I think one of the things that is intended -- As I mentioned before, part of this bigger ecosystem process or the ecosystem amendment process is we'll probably be scoping new items for consideration in February or March of next year. It would be very timely to recommend that that be one of the actions to consider as one of the other management actions for review, as part of that scoping process.

The council will be probably looking at the suite of lists of different things to consider in March or February. It's important that that -- With this kind of a recommendation, you are beginning to build that type of a recommendation directly into a consideration for pretty much immediate movement as we're moving forward with these kind of regulations under the existing amendment.

Mr. Whipple: You notice the wording here is very general, explore management mechanisms. At this point, we don't know what the mechanisms should be and we would like to get it right, from the standpoint of everybody that's involved. All we're doing here, I think, is in sync with what you're suggesting, that this not get left off in the drift water for any great length of time, but that we should work together to get everybody's interests clarified and then try to determine the ways to get the most benefit possible.

Mr. Pugliese: Bill, to that, that's the idea of that process. I think that's exactly what you do. You get the individuals to the table and look at the types of avenues and methodologies and what really can work for the fishery and I think you can really air some of the considerations for other technological capabilities that are needed in the fishery, in terms of understanding that the VMS

operates for the system for this way and for your fishery they better have it right, because it operates totally different on how you're doing that and you add in other technologies.

All those things, I think, can get really elaborated in the direct interaction with all the fishermen as you're developing this. If the fishermen don't want it, it's not going to happen. It's not one of these that it would be a mandate. Either there has to be a desire to move forward on it or it doesn't go forward and pretty much the structure will end up being the direction that the industry wants it to go.

Mr. Whipple: We see the need for it and the obvious necessity for cooperation with the council, but we don't, as yet, have any idea what it is.

Ms. Brouwer: Is there any further discussion or any objections to this recommendation? If it needs to be edited to capture the thoughts of the AP members, we can do that at this point. If not, I'll move on to Recommendation Number 3, which reads: Emphasize the willingness and readiness of the golden crab fishermen to participate in cooperative research with scientists and council. Numerous mutual benefits are expected.

Mr. Whipple: This has already been mentioned and discussed. We're just trying to emphasize what we feel is a pretty good potential for all parties. We could certainly use the help of scientific and any kind of inventive inquiry. Funding the bill is not easy and you people have the same problem, I'm sure, and to the extent that we can cooperate and collaborate, it's good for everybody.

Ms. Brouwer: Any further discussion on that recommendation? Moving on to Recommendation Number 4, that recommendation reads: Make Alternative 3 a preferred alternative, along with Alternative 2, for the Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area.

Mr. Whipple: Do you want to --

Mr. Pugliese: Let me clarify for everybody what that is. Alternative 2 essentially is the establishment of the Northern, Middle, and Southern Zone Allowable Fishing Areas for Golden Crab. At the last council meeting, the industry had asked that there be consideration of possibly seeing if they could actually fish within what are proposed as the shrimp fishing access areas. Some industry individuals had indicated that that would not be a problem and I think that's what the latest input from some other individuals in the fishery is, that that still would not be a problem.

What you're looking at is a recommendation from the AP to say that you would be able to access and be able to fish in those four subareas that essentially are identified if you've got your -- You've seen those in the images I distributed, Section 4, and it would be opening up the shrimp fishing access areas to allow golden crab fishing in those areas. That would be Alternative 3. I guess when we get to the shrimp industry, the Deepwater Shrimp AP, we could get some input on that specifically, but that is the essential recommendation from the advisory panel.

Mr. Whipple: That's the point and I think it's pertinent to point out that we have existed side by

side here for a number of years with no gear conflict that I'm aware of and I've heard that there has been none on their side. Also, I would like to point out that this area in question is part of our traditional fishing grounds and so we would like not to have that taken away from us. To the extent that's agreeable to everybody -- As far as I can determine, from what discussions I've had with the shrimp people, as I said, it's a non-issue. If it has been, hopefully it will continue to be and it's presumably not an issue with enforcement and what have you that's going to develop out of this.

Mr. Williams: I would like to hear from Bill and maybe Marilyn, for the record, potential gear interactions in those areas. You say you've traditionally fished those areas with the boats working, with the royal red trawlers working out there. I can't imagine there not being some gear conflict over the years, at one time or another. I was wondering if you all could clarify that a little bit.

Mr. Whipple: We're just talking about what's -- To this point anyway, the one mile and one-and-a-half mile corridor, which is presumably -- I don't want to get into who is where when and why and any arguments about that, but my understanding is that this is not a heavily trafficked area, as Roger has already pointed out, and so would not expect to have the interference.

I know of pre-HAPC days of no issues. We were worried about it and we have, on occasion, talked to some of the royal red people and not extensively, but typically they tell us there's no problem, just let us know when you want to go there. So far as we know, we're not encroaching on your activity in any way that hasn't been going on for a number of years anyway.

Mr. Williams: You actually contact the royal red fishermen to avoid gear conflicts when you all are fishing that area? Do you have contact with them in the past?

Mr. Rau: I've fished probably eight years, from 26 to 27, in that area, latitude in that particular area, and I never had a problem with them. I've seen them dragging inside of me, but in that whole period of time, there's never been a problem. I've tried to contact them, but they never really responded on the radio.

Ms. Solorzano: To my knowledge, there hasn't been any problem with it. Generally, I think the time of the year that we're working there is at a time of the year that you guys probably are not working there. Yes, the few times that you all have been out there, there's not been any gear problems. I think there's communication pretty well. The shrimpers see them and it's -- To my knowledge, my son, Woody -- Woody actually even commented that he didn't have any problem before when he was here. I don't believe there's any conflict of interest over that mile or so area. I think there's room for all of us.

Mr. Whipple: It's in our own self interest not to have this conflict anyway, because you can do us a lot of harm.

Mr. Pugliese: Just as a follow-up, I think it's important that it gets very clear in the record from both panels, because enforcement will jump right in. They'll look at that and they'll go, wait a minute, you're going to do what? If it's clear that this is -- I think the information also shows --

The VMS shows that those areas, that bound area, is -- At certain times, it's probably significantly fished, but in the vast scheme of the fishing operations of the industry, generally the real bread and butter of the industry is somewhat west of the 400-meter line.

You can see it from both the trawl tracks that have been provided as well as that. That probably validates some of the fact that you're not having as much interaction. It's just a concern -- I'll guarantee you that it will be raised by enforcement, but if it's clear in the record that the industries see themselves as coexisting -- Plus, at this point, you all have VMS systems and you're proposed to have VMS systems in the golden crab fishery. If they can't work out there and have all the technology in the world -- Hopefully that will help all these types of things.

Ms. Solorzano: Yes, the document you guys show here, where it's showing that we're mostly on the western edge, you're using it under a speed of four knots, two to four knots. Generally, as a rule, dragging north, you're probably dragging over four knots. Most of the time, the guys will run a little inshore down, because running against the current is a little easier inshore.

Some of your track lines you're seeing are them actually going south, running south. They're not dragging, but some of it is dragging. You left out -- You said there's only 1 percent of dragging inside of that boundary, because you based it on four knots or less. Dragging north, you tend to be dragging four knots plus, because the current is running so strong.

It's very difficult to drag -- Sometimes, when the conditions are -- If the tide isn't running hard, you might be dragging under four knots, but a lot of times you are dragging over four knots and that tends to be further to the east that you're dragging more than four knots. When they came in and they said that only 1 percent of the dragging is inside of the HAPC, the C-HAPC, based on VMS tracks, based on the speed of two to four knots, the thing is that most of the royal red fishermen are dragging over four knots.

Sometimes when you're going south and the current is running extremely hard to the north -- When you set out to drag back north, you're going to be trawling a good five knots. When you turn around and you go to run south, you're going to ease inshore, because the tide isn't running as strong inshore. You're going to ease a little bit in and you're going to run back down and you're probably not going to be running but three or four knots, maybe five, back to the south.

Some of the information that was used to determine what percentage of dragging is going on inside of the HAPC was based on under four knots. You may have been asked what's the overall average speed of trawling and your fishermen are going to tell you that it's going to be two-and-a-half to three knots. That's the average speed, but it's not going to be the speed in the royal red bottom going north, because you could pull the -- Sometimes we're using 1,100 RPMs, which may not mean a lot to a lot of people here, but you're barely using any fuel and you're screaming north. You guys know. You all know.

Then you turn around and we can't even drag back to the south, because we wouldn't be moving. We pick up and we run back and we're running back at three or four knots to the south and we ease inshore a little bit, because the tide doesn't run as strong inshore. You guys know that. Whenever you're sitting here showing only 1 percent of our dragging is done inside of that C-

HAPC, that's incorrect, because you're basing it under four knots. That's totally incorrect.

Mr. Pugliese: One thing about it is that information was actually validated with the trawl tracks from people like Woody Moore and others that are fishing the area. One thing that was obvious in getting the trawl tracks, other than the VMS, is it was obvious that that southern area had a whole lot more and that actually validated that one-and-a-half-mile bound area. That's the question I was going to ask you. That area probably is the most significant area that you're having --

Ms. Solorzano: Right and the southern area is more exactly what you're saying, but what I'm saying is whether you're south or north, when you're dragging in the direction north, you're going to be going at a faster speed than four knots most of the time. In other words, there's more than 1 percent of trawling in the royal red fishery done inside that HAPC. You've got 1 percent in your diagram, saying only 1 percent of the VMS track data, based on four knots, was based inside the HAPC. There is more than 1 percent of trawls, even based on Woody's diagram off his thing. You are going to find that more than 1 percent of his royal red fishing was done inside that C-HAPC.

Yes, the one mile and the one-and-a-half mile would compensate most of it and that's where our concern comes in with this one and one-and-a-half mile. We don't seem to understand why you want to give an allowable area. We don't understand what the difference is in just moving the line. Why can't you just move the line? Why give an allowable area when you can just move the line?

If you're going to let us drag in it, what is the reason behind not moving it instead of giving the allowable area? Why? Why not just move it? That's what we don't get. If you're going to let us drag in it, just move the line. It's only a mile.

Mr. Pugliese: Why don't we move forward with the golden crab discussion and then we can get back into it when we have the deepwater shrimp, because there are some specific issues with regard to especially those cutout areas that have significant habitats in those areas that were pulled out of even the proposals that were laid out.

The other consideration is the continuity of some of those habitats and the science recommendations on those habitat distributions, but I think it would be appropriate to probably wrap up at least the initial discussions and recommendations of the golden crab and then get into some of these specific discussions from the Deepwater Shrimp AP.

Mr. Whipple: Anything more on Recommendation 4? Any objections to it?

Ms. Brouwer: Without objections to Recommendation 4 from the Golden Crab AP members, we'll move on to Recommendation 5, which reads: The council and golden crab participants must quickly address serious concerns about the impact of VMS on the fishery. The concerns center on the fact that in normal conduct of the fishery, the boat is often well east or west of the gear. To avoid violations, the practical effect is a loss of a true half-mile of critical fishing area on both sides of the C-HAPC. I'll, again, let Bill Whipple lead discussion on that

recommendation.

Mr. Whipple: I think you can tell by the language that we've got a lot of emotional energy about this. The purpose of this recommendation isn't immediately obvious to people that aren't in the fishery. Even other trap fisheries don't have this problem. It's largely the result of the Gulf Stream being very much in presence where we have our best fishing and in the fact that fishing in 2,000 feet of water or more -- There are routine situations in which the boat will be as much as a half-mile off to one side. In some of the situations it will be to the east and in others it will be to the west of the actual location of the gear.

I can go into the specifics of this if it's appropriate here, but the impact is if we're not going to have the pinger go off on the VMS, we've got to stay at least a half-mile away from where the boundary is of the HAPC and that will mean, for practical effects -- Again, a very critical important part of our area is, quite frankly, to be near these areas of coral and so forth, but not on them.

The fact that the boat may be over them does not indicate that the gear is. This can be a very involved discussion, but it's something that's of very high importance to us and we would like to see some kind of a process developed whereby we can actually use the amount of area that's designated by the boundaries rather than have the boundary there but we can't get there, because of this VMS situation.

Mr. Pugliese: To that, Bill, I think we had some discussion before about -- In this situation, I think it's going to be really important that in implementing a VMS system here that they're really going to have to tailor it and structure it to the operational characteristics of the fishery. It's not a trawl fishery and so they have to understand exactly how that is, so it can compensate for those types of specific operational characteristics.

Emphasizing that I think is going to be the biggest thing, to ensure that that be done upfront and not just put something in and then expect it to function effectively. I think the earlier they can understand exactly how the fishing operation haul-backs and everything occur, then it can be captured in the way the VMS track indicates what you are actually doing.

Mr. Whipple: That's exactly right. We just want to make sure that happens before things get going here. Every single trawl, to get our tow lines set up, if we're on the eastern side, we're going to be over the boundary. The boat is going to be over the boundary. The gear isn't there and the drag isn't there, but the procedure of getting that drag going entails that.

Similarly, if we happen to part a trawl, the only way we can get at it is to get the boat over on the east side, where we don't belong, but the drag isn't going to go there and where we're going to tow isn't going to be there, but how do people know that this is not just occasionally, but routine kind of problems? I think the depth of the column is indicative. In fact, we're almost half a mile deep. These side excursions aren't as dramatic as they sound when you say we can be half a mile. That's a pretty good angle, but it does happen. Anyway, not to belabor the point, but attention has to get into this some time.

Ms. Brouwer: Are there any objections to that recommendation from the Golden Crab AP or any further discussion?

Mr. Rau: I would just like to say that Gulf Stream and the VMS I don't think are going to like one another too much. Sometimes it depends on the conditions. It's going to be very hard, I think, to be able to diagnose exactly what a vessel is doing in the crab fishery, whether he's hauling or whether he's running back or whether he's running home.

Mr. Pugliese: Following up on that, I think that makes it really critical that the characterization of the fishery and some cooperative research in doing that, to be able to define exactly how the operations are -- Groundtruth that relative to VMS operations, as well as get back into the issue of possibly looking at new technologies to couple that with acoustic and whatever in the future.

Hopefully that's an opportunity that we have and we have the ability to look at something else that adds to the system. I think that still is going to be pursued, but the biggest thing is to look at cooperative research that can also provide the characterization of that, so that when you're looking at the VMS information that you're looking at exactly the type of operations that are occurring.

Mr. Wilson: This is out of my realm, but given the nature and what they're doing and having the VMS, how is enforcement going to be able to deal with that? How are you going to be able to enforce it?

Mr. Pugliese: I think that type of thing is going to have to be worked out, in terms of understanding how to characterize when a vessel is setting line, when a vessel is hauling back, when it's drifting. As small as the industry is, they ought to be able to characterize it for each individual vessel and be able to know exactly how that works and how it translates into what the VMS information is showing.

Plus, the VMS that's proposed under the golden crab is comparable to what's being proposed or is included in the Gulf of Mexico. It's a lot more potential two-way communications and so there's a lot of opportunity to have things beyond what the base VMS does, I think, that will validate and -- I think the biggest take-away from Bill's point is that it's something that needs to be addressed right from the beginning and start getting this type of thing upfront and enforcement to make it work.

Mr. Whipple: I might step on a landmine and throw out the idea that we could have a simple solution to this by having a half-mile buffer zone. This has to be said.

Ms. Brouwer: Is that something that the AP would like to add to their recommendation or is that something that you would like to discuss further and come back to the council with later on?

Mr. Whipple: I don't know just how to phrase it, but it's certainly, from my point of view, something that we would like to have considered seriously, seriously considered if possible.

Mr. Pugliese: I think as we report out on your recommendation to the council that this can be

very clear in the way this identifies that, is that one of the considerations was a possible buffer zone, but also reaffirm the fact that there has to be a commitment upfront to make the VMS do what it needs to do. If it can't do what it needs to do, then the fallback is something that would provide that.

I think if it's couched that way in the way the recommendation is brought back to the council, I think it's going to be clear about what the implications are, but also force the issue to make the structuring of the VMS system functional, so you do not have to have -- Enforcement does not like to call them buffer zones. That's something that they have not been real supportive of in any area management activity we've been involved in. If it can be done technologically, in cooperation with the industry, as I mentioned, as small as the industry is -- If they can't do it with this -- Let's use the technology.

Mr. Iarocci: I am Chairman of the Golden Crab Committee and I think, Bill, I've heard you loud and clear and I like the discussion I'm hearing. It is a small fishery and I think beforehand -- Buffer zone, it is a sore subject. I know we're going to have to bring it up at one time if we have to, but I think preliminarily that we can deal with this, the drift. We talked about it this morning and from what Roger is saying, I think the full council -- Once we get into this at committee and full council, we'll be able to deal with this the right way.

Before VMS is initiated, we'll be able to have this covered, so you guys aren't breaking the law, especially with that form of VMS like Roger has stated. There is a lot more open communication and there's only a few of you guys in those areas and it shouldn't be a conflict, but we will cover it.

Mr. Whipple: I'm not trying to stir up the sands of confusion. All I'm saying, and we've all agreed, is there's a problem there as we see it and it does need to be addressed somehow and as long as we all have that objective --

Mr. Pugliese: Bill, I think what we're going to do is see if we can take a break and then we'll come back and get Kate to do the economic impacts before we go into the deepwater shrimp discussions. If that sounds good, we'll take a fifteen-minute break.

Ms. Quigley: Okay, what I'm going to do is I'm just going to walk through a summary of the economic impact as you find them in the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment, so this is just a brief overview, so please stop me if you've got questions or would like me to go into a little bit more detail.

First, Action 1, the first alternative, of course, is no action, no expected impact. Alternative 2 is establishment of Coral HAPCs and there are a number of different sub-alternatives, with Stetson Reef being Sub-Alternative 2C, along with a couple of other areas. That's where there are significant negative impacts especially to the golden crab fishery, so let me go into a little bit more detail on that.

With regards to Alternative 2C, Golden Crab Fishery, significant negative economic impacts are expected in the short term. Right now what we're talking about is if Coral HAPCs are

implemented in Action 2, establishment of these golden crab allowable gear areas are not implemented, so just Coral HAPCs would restrict golden crab fishing vessels from going into these HAPC areas.

If that were to occur, then there would be significant negative economic impact. These are expected to be offset with provisions for allowable gear areas, Action 2, Alternative 2. Logbook data indicates that seven vessels would be impacted in the absence of Action 2. The number seven we get from just taking a look at who has fished from 2005 to 2007 is the total of seven vessels.

More vessels may be impacted if they decided to being fishing again, but under the assumption that there are seven vessels, about 510,000 pounds were caught on average over 2005 to 2007, assuming \$1.40 per pound, this would be valued at \$714,000 ex-vessel value, and this is the number that was put into the document as expected impacts, Action 1, Alternative 2. In the absence of Action 2, crab vessels may cease to operate, creating negative social and economic impacts.

The Royal Red Shrimp Fishery, minor negative economic impacts are expected. As written in the document, less than 1 percent of VMS points were identified as potential royal red shrimp fishing in these areas. These impacts are non-quantifiable due to lack of data, but any of these impacts can be offset with allowable gear areas, Action 3. This refers to Action 3, Alternatives 2 and 3. In the absence of Action 3, only minor, if any, negative social impacts are expected.

With regards to the recreational fishery, no negative economic impacts are expected, due to the inability for most recreational vessels to anchor in these depths. There are positive long-term economic impacts expected due to an overall healthier ecosystem.

With regard to nonuse value, overall positive socio-economic benefits to society are expected, increase in existence value and bequest value, and you can find definitions for those terms or I can expand upon that. You can find them in the document or I can expand upon that if anyone is interested.

Okay, then we've got Action 2, allowable golden crab fishing areas, so what are the economic impacts of the allowable golden crab fishing areas. Under Alternative 1, assuming Coral HAPCs are implemented, elimination of the golden crab fishery would likely occur under Alternative 1, which is status quo, where there would be no golden crab fishing areas allowed.

An average of seven vessels have fished from 2005-2007, as mentioned before, landing about 510,000 pounds annually, valued at \$714,000. Then we've got Action 2 which is implementation of these allowable golden crab fishing areas. There is expected to be positive economic impacts compared to Alternative 1, whereby the fishery could continue to improve landings and value similar to current levels. Then there is also, under 3, positive economic impacts possibly in excess of Alternative 2, as additional areas provide future yields.

Then we've got Action 3, allowable shrimp fishing areas. Alternative 1, this is the status quo where no allowable shrimp fishing areas will be allowed. Small negative socio-economic

impacts expected to the royal red shrimp fishery. You recall less than 1 percent of VMS points were identified as potential royal red shrimp fishing area.

Alternative 2, possibly small positive socio-economic impacts. It eliminates any negative economic impacts felt under Alternative 1 because of the implementation of the allowable gear areas and then Alternative 3, positive short-term socio-economic impacts if the additional areas are harvested in the future for these vessels. However, this could harm habitat and result in negative long-term socio-economic impacts.

We've got Action 4, implementation of VMS. Alternative 1 is no additional VMS required. Possible negative long-term socioeconomic impacts resulting from lack of enforcement capabilities, decrease in existence and bequest value possible. Alternative 2, which was require that vessels within the golden crab fishery that actually fish in the HAPCs carry VMS units and negative socioeconomic impacts are expected to seven vessels and I'll go into more detail in just a minute. Under Alternative 3, which would require VMS units to be carried by all golden crab permit holders, vessels, negative socioeconomic impacts to eleven vessels are expected. There are three vessels that are not fishing, but that do hold permits.

This is in regards to Alternatives 2 and 3 under Action 4. The first column, you see the alternatives. First, we have Alternative 2. We have impacts for the first year and impacts for additional years and then down below, we've got Alternative 3, impacts for the first year and impacts for additional years.

This is assuming that the units, the cost of the units, are subsidized by the National Marine Fisheries Service to the amount of \$3,100 per VMS unit. This is specifically for the golden crab fishermen. The second column is vessels impacted and annual cost to individual fishermen. Under Alternative 2, we're looking at seven vessels. Those are the seven vessels that have been fishing from 2005 to 2007. We think seven vessels, possibly, would be impacted.

The first number is \$1,200. We're looking at an impact of \$1,200 to individual fishermen on the upper level and \$660 on the lower level. There's different VMS unit costs and so for the most expensive units, it would be \$1,200 and for the least expensive units, it would be \$660. For the seven vessels, it would be \$1,200 in the first year. That would be the cost for the first year, \$1,200, and then \$660 for each additional year. That's the cost. The \$660 refers to the cost of maintenance and to the cost of communication.

This is more expensive than the VMS units that the shrimp vessels are now carrying, because there is this additional requirement by enforcement that any new VMS units have to carry these revised VMS units that include a computer screen and so there are different costs associated with these new VMS units than the VMS units under the older regulations.

Mr. Herring: I would like to just get one that that's cheap. You say this is cheaper than what the shrimp ones are, but I would like to get one that only costs that much. It doesn't exist.

Ms. Quigley: Maybe I'll explain how I got that number and you can tell me what doesn't make sense there. In the document, the actual units are \$3,000 to \$4,000. I'm saying \$3,000 to \$4,000

minus \$3,100 and this is the number left that the individual fishermen would have to pay in the first year for the VMS unit after the government pays --

Mr. Herring: I thought you meant operating expense. I apologize and I misunderstood you.

Ms. Quigley: Actually, the first year the \$1,200 refers to the unit price and then the operating expense is the \$660, which would cover -- What I calculated was communication costs, annual communication costs. That's the \$660. Let me know, so that I can incorporate it into what else is there besides communication costs. For the first year, I calculated implementation costs, around \$300, to get it installed, plus the VMS unit minus the government subsidization. For additional years, it was communication costs. We know there are maintenance costs, but we don't know how much they are.

Mr. Herring: Realistically, the communication costs, when it's pinged back, if I have minimum emails to the boat, which is handful, you're talking \$1,500 to \$1,600 a year. My costs, probably, for the last full year have added up, the two boats that I have -- They have Boatracos on them and it's \$1,500 to \$2,000 each.

Ms. Quigley: Does this include the monthly fee that you would pay to the -- He said yes. He nodded his head yes. Let me take a quick look in the document.

Dr. Travis: Kate, can I step in for a second? Could the industry folks take a look at Table 4-11 on page 4-70? I think it would help Kate out considerably if you could look at the cost numbers that she was given and I believe she based her estimates here on the information in that particular table. If you could take a look at those numbers and tell her where you think those numbers might be wrong or what numbers need to be adjusted, because she got this information directly -- If I recall correctly and, Kate, correct me if I'm wrong, but directly from our law enforcement people and those numbers came from the manufacturer. If there's something wrong in there, let her know, because she's basing her estimates on those numbers.

Ms. Quigley: That's right and thank you, Mike. I received these numbers from Pat O'Shaughnessy at Office of Law Enforcement. In this table, what you'll see is under Qualcomm, at the end of that little paragraph, it says \$80 per month. That's the average price that the industry provided us with and then for Telenor, they've got \$30 per month, average. Those averages, I took all of those averages provided for each of those units and averaged those and multiplied it times twelve and that's where I got \$1,200. Now, I added on \$300 for implementation of the unit, but that's for the first year. That \$660 is basically about \$40 per month, \$45 per month, times twelve.

Ms. Solorzano: Mine average about \$76 a month and that is basically I have the second level package and it took the second level package to compensate, because every time NMFS hits it or Thrane or whoever's satellite system hits it, they're using your characters and so you have nothing left to email with.

Basically, the minimum package doesn't cover as many times as you're hit and so that's why you can't use the minimum package and you tend to have to go up and if you do any emailing,

then, of course, you're going to use a larger package. We use I believe it's the second level package and mine averages on the average of -- If I don't use any emails and it's a standard month and I don't exceed my limit, it's usually around \$76 a month per vessel is what mine runs.

Mr. Herring: Just for these folks over here, if they're going to be involved in it, you better make sure when you fill out -- When it comes to the point of filling out your different paperwork and the blocks that you want to put on it for emailing, you had better make sure you put them on there. If you don't, you're going to get junk email. You're going to have a bill that's \$500 or \$600 a month, if you don't have all the appropriate blocks on there. I'm telling you from experience.

Ms. Quigley: Thank you, Marilyn. Can other people provide me with how much they pay per month, on average, for communication costs?

Ms. Solorzano: That's just for my VMS. That wasn't no installation. That's just the monthly fee from the get-go. I know we're on the VMS subject, but stepping back just a minute to one of your earlier comments on the cost to the royal red fishery and what the impact would be, you stated again that less than 1 percent would be a very negative impacts, small negative impacts, to the fishery, because it was less than 1 percent of VMS tracks.

Even in the information we're showing here, what happened is they kicked out the data over four knots and so there's more than 1 percent. There's more than 1 percent inside that C-HAPC. Now, if they do the allowable trawl area, then yes, that information is correct on the 1 percent, but not from the C-HAPC, which it reads in your study and this study. It is more than 1 percent and so we need to make sure that that is an incorrect number, saying that it would be a minor impact. It is much more than 1 percent in that one mile.

Ms. Quigley: What percentage would you estimate?

Ms. Solorzano: I would say maybe as much as -- Even by the looks of this chart, say 15 percent, by the looks of this. If you look on here, what we have inside the one mile on that south end, it's about 10 or 15 percent. I'm looking at a chart and I don't have any graph to go by other than this, but it's more and it's inside there.

Now, when you give us the one mile in on that south end, you're going to see it and I'm looking at the tracks that come off of the boats that Richard brought with him. When you give that allowable one to one-and-a-half mile area in, yes -- On the north end, it isn't any, but on the south end, that's where the lines go over and they're on this information that he brought to us. That 1 percent is incorrect.

Dr. Travis: Marilyn, instead of using a cut-off point of four knots, what would you advise them using as their cut-off point in that area, to determine which points are trawling? How high up would you go, because it sounded like you were saying maybe five or even six before.

Ms. Solorzano: Maybe 5.5, to be on the safe side, because the current will run that fast. The current will be running that fast and even if you pulled back and put your rigs on the bottom and

just went with it, you would be moving five knots, because the current is. If you were drifting, you would be drifting five knots, going north with it. If you put a little power to it, maybe a little more than that. That's why I'm going to say on the safe side, on the north end, it would be that.

We have track data here that Richard has brought with him that do show some inside the one mile and they kicked them all out when they did under four knots, which was understandable, because the average shrimp fishery does not travel that fast. Two-and-a-half or three knots maximum, that's your regular trawl speed, but not in the royal red bottom, because of the current.

Going south, sometimes you're doing good to get to two knots, but most of the time a lot of the vessels cannot even drag south, because they can't go against the current. Many times you have to pick up and run south and you're running three or four knots, because you can't make any time against it. You tend to ease inshore a little bit and go south.

These guys know what the current does out there, too. I'm not exaggerating on five knots. Sometimes it's more than that, but that would be -- Sometimes you don't have much current, but most of the time you do.

Ms. Quigley: Thank you very much for that information. That's really helpful. A couple of different things we can do is for the EIS, we could possibly ask the Office of Law Enforcement to redo some of those data points and find out how many there are at 5.5 knots. Another possibility is that for the upper range that we can go ahead and use 10 to 15 percent. We can show a lower range and then we can show an upper range as well. That's a possibility.

Ms. Solorzano: That looks more like 10 when I -- You're asking me -- We're on charts here, but it is more than 1 percent, you can look at that and see. That's inside of the C-HAPC. If you give the allowable trawl area, then the 1 percent would be more inline.

Ms. Quigley: Thank you. That's really helpful and with regards to the communication costs, we can go ahead and do the average and then we can go ahead and do \$76 a month or \$75 a month or something like that, to show a range. Now, there was also the estimation of \$1,500 per year and so we could go even higher than that. We could do a whole range and use these meeting notes as a reference. That's not a problem to do. I can recalculate some of those numbers and so thanks, that helps.

Let's look at some of those other numbers then. That's costs to individual fishermen. For Alternative 3, that's everybody in the fishery. Again, it's \$1,200 and \$660 and then we look at the aggregate costs to the fishery. For the first year, I'm basically taking \$1,200 and multiplying it times seven and using the lower range for the least expensive units and then going to the most expensive units. That's where I get that range of \$4,620 to \$12,285. Now, the cost to management for paying for the \$3,100 per VMS unit times seven is \$21,700. That's where those calculations break out.

One thing I want to point to under Alternative 3 is the first year, that range there under aggregate costs to the fishery, in the document I have written \$7,000 to \$13,000. I redid the calculations

and made a correction. It's \$7,000 to \$19,000. If you get the more expensive unit, then it goes up quite a bit.

That's if the VMS units are subsidized. If the VMS units are not subsidized, which we don't think that's going to happen, but we haven't heard from NMFS directly, then you're looking at much higher costs, \$4,305 for the first year. That's the entire cost of the VMS unit. Again, the additional years of communication costs, I have the same, but I'll go ahead and make the corrections, so we've got a range for that as well.

Then aggregate costs to the fishery obviously would be much higher and costs to management would be nothing. They would not be subsidizing those VMS units. That's what I've calculated out as costs. Please definitely take a look at some of these tables that we've got, again, for the communication costs, summarization of the other costs, and let me know if something doesn't look right. That's what I have. That's basically it at this point in time. Thank you for your comments. Those are really helpful and I will go ahead and expand the economic impacts in whatever way that I can.

Mr. Rau: Kate, where did you get the landings? Did they come from the state or --

Ms. Quigley: The landings I received from Mike Judge at the Science Center. Those were the logbook landings by area, annually, for individual vessels. Do those look accurate to you?

Mr. Rau: They looked a little low to me. The price was an average, I think. Is that correct?

Ms. Quigley: Yes, that's correct. The price was an average, \$1.40.

Mr. Pugliese: Are there any other comments for Kate or any other issues on the economic analysis?

Ms. Quigley: If the landings numbers look a little bit low, what seems right to you?

Mr. Rau: What numbers would seem right?

Ms. Quigley: Yes. I've done 510,000, which was an average of 2005 to 2007.

Mr. Rau: I don't know. I'm not sure about what -- I just know what I catch and I think I know what the other guys catch or caught, but I don't want to give you a number here.

Ms. Quigley: I've got monthly golden crab landings, Figure 3-18, and that's ALS data. I'm just looking for ALS data versus logbook. 2005, 2006, and 2007 landings data is shown in Figure 3-16, the numbers that I used. They averaged 510,000 pounds. For 2006, 599,000 pounds and in 2007, 502,000 pounds. 2005 was a little bit lower. 2006 was definitely higher than the 510,000 pounds. It seems low to you? All right. Any other questions? Thank you for your input.

Mr. Pugliese: With that, I guess what we'll do is move into the discussion with the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel.

Mr. Wilson: We'll begin discussion with the Deepwater Shrimp AP on the Fishery Ecosystem Plan and Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1. Before we get to the particulars, I did have an issue I would like to bring up. It refers to the general, overall perspective. I understand, with respect to the council, that they have a difficult job to manage these fisheries, but I was wondering if there is a process -- I see a general ideological thing happening here.

Before the ocean was open and we were protecting -- Taking certain areas to protect and what I see happening now is we're closing the ocean and we're going to divvy out certain areas to the industries and I see this as -- Maybe I'm sounding like the bad guy, anti-conservation, which I'm not. I am for conservation, but I'm not necessarily for preservation.

Is there a process where the Secretary of Commerce can clarify the general direction or does it have to go to Congress or what's legal here in this general making this FEP? How far can the council go in taking areas, because this is a continuous process. This is the reason we're having trouble getting industry to participate now, because they feel like they're being asked to participate in their own death.

Mr. Pugliese: Let me try to tackle that, at least on a first level. What you see are really just tools that the council has to manage with. Area management has been something the council has dealt with for a long time and the movement toward possibly allowable gear areas or fishing areas I think is something that the intention of that is to nip at the bud this issue that people are feeling that fisheries are operating virtually everywhere.

From your standpoint, I think one thing that has been highlighted before is the fact that understanding the true operation nature of the fishery and identifying where the fishery operates and potentially even identifying an area within it could operate and turn it around as then you can ensure the long-term conservation of that fishery, by showing that that area is significant and not only from potential fishing impacts, but from non-fishing impacts, the possibility of other activities influencing it, pipeline establishment and wind farm development.

All types of things are on the table right now and a lot of the areas in the Southeast, in our region, are being looked at for even things beyond fishing activities. The opportunity to look at potentially areal management as a tool to be able to ensure that fisheries operate in the future I think is one of the aspects that has been at least looked at and in the case with golden crab right now, very specifically, an opportunity to try to secure the traditional fishing areas and emphasize it for a lot longer term than people would envision.

I think that idea of a conceptual move toward looking at the use of area isn't necessarily on a preservation side. The issue we have at hand has to do with a very unique situation with the deepwater coral systems. The movement with working with the golden crab and the other fisheries in the future really is to try to highlight and balance all of these different things to protect the fishery operations and protect habitats at the same time and make it clear in the eyes of other competing fishing groups or efforts that the fishery has a place in the area.

I think that is what you really are seeing, is the opportunity to validate the operation. Otherwise, you get continual legislation like a total trawl prohibition or a total -- Just blanket activities,

because it's fishing everywhere. I think when we had discussions before about allowable rock shrimp areas, it wasn't to limit it. It was to ensure that the fishery operation is captured and understood.

They're not looking at a lot of other activities going on right in the middle of where your fishing efforts are going on. It's not like a charge forward to just preserve habitat or just preserve activities, but it's to try to effectively manage competing interests in the ocean and be able to ensure that fisheries are preserved for the long term. That's at least my conceptual view of how we are looking at the move toward areal management in a different way and not just habitat and conservation.

Mr. Wilson: I understand your concept of it and that's the concept we had when we started working as an AP committee, but it's a continuing thing. I think there's a catch-22, because as we have to preserve more area, then the coral expands and we have to have more area. What's happening, in our eyes, is that it's just -- Instead of just whacking us off, we're just being led along until eventually we're going to need all that area.

We gave a buffer zone for enforcement and now they're talking -- The one slide was showing the boundary six miles to the west and now we're taking 28,000 square miles of the ocean and there's no end, as explained to me by Mr. Waugh in the previous meeting, that yes, even though we come up with decisions today, there's no guarantee that the next time they won't want more. They can't guarantee it.

Of course, if the coral expands -- The Coral Committee has to say something, because they're the Coral Committee, that they want more and they need more and they've found coral in more places and they need that area. When we originally went with the HAPC, we were led to believe that we were conserving 95 percent of the coral, but I would like to know, are there boundaries and what's considered proper protection, what limits there are. This apparently is going to be an unending process, until finally there won't be any place. That's my --

Ms. Brouwer: Just to note that the coral is really not going to expand. Deepwater corals grow very, very slowly and that's one of the reasons that the council is interested in preserving these areas, because they've been around for millennia and one pass of a trawl can obliterate, as you know, a coral colony.

The fact that we have brought industry into these discussions and tried to work out what the footprint of the fishery is is to make sure that these protected areas or HAPCs, whatever you want to call them, are not going to be in the way of where the fishery has traditionally operated. Even if they find more coral further east, on the Blake Plateau, it's not really going to be getting in the way of fishing operations, at least not for your fishery anyway.

Mr. Wilson: It still doesn't go back to the issue of what's the legality of closing the ocean and divvying out areas, as opposed to closing areas in an open ocean.

Ms. Brouwer: There's language in the new Magnuson Act that actually allows the councils to designate areas of deepwater corals in the ocean for protection, through the new Magnuson.

There is an actual -- I don't want to say mandate, but there is guidance in the current version of Magnuson that deepwater corals need to be addressed and managed and protected.

Ms. Solorzano: Basically, what it gets down to is you're also protecting us, by giving us allowable trawl areas, to say this is yours and no one can come in and do whatever, from coral to windmills or whatever it may be. We are grasping that idea of it and that's okay, but what we want to know is what stops you from coming in and taking those allowable trawl areas back and what process is that?

Say the whole ocean is closed, even though the whole ocean isn't now, but the HAPC, but inevitably the whole thing would be closed and we have these allowable trawl areas and what process and what time limit -- You guys come in and say we think there's coral here or there's whatever other habitat of particular concern comes up at the moment is in this area and so we're going to take that away and that's where our concern is and in the future, with more technology and things, who is to say that we can't find smaller areas that we don't know about now that we may be able to go in and work and work out and make money with, but we won't be able to go to those areas and so it's kind of prohibiting us from also -- In essence, it's a protective way from keeping other industries or different things to come in, but it's also prohibiting us from going out and we want to know, what is the process of coming back and taking one of a hundred allowable trawl areas or all? What's the guidelines on that and are we ensured that you won't come in and take the allowable trawl areas? That would be my question.

Mr. Pugliese: I guess I have to say you're not sure, but it's the council's role to balance social, economic, and biological information in building regulatory structure and regulatory measures to manage the fisheries, manage habitats, and deal with the issues in the South Atlantic region.

Any change is going to have to go through an entire process of scoping and all the way down through the entire EIS development process or EA development process. It would have to be something fairly significant to move down through to justify a significant change in time and with specifically the activities we're talking about, say the trawl areas themselves, the consideration that there may be impacts in there, I have a hard time believing that there would be a consideration in the future, in the near term, of modifying those.

The whole point of that is you're trying to address the potential impacts to industry, but also balance that very significant need to move forward with conservation of this very unique system in the southeast, the deep coral system. The information that's built this process to do it is pretty significant, but the whole point I was making is the effort to try to go back through and change those -- All these area management are usually a pretty significant process to get to the point we're at.

To go through and do something to pull it away -- We've never actually removed any areas that we've created like that before and if it's an intent to address traditional fishing, that makes it even that much more, I think, difficult in the future to do that.

I won't guarantee you, because based on science and based on information, the council has to react and respond to changing activities, but in this case, I think it would probably be very

difficult, because of the nature of what we're dealing with.

Mr. Williams: Roger and Myra, I appreciate you all's thoughts on all this, but I think this panel should be very aware that what we're doing now, protecting these corals, the fishermen are certainly for protecting corals, but they should also be very aware that this is not the end and this is just the beginning.

We all know that most of these issues are environmentally driven, through certain environmental groups, and they are looking at allowable trawl areas in the entire South Atlantic EEZ and this panel should at least keep that in mind when taking the next steps and deciding what to do on this particular issue, because that is coming. We all know it's coming and we have to do whatever we think is necessary to make sure that doesn't happen, because we don't know who is going to define the allowable trawl areas in this EEZ.

Yes, they will try to take them back. Their sole purpose is to eliminate trawling in the entire world, especially the United States. This may not be relevant to what we're trying to do here today, but I think this panel should be very aware that that's what is happening.

Ms. Solorzano: He kind of led to my next question. In the proposed near future, say in the next year or two, does the council have intentions to expand and close further inshore of the HAPC that you have right now? In other words, is it coming into the rock shrimp bottom and is it moving further inshore? Someone made the comment, and I don't remember who, that 95 percent of the coral was from this point out and the Oculina Bank. What would drive you to go further inshore and is there a plan to do so that you are aware of?

Mr. Pugliese: There's not a plan to just automatically move forward and start looking at conservation inside of the area. We're just coming off of Snapper Grouper Amendment 14, the marine protected areas. They're essentially being finalized and approved and that is the shelf-edge habitats that are being protected for specifically a regulatory measure for snapper grouper populations.

The deep coral activities and the deep coral areas, other than future research needs and moving forward on that, there is not a plan to automatically move forward with an inshore, because the science is saying it's 400 meters and so definitely on the deep coral side, that's not going to be in the works.

The discussions we had earlier with this group was the looking at allowable trawl areas, but it was originally looking at allowable trawl areas with regard to protecting the fishery and at the same time, ensuring that it wasn't impacting the deep coral areas. If the industry isn't looking very specifically at the need for that right now -- That's not necessarily slated on immediate development.

That was being developed in combination with this, but it was really to address what the potential impacts of the industry were and it focused, focused, focused, focused down to royal red fishing operations and not rock shrimping at all.

As I said before, there is an opportunity to clarify what the fishing operation is of the rock shrimp fishery and to be proactive in doing something, if the industry would want something like that, because you're going to have other opportunities to potentially legislatively move down some of those roads and they've happened in the past and I think sometimes it gets misinterpreted that the council is moving in that direction and it's not. It's to address how to balance those versus how to just blanket do something.

Right now, no. Other than that original discussion and we've kind of zeroed it all the way down to what you're seeing now, is addressing this action. The inshore -- I'm not sure in the future when we're going to look at protected areas beyond what we've done now. That's going to be a longer term process, because it's getting into very significant different types of things.

However, I will say one of the things that's going to be the biggest problem as we move inside is all those inshore habitats are the ones that are under the gun for everything else other than fishing and we're going to have real significant problems in the Southeast if we don't get ahead and that's where I think fishermen saying that these are significant fishing areas need to step to the table as soon as possible, to ensure the penaeid fisheries and the mackerel fishery and all these fisheries get very clear about they operate.

As you see alternative energy development and marine aquaculture development and the movement offshore of waste disposal and all these types of activities, they're going to have pretty significant impacts on a lot of these industries.

Mr. Herring: Roger, there is development now to define what would be allowable trawl areas for the rock shrimp fishery as well, isn't there?

Mr. Pugliese: No. We started that discussion when we first started this process and as it evolved -- We had said we wanted to do that because we were trying to couple it with what potential impacts would be on this specific action, deepwater coral conservation. It focused very specifically on the royal red fishery and immediately separated those two industries. The rock shrimp fishery is not impacting the deep coral activities.

That was where we had discussed the opportunity to develop this. We have set the foundation and the opportunity to have those considerations, but mainly it's to do what I'm saying, is to try to look at if you can secure what the fishing operation of that fishery is now. It would be to the benefit of the industry to come up to the table and say this is our fishing operation areas and to be able to validate.

The reason we did it with the rock shrimp is because we had VMS information. Right now, we don't have that in the queue for consideration. We had said that before, but it was really tied to this action.

Mr. Williams: In the beginning, Roger, wasn't the allowable trawl areas included in this FEP and the only reason that it wasn't continued with it was because of the fear it may slow down this coral habitat?

Mr. Pugliese: In the initial discussions, yes, but, again, it was also balanced with the fact that it was not going to impact the actions that were considered. Once it was clarified what the operations were -- What that was doing is it was going to ensure that that fishery would be -- It was a unique situation. We had the information and you could document that allowable gear area and do that and at the same time, ensure that it's not impacting the thing. Originally, yes, it was on there, but right now, it's not necessarily on the table for immediate consideration.

Ms. Thompson: I have a procedural question and this goes back to the very significant information that Marilyn presented a while ago in her analysis of the boats actually trawling at speeds greater than four knots. Kate implied that the VMS study could be brought back and tweaked, so that they could add speeds up to five-and-a-half knots.

There's a very specific timeline that this process is on, with the second public hearings being heard in October and the final approval by the council in December and implementation at the beginning of next year. How are you going to resurrect the VMS study and bring to this body and council the results of looking at that study again and still stay on that schedule and incorporate Marilyn's observations? I think it could make a significant difference in the royal red allowable trawl area.

Ms. Quigley: I can look into seeing whether that's a possibility. If it is not a possibility, then one thing I could do is take your estimate, 10 to 15 percent of royal red shrimp landings, and say okay, that would be the impact and multiply that by some average price and say that would be the dollar impact. If we're not able to, under the short time constraint that we have, if we're not able to get some new number from Office of Law Enforcement, from the VMS office, then I can go ahead and just say this amount of revenue, 10 to 15 percent of revenue, is the Shrimp AP's estimation of how it would impact them.

Ms. Thompson: Then this handout that Mr. Williams gave us, the blue lines, these are the actual lines of the trawls? Is that correct? By moving the allowable trawl area boundary further east, that's incorporating all of these trawl tracks?

Mr. Williams: Yes, that's true.

Ms. Thompson: Will that change anything as far as the schedule? Will all of that moving of the boundaries and everything -- That will include all of, at least since 1996, the trawl tracks? They will all be included within the allowable trawl area?

Mr. Pugliese: If you use the information that was provided by Richard, yes. This is -- If you look at it, the only place you really see even a significant area that is in the allowable trawl areas is in the southern zone, in Section 4. If you look to the north, there is almost no occurrence to the north of Area 4 and that was acknowledged in this and that was the outlier in the VMS information, that didn't really as much identify how significant that southern portion is.

I think what Marilyn had said before is that if you include this, you basically capture the significant portion of the royal red fishery. Yes, the long answer to your short question is from this information and then from the rest of the VMS information, that would capture virtually all

not only the VMS points, but when you're looking at full vessel tracks. Again, other than the southern area, south of that one habitat, it captures virtually everything and then goes a mile in some cases and then a mile-and-a-half even further beyond what the existing tracks show.

Ms. Thompson: At the last meeting, I came in at the tail-end and there was some discussion about disabled vessels drifting into the Coral HAPC and at that point in time, that was when you were talking about moving the boundary of the Coral HAPC six miles further east and I understand that's not going to happen, but what provisions are being considered for a disabled royal red vessel that may drift into the restricted area? Is there a way to accommodate them without having their licenses or their catches taken away?

Mr. Pugliese: Again, I think one of the things is the call-in provisions and hopefully two-way communications that can immediately identify that. The group is small enough -- Just like the golden crab fishery, the group is small enough and they need to do a better job in terms of the VMS monitoring and characterization of these operations, because anything like that should automatically be able to be logged into the system and be able to be part of the official record.

Mr. Herring: Roger, you bring your NMFS GC in here and she'll tell us that and we'll believe you. Until then, with all due respect, I don't put one grain of salt in what you just said.

Mr. Wilson: At this point, we could have a lot of discussions here, but we have specific business that we have to deal with at this --

Mr. Pugliese: Are there any other specific recommendations? What we have before you are the proposals that --

Mr. Wilson: Can we see the recommendations up on the screen?

Mr. Pugliese: Which recommendations?

Mr. Wilson: That we're supposed to be dealing with.

Mr. Pugliese: The recommendations are the management actions that I went through that are being proposed for the establishment of the HAPCs and creation of the shrimp fishery access areas, which we just discussed what the potential impact is relative to the information, both in the document, but also in here, the considerations. Are there any other specific recommendations?

I think one of the biggest recommendations that comes immediately is to ensure that any vessel that has issues relative to safety or breakdown, they can absolutely make sure that that's not going to get a violation by ensuring the VMS can do a two-way communication, something that can guarantee that that's -- Force GC or Law Enforcement or all of them to ensure that that can be part of this system.

That's one key part, but back to it, it's really the comprehensive amendment we have here and any other issues on characterization of the fishery and discussions in the documents. I would encourage if there are things that are not captured right about the way the fisheries operate or

information beyond -- Most of it's been provided by members of the APs and so we've got most of the updated information or on the record from them.

It's really we're at that stage to look at this. This is your opportunity to have input before we go to the next round of public hearings. The council committee will be deliberating tomorrow and reaffirming. They've selected right now that an alternative with providing those bounds that capture all the areas as the preferred shrimp fishery access areas.

Mr. Wilson: We could make a motion to strike -- Do we have to accept Alternative 2 as is or we could make a motion to strike some of it?

Mr. Pugliese: You can make any motion that -- You don't have to make a motion, but you can make them recommendations, however you want to deal with it, and those are your recommendations to the council and the council will balance those in their considerations. The record is clear about some of your concerns about various activities and now is the time to make the recommendations to the council on what your thoughts are.

Mr. Wilson: Do we have on the Deepwater Shrimp AP Committee any recommendations, a motion to make or recommendations, about extending the coral habitat?

Ms. Solorzano: We would like the recommendation to move the line to allow us to trawl at least one mile in, the mile-and-a-half in. We recommend that the HAPC line be moved over to -- I believe that may already be one of our options, but I think it said six miles. That's our recommendation. Is that okay with you guys? That's a recommendation.

Mr. Pugliese: Would it be essentially -- I think that's what you were trying to tell me before. Essentially, you're looking at what stand as the shrimp fishing allowable areas right now and potentially look at the eastern boundary as the HAPC boundary instead of the eastern boundary of the shrimp area and that's what you're looking at recommending right now?

Mr. Wilson: Are there any seconds to that motion?

Ms. Brouwer: If you'll give me just a minute to get the screen up, so I can type it and you all can make sure that the wording is correct.

Mr. Wilson: The recommendation was to move the Coral HAPC line to the west a mile-and-a-half. Wait a minute. I didn't say it right. Marilyn, you say it.

Ms. Solorzano: The recommendation would be to move the boundary line to the east. We would like six, but it's not going to happen. We would ask you for ten, but we know that's not going to happen. It's basically the same thing as the allowable trawl area. It would be allowing us to drag, to have our bottom, and to be sure that in this recommendation the -- If the vessel gets into any sort of distress that there is something drawn up if the vessel is in distress and drifts into the area that we work in some -- I don't really know how we would word that.

If the vessel is in distress, law enforcement would be willing to work with us, if we can contact

them in a two-way situation, however we would word that. I don't know how to word that part, but right now, we want to move the boundary and the second recommendation is going to be to ask law enforcement to allow us maybe a buffer or something, in the event of an emergency situation with the vessel.

Mr. Pugliese: A point of clarification on that. Are you saying one-and-a-half miles for the entire area or are you mirroring what is being put together that was trying to capture the fishing operations?

Ms. Solorzano: You know I would recommend six miles, but I know they're not going to give it to me. As long as we can have our allowable trawl area. It's the same thing as the allowable trawl area, one mile to the north and one-and-a-half to the south, just moving the line. It's the same thing, just a recommendation of moving the line over versus leaving it where it is, leaving that other alternative there as an option also. It's not like we're taking that away, but adding this as a recommendation, but that's really what, as an AP group, I think that we would like to see it moved. I know you're telling us it's not going to happen, but it's our recommendation.

Mr. Pugliese: Another quick point of clarification, just for the record. The most significant area that is of concern is the Area 4, where you are one -- That's constituting the bulk of the area that's encompassed in there right now. That would be the most important area out of all these ones to look at.

Ms. Brouwer: What I have up on the screen, I'm going to read it to you and then you guys can advise on how you want to edit it. Recommendation Number 1 is to move the C-HAPC boundary to the east by 1.5 miles, in place of establishing a shrimp fishery access area. Did I capture that correctly?

Mr. Wilson: It actually should have read just -- It's not a mile-and-a-half in all areas. It should just mirror what would be the allowable trawl area. We want that to mirror, to move the line that same amount, which would be different amounts between the northern end and the southern end.

Ms. Solorzano: Instead of an allowable trawl area, you just move the boundary. It's the same as the other recommendation, but instead of it being classified allowable trawl area, it's just a movement of the boundary.

Mr. Herring: Roger, since in both the conversations with the golden crab and with us, you seemed to voice a certain amount of -- You were pretty sure, I think were the words that you used, that something could be addressed as far as with them, because of the mechanisms that they're fishing, the way it is, they're going to be different where they're sitting -- Their VMS is going to be different than where their pots are going to be set and with us, we're concerned about a breakdown of a vessel.

You said you were pretty sure that could be worked out on both issues. Can you give us an idea of how that can be worked out? You addressed back to us and said I'm sure that there can be something from the council and that can be addressed and something can be done and what are some particulars with that?

Mr. Pugliese: The VMS -- Once it gets the information, the analysis of that information by the software, you've got to be able to characterize individual vessels and I know they can do that now and they can characterize exactly what that vessel is doing, whether it's moving, towing. They used to be able to do that fifteen years ago and in order to take it to another step, they've got to use and understand how to characterize the individual vessels further. I think that's what it comes down to, is to be able to have on-the-water validation of what a vessel is doing and then what the VMS is showing and the opportunity to do that will give you then the capability of characterizing the different levels.

In the golden crab, what it is relative to setting, haul-back. It's going to have a fixed number of points that you can understand what's going on and with theirs, it's going to be more sophisticated, because it's going to have two-way communications. There could be an opportunity to log in when they initially are deploying and a number of things.

Some of that I think just has to be worked out with the people working on interpreting the VMS information. I'm not doing it, but I know that they're not using that as far as they can go and should be able to do it very specifically tailored to especially a small industry. It's not as if they're overwhelmed by that many vessels.

Mr. Herring: I agree with what you're saying completely, but unfortunately, they have laws that they go by that's in black and white and says this is the definition of fishing and this is the definition of what the law says if you are fishing and that can be nets in a well and drifting or whatever. You still have nets in the water or you have gear that is out.

Unfortunately, in meeting with General Counsel and with Dr. Crabtree and in particular myself, going over that with them face to face, those laws are in place and the definitions of them are in place and what General Counsel has told me is that as long as those definitions are in place, that's the way it's going to be, period.

It's ambiguous in what you're saying, is gee, we can work something out, whereas I've been to St. Pete and sat face to face with General Counsel, who said no, we can't. This is the law and this is the definition of a law and we're going to hold to the definition of the law, to the letter of the law, and you're guilty and that's just the way it is.

Mr. Pugliese: I don't want to belabor it, because you're right in the frontend with this, specifically with trawl activity. The idea is that hopefully there's going to be an opportunity to be able to tailor this system to operate very specifically to the vessels working in this fishery, because of how the size is and the commitment of the council to ensure that this tool is a useful tool. You've got to go forward with intent and hopefully that's going to be able to be seen out.

One of the options we had originally talked about and industry had talked about is acoustic monitoring of the vessels, to ensure where they are, and one of the problems we had with that is the arrays in the Southeast are not big enough yet to really be able to pick up all vessel operations. Ultimately, they will be. I think you're going to see that and if not, you're going to see HF radar be able to do that, because they can see anything with that stuff.

Technology, I think, is going to evolve in the future to be able to do some of these things, but hopefully, if it's clear that there's intent to use this for this fishery for golden crab especially, there's an operation. In terms of fixed operations for the way they're interpreting the law and trawling and the VMS operations right now -- That's something that you've been working directly with NOAA GC and the Regional Office and hopefully you can resolve that. If not, I can't get in the middle of that.

Mr. Wilson: We would like to make one more recommendation.

Mr. Pugliese: You've got the first recommendation is -- Let's take them one at a time. The first recommendation was to move the western boundary of the C-HAPC.

Ms. Brouwer: I'm going to read the first recommendation of the Deepwater Shrimp AP and that is to move the western boundary of the C-HAPC to the east instead of establishing a shrimp fishery access area.

Mr. Wilson: Is there any opposition to this recommendation? Hearing none, this recommendation is passed.

Ms. Brouwer: I also have up on the screen Recommendation Number 2 and this is my proposed wording and please give me some guidance as to how it needs to be changed. Ensure that there is a mechanism whereby a vessel in distress will not be in violation when drifting into the C-HAPC.

Mr. Wilson: Any opposition to this recommendation or any change? Hearing none, this recommendation is approved. **We would like to recommend that the council accept Alternative Number 1 as to amending the coral, coral reef, and live hard bottom habitat.**

Mr. Pugliese: Alternative 1, Action 1, no action.

Ms. Thompson: I would like to ask Mr. Wilson why he picked that alternative.

Mr. Wilson: There's only two alternatives there.

Mr. Pugliese: You can actually pick sub-alternatives.

Ms. Thompson: What page are you on?

Mr. Wilson: The first page.

Ms. Thompson: On a different page, I don't know which page, but it very clearly says that if council chooses Alternative 1 that it would have a negative impact on the royal red fishery -- Wait a minute. It says do not establish additional HAPCs. I don't think they're going to go along with that.

Mr. Wilson: I don't think they'll go along with it either, but we have to have some way of

addressing the problem with the discussion we started out with.

Ms. Brouwer: What you can do is just put this recommendation forward and then take a vote and we can see how many AP members are for and how many are against.

Mr. Wilson: I made the motion to recommend to the council to adopt Alternative 1. Is there a second to that motion?

Ms. Solorzano: I second. I thought we had other alternatives in play than just these two. We had the one with the shrimp and remember moving the allowable trawl area and all that, but I don't see any of those.

Mr. Pugliese: They're all included in the considered but not held for detailed analysis, because the council selected this for public hearing. They're in the document as considered but not for additional detailed analysis, because the science was saying that the distribution of deep coral habitat encompassed all these proposals.

This has been an evolving process over three different iterations from the Habitat and Coral Advisory Panel that has added more science and more information and more science to the last recommendation of the council. That was what the recommendation was based on, the science and on the distribution of known coral and the intent of looking at a reasonable option to preserve that.

Ms. Thompson: I think that there's like two or three different places where we can make recommendations and he's on a recommendation about the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, I think, and then -- All of the other stuff that specifically applies to our fishery -- I think he's under Action 1. Is that what it is? Yes, Action 1. Are we going to make specific recommendations for each action then?

Ms. Brouwer: You can if you would like to.

Ms. Thompson: You do only have two choices under Action 1 and then there's Action 2 and that's the one where they create the allowable golden crab fishing areas and then Action 3 is -- That's where they create a shrimp fishery access area. Mr. Wilson, are you on Action 1 or the Action 3, which specifically speaks to a shrimp fishery access area?

Mr. Wilson: I'm on Action 1. Our first recommendation deals with the shrimp fishery area.

Ms. Thompson: There is no mention of the specific shrimp fishery in Action 1. That deals with the whole Fishery Ecosystem Plan and the Ecosystem Amendment 1 and you don't really get down to where it specifically talks about shrimp fishery access areas until you get to Action 3.

Mr. Pugliese: I think what Steve is saying is basically take no action, don't put in Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern at all, period. That's what his recommendation to the council is.

Mr. Wilson: Is there any other further discussion on the motion? **I would like to remove my**

motion. I would like to withdraw my motion.

Ms. Solorzano: I agree.

Mr. Wilson: **Is there any objection to withdrawing the motion? Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.**

Ms. Brouwer: Would the AP like to continue making recommendations at this point?

Mr. Wilson: No, we would like to move on to the next item in the agenda.

Ms. Brouwer: The next item on the agenda is Discussion of Shrimp Amendment 7. What I'll do is provide you with a very quick overview. There was a new action that was added to the amendment in June and so I'll walk you through it very quickly and then answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Wilson: You said there was one and I think there's two new things that have been added to it.

Ms. Brouwer: There was actually only one action that has a couple of alternatives that were added and I also wanted to -- For those of you who don't know him, Dr. Mike Travis is here from the Regional Office and he is a shrimp expert extraordinaire and so he can answer any questions you may have and so we're glad to have him here.

I'm quickly going to go over Shrimp Amendment 7. As you know, this pertains mostly to the rock shrimp fishery, although Action 6 pertains to all the shrimp fisheries. Items that are being addressed came from the need to maintain effort and infrastructure for this fishery to continue to happen. There was concern that the make-up of the fishery could change under the current requirements.

As you know, there's going to be a potential loss of endorsements due to not meeting the current landing requirement and also due to confusion regarding the renewal timeline for those endorsements. Item Number 3 is what was added at the June meeting and that stemmed from the need to verify VMS use, in order to ease the enforcement burden, and then Item Number 4 is to address the lack of economic data for shrimp fisheries in this region. These are listed in the summary that is at the front of the draft document. If you would like to follow along, those are all bulleted in the front of the document.

As I said, Amendment 7 includes six actions. Actions 1 through 5 are specific to the rock shrimp fishery and Action 6 applies to both. Action 1 deals with the landing requirement and there's three alternatives. There's no action, the preferred alternative, which is to remove it altogether, and Alternative 3, which would only reduce it to 7,500 pounds.

Impacts, no action would result in a 34 percent reduction in participation in the fishery this year alone and potentially a 56 percent reduction in the future. There's obviously negative economic effects due to loss of revenue. Under the preferred alternative, this obviously has the most

beneficial socioeconomic effect, due to allowing the greatest number of participants to remain in the fishery.

This is something that I would encourage you to give us feedback on. What I have been hearing from some of you is that there doesn't need to -- There doesn't seem to be enough effort out there even if these actions are taken by the council. Just keep that in mind as we go through this, so you can give us your input after the presentation. Alternative 3 would result in a 32 percent reduction in fishery participation this year and possibly 54 percent in the future. That's not very different from the no action alternative at all.

Action 2 deals with the endorsements that were lost due to not meeting the landing requirement. There's three alternatives again. The no action alternative and the preferred alternative is to reinstate all those endorsements that were lost and Alternative 3 is to reinstate endorsements for vessels that landed at least 7,500 pounds of rock shrimp.

The no action alternative would reduce the fleet size from 125 to eighty-two vessels. Forty-three vessels would permanently lose their ability to participate in the fishery and the market value of their endorsements. Under the preferred alternative, the maximum fleet size would be retained, as well as the productive capacity associated with that, and there would be five additional vessels that would be added to the fishery, depending on choices under Action 3.

Under Alternative 3, it would only allow three vessels or four, depending, again, on the alternative chosen under Action 3 and so the maximum fleet would be reduced to eighty-five or eighty-six vessels, down from 125.

Action 3 deals with endorsements lost due to failure to renew. In Shrimp Amendment 5, the council wanted to have a limited access rock shrimp permit. The final rule, when it came out, actually implemented a limited access endorsement. This has created a good bit of confusion. The federal rock shrimp permit can be renewed at any time, but the endorsement is renewable only for one year after it becomes inactive. After that, it gets lost to the fishery.

Right now, a number of endorsements are currently non-renewable, yet they are linked to vessels that have met the landing requirement. If things don't change, those vessels would lose their endorsements.

Action 3 has three alternatives, the no action and the preferred alternative is to reinstate all the endorsements that were lost, but for those who renewed their permit in the year in which they failed to renew their endorsement. The reason the council wanted to word it that way was to make sure that folks who were serious about participating in the fishery would be the ones that would get to remain.

In addition, the alternatives reads to require vessel owners eligible to have their vessel endorsements reinstated to apply for an endorsement within one year after the effective date of this amendment. Then the council went on to even add a note to that, saying that eligible individuals need to have had an endorsement at one time. Again, it's making sure that only serious participants are going to benefit from this. Alternative 3 simply would extend the time

allowed to renew that rock shrimp endorsement.

The impacts, under no action, five vessels would permanently lose their endorsements and their associated market value. From what I understand, these are vessels that are very productive and not necessarily in the rock shrimp fishery -- This is where I might need Dr. Travis's help, but these are vessels that are productive and so it would be a hefty economic impact.

Preferred Alternative 2 would reinstate the endorsements to those five vessels, resulting in positive benefits, and Alternative 3 would simply give those five vessels some extra time to renew their endorsements.

Action 4 deals with renaming the permit and the endorsement to minimize confusion. No action would continue to use the current names, which is an open access permit and a limited access endorsement. You need both of them to fish in areas off of Georgia and Florida and you only need the open access permit in order to fish off of the Carolinas.

What the council prefers would be to rename the limited access endorsement and the open access permit with Rock Shrimp Permit South Atlantic EEZ would allow a vessel to fish throughout the South Atlantic EEZ, and Rock Shrimp Permit Carolina Zone, which would allow a vessel to fish off of North and South Carolina. Each vessel would only have one of these. You would no longer need the combination permit endorsement and this will be a lot cleaner to keep track of. No action, there would continue to be some confusion related to this and the preferred alternative, evidently, would simplify the whole application process.

Action 5, this is the new one that was added in June and it's verification of vessel monitoring system. Alternative 1 is no action and Alternative 2, which is the council's preferred, I believe, is that an application for renewal, reinstatement, or transfer of a rock shrimp limited access endorsement would not be considered complete until proof of activation and operational status of an approved VMS has been verified. This is to ensure that vessels that have a limited access endorsement do indeed have a vessel monitoring system on their vessels.

Effects under Action 5, no action would not address this need and the preferred alternative will impact twenty-one vessels, nineteen of which did not -- Mike, can you help me out with this one?

Dr. Travis: I need to interject here. The council has not picked a preferred alternative under this action. That is not correct.

Ms. Brouwer: That's what I thought. Sorry, that's my mistake.

Dr. Travis: Now do you want me to address the other issue?

Ms. Brouwer: Yes, can you explain the twenty-one vessels?

Dr. Travis: I need to help her out, because this is my doing. It's a little bit confusing in the write-up. Because the council has not picked a preferred alternative yet, the last components of

the analysis have not been completed, because we don't do that until after they pick a preferred. Anyway, the twenty-one vessels is actually a combination of nineteen vessels that have endorsements that do not currently have -- Not only do they not currently have VMS, but they're not currently required to have VMS under the current regulations.

Now, there are two others that, based on the data that I have -- These vessels do not have VMS, but as far as I can ascertain, based on the data I have, it looks like they are in violation of the regulations and they should have VMS onboard.

The thing to keep in mind here that Myra told me may be a source of confusion for these two boats -- I don't know, but the regulations say that if you have the limited access endorsement and you are on a trip in the South Atlantic -- It doesn't have to be in the rock shrimp fishery, but if you're operating in South Atlantic waters, you have to have a VMS onboard and it has to be functioning. It doesn't matter whether you're going after penaeids or you're going after mackerel or whatever it is. If you've got an endorsement and you're operating in South Atlantic waters, you had better have that VMS on.

It appears to me as though we've got two folks that -- I don't know if they were confused by the regulations, but it looks like they're in violation. The twenty-one is actually a composite of nineteen new vessels that don't have to have VMS currently under the regulations and two that should have it already.

Ms. Brouwer: Thank you for clarifying that, Mike. The owners of these vessels would have to purchase, install, and activate a VMS or they could choose not to comply and therefore, are going to lose their endorsement for their vessels. Those would be the impacts under this alternative.

Alternative 6 is to require shrimp permit holders to provide economic data. There are three alternatives. Again, it's no action, to require all South Atlantic shrimp permit holders to provide this information, and Alternative 3, which is the preferred, is to require a subset of those permit holders to provide economic data.

The impacts are -- Of course, if we don't have the right information, the council can't manage as effectively as they could if they had this information. Alternative 2 would cause a paperwork burden, just filling out the survey and all that, for approximately 400 vessels and Alternative 3 would impact only a subset of those 400 vessels and one thing that we included in the draft document is an example of the economic survey that is conducted in the Gulf and so that is in the back of the document if you are -- I got a lot of questions during public hearings as far as what kind of information would be collected and how long is it going to take for me to fill this out and all that sort of stuff. You can look through that survey to get an idea of what it would entail and that's it. Do you have any questions?

Ms. Thompson: Would the subset of vessels that are going to be questioned, would that be the same owners every year or would that rotate?

Ms. Brouwer: From what I understand -- I'll just take a quick stab at it and then I'll let Mike

explain. It would be a subsample. They would probably be picked at random to get a statistical significance, so that then the results could be validated for statistical purposes.

Dr. Travis: It definitely will be a random sample. We're still trying to figure out sort of -- We want to stratify it so that we make sure that we have appropriate coverage of the Gulf shrimp, the South Atlantic rock shrimp, and the South Atlantic penaeid shrimp fishery. We're still kind of working out the details, but it would be random.

I know with the Gulf folks we've tried to set it up so that if we hit you in one year that we kind of take you off the board and if you want to get into statistical jargon, it's sampling without replacement is what we call it. Next year, you don't get pinged on again, because you just got pinged on this past year. We try to spread it out, because I know that's been a concern, for example, in some of the observer programs, where people felt like they were getting picked on because they got picked last year and somehow they got picked again this year. Yes, that can happen. It is possible, but we understand that people are sensitive to that and so we will do our best to see that doesn't happen.

Mr. Herring: I think it was Action 4 where folks that didn't renew the endorsement and/or permit that had lost their ability to do so. One of the things you guys added to it -- I agree with the part that said if you haven't gotten the permit to begin with then you shouldn't be considered. Then you came back and added a second part and said if you hadn't at one time had an endorsement then you would become ineligible. That's going to strike the action -- That line by itself is going to strike any purpose of that action, because I think Jake was the one that brought it up.

He in particular knew of specific cases where someone had gotten the rock shrimp permit, but through a misunderstanding with the endorsement, never renewed the endorsement. If they didn't hold an endorsement from the first year, then they're automatically ineligible again and those were the particulars of that and so you've, in effect, killed what it was intended to do to begin with, I think.

I agree if they didn't renew their rock shrimp permit to begin with then they had no intentions, but if they did do that, but they didn't hold the endorsement, it could have been because of a misunderstanding in not renewing both of them. If they didn't do it from the first year, they didn't do it at all.

Dr. Travis: Can I ask for a clarification? You're saying this is someone who potentially qualified and they had the necessary landings to qualify initially for the endorsement back in 2003, when we implemented, but then when they actually submitted their application, they applied for the wrong thing at the onset and therefore never had an endorsement?

Mr. Herring: Never received an endorsement. They renewed their rock shrimp permit and I think renewed it for more than one year, but didn't fish in it the first year or whatever were going to and then you can't do it if you don't have an endorsement. You never applied and got the endorsement along with the permit and so you're, in effect, ineligible now.

Dr. Travis: That's a different scenario than what had been provided to me by council. This was about confusion over the renewal process and not confusion over the initial application process. Those are two completely different scenarios and so if that -- What you're talking about is --

Mr. Herring: In fact -- It's a little ambiguous, because in fact it was a renewal process for the rock shrimp permit. Those were already in existence. The endorsement was a new attachment to that. It was a renewal on the rock shrimp permit. That was already in existence and had been in existence and so it was a renewal on that. There was a new endorsement that went along with it that was added to it, but the wording is right. It was a renewal, but it was just the attachment that was added to it that did not get done.

Ms. Brouwer: Tony, if I'm understanding correctly -- I've got the action and the alternatives up on the screen and so if the note that follows that alternative were not there, would that then address what you're talking about?

Mr. Herring: It would and I think by leaving that note in that it kinds of cancels out the purpose of the action to begin with, from what -- It's not my personal experience. Jake Flowers was the one that brought it to the attention of the council to begin with. He knew specifically of cases where this happened.

Dr. Travis: Actually, let me -- I have to disagree with you a little bit, because even taking out the note still wouldn't fix it for you, because it starts off saying to reinstate endorsements. If he never had an endorsement in the first place, you can't reinstate something you never had.

Mr. Herring: He never had it.

Dr. Travis: That wouldn't fix it either. It would need to be considerably reworked to address that scenario that you're bringing up and I'm sorry this is the first time that I've heard of this. I wasn't aware that was what you were trying to get at.

Ms. Brouwer: In fact, the one person that commented on the record when we were doing public hearings for this amendment was somebody who brought this to my attention. It was that very same scenario, somebody who had a permit and never got an endorsement, because they didn't know they had to, and now were thinking they should be allowed to get an endorsement. We just didn't have a whole lot of information at the time that these alternatives were developed to account for those folks.

Dr. Travis: I'm not sure that we have -- Ever since Amendment 5 was implemented, I'm not sure that we've ever gone back and looked to see of those who we thought were eligible who did and did not apply for the endorsement and what you're talking about would require us to go back and do that and I'm not sure that it's ever been done. We would have to go back and do that, if that's what people want us to do.

Ms. Thompson: I believe the intent of Amendment 5 was to limit the fishery to approximately 150 boats and 155 were eligible, but some of those boats have sank or burned or whatever. They're not in the fishery anymore. If the original intent was to limit the fishery to 150 boats,

but now we're way below that number, what has happened to the endorsements that were lost? Can they be purchased by somebody else? Is there any mechanism to allow the fishery to remain at that 150 boat level or is the fishery just going to keep getting smaller and smaller and smaller?

Dr. Travis: There were multiple questions in there and I'll try to address a couple of them. The answer to one of your questions, which is for the endorsements that have not been renewed in a timely manner, once they go beyond the one year after they expire and they're still not renewed, they become non-renewable or terminated.

I think, as Myra mentioned in her presentation, basically those endorsements are permanently lost to the fishery and so it is sort of death by attrition, if you want to think of it that way. I did want to mention and in fact, I wanted to bring it up to the AP. We had -- Also as part of Amendment 5, there was a provision in there -- It doesn't directly deal with this, but I wanted to mention it, because we were surprised that no one sort of put their name in the pot.

The plan back then -- Remember there was this landings requirement. The plan was the landings requirement was basically going to kick in at the end of 2007 and so in 2008, the belief was that some of the people would, potentially, not meet that landings requirement and those endorsements would have to be forfeited.

In that case, there was a provision in Amendment 5 that said look, for any of you guys that did not qualify for the endorsements back when we implemented Amendment 5, if you are interested in getting an endorsement four or five years from now, when these guys who lose them because they didn't meet the landings requirement, please submit your name to us and we will keep a list so that those endorsement become available in 2008 and you may be able to get those endorsements that end up being surrendered.

That's different that -- That was in respect to people losing their endorsements because they didn't meet the landings requirement and not because they didn't renew their endorsements in a timely manner. It's two different scenarios. We have this happen in all of our fisheries and I know Dr. Crabtree will tell you the same thing.

We end up losing permits in our fisheries because people don't renew them in a timely manner and so the number steadily goes down over time. Why they're not renewing, I don't know that. In some instances I know, because I know they've lost their boats, just from personal knowledge, but I don't know in all cases why people are not renewing them, but we -- When I did the analysis for this amendment, there were thirty of them that just have never renewed their endorsements and so as of right now under the current regulations, those endorsements are gone. They've gone into a black hole.

Mr. Herring: They gave up.

Dr. Travis: The thing is what's potentially disappointing about that, maybe for other industry members or for people who may have been interested in getting in, is that those endorsements -- If they had simply renewed them, they could have transferred them to somebody else and they would still be alive. The endorsements would still be alive and useable in the fishery, but

because they didn't do that and they let them die on the vine, they're gone. I hope that answers at least part of your question.

Ms. Thompson: It answers my questions, but it doesn't make sense to me, because you guys are eliminating your own job security by allowing these fisheries to go by death by attrition, as you called it. We were under the impression that the rock shrimp was going to be a limited access fishery that was going to be stabilized at approximately 150 boats. That was our impression, that there would always be 150 boats that would be allowed to fish for rock shrimp, but now we're learning different.

With the pressures that all American fisheries are faced with, is there any plan in the future of maybe changing the numbers or doing something so that if new people want to enter the fishery that they can do so?

Dr. Travis: I can't speak for the council. The council would have to do that. I don't believe that that is anticipated with respect to this amendment and the reason simply being because -- I hope the industry supports this idea, that we need to get that landings requirement off the books. If we don't get it off the books now, we're going to have to start not renewing people's endorsements like immediately. We don't want to slow this down, because it's going to hurt other people outside of the ones that have lost their endorsements.

If the AP wants to recommend to the council that they start working on a new amendment, which would be Amendment 8, to the FMP to look at options to get the industry back up to the previously desired 150 vessels, then I think you guys should go on the record and say, council, we would like you to do this and maybe start offering some ideas on how they might do that.

Mr. Herring: I would love to start an Amendment 8. My only recommendation for Amendment 8 would be the elimination of limited entry. That would pretty much be it. There's an economic limited entry. It's there and it's not going away. We're talking about 150 and hell, we can't put twenty-five boats in that fishery.

Ms. Brouwer: I just wanted to make sure that I brought up that Jake Flowers wanted to make sure that this was brought up at the meeting and discussed. He very strongly feels that the limited entry system needs to go away.

Mr. Herring: One other question about what I brought up with I think Action 4. I do not want to slow down the process of these guys and a lot of those are guys that have been over here and have fished in previous years and maybe not in the last few, because of economics, and have not gotten that 15,000 pounds. Hopefully they may sometime in the future.

I don't want to slow down the process of making sure those guys are able to get their permits back by talking about that one in particular thing with the endorsement. Can there be a change made within this amendment in the timeframe that's left, to where it can still go forward? I don't want to hold the whole thing up over one or two that's going to sacrifice thirty-five.

Dr. Travis: I am certainly not even close to being the final decision maker on that, but since I've

been involved in this from day one, my suspicion is the answer is no. The addition of Action 5 the last time had the potential to slow us down and so if we add anything at this point, I guarantee you it will slow us down and it will present that problem.

Ms. Brouwer: As Mike said earlier, you guys can always recommend potential actions that the council should take in Amendment 8 and so perhaps you want to make a list of things that the council should consider.

Mr. Herring: In that case, I would just as soon not see anything done with the actions, with that Action 4 or 5, whichever one it is. I don't want to slow down those other ones, which are more important to be able to keep those other endorsements in the fishery. We can address that at a later date with a separate amendment, but I do not want to slow down maybe one or two that are in question versus thirty-something that we know are going to be lost for sure, if not fifty. I would definitely not want to try to save two and cut out fifty.

Mr. Williams: **With what Tony just said, I would like for the panel here to at least think about recommending now all the actions with the preferred alternatives as written and any actions we want to take in the future, we'll make recommendations for Shrimp Amendment 8.**

Ms. Thompson: I would like to second John's motion.

Dr. Travis: John, can I ask a point of clarification? Since we do not have a preferred alternative on Action 5, how do you folks want to address that? Action 5 is the VMS action.

Mr. Williams: You would ask me that, wouldn't you? I'm going to leave that to the rest of the panel. You have my comments already on how I feel about that.

Ms. Brouwer: I think we still need to approve the motion. We've got a second and now we need to vote.

Mr. Wilson: There's a motion for the Deepwater Shrimp AP recommending that the council adopt all the preferred alternatives in Shrimp Amendment 7. It's been seconded by Ms. Thompson. **Is there any opposition to this motion? Hearing no opposition, this motion is approved.**

Ms. Brouwer: Did you want to recommend a preferred alternative to the council for Action 5?

Mr. Herring: **We recommend the preferred option is there be no action.**

Ms. Brouwer: Is that a motion, Tony?

Mr. Herring: That's a motion, yes.

Mr. Wilson: Is there a second to that motion?

Mr. Williams: I'll second it.

Mr. Wilson: Is there any opposition to this motion? **Hearing no opposition, the motion is approved.**

Ms. Brouwer: Are there any other items that the AP would like to discuss at this time?

Mr. Herring: I would like the council to seriously look at a future amendment to address the fact that we don't need a limited entry in this fishery.

Mr. Wilson: Is there any objections to this recommendation? Hearing none, the recommendation is approved. Is there any other discussion?

Mr. Herring: That would be Amendment 8.

Mr. Wilson: Are there any other items up for discussion? I guess we're ready to move on to the next step in the agenda.

Ms. Brouwer: The next item on the agenda is for the APs to wrap things up. If there are any other items that need to be discussed, we still have the Golden Crab AP present in the room and if there's any other business --

Mr. Whipple: I think there's none.

Mr. Wilson: Any business from the Deepwater Shrimp AP? I move we adjourn.

Ms. Brouwer: Then we are adjourned and I thank you all for coming and for all your input.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 o'clock p.m., September 15, 2008.)

By: _____ Date: _____

By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 15, 2008

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

JOINT GOLDEN CRAB & DEEPWATER SHRIMP ADVISORY PANELS MEETING

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 15, 2008

TABLE OF MOTIONS

PAGE 40: Motion to recommend that the council accept Alternative Number 1 as to amending the coral, coral reef, and live hard bottom habitat. The motion was withdrawn on page 41.

PAGE 50: Motion that the Deepwater Shrimp AP recommends that the council adopt all the preferred alternatives in Shrimp Amendment 7. The motion carried on page 50.

PAGE 50: Motion that the AP recommends to the council that the preferred alternative for Action 5 be the no action alternative. The motion carried on page 51.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel

Jake Flowers, Chairman
Fernandina Seafood
P.O. Box 1257
(312 N. Front St.)
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034-1257
904/261-5830 (ph); 904/261-9964 (f)
(Comm.) 11/98, 12/01, 6/08*

Laurilee Thompson
Dixie Crossroads Seafood Rest.
1475 Garden St.
Titusville, FL 32796
321/268-5000 (ph) ✓
321/268-3933 (f)
laurileethompson@aol.com
6/08*

Steven Wilson, Vice Chairman
International Oceanic Enterprises, Inc.
P.O. Box 767 ✓
(9225 Seafood House Rd.)
Bayou La Batre, AL 36509
251/824-4193 (ph); 334/824-7687 (f)
swilson@ioealabama.com
(Comm.) 6/98, 12/01, 6/08*

John A. Williams ✓
6631 Ridge Top Drive
New Port Richey, FL 34655
727/375-5083(ph); 727/934-5362 (f)
john@shrimpalliance.com
(Comm.) 3/01, 6/04, 6/08*

Fred Dennis
199 Georgia Hwy. 147
Lyons, GA 30436
912/565-7631 (ph); 912/293-3566 (f)
dFredJr@bellsouth.net
3/00, 3/03, 6/08*

Warren Gautier
P.O. Box 1090
Pascagoula, MS 39568
228/762-2541 (ph)
(Comm.) 11/98, 12/01, 6/08*

Tony Herring ✓
7580 Knightwing Circle
Ft. Meyers, FL 33912
239/454-7815 (ph)
305/747-0330 (ph) (Spring-Summer)
(Comm.) 11/98, 12/01, 6/08*

Archie W. (Woody) Moore
289 Old Mill Rd.
Richmond Hill, GA
912/727-2232 (ph)
diamondshoalinc@coastalnow.net
*12/07

Marilyn Solorzano ✓
4061 Starratt Road
Jacksonville, FL 32226
904/757-0666 (ph); 904/757-1155 (f)
solorzanom@aol.com
(Comm.) 12/01, 6/08*

* Denotes year of appointment

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Golden Crab Advisory Panel

William Whipple, Chair
4501 S.W. 44th Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33314
305/393-2511; 305/583-9104 (ph)
(Comm.)
11/97, 3/01, 6/04*

Gary Graves, Vice Chairman
3390 Gulfview Avenue
Marathon, FL 33050
305/743-6727 (ph)
(Comm.)
11/98, 12/01*

Union "Chip" Bethell
4671 S.W. 35th Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312
954/964-9187 (ph)
(Comm.)
3/01, 6/04*

Randy Manchester
640 SW 8th Terrace
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33315
(954)632-9492 (ph)
Crabsrus61@msn.com
6/08*

Robert Palma
1280 Oceanview Avenue
Marathon, FL 33050
305/743-2281; 305/743-9221 (f)
(Comm.)
3/03*

Howard Rau, Jr.
1673 NE 36th Street
Oakland Park, FL 33334-5387
954/ 568-1527 (ph); 954/648-0687 (f)
Comm.)
11/98, 12/01, 6/04*

Charles H. Renier
Fishbusterz Fisheries, Inc.
P.O.Box 169
(7001 Shrimp Road, Key West, FL
33040 for FeEx only)
Key West, FL 33041
305/296-3067 (ph); 305/294-6438 (f)
(Comm.)
12/01, 6/04*

* Denotes year of appointment

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2007- 2008 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

George J. Geiger
566 Ponoka Street
Sebastian, FL 32958
772/388-3183 (ph)
georgegeiger@bellsouth.net

COUNCIL VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

Robert H. Boyles, Jr.
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9304 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
boylesr@dnr.sc.gov

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

Dr. Brian Chevront
N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries
P.O. Box 769 (3441 Arendell St.)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 Ext. 8015 (ph)
252/726-6187
brian.chevront@ncmail.net

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

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

Benjamin M. "Mac" Currin
801 Westwood Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607
919/881-0049 (ph)
mcurrin1@bellsouth.net

Anthony L. Iarocci
236 Guava Avenue
Grassy Key, FL 33050
305/743-7162 (ph); 305/743-2697(f)

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

John V. O'Shea
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1444 Eye Street, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/289-6400 (ph); 202/289-6051 (f)
voshea@asmfc.org

Lt. Brian Sullivan
U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6781 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Brian.A.Sullivan@uscg.mil

Mark Robson
Director, Division of Marine Fisheries
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
620 S. Meridian Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847(f)
mark.robson@myfwc.com

Susan Shipman
Director, Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
sshipman@dnr.state.ga.us

Tom Swatzel
P.O. Box 1311
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
(C/O Capt. Dick's Marina
4123 Hwy 17 Business,
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576)
843/357-1673 (ph)
tom@capticks.com

John A. Wallace
5 Buddy Beckham Road
P.O. Box 88
Meridian, GA 31319
912/437-6797 (ph); 912/437-3635 (f)
Ga_shrimp@darientel.net

KATE MICHIE
RICHARD VENDETTI
DAVE ALLISON
MIKE TRAVIS
JACK MCGOVERN

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist ✓

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Staff Economist ✓

Kathryn (Kate) Quigley
kate.quigley@safmc.net

Cultural Anthropologist

Open Position

Environmental Impact Scientist

Rick DeVictor
richard.devictor@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Graduate Student Intern

Gregg Swanson- gregg.swanson@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

Andi Stephens
Andi.Stephens@safmc.net

Coral Reef Biologist ✓

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing/Adm. Assistant ✓

Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

SEDAR/ Staff Administrative Assistant

Rachael Lindsay
rachael.lindsay@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

**Joint Golden Crab/DW Shrimp AP Meeting
Charleston, SC
Monday, September 15, 2008**

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Bill Whipple, Nielsen Golden Crab Fishery 954 850-5330 4501 SW 44th Ave #B Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314

DAVE Allison Oceana 202-422-9049 1350 Connecticut Ave NW 4th Floor Wash. DC 20036

Randy MAUCHESTER 954-632-9492 FT. LAUD FL 680 SW 8TH TERR 33315

Kate Wunderlich ⁹¹⁹⁻⁸⁸¹⁻²⁹³⁰ 4000 Westchase Blvd. Raleigh, NC 27607

Sarah Hagedorn 919-881-2910 4000 Westchase Blvd. Raleigh, NC 27607

Laurin Massengale 919-881-2920 4000 Westchase Blvd Ste 510 Raleigh NC 27607

John Tibbets 843-953-2078 South Carolina Sea Grant 287 Meeting St. Charleston SC 29402

Dan Whittle SNF

Sera Drevencik MFCN 910-762-4401 617 Surry St. Wilmington, NC 28422

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