

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

**LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE
PROGRAM COMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP**

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 18, 2008

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

LAPP Committee Members:

Rita Merritt, Chair
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Susan Shipman
John Wallace

Robert H. Boyles, Jr.
David Cupka
Dr. Brian Chevront
Tony Iarocci
Tom Swatzel

Council Members:

Duane Harris
Bill Sharp

Lt. Brian Sullivan
Dr. Wilson Laney

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Gregg Waugh
Roger Pugliese
Kim Iverson
Kate Quigley
Dr. Julie Neer

Mike Collins
Dr. Andi Stephens
John Carmichael
Rick DeVactor
Myra Brouwer
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Dr. Tom Jamir
Dr. Jack McGovern
Ed Sapp
Kate Michie
Gregg Swanson
Amy Dukes
Michelle Owen
Linda Hagan
Kenny Fex
Robert Cardin
Ernest Muhammad
Matt Raby

Monica-Smit Brunello
Rebecca Champion
Dr. Joe Kimmel
Red Munden
Fred Kinard, Jr.
Otha Easley
David Hagan
Dave Allison
Harold Olsen
Megan Westmeyer
Wallace Jenkins
Mark Marhefka

The Limited Access Privilege Program Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, Thursday morning, September 18, 2008, and was called to order in closed session at 10:02 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Rita Merritt.

(Whereupon, the committee resumed open session.)

Mr. Geiger: I would like to apologize to the public. When I asked for the room to be cleared and that we were going into private session, I neglected to say that the reason for the private session was we were going to be considering personnel issues, which routinely are discussed in private session. That being concluded, we will now go back to the full agenda.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We did amend the agenda and approved the change that we would first discuss the selection of the LAP Program Exploratory Workgroup nominees. We did that while we were in closed session and now we'll go back to the agenda as amended. We need an approval of the committee meeting minutes from June and you've received that in your briefing book material. Are there any changes or corrections to the minutes as sent? Seeing none, the minutes are approved.

Next on our agenda is to go into discussion regarding the Wreckfish ITQ Program and we're going to hear some information from Kate regarding the program and discuss future monitoring options for that program. Kate, if you want to give us your overview, please.

Ms. Quigley: I'm just going to provide you an overview of the Wreckfish Fishery ITQ. The Wreckfish ITQ was implemented in 1992 in Amendment 5, to alleviate two primary problems, dropping prices due to market gluts and race to fish and resulting gear conflicts. This is just a view of the historical landings from 1992 to 2001. The landings after that are confidential and so those aren't included here.

Just a little bit of information about participation, landings, and the ex-vessel price that fishermen have received for wreckfish. Ninety-one permitted vessels existed in the 1991-1992 season. There are now nine permitted vessels. Four vessels reported landings in 2007-2008. Landings have been made in South Carolina and Florida since 1995, with South Carolina accounting for the majority since 1992.

Annual landings 2001 to 2008 are less than 20 percent of the TAC and are confidential. That's why they're not included in the previous graph and prices paid to fishermen average about \$2.68 per pound and that's gutted weight. This is just an overview of price per pound, 1992 to 2007. Here's a slide that shows distribution of shares. There are currently twenty-five shareholders and so even though there's only nine permitted vessels, there are twenty-five shareholders. This is the permanent type of ITQ share. The top three own 40 percent of the shares and the top five own 56 percent. The top ten own 81 percent and the top fifteen own 95 percent and the top twenty own 97 percent.

There have not been any coupon or share exchanges made since 1996. You've got these shares which are a percentage of the TAC, of the total allowable catch, or of the ABC, and then you've

got these coupons which are pounds per year that are allowed to be caught. Coupon pound transfers occurred in 1992, 1993, and 1994 and you see a decrease each year.

Mr. Geiger: Who is eligible to buy the coupons?

Ms. Quigley: I believe that you have to be a wreckfish permit holder.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: I think to transfer coupons that you have to be a shareholder and so there's kind of two things. You have to have a wreckfish permit and you have to be already a shareholder.

Dr. Crabtree: Kate, do you know what the current TAC for wreckfish is? I think it's like two-million pounds. We're going to have a major issue with this fishery when we do ACLs, because I suspect the TAC is going to be reduced to about 10 percent of that. The very few active vessels that we have are not going to be able to continue their operations as they've done in the past and there's going to have to be some sale and transfer of shares.

We're going to run into a situation where we're going to have to consider what constitutes excessive shares in this fishery and I think the ACL amendment that will be in place in 2011 is going to drive all these issues home and I think we're going to have to address some revamping of this fishery as we develop the ACL amendment or we're really going to, I'm afraid, almost shut down this fishery as a result of the ACLs.

I don't believe there's any cap in this amendment right now that addresses excessive shares, but that is a requirement of Magnuson, that we not allow anyone to obtain excessive shares. I think we're going to have to make some modifications to this.

Ms. Quigley: I'll continue. Information on share transfers, there is some information available. However, some of it may be confidential and so I haven't included it here. There is information on shares transferred. There have not been any recent share transfers, as I indicated before, not since 1996.

The number of shareholders has gone from fifty-one down to twenty-five and number of wreckfish permit holders, as I indicated before, has gone from ninety-one to nine. With regards to monitoring of the Wreckfish LAP or the Wreckfish ITQ -- When I say monitoring here, what I'm talking about is what type of tracking is there on the part of the National Marine Fisheries Service of this fishery.

Landings, effort, and participation data are collected by the wreckfish vessel logbook. There is a monthly wreckfish dealer reporting system, which provides partial verification for the logbook, as well as price and sales data. There is a two-part coupon system included in both reporting systems and this provides additional verification data. It serves an enforcement aid and records annual catch quota transfers and then sales and transfers are also recorded by another system operated by the Regional Office, by the Permits Office, I believe.

This is kind of the paper trail that's commonly tracked in ITQ fisheries and then I've got a little

bit of information about the administrative costs of the wreckfish program. I talked to both the Science Center and the Permits Office at the Regional Office and they indicated that it totaled about \$4,000 per year to run the wreckfish ITQ. This includes labor costs from the Permits Office and the Science Center, which is the majority of the cost, about \$3,000, and then there are indirect costs having to do with the facility, IT costs, postage, printing. That was almost \$1,000 per year.

Other than what has been included in the briefing book as far as the history of what was the impetus for implementing the ITQ, that's the information that we have available on the wreckfish ITQ program.

Mr. Geiger: Are the administrative costs associated with this program being collected currently? If not, why not?

Ms. Quigley: The costs are not being collected at this point in time. The intention in Amendment 5 was for those costs to be collected in the future.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Kate. Are there any other questions?

Dr. Crabtree: This is part of the problem. This fishery and this whole program is woefully out of date and we need to reassess all these things. We need to convert this thing over to a more electronic reporting, like the Gulf red snapper program is, and address all these things, because the requirements of the Act with respect to IFQ programs have all changed since this was put in place and I don't believe there's been a plan amendment to change anything with the wreckfish fishery and I don't know if you know, Kate, but it's been at least a decade since anything changed.

Mr. Geiger: To that point, I appreciate those comments and that's exactly why I asked for this review. This was not on our work plan to do and I think it's critical that we do it and we have not discussed it, nor do we have any plans to do it. Kate alluded to the fact that we can do it in Amendment 5 or something, but I don't know when we're going to get to that. I see Gregg has come to the table.

Mr. Waugh: In terms of our Comprehensive ACL Amendment, every FMP will be revised and reexamined and so we will have to deal with this, as Roy has indicated. We will be getting overfishing level and ABC recommendations from the SSC for all our species, all our FMPs. The next committee that will be meeting is Dolphin Wahoo and we will be reexamining the Dolphin Wahoo FMP and setting all of these parameters, just like we've been struggling with in ten species in snapper grouper. Every FMP will get an examination and we will need to reevaluate how you're going to manage each of those fisheries under this new ACL regime.

Ms. Shipman: I think Amendment 5 that Kate referred to is the Wreckfish Plan. That was what set up the whole system and it has not been amended since and historically, we've sort of talked about it over the past decade, but it's been such a small fishery and I agree that it's not in conformance with the current mandates of the Act and I figured we would bring it in under the ACL Amendment, but that is what Amendment 5 was. That was the wreckfish limited entry

program.

Dr. Laney: Kate, on your graph of the economic values of the fish, the price per pound, was that adjusted for inflation and all?

Ms. Quigley: I'm not sure. I would have to go back and check. I don't think it has. I know that it was weighted by the amount of fish coming in, but I think it's nominal.

Mr. Cupka: To that point, I know we used to get reports on things like wreckfish price per pound and all and I think they were adjusted when we got those reports, if I'm not mistaken.

Ms. Merritt: Are there any further questions for Kate? If not, I would like to ask Monica to address the requirements under the new MSA for monitoring.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: It's set out right before you. There's not a lot in terms of additional provisions in the Magnuson Act, of course, that apply to the wreckfish program, but in terms of monitoring for LAP programs, of which this is one, there's a paragraph in the Magnuson Act that talks about the council and the Secretary determining the progress -- Looking at the program to see if it meets the goals of the program, as well as the Act, and see if it needs to be modified to meet those goals with a formal and detailed review five years after the implementation of the program.

Of course, this came in well after the wreckfish ITQ program came into being. It does say that that review should be done no less frequently than once every seven years, but they do want a detailed review every five years.

I will say anecdotally as well that I've had several calls from the Permits Office asking questions about wreckfish, transferring coupons or shares and all that, because they are receiving calls from I assume shareholders and other folks wanting to know how they can get coupons transferred. It's coming up a little bit on other people's radar screens too, because I went for years without getting a wreckfish question at all and so I've had to review the parts of the program as well.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Monica. To that, I would like to know, do you recall whether or not any of those came from outside of the South Atlantic purview?

Ms. Smit-Brunello: I have no idea.

Mr. Geiger: Roy, I guess the question -- It might go to Monica or you, but when this program was instituted, it was 100 percent commercial. It was allocated 100 percent commercial. Since that time, there have been an increasing number of recreational catches of wreckfish in places heretofore that were not made. When we go through this revision of the LAPP program, is there the ability to reallocate once a LAPP program is in place or not?

Dr. Crabtree: Yes, you could change the allocation in this fishery, as long as you have a record to support what you're doing.

Mr. Currin: Just more or less follow up to George, I think some of those inquiries perhaps, Monica, that the Permits Office has received have come from non-quota holders in other parts of our jurisdiction, other parts of the South Atlantic, who are encountering wreckfish in the course of their fishing activities.

It seems that it's difficult to impossible for anyone outside of the current system to receive a coupon and so we should give, I think, some consideration to addressing that, so it's not all the shares and coupons are not held by individuals -- We should make some allowance for folks that are encountering those fish to be able to land those fish that are dead when they come to the top of the water.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: That's something that you should all look at. I believe that a vessel permit for wreckfish is separate from the regular snapper grouper two-for-one kind of permit and I believe it's an open access kind of permit. When you apply, if you meet the requirements for -- You have a vessel and it's documented and all those sorts of things, you can get the wreckfish vessel permit.

In order to use a coupon, of course, you have to be a shareholder. Now, that's -- You can transfer freely. If you wanted to go buy shares right now from a shareholder, you could, as long as you had a wreckfish vessel permit. It's kind of tied together, but that, again, is an open access permit. It's just got a few steps to it.

Ms. Merritt: Correct me if I'm wrong, but if I'm not mistaken, one of the qualifications to get a wreckfish is that you have a snapper grouper permit.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: I'll look right now for that.

Mr. Cupka: I was just going to point out that it probably wasn't in the sense that Magnuson envisioned it in terms of monitoring and all, but when that program was first set up, we used to get annual reports on that that talked about the number of participants and the price per pound and the whole nine yards. Then as the number of participants decreased, we kind of got away from that, but we used to get regular annual reports on what was going on in that fishery that were very useful.

Ms. Merritt: Are there any further questions?

Ms. Smit-Brunello: I don't think you need a snapper grouper permit. To obtain a commercial vessel permit for wreckfish, the applicant must be a wreckfish shareholder and either the shareholder must be the vessel owner or the owner or operator must be an employee, contractor, or agent of the shareholder. I think that's a separate permit from the South Atlantic Snapper Grouper Permit.

Ms. Merritt: Let me get that straight. In order to get the wreckfish permit, you have to have a share?

Ms. Smit-Brunello: That's what it says. In order to get a share, you need to have the vessel

permit and so I think you kind of do that at pretty much the same time or I would say in very close proximity to each other.

Ms. Merritt: Okay, I'm with you. Are there any further questions on the Magnuson-Stevens requirements on the monitoring? If not, Kate, do you want to talk about the other LAPP program monitoring?

Ms. Quigley: Actually, I don't have much to talk about. I was just going to point out that as part of your briefing book materials you have an overview of the red snapper fishery. This is an annual report that they put out in the Gulf red snapper IFQ and it basically tracks landings and shares that have been exchanged and gives information about that fishery. There's a couple of questions before us, how are these LAP type programs monitored? That's an example of how it's currently being monitored by the National Marine Fisheries Service. That's all. I just wanted to point out that you do have that document to review.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Kate. Is there any further discussion regarding the ITQ for wreckfish program? We're going to go on to the tilefish limited access program. Earlier, we did come up with a number of names to appoint to this -- Nominations to appoint to this workgroup. I think now we need to talk about the participation on that workgroup, the timing and number of meetings.

Ms. Quigley: Actually, I think we have Item Number 4. Maybe you're looking at an older agenda. Item Number 4 is a presentation of the results of a survey done of the Snapper Grouper LAP Exploratory Workgroup members by Gregg Swanson at the College of Charleston. We have that presentation, I think.

Ms. Merritt: Yes, Kate, and thank you. I do have the older version. Go ahead, Gregg.

Ms. Swanson: Thank you, Rita, and thanks everybody for this opportunity. I'm going to be speaking about the survey results of the Limited Access Privilege Program Exploratory Workgroup that I distributed this past April of 2008. I'm going to skip through the first couple of slides, because they're review and most people have the actual PowerPoint in front of them, the computer screen or on paper, and so I'm just going to go to Slide 3, which is the purpose of the LAP Workgroup survey.

This survey was to obtain feedback from workgroup members, in order to improve the interaction and communication between resource managers and resource users and also to ensure that this management tool of incorporating a workgroup in the early stages of developing a management plan is utilized to its best ability.

The scope is simple. An eleven-question survey was mailed to each workgroup member. There were seventeen total members. Questions consisted of a Likert scale, 1 being strongly agree and 5 strongly disagreeing and yes/no type answers. Workgroup members were asked to return the questionnaire in a self-addressed stamped envelope by May 1, 2008. A total of fifteen out of seventeen returned surveys, which gave me an 88 percent return rate.

Question 1 was how would you describe your participation in the snapper grouper fishery? The dark green were commercial fishermen and this was an open-ended question and so a lot of members did have dual professions. I just wanted to show that yes, there were commercial fishermen involved, but not the majority.

Question 2 was do you think participation was rightly represented in the LAP Program Exploratory Workgroup? Two members strongly agreed and six circled two and one strongly disagreeing. Comments in regards to Question 2 were: that we were missing adequate representation from the longline sector; this was an industry meeting and it should not have had so much influence from Environmental Defense; there were too few representatives from south Florida, which has the most fishermen; there should have been more fishermen and less fish houses and less concentration on Environmental Defense; the recreational sector was unable to attend meetings and therefore, this sector was not represented; over 50 percent of the members were non to little dependent on the South Atlantic snapper grouper fishery; the workgroup should be dominated by full-time commercial fishermen; I thought it was a diverse group and I did not feel one view had an unfair advantage in representation; and lastly, I believe that the group should be dominated by actual full-time commercial fishermen who use the snapper grouper resource for all or only a portion of their yearly income.

In regards to Question 2, I just wanted to point out, going back to the graph, that although most people were on the side of strongly agreeing, most of the comments were more towards strongly disagreeing. Again, some people -- I actually went back and looked at everything, the surveys themselves. Even though some people did agree, they still wrote down a comment of this aspect I did not agree with. That's kind of where that came from. It could be confusing.

Question 3, moving on, was do you think other people, professions, should have been placed on the LAP Program Workgroup that were not? Eight members said no and seven members said yes, about even. More full-time commercial fishermen, cultural anthropologists, NMFS economists, NMFS legal department rep, knowledgeable scientists, a sociologist, university researchers, professors maybe coming aboard, a Gulf Council member, a recreational angler, a longliner and a Cuban fisherman from the Miami area.

Question 4 was overall, do you think this management approach was more effective than the ordinary management approach? Nine people strongly agreed with this newer approach and one strongly disagreed. The workgroup process provides for more meaningful dialogue than do traditional public stakeholder participation methods and it also encourages cooperation and communication. The exploratory workgroup takes up too much time and too many fishing trips had to be missed in order to attend meetings. Without this group, there would never have been this much depth in all of our discussions. This approach was absolutely necessary, due to the complexities of the topics and the amount of information to consider.

Question Number 4 continued comments were frequently the meetings were slightly redundant and non-productive. Not more effective, but used together with the right people on the workgroup with outreach, dealers, fishermen, and industry leaders is the right approach. The workgroup is as close to co-management that we have experienced in the council process. I strongly recommend using those foremost in the future for other management efforts and lastly,

there could have been more telephone work instead of meeting so often.

Question Number 5 was do you think the amount and quality of research and outreach materials distributed to the exploratory workgroup was adequate to make informed decisions? Two members strongly agreed, with seven circling 2 and one strongly disagreeing. Kate did an excellent job in bringing reference materials to the table. In general, the information was good, but we probably could have used more information on alternate LAPP designs and how each design would affect fishermen. There were concerns about information concerning potential allocation and some members needed exact numbers to make their decisions and the group could not get data back from NMFS in a timely manner to help the group on some issues.

Comments continued were it was difficult conveying the technical information to people outside the workgroup. On the council level, yes, and on NMFS level, no and there was tons of information that we asked NMFS to provide and it did not happen. More data of the effects on this fishery and economic analysis on the costs of doing business with increased costs of monitoring wasn't presented and the quality of research compiled was great, but the NMFS permit department struggled or failed to meet our requests.

Question 6 was are you satisfied with the effort and participation of workgroup members? Five members were strongly satisfied and seven circling 2, or close to strongly satisfied, and one member was strongly unsatisfied and I do want to note that one workgroup member rated the effort of the commercial fishermen as a 1, while rating the participation of fishing organizations as 4. We'll see that comment in just a second.

No, with a thousand people's investments, futures, and grocery money at stake, workgroup members needed to look past their own needs, regardless of what might be best for you or me. If a plan puts 75 to 90 percent of the fishermen out of business, how can the vote against it be anything but 75 to 90 percent against LAPPs? Overall, most workgroup members approached the task at hand with an open mind and respected each other's comments and opinions.

There were some members that did not show up and others showed up, but did not participate at the meetings. We did all we could, considering that we didn't have all the information. Satisfied, but with one exception. The environmental advocate was too intrusive, with paid educational trips to Canada for other board members. Participation was uneven and key members missed one or more meetings and several key members missed the last meeting, in which recommendations were made. Again, what I noted earlier reflects this comment, that I would rate the participation of the true commercial fishermen on the workgroup as a 1, very satisfied, and the executive directors of fishing organizations a 4, unsatisfied, as the latter's involvement was dominated by the ideas of their respective board of directors. They actually can't act independently, where actual fishermen can and do.

Question 7 was are you satisfied with the amount of effort the council put forth to engage different stakeholders in the workgroup process? Seven members were very satisfied and four agreeing with a 2 and one member was strongly unsatisfied.

Comments for Question 7 were all fishermen present were fully engaged and productive in the

process. The staff was very committed to making the process work. With Environmental Defense's participation, sometimes it was unclear who brought in whom to speak at our meetings. I did really appreciate hearing from as many experts as possible.

Question 8 was do you think the LAPP Workgroup accomplished the tasks requested by the council? Four members strongly agreed and five circled 2. Comments regarding Question 8 were we tried and it was a very complicated task, with many questions from the group at the end. Yes, no, maybe. I don't think the council heard our recommendations. No, we had too little time to engage fishermen as to their options and opinions and therefore, we could not develop a fair and equal plan to carry the fishery into the future.

Probably, but it really came down to money and change in a fishery and fishermen are stubborn. Although we didn't produce a fully finished product, we did give the council a template of the most important aspects of a LAPP program. Not enough time. The workgroup stopped short of developing clear options or developing a clear path for moving forward. To the extent we were able to, yes. It's hard to make decisions when enormous uncertainties remain in question, such as recreational accountability, the lack of a monitoring program, federal money for LAPP implementation. We accomplished the task to the best of our ability. However, we discovered that there were many more unanswered questions and information needs that ultimately hindered our ability to present a definitive yes or no recommendation about LAPPs at this time for this complex fishery.

Question 9 was did you feel that you could voice your opinions in an effective way by serving on the workgroup? Nine members strongly agreed. I don't think anyone on the workgroup held back any opinions they may have had. It was a very inclusive process to the extent that the audience was also allowed to comment on the program.

It was interesting in that we never knew whether individuals supported or opposed LAPPs. The workgroup process was very conducive to expressing opinions and sharing information. I don't know, but I tried. No, lack of time and information. The meetings were conducted in a fair and informal way, which allowed all views to be expressed.

Question 10 was would you consider serving on another workgroup like this one in the future? All fifteen members agreed to that and said yes. Only to be paid for my time and experience in the industry. Yes, with the knowledge I've gained through this experience. I believe that some people feel that I was representing them and so I would have to follow through. Yes, but reluctantly, because enforcement needs to devote its effort towards enforcing laws and not talking about them for six months.

This was an extremely valuable experience that helped build communication networks between all stakeholders involved across the region. I have too much at stake to give up now. I would evaluate on a case-by-case basis. In general, conservation groups should have a seat at the table. There are times, however, where having a seat on the workgroup is not necessary. Yes, but not without some reservations.

Question 11 was what recommendations do you have to improve the workgroup process in the

future? The council should consider conservation groups as legitimate stakeholders and include a voting conservation seat. Council should not require consensus from the workgroup, because it provided some council members with an excuse to do nothing.

Workgroups are advisory and the council needs to give weight to workgroups, but needs to assert more leadership when the workgroup doesn't produce a consensus set of recommendations. Better use of the voting process, higher priority of NMFS and council staff time and efforts. Simplify and shorten the process. More time, as in calendar days and not necessarily meetings. More background information. Workgroup members should be present and engage other fishermen at public meetings. In choosing workgroup member, send an application to every permit holder and dealer and after reviewing applications and choosing workgroup members, follow up on those that were not chosen, so that they can follow the process and be present at open workshops. Make telecom possible.

Develop the concept of directed subcommittees for specific issues. Reduce travel. Let's get better science from the fishermen and not environmentalists. Identify data analysis needs early in the process, in order to identify the realistic capabilities of the analysis, data availability and timeframe for which to complete the analysis. Consistent participation of NMFS staff and perhaps have legal counsel expertise available if needed. Lastly, from the beginning, frame the tasks assigned to the workgroup in the context of all other amendments that they may impact or affect the decisions made by the workgroup. Thank you and I'll take questions.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Gregg. Are there any questions for Gregg on her survey?

Mr. Boyles: Not a question, but just a thanks to Gregg for this work as we have gone down this road in trying to pull apart very, very difficult issues. It's always nice to get feedback and, Gregg, we appreciate you sharing that with us. Nice job.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: Did you conduct this survey in April of 2008?

Ms. Swanson: Yes, I did.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: Was that before the group -- That was right after?

Ms. Swanson: Right after.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: The workgroup presented their views to the council in March, in Jekyll Island, then?

Ms. Swanson: Yes, that's right.

Ms. Merritt: Are there any further questions for Gregg? Gregg, I think you did a super job and this is our first workgroup. I think we learned some lessons from it and I think the survey is very helpful for us to go forward with the tilefish workgroup and I really appreciate all of your efforts. It was very thorough and I was glad to see that the survey wasn't just the 1 to 5 spread with no explanations and no comments. The comments are helpful to explain some of the responses and

I appreciate it.

Next on our agenda is for us to talk about the golden tilefish limited access program and, Kate, I believe we're going to talk a little bit about timelines and meetings and get into the nitty-gritty of getting this moving forward and getting feedback to our fishermen.

Ms. Quigley: I just wanted to get input from the LAPP Committee on what you would like to see as far as a timeline and any suggestions you have as far as the process of meeting with the fishermen. One thing that I made Bob aware of and council staff was when talking to the fishermen -- The longline fishermen, at least down in Florida, begin fishing in January. They fish January, February, March, April. What they wanted to do was to see the meetings take place in the fall, basically between now and December.

Then we've got the hook and line guys who said that they would make themselves available whenever possible, but they wanted to -- They had other things going on in the fall. It was going to be difficult to arrange meetings when everybody was available and so we wanted to try to get in at least one or two meetings in the fall months.

I wanted to get input from the LAPP Committee on just what kind of timeline you would like to see and when you would like the tilefish workgroup to come back to you with some sort of report and what type of report you're looking at. Any kind of input at all would be helpful.

Ms. Shipman: I think our fiscal situation is going to somewhat dictate the schedule and Bob may have some input on that, as may you, Kate, in terms of how to do that. As I mentioned earlier, I think we've got to accomplish this in as fiscally efficient a manner as we can, given the budget situation, the unknowns about next year's budget. At the same time, certainly trying to accommodate the fishermen's schedule. That's going to be hard trying to juggle all of that, I think.

I don't know that we can get started this fall or not, given our budget. We don't have much pad in there and I honestly don't know -- I don't recall what we've got in that activities schedule for this, for the remainder of this year.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Susan. Bob, do you want to respond?

Mr. Mahood: I think we can probably accommodate at least one meeting this fall and then in our planning for the 2009 budget, we can develop a full-blown schedule. Again, like Kate said, it appears part of the problem is going to be getting these guys together, because of the fisheries they're involved in. We'll have to look at that also. We will try to get them together at least one time this year, to get them oriented and started thinking about where we're going with this.

As Roy pointed out to me earlier though, we ought to make a determination that we're not going to close the golden tile fishery down before we embark on this. Anyway, I think we can deal with one meeting in the budget this year and I've talked to Kate a little bit about that and we'll try to pull them together.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Bob. Any other thoughts on the timing, the schedule? In the survey results, we got back some feedback that -- Tony, did you have a comment?

Mr. Iarocci: Bob kind of answered my question, but especially with the longliners and to try to move this thing along with the timing and the pending closure of the tile fishery, I was going to see about maybe trying to organize a meeting this fall, whether it be in Charleston or north Florida, and then see about a second meeting at the December council meeting, to get things rolling, but with only one meeting coming up, I don't know if we could pull that one off, but I do see the importance of doing the fall, because the longliners are the highliners and have the most catch.

Ms. Merritt: Bob, I have another question to follow up on that. Do you think it would be possible for us to take a representative from the workgroup to report and be present during committee work during the council in December?

Mr. Mahood: I will have a much better idea of where we are budget-wise by December. As a matter of a fact, we'll have a much better idea after this meeting and if that's -- As we get on towards the end of the year, we'll know what our feasibility of possibly bringing them to the December meeting would be. I hate to say right now, but I think we'll have a better idea in about a month of where we are.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you.

Ms. Quigley: Any other suggestions, based on Gregg's presentation, that don't have to do with timeline?

Ms. Shipman: Just a question in terms of some of the feedback you got. It talked about telecommunications, but then on the flip side of that, and to counter that, we also saw a strong endorsement of being able to get together and I think for fishermen that may be more effective. As much as I would love to try to use teleconferencing as much as we could, I just don't know how practical that will be for this type of a forum.

Mr. Iarocci: To that point, Madam Chair, I agree, Susan. I did talk to a couple of the guys and most of the guys, when they aren't fishing, if they're on the wheelhouse, they're on the VHF radio. That's when that telephone thing came in. They made the comparison between talking on the phone or on the VHF radio and so in between -- A lot of times you see fishermen don't communicate or I should say AP members don't communicate between meetings, but I think with this going on and being the small amount of people on this working group, I think maybe some conference calls or just getting the guys together on the phone and tell them to have open communication. If you've got questions, talk amongst yourselves between these meetings. We can stress that point.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: Remember too that this is an AP of the council and so the meetings, whether they're telephone or in person, have to be noticed in the Federal Register and there has to be public participation allowed.

Ms. Merritt: Thank you, Monica. I think we're ready to move into Other Business. We've pretty much got that timeline going and, Kate, you're going to be communicating with the nominations after the council approves that and we'll try to get the first meeting going as soon as we can.

Under Other Business, I would like to first go back for just a moment. We never did decide whether or not we wanted to, in the form of a motion or in any formal manner, to make a recommendation to council, as a committee, on whether or not to move forward and when on the wreckfish ITQ.

I got the feeling that there was some general consensus that something needed to be done, but we didn't quite get into the timing and all. Does anybody have anything they want to say about that? No? When we get into council, we'll discuss that as a possibility and see what we can come up with. Kate, do you have anything else under Other Business? Seeing none, is there anyone else on the committee who has something they would like to bring forward? Seeing none, this committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 o'clock a.m., September 18, 2008.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 16, 2008

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~~ **BILL SHARP**
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@dariantel.net

JOE KEMMEL
JACK MCGOVERN
MARICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
TOM JAMER
REBECCA CHAMPION
OTHA EASLEY
KATE MICHIE
ED SAPP
RED MUNDEN
GREGG SWANSON

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2007 - 2008 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

David Cupka, Chair
Robert Boyles
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

ALLOCATION Committee

Brian Chevront, Chair
Duane Harris
George Geiger
John Wallace
Rita Merritt
Robert Boyles
Tom Swatzel

ECONOMICS

Robert Boyles, Chair
Brian Chevront
Mac Currin
Roy Crabtree
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Rita Merritt
John Wallace
Staff Contact: Kate Quigley

ECOSYSTEM-BASED

MANAGEMENT*

Duane Harris, Chair
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Wilson Laney
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Gregg Waugh- FEP Comprehensive
Amendment

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT / NEPA

George Geiger, Chair
Robert Boyles
Brian Chevront
Tony Iarocci
Wilson Laney
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Rick DeVictor

EXECUTIVE

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

FINANCE

David Cupka, Chair
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

Tony Iarocci, Chair
John Wallace, Vice Chair
George Geiger
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

HABITAT & ENVIRON.

PROTECTION

Duane Harris, Chair
Robert Boyles
George Geiger
Wilson Laney
Vince O'Shea
John Wallace
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Rita Merritt, Chair
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Mark Robson
Wilson Laney
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

David Cupka, Chair
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Rita Merritt
Tom Swatzel
Ron Smith, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Jack Travelstead, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LAW ENFORCEMENT

George Geiger
Duane Harris
Rita Merritt
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
John Wallace
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

✓ Rita Merritt, Chair
✓ Robert Boyles
✓ Roy Crabtree
✓ David Cupka
✓ Mac Currin
✓ Brian Chevront
✓ George Geiger
✓ Tony Iarocci
✓ Susan Shipman
✓ Tom Swatzel
✓ John Wallace
Staff contact: Kate Quigley

MARINE PROTECTED AREA

Tony Iarocci, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice Chair
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Wilson Laney
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

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.

**LAPP Committee Meeting
Charleston, SC
Thursday, September 18, 2008**

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Megan Westmeyer SC Aquarium

Ernest Muhammad SCDNR

Wallace Jenkins SCDNR

Mat Kabay Little River T. Lighthouse 812-902-4734

440 W. ...

DAVID C. HAGAN 904-262-2869 2323 Orange Picker Rd JAFFI 32222

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

**LAPP Committee Meeting
Charleston, SC
Thursday, September 18, 2008**

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Fred Kinard Jr.

843/723-1135

412 Huger St.
Charleston, SC 29403

Amy W Dukes

843/953-9225

267 Ft. Johnson Rd.
Char. SC 29412

Mickelle Owen EDR

Sarasota FL

Dunlap Hagan
David Hagan

904-262-2869

2323 Orange Pickers Rd
Jax, FL 32223

Kenny Fex

910-620-5847

DAK Island, NC

Muh Kuhn

843-478-5078

1676 Calappa Ln
Char. SC 29407

Dave Allison

202-833-3900

1350 Connecticut Ave NW
5th Floor Washington, DC 20036

Robert Green

772-466-2105

5106 Palm Dr. Ft. Pierce

Harold Olsen

843 822-0659

6276 Hwy 17 N Amherst SC

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