

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COMMITTEE

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, Florida**

JUNE 14, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Members:

Ben Hartig, Chairman
Tom Burgess
Dr. Michelle Duval
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips

David Cupka
Mac Currin
Duane Harris
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel

Council Members:

Mel Bell
Lt. Robert Foos
Dr. Wilson Laney

Dr. Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans

Council Staff Members:

Robert Mahood
Kim Iverson
Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
John Carmichael
Julie O'Dell

Gregg Waugh
Andrea Grabman
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Mike Errigo
Dr. Brian Chevront
Mike Collins

Observers/Participants:

Phil Steele
Bob Gill
Monica Smit-Brunello
Andy Strelcheck
Dr. Marcel Reichert
Karen Raine

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Sue Gearhart
Dr. Jack McGovern
Joey Ballenger
Otha Easley

Other observers listed in the back of the document:

The Mackerel Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, June 14, 2012, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: I would like to welcome you to the Mackerel Committee Meeting. The first thing on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions to the agenda? I have an addition and we're going to talk a little bit about Atlantic Group King Mackerel at the end of the discussions today. That is one addition to the agenda that I have. Is there any objection to approving the agenda with that one addition? Seeing none, that agenda is approved.

The next order of business is to approve the March 2012 minutes. Are there any additions, deletions or corrections to the minutes? I had a couple I gave to Kari; but seeing none from the rest of the committee, is there any objection to approving the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. That brings us down to the status of commercial and recreational catches versus ACLs for King and Spanish Mackerel and Cobia. I guess Jack McGovern is going to give us an update on those landings.

DR. McGOVERN: Mr. Chairman, I'll just give you an update on the commercial. The king and Spanish mackerel, these landings are under Tab 7, Attachment 1A. The cobia landings are available under Tab 5, Attachment 1A. They have been provided as part of the science center's new commercial landings monitoring system. As May 31st, 32 percent of the 125,712 pound commercial ACL for cobia has been met. Right now the ACL is not projected to met this year for cobia.

The data for the Spanish and king mackerel are not yet available on the science center's new CLM Program. Dr. Ponwith indicated I think it was yesterday or the day before that the science center is working on the coding issues to deal with the expansion of data from dealers that are not reporting, and there is a chance that we might – we were told we'd get that really soon, and so there is a chance that we might have it by full council.

Up on the screen here shows the data for king and Spanish mackerel through April; and as of April 73,000 pounds were caught. I guess the main thing to notice from this slide is the landings for 2011 and 2012 are considerably lower than previous years for king mackerel. If you scroll down, those are Spanish mackerel landings and there were 362,000 pounds landed as of April and the landings for Spanish are higher than in previous years. That's all I have on that.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Jack. Are there any questions for Jack? All right, the next item is the South Atlantic Council Mackerel Advisory Panel Report.

MR. WAUGH: We have got the recreational numbers.

MR. HARTIG: I'm sorry; I skipped Bonnie. We've got the recreational numbers from king and Spanish mackerel and cobia. Thank you, Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: For king mackerel we have 153. These are whole weight pounds. Again, please notice the caveats at the bottom of the slide that explains what is in and what is not in the report at that point. If you will go to the slide you will see the bar chart showing patterns of landings, patterns of effort and the ACL up at the top. For Spanish mackerel for 2012 thus far, in Wave 1 we have 134,698 pounds whole weight. The next slide shows the ACL and what that looks like relative to past years. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions for Bonnie? Thank you, Bonnie, I appreciate that. All right, now that brings us to the Mackerel Advisory Panel Report.

MR. WAUGH: This is Attachment 3 and this in your briefing book. You have the report and the minutes, and we're not going to go through this. What Kari has done is pulled any recommendations from the AP and folded them into Amendments 19 and 20, those decision documents so unless there are any questions.

MR. HARTIG: So we have all of the AP recommendations even if they weren't pertinent to 19 and 20?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, we do; and if we need to, when we get to the framework, we can come back to this list and I can pull the recommendations from the AP when talk about our potential framework.

MR. HARTIG: All right, any questions about the AP work and how we're going to proceed with that? They are in the document. If you had a chance to read it, they were right underneath all of the options, and I appreciate that. Okay, the next order of business is actually to address the Joint Gulf and South Atlantic Mackerel Amendment 19, the permit and sale amendment. The overview is going to be by Gregg and Kari. Kari is going to be our new lead on mackerel in case you didn't know, and I welcome her. We have been working pretty closely on several items and I think it is going to work out perfect.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, the decision document is Attachment 8A, and in 19 there eight actions and they're dealing with recreational bag limits and then also some latent effort with the permits. I included some background on Actions 1 through 3 because those specifically talk about bag limit sales. You guys talked about that a lot yesterday so I won't go into that.

The Gulf Council did scoping meetings in March for this and so I pulled some of their comments from their scoping meetings. In general people just talked about recreational bag limit sales. These are just some of the things that come up that you've heard before, concerns that this will harm businesses for the people who depend on the bag limit sales and then some other requirements maybe that could be put in, they have to go through a fish house.

And then some people, sales during the commercial season is unfair and then just overall that recreational fishermen should not be selling fish. I have included some of these with the specific actions to think about when you're making your decisions. Action 1 is this king and Spanish mackerel bag limit sales. This one has gone back and forth between the Gulf and the South Atlantic Council.

The language in the alternatives has kind of gone back and forth, so we want to be sure to be really clear what your intent is and clarify the language. Alternative 1 is no action, to continue to allow the king mackerel and Spanish mackerel bag limit sales. Two would prohibit the sale of king and Spanish mackerel caught under a bag limit except for sale by for-hire vessels that possess the necessary state and federal commercial permits to sell the CMP species.

And then there are two options; one is just in South Atlantic and then one is in the Gulf. And then Alternative 3, a person to sell a king or Spanish mackerel, the fish had to have been harvested aboard a vessel with a commercial vessel permit or endorsement for each species taken and then prohibit the sale of king and Spanish mackerel caught under the bag limit.

Just to be clear, basically Alternative 2 is that the king mackerel and Spanish mackerel that is caught on a charter trip or a recreational trip can be sold if the vessel has the king mackerel and/or Spanish mackerel commercial permit. Alternative 3 would prohibit sale for any recreational trip. There is actually a definition of a recreational trip that I added at the end.

Here under the bag limit refers to these situations in which it is a charter trip when there is a passenger who pays a fee or when there are more than three people aboard; or – and then the headboat carries a passenger who pays a fee and there are more than three people on board. That is what we're going to be working under for the different kinds of trips.

The Gulf Council, at their meeting in April, directed staff to add an Alternative 4, and this is where it kind of feels like the language is getting a little confusing, so we just want to clarify, but basically this is just another – I don't know, it seems kind of redundant and it may just be in there – and then also to add the Option A and Option B so that each council can decide.

So the Mackerel AP actually discussed this at length and you can see that in the minutes, but they did not make a formal AP recommendation, so I just added some of the things that they brought up in their discussion. Their primary concern is counting the bag limit sales towards the commercial quota.

They thought that a portion of the recreational allocation had been moved to the commercial allocation to cover bag limit sales. I guess this is something that they did with the Gulf group king mackerel quotas in Amendment 9, but it wasn't for Atlantic group king or Spanish. They thought bag limit sales after the commercial season is closed is unfair and some thought only commercial vessels with commercial permits should be allowed to sell the fish.

And then they talked about in some areas the bag limit sales are kind of traditional and part of the for-hire crew's incomes and then in other areas it is not really a big deal, and it is minimal. Someone brought up it is a waste of fish if the customer cannot or does not want to take the catch and so the crew can't sell it if it prohibited.

And because the stocks are not overfished, there is no reason to deny the market of these fish. So the first thing to go through the decision document for this one is I just want to make sure that

your intent for the different alternatives is what the language is reflecting. The IPT is going to recommend just a little language change for the different alternatives, but just to be very clear.

The current Alternative 2 is to prohibit the sale of king and Spanish mackerel caught under the bag limit except for allowing sales by for-hire vessels that possess the necessary state and federal commercial permits to sell CMP species harvest in or from the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction. Prohibition of sale during a commercial closure would apply with; Option A, the South Atlantic's jurisdiction; Option B, the Gulf Council's jurisdiction. I just want to clarify with the committee that the intent is to allow fish caught under a bag limit on a charter trip as long as that vessel is duly permitted. Is this correct?

MR. HARTIG: Is that what everybody gets out of that particular alternative? That is what it means to me. Yes, I see heads shaking so, yes. Do we have some suggested wording?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Yes. The IPT was just going to recommend a little tweaking of the language to be clear, so Alternative 2 prohibits the sale of CMP species caught in federal waters under the bag limit with the exception of for-hire trips in which the vessel also holds the appropriate federal commercial permit. All sales of CMP species during a commercial closure are prohibited; and then with our two options.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So CMP species covers more than king and Spanish mackerel and that is intentional because that is different than what the previous alternative said.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I have discussed this because Action 2 actually addresses cobia sales specifically so maybe creating a commercial permit, so this action could be specific to king and Spanish or it could go ahead and include cobia since the councils will be considering permitting them.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And if it does – I guess the council will need to decide, but if it does you definitely have to title Action 1 differently than it is now.

MR. CURRIN: Ben, I was just going to speak in favor of shifting the recommended language by the IPT to include cobia in there. That is certainly my intent. **If you need a motion, I would move that we adopt the recommended language for Alternative 2 under Action 1.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Mac and seconded by Duane. I want to make sure you all are comfortable over there. Go ahead, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm okay with that, but that means then we have got to restructure Action 2 because we would already be addressing in Action 1. And then it also seems to me that Action 3 is connected to this because we're prohibiting bag limit sales, but then Action 3 would allow bag limit sales if it was in a tournament, and we need to somehow reconcile this so we don't have contradictory things. I think there is some restructuring that needs to be done here.

MR. HARTIG: So you're saying that if did the prohibition of bag limit sales that you would already be eliminating the tournament sales by that?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it would but then you have another action that I guess makes an exception; and then if we're going to prohibit bag limit sales of cobia in Action 1, the title of Action 2 is sale of cobia.

MR. HARTIG: They're interconnected and we need to deal with that.

DR. CRABTREE: They are and that's what I'm getting at, we need to think it through.

MR. HARTIG: We'll deal with it. I think we probably eliminate the sale issue of cobia by the CMP definition we have in this option. We have got a motion and a second. Is there anymore discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: So we've got Action 3 which is just specific to king or Spanish mackerel; but if we're going to pull cobia into Action 2, do you want to pull cobia into Alternative 3 as well? It would seem to me that it would make sense to do that if we're going to deal with the whole issue here.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, we have wording to do that also, the change the wording to be consistent with each alternative. Go ahead, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Just to remind everybody, this is a joint amendment with the Gulf; so any restructuring we do here complicates it when it is presented to the Gulf Council next week, and so it may better just to leave it the way it is structured now and deal with king and Spanish mackerel in Action 1, then deal with cobia, then deal with tournaments. Yes, they are linked but I think in terms of working this between the two councils it may be better to do it like that.

MR. HARTIG: I think you're right, and I think the CMP is linking them. If we get rid the coastal migratory pelagics issue, then we can go back to king and Spanish mackerel and then we will fine. I think you're probably right because I think we do have concurrence from the Gulf about the sale issue for king and Spanish mackerel.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: What I have up here is the language that the IPT recommended but just specifically said here prohibit sale of king and Spanish mackerel.

MS. McCRAWLEY: It is not specific to just king and Spanish because look at the last sentence of that.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, the last sentence, I agree. Mac, we've got a motion from you and then we have got a second by Duane and we had some discussion. Go ahead.

MR. CURRIN: I will be happy to withdraw the motion, Ben. It does seem to be cleaner if we keep them separate.

MR. HARTIG: With the concurrence of the committee; I'm seeing heads nod so we will withdraw that motion. So where are we?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I guess my question is for the committee this language that specifically says “with the exception of for-hire trips in which the vessel has the appropriate federal commercial permit”; that is a little different from the language that is in the current Alternative 2. And that is what I’m looking for from the committee if you want to change the language just to make it clearer, we hoped.

MR. HARTIG: Repeat that one again for me.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Up here, this alternative is just some clarification in the language, so it is a little different from the current Alternative 2. That doesn’t specifically say for-hire trips in which the vessel holds the appropriate federal commercial permit; but if the committee thinks that the Alternative 2 is fine and is clear, that’s fine.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I’m sorry, but I’m confused. The current Alternative 2, you just read what it says, so what is the IPT suggesting – how does that language need to be clarified, the current Alternative 2, what is exactly the suggestion?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: The main difference is that it specifies that it can be a for-hire trip under the bag limit as defined with paying passengers and more than three people and et cetera, and so with the exception of a for-hire trip, what we’re trying to get with clarifying Alternative 2 is that you can sell fish that were caught on a for-hire trip as long as that vessel has the permits. Alternative 3 is that you can’t sell it if it happened on any recreational trip, and so that is what I was trying to go for.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So in Alternative 2, just to be clear, if I have a for-hire permit and I have a commercial permit, I’m going to be able to sell king or Spanish whether I harvest it under my for-hire trip or commercial; so if I take out paying passengers, I’m still allowed to sell that, and then the difference is Alternative 3 would not allow me on a for-hire trip to sell my fish.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Yes.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: But, if I was a person who had a for-hire permit and a commercial permit and I went out and strictly commercially harvested on my trip, then I could sell my commercial harvest? Got it; thank you.

DR. CRABTREE: But the problem I think is that the federal king mackerel permit, as I understand it, is not a permit required to sell; it is a permit required to exceed the bag limit. So the language of the necessary state and federal permits to sell, I don’t think there is a necessary federal permit to sell right now. It seems to me the question is if we want to allow for-hire vessels to sell, do we want to allow all for-hire vessels to sell or only dual-permitted for-hire vessels to sell?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I think the intent was only dual-permitted vessels would be able to sell; yes, but in which alternative, that is a good question. We’re in the weeds. John.

MR. JOLLEY: I think everybody knows how I feel. I sent an e-mail out on the dolphin thing. I would just hope that is consistent with our thinking in the way we treated the dolphin fishermen, and it looks to me as though it is. Whatever we decide, it should certainly just like the dolphin restrictions.

DR. CRABTREE: And what we have decided there is not to allow sale of bag limit caught fish. We have over the last few years prohibited the sale of snapper grouper caught under the bag limit, we have prohibited the sale of dolphin caught under the bag limit. Now, the Gulf of Mexico 15 years or more ago prohibited the sale of reef fish caught under the bag limit.

Whether you have dual permits or not, if you're fishing under the bag limit you can't sell it. The path that both councils have been on, although it has been a slow and rocky path, has been to prohibit bag limit sales, period, and that has been the consistent path we have been on. There are a lot of reasons for that.

One is it creates double-counting problems. You have fish that are potentially intercepted by the recreational survey, but then they're sold; and if they're sold to a licensed dealer, they're going to be reported under the quota monitoring program and that kind of thing. Secondly, our Law Enforcement APs, as I understand it, have supported eliminating bag limit sales because by reducing the number of vessels selling fish they think it makes it easier to stop backdoor sales to restaurants and that sort of thing.

The second thing that has been driving this is as these ACLs have all gone into place, there have been concerns that allowing a very large group of people to sell bag limit caught fish will result in the ACLs being caught more quickly and that undermines the professional fishermen who are fishing commercially for a living. I think those are the kinds of rationale that we have been applying to all these decisions. In terms of being consistent where we would go would be eliminate bag limit sales, period.

MR. BELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee but I have had to deal with this from the state perspective, and it is a lot easier if you're either this or you're that from a law enforcement perspective. Also related if you have a relatively – like for us king mackerel is not a huge commercial fishery; but if you have a fishery where a whole bunch of people that aren't necessarily a true commercial fisherman all the time are putting product in the market and dealing with flooding fish in, whether it is cobia or king mackerel, at certain times, it really makes it hard for the guys that are trying to make a living at just the commercial side to do that, so it presents a lot of complications.

It is much simpler – and I know maybe me coming at the last minute, but either this or that; and then in terms of the reporting, the reporting stream goes one way or the other. It is just a lot easier from the management perspective if you're one or the other. It's that my two cents worth.

MR. HARTIG: Well, this is all great discussion for the preferred alternative if you want to pick that. Let's get the wording straight first and then we'll – go ahead, Mac.

MR. CURRIN: That is what I will attempt to do, Ben. I think Roy is right, I think the language should be dually permitted vessels rather than state and federal permits to sell. If that makes it cleaner – and that may not be the absolutely most appropriate way to state and I’m certainly willing to give the staff editorial license to come up with the appropriate wording, but I think that would be my intent regarding Alternative 2 is that you have a for-hire permit and you also have a CMP permit. Then you would be allowed to sell; that is what Alternative 2 says to me.

MR. HARTIG: Anyone else? I thought I saw another hand. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: It was me but it is really more germane to the discussion about a preferred alternative.

MR. HARTIG: All right, are we clear on that wording for Alternative 2?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I mean, is that okay?

MR. HARTIG: Okay, we’ve got it up there. Alternative 2 now to prohibit sale of king and Spanish mackerel caught in federal waters under the bag limit with the exception for for-hire trips in which the vessel also holds the appropriate federal commercial permit. All sales of king and Spanish mackerel during commercial closures are prohibited. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think the phrase “appropriate federal permit” though is still ambiguous because I don’t believe there is an appropriate federal permit since the federal permit is a permit to exceed the bag limit and not a permit to sale. I think we can say unless they have a commercial king mackerel permit, but I don’t think just the word “appropriate” is sufficient. Do you see what I’m saying?

MR. HARTIG: Yes. Well, you have to have the recreational permit as well. I mean if you’re a charter fisherman you have to have the charter permit; is that also included in this option or not?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I think if there is a for-hire trip that happens and the vessel has the permit for that, so that is why it says “in which the vessel also holds a federal king mackerel or Spanish mackerel commercial permit”.

MR. HARTIG: I’m clear; is everybody comfortable? Monica. I mean let’s get this right. There are a lot of people in the back that have been looking and trying to do this for a long, long time.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So I could read that if I harvested my bag limit of king mackerel and if I had a Spanish commercial permit, I could sell my bag limit of king mackerel. I think it might be a good idea to – one idea is to break king out and deal with it and then break Spanish out and deal with it unless you want to make a long alternative, a long couple of sentences here and talk about you prohibit the sale of king mackerel caught in federal waters under the bag limit with the exception of for-hire trips in which the vessel also holds a federal king mackerel permit, and then say the same thing for Spanish or you could break it out. They really are two separate fish, they’re two separate actions or they really are separate.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Another alternative?

DR. CRABTREE: No, just reword this. The way that is written right now if you were a for-hire vessel and you have a Spanish mackerel permit, you can sell king mackerel. That is not what we mean. We want you to have to have the king mackerel permit to sell king mackerel. That is not the way it is written. It says king or Spanish.

I think all we've got to do is rewrite it and say "prohibit sale of king mackerel caught in federal waters under the bag limit unless you have a king mackerel permit and prohibit the sale of Spanish mackerel caught on these vessels unless you have a Spanish mackerel permit." But I don't think we mean you can sell both if you have one, because remember Spanish mackerel is open access, so anybody can get that. We don't want to let them sell king mackerel because they have a Spanish mackerel permit, but that is the way it's written.

MR. JOLLEY: I'm still a little confused. Is it the intent to prohibit these for-hire people from selling any bag limit fish like king and Spanish mackerel? Is that the intent; you can't sell – if you're on a for-hire trip, a charter trip, you can't sell the bag limit; is that the intent?

MR. HARTIG: Well, we haven't quite got to the preferred yet. We're still trying to get the wording right on all these different options and when we get to the preferred –

DR. CRABTREE: That is not the intent of this alternative; that's the intent of Alternative 3.

MR. HARTIG: All right, have we added the wording in there, Kari, or not?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Yes, and it is specified –

MR. HARTIG: Okay, are we alternative with Alternative 2 as it is up there now? Okay, Alternative 2 currently, "Prohibit sale of king mackerel caught in federal waters under the bag limit with the exception for for-hire trips in which the vessel also holds a federal king mackerel commercial permit; prohibit sale of Spanish mackerel caught in federal waters under the bag limit with the exception of for-hire trips in which the vessel also holds a federal Spanish mackerel commercial permit. All sales of king and Spanish mackerel during a commercial closure are prohibited." Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Now that you read that, I think that is much better and that is much more clear. My question is going to be for this alternative and then the next one; do you want Option A, South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction; Option B, Gulf of Mexico Council's jurisdiction; to provide each council maximum flexibility.

Now you may not want that. You may decide this is an all or nothing thing and we want both councils to be similar; or actually not similar but we want both councils to do the same thing, but I'm not sure if you want to keep that flexibility in there or you do not want it.

MR. HARTIG: I kind of think we probably should since the Gulf is going to look at this again and may have a difference of opinion and then we could separate out the jurisdictions if we had

to. I think they're on the same page as we are so far, but let's leave that flexibility in there. I think that is a great suggestion. Now we need a motion to adopt the corrected language for Alternative 2 with the addition of Option A, South Atlantic Council jurisdiction; and Option B, Gulf Council jurisdiction under Alternative 2. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: I'd be willing to make the motion to adopt the language for Alternative 2 as indicated.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Mac; second by Duane Harris. Any other discussion? Any objection to this wording? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.** Okay, that was a little more difficult than I had anticipated.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Well, Alternative 3 we also wanted to clarify and everything, so here is our recommendation. Alternative 3 just prohibits sale of CMP species caught in federal waters under the bag limit, and we can change this to king and Spanish mackerel to track what we have done in the others. If this is good enough and clear enough, then I think that Alternative 3 can just – that's all it needs to say.

MR. CURRIN: I would suggest that we also add those Options A and B under this as well so that we have that flexibility if the Gulf decides they don't want to do that. **With that added language, Mr. Chairman, I would move that we accept the recommended language for Alternative 3.**

MR. HARTIG: Okay, motion by Mac; second by David Cupka to accept the recommended change in language. Any discussion? Roy and Monica, that is pretty clear and straightforward. I liked that when I read it before, no problems.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do, too.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, great! Anymore discussion under that alternative? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman, just indicate that would be my preferred. I'm not going to offer that as a motion right now. We'll let the council receive public input and accept that later unless there is a desire by the committee.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, and I think it gets to John's point. John made it clear that he thought we should have consistency in what we're doing. That one is there, John, so it would be consistent with the others.

MR. JOLLEY: Thank you; I'm a little less confused.

DR. CRABTREE: I think somewhere right up front in this action, though, we need to state that Action 3 considers an exception to these prohibitions, right, because here we're prohibiting bag limit sales but Action 3 may turn around and allow bag limit sales for tournaments depending on what we decide. It seems there should be a statement here that Action 3 is related to it.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I kind of wanted to follow up on a conversation that Roy had started earlier with the council's intent in terms of proceeding down the road of disallowing bag limit sales in general for all of our managed species, sending a message that the commercial quota is for the bona fide commercial fishermen. I just wanted to say a few things about this particular action in terms of doing that.

I know that when we did an analysis several years ago, four or five years ago, and worked with the permits office to do an analysis of what the permitted sales versus the unpermitted sales – and it was specific to king mackerel. There was quite a contribution of what we're calling bag limit sales to, I guess what I will call, the overall commercial allocation.

This is an analysis that I would like to see. I think in order to be really fair – and this impacts some of the other actions that we're going to be considering – that I would like to see a historical analysis of the permitted versus unpermitted king mackerel sales. I think if we are going to go down the road of prohibiting those bag limit sales that analysis is necessary; and I would suggest that if you're going to cut those folks out who basically contributed to what is now the commercial portion of the ACL, that those unpermitted sales then be added back into the recreational ACL.

If we're going to go down the road of creating a set-aside for tournaments, that you could then create a sub-allocation from that recreational ACL. That is just an analysis that I would like to see of the permitted versus the unpermitted sales. I know it is uncomplicated to do that analysis, but I think that would probably be the fairest way to go.

MR. HARTIG: Well, thank you, and we do that for reef fish. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: And I would just ask that you keep in mind when you view that analysis that it will be a conservative estimate because we all know that there are backdoor sales that occur off the back of charterboats and have for a long time and probably will continue into the future. Keep that in mind as you view those analyses when you receive them.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that kind of economic analysis will have to be done. We did it in 15B, I think it was, for the snapper grouper fishery, and I think it will have to be done here.

DR. DUVAL: But I'm not just talking about economics; I'm talking about landings.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, to do the economic analysis you will have to look at the landings.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, I just wanted to be clear about that because I'm looking at the overall recreational versus commercial allocation, that's all, and saying if you have had a significant percentage of the commercial landings, say 40 percent were unpermitted, that has contributed to the commercial versus recreational sector allocation that we have set up.

If we are going to prohibit those bag limit sales which contributed to the calculation of the sector allocation for the ACLs, it seems to me that is one of the fairest ways to go, especially if the council is considering looking at a set-aside for tournament sales. You know, take those

unpermitted sales, add that average – and this is just off the top of my head – to the recreational ACL in order to be fair; that's all.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I don't think we did that with reef fish, but that is another discussion we can have at another time after we look at this as it is broken out. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, just if we're going to get into making adjustments to the allocation, you're talking about a whole new level of controversy from this. I don't think there is anything in here right now that does that, and I don't think the tournament sale action actually creates any sort of set-aside.

It just allows it and says that they're going to be counted against the recreational quota. I think that's a whole 'nother set of complexities we really haven't talked to you yet is how exactly would we make sure that happens, but we can talk about that when we get to tournament sales.

MR. JOLLEY: Did we do this same kind of analysis with dolphin and wahoo?

MR. HARTIG: That I don't remember; I don't remember if we did with dolphin and wahoo or not. Do you remember, Phil? Okay, I don't know that we did, but we're going to do it with king and Spanish. Mel.

MR. BELL: Mr. Chairman, again I'm not on your committee, just commenting and whining a little bit more. Just something to keep in mind is we have sector allocations. When I was talking about it is easier to be – you know, it is much simpler if you're one or the other and it feeds into the proper sector and the allocation stuff makes senses.

But one thing to keep in mind with the for-hire sector, they make money off of taking people while fishing. That's the primary way that they run that business. A more traditional commercial fisherman, his total profitability and his business has to do with bringing that product to shore and selling that product for a good price.

And again we have some small fisheries that maybe this is a bigger deal for us; but when you have the ability to introduce a lot more product into the market, you can suppress prices, you can suppress the ability to even want those fish from the traditional commercial side of the house. It is one sector potentially having an influence on another sector, and it is kind of an unfair thing I guess in my mind.

It's just something to keep in mind; you're kind of crossing influences across those sector lines potentially, and that is some of my resistance I guess to this to stay on one side or the other. Again, you can run a successful for-hire business without – and I realize the desire. One, you don't want to waste product or fish, but you also want to be able to recoup some of the expense perhaps.

You can still run a successful for-hire business with your clientele and not necessarily have to sell the fish. The commercial fisherman, on the other hand, has to sell those fish and he has to

get the best price he can get for those fish; and that's another reason I think in my mind if you're on one side or the other, it just makes a lot more sense. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that, Mel, and there are a lot of people in the back of the room that appreciate that, and there are a number of people that have been impacted by recreational sales, depressing prices in one case in particular that I'm thinking of, but it has happened and I think it is time to move on. Go ahead, John.

MR. JOLLEY: A little bit of the weeds, I guess, but I just hope as a group we don't lose sight of the biggest owner of this resource is the consumer; and when we make these judgments it may not be in the best interest of the consumer when we're restricting more sales by entities that have historically sold fish off the boat for 50, 60 or 70 years now. I thought I'd put that out there as we make these final decisions.

DR. DUVAL: Just to follow up on what Mel said, I agree and I know that based on what we have been seeing this year, so there is some concern. We have got a benchmark stock assessment coming up for king mackerel next year. We haven't seen a lot of the fish up where we are. If we end up having a lower ACL as a result of the assessment, those bag limit sales are going to have that much more of an impact on the bona fide commercial fishermen who, like you said, their entire productivity depends on the sale of that fish.

MS. McCAWLEY: Along the lines of what John Jolley said, our commission has gone on record as wanting to allow the for-hire sale so any type of motion that we make to pick a preferred that would eliminate those for-hire sales, I'm going to have to vote against it.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, and I have been informed that we do the economic analysis on dolphin and wahoo, also, so we will be consistent in doing that. Anything else? Okay, we have got our language straightened out; does the committee want to select a preferred on this one? Just take it out to hearing.

Okay, Alternative 3, prohibit sales of king and Spanish mackerel caught in federal waters under the bag limit; Option A, the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction; Option B, Gulf Council's jurisdiction. Is there anymore discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved. All right, would the committee like to pick a preferred in this one or just take it to hearing? Mac made the statement before he was comfortable going to hearing without it. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I'd sort of like to see the economic analysis and see how this plays out and how much impact it has on people, and I think that is going to be a while before we have it.

MR. HARTIG: That makes sense; no preferred.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, Action 2, sale of cobia, there are four alternatives. The first is no action so there is no federal permit required to sell cobia. Again, this is I think a similar language situation that Roy was just talking about where the commercial permits for king and Spanish are to harvest over the bag limit, so we may need to fix that.

Sale of cobia harvested under a possession limit is allowed for persons that possess the necessary state permits; but if a commercial closure has been implemented, the sale or purchase of cobia in the migratory group subzone or gear type is prohibited including any cobia taken under the possession limit.

Alternative 2 would create a new commercial cobia permit; so for a person to sell cobia in or from the EEZ of the Atlantic or Gulf or Mexico, the fish must have been harvested aboard a vessel with a commercial cobia permit. Three would be for a person to sell cobia they would have to be fish harvested aboard a vessel with a commercial vessel king mackerel or Spanish mackerel permit – so basically just including cobia in one of the existing permits that we have.

Alternative 4 would be for a person to sell cobia from the EEZ the fish would have to have been harvested aboard a vessel with at least one of the following commercial vessel permits; king mackerel, Spanish mackerel, Gulf reef fish, South Atlantic snapper grouper, or South Atlantic dolphin and wahoo. Basically, the vessel would just have to have any commercial permit.

The Gulf Council made no motions and did not select a preferred. The Mackerel AP recommends selecting Alternative 4 as the preferred because it covers most of the commercial fishermen already. During Gulf scoping, most of the commenters did not feel that a separate cobia permit would be necessary, that it could probably just be linked to an existing permit like king mackerel or Spanish mackerel. Here are the alternatives, and I have two questions if you want to add or remove any of those and if you want to select a preferred.

MR. HARTIG: Are we comfortable with the wording under this, Roy and Monica? Since cobia is a bag limit, if you had a permit it wouldn't be to exceed the bag limit, it would be to sell the possession limit.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I think the reason we need a permit – and this ties into the dealer permit because we've got problems because we have don't have a dealer permit right now for these things. If you don't have a permit and a dealer permit, these guys can sell straight to restaurants and restaurants aren't interviewed in the dealer report survey, so I don't know how we'd ever track the ACL in that case.

We've got to tie this down to where only permitted fishermen can land and they have to sell to permitted dealers so they're part of the quota monitoring system. I think you could require one of the existing permits, however you want to do that. It seems to me if you allow Spanish mackerel to be one of those permits, then anybody who doesn't have one of these permits go get a Spanish mackerel permit. But we need all that and the dealer permit amendment to close the loop and make this work. I believe we do have separate cobia commercial and recreational ACLs. I think the Gulf just has a single cobia ACL and doesn't separate the two.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I wondered whether this is going to be unified all or nothing or whether you want to break it out into South Atlantic jurisdiction and Gulf jurisdiction like you did for king and Spanish. That would be for a number of these alternatives.

MR. HARTIG: Bob, have you got a sense of where you are on these options; do you have a sense of the direction that you're thinking about going? That is kind of putting you on the spot a bit.

MR. GILL: Well, from a personal point of view I don't have a good sense where the council is on these. I think the intent is that whatever we do we do it together because I think if we split we've created a real mess down in the Keys, and we don't want to go there. The hope is that we're unified in our agreement as to how we proceed. That will be my argument next week.

MR. CURRIN: The only other thing that is missing here, if you remember in the first action we included cobia in there addressing the sale by the for-hire sector, and that is absent from this action now. We need another, I guess, suite of subalternatives under Alternative 5 on this action to address the for-hire sale.

I would suggest that it mirror the wording in the king mackerel and Spanish mackerel action. It is going to be a little touchy because it is going to assume that there is a permit for cobia, so I don't know how you work that all out, but I would strongly recommend we have similar language addressing the sale by the for-hire sector somewhere in here for cobia.

MR. HARTIG: That is a good recommendation. Do we need to add the concurrence? Monica has got a good point, but functionally how is it going to work if we don't come to a consensus on it. I'm not sure. Go ahead.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, there may be good reasons not to separate it out to the two jurisdictions because cobia is quite different than the king mackerel fishery or the Spanish mackerel fishery. It's two-fish I believe limit for everybody regardless of what you consider yourself to be, commercial or recreational, so you may just not want to do it. I just wanted to bring it up for you to think about.

MR. HARTIG: Is the committee comfortable adding those? I think the Gulf Council is going to understand from the discussion we had that if we don't do the same thing, Bob has said the concurrence is going to be critical on this and his intent is to push that. Do you want to include those? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think they should be included, Ben. It doesn't preclude selecting both of them; and then if there is a problem at some point we'll have to sort it out, but it at least allows both councils to consider acting independently and to me that is important.

This Alternative 5, I'm not sure to goes all the way, Kari, that we need to go because I think we need some specific language regarding the for-hire dual-permitted vessels once we have a cobia permit or tack it on to an existing permit or something. Do you know what I mean? I'm perfectly fine with letting you work on that language.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I think maybe it would be good to have a motion from the committee to add an alternative that would allow dual-permitted vessels to sell under the bag limit. It is just one bag limit.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, it is just one limit.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So I don't know what it would give people.

MR. CURRIN: What I'm trying to have is the opportunity for the council to select an alternative that would not allow the sale of cobia from a for-hire vessel that was dually permitted. As we did with king and Spanish we had one alternative where it would allow them if they were dually permitted to sell king or Spanish mackerel but for cobia we do not. I would like to see that covered in an alternative and give the council the option to allow for for-hire vessels and not allow it for for-hire vessels.

MR. HARTIG: And that is good because none of these alternatives captures any of that. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: One issue with the way that is written is it only applies to cobia caught in federal waters, but you could prohibit the sale of bag limit caught cobia by federally permitted vessels, period, regardless of where they caught it. If you just say you can't sell a cobia if it is caught in federal waters, you're going to create a big loophole because nobody is going to know where those fish were caught. I don't think we worded that in the previous ones for mackerel and all that. We just prohibited sale of fish caught under the bag limits by vessels. We didn't get into where it is caught.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: That is the language in Action 1 so we may need to go back. In Action 1 king and Spanish mackerel, these are the alternatives that you've just approved.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't see any language in those alternatives that says caught in federal waters.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So we can take that out if it needs to be removed.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think it creates a loophole. I think it is easy to see it.

MR. HARTIG: Well, all this is going to work, Roy, under the concurrence thing we look at it at the back, whether you have to abide by the most stringent state or federal regulations, in state waters you have to fish under the state regulations and in federal waters you have to fish federal regulations. If the state doesn't prohibit the sale of bag limit caught fish, then that becomes a moot point, anyway, correct?

DR. CRABTREE: It doesn't have to be. You can require that federally permitted vessels can't sell it. You can't require that a non-federally permitted; that is up to the jurisdiction of the state, but you can make these sorts of things conditions of the permit. It's really up to what you want to do.

MR. CURRIN: I guess a question for Roy; and, Roy, can't we also require that federally permitted dealers purchase only from federally licensed – Monica is shaking her head no.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I don't think that we could do that under the law.

DR. CRABTREE: It gets confusing because we have an Action 6 that is the federal consistency provision, but then in this action we assume to be by intent not prohibiting this activity in state waters. I guess you can do it that way, but it is just kind of confusing and I think it would be good to clarify exactly what you mean.

MR. HARTIG: Well, do you need that state and federal waters; is that what we need to add or how do we change the wording? Monica.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, take out "caught in federal waters".

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I'm not sure if this exactly solves this for cobia, but there is an action in here, Action 6, federal regulatory compliance, which talks about that a commercially permitted vessel at least for king and Spanish I think has to abide by the more restrictive – if it is closed in federal waters, they can't go into state waters and harvest and sell if they have a federal permit, so you could deal with that then; I'm not sure.

DR. CRABTREE: Monica, if this was passed with that language up there, even if we chose in Action 6 – I guess it's Alternative 2 that you have to comply with the most restrictive; if the state then doesn't do anything we're allowing the federally permitted vessels to sell cobia caught under the bag limit if they're caught in state waters.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's true.

DR. CRABTREE: The question is, is that really what you intend because you could say we prohibit the sale of fish caught under the bag limit. Then that becomes the most restrictive and the federally permitted vessels wouldn't be allowed to sell fish caught under the bag limit even if they caught them in state waters. That is what we've got to figure out.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and the only problem is cobia in both the commercial and the recreational fisheries is caught under the bag limit so you have that confounding issue for cobia.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, you could just define it as a trip limit in the commercially permitted vessels to get around that. I think that is just a semantics clarification.

MR. EASLEY: As written here, there is nothing the enforcement folks can do with this. That's the bottom line.

DR. CRABTREE: Because you're not going to know where the fish was caught?

MR. EASLEY: Exactly.

MR. HARTIG: So if we had sales caught under a bag limit prohibited, you could do something with that?

MR. EASLEY: Right.

MR. HARTIG: And if we had the concurrence that you had to abide by the most stringent regulation or federally permitted vessels had to abide by the federal regulation.

MR. EASLEY: That would work, right.

MR. CURRIN: If you remove that and just said prohibit sale of cobia caught under the bag limit, that may even address the for-hire sector as well. We'd have to do something to redefine how the commercial trip limit is defined and make sure those are separate because we certainly don't want to prohibit the sale of fish caught under the trip limit. But, if that wording would deal with the sales by the for-hire sector as well as the recreational sector, then that would seem to be clean and simple. I'm not positive that it would, though.

DR. CRABTREE: And it may be just a matter of defining that caught under the bag limit means a vessel that – since we're talking about vessels that have commercial permits, if it is a dual-permitted vessel that is fishing while under charter, then it is fishing under the bag limit; but if it is not, then this doesn't apply to it. There is language at least I know in the Gulf regulations that defines when you're fishing under the bag limit and when you're on a charter trip and when you're not and some of those kinds of things.

MR. HARTIG: We have it here, too, we prohibit the bag limit sales on – I thought we did at least in one instance, anyway, and we used the same definitions and under the bag limit. There they are, just what you were referring to, so we have those. Are you comfortable with that or do you want to look at that a little more? Go ahead, Otha.

MR. EASLEY: Is there a way to better define the difference between operating as a headboat versus commercial for dual permitted? I think the Gulf addressed it by the number of people on board. We will hear on the water that, hey, we're all working together or – well, they'll say the appropriate thing to match the catches on board; I'll put it that way.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I don't know how many crew you have to have to safely operate a headboat. Certainly, we could ask and see if we can further define that headboat requirement. I understand; we have that problem where we I am.

We have six-pack or eight-pack, nine-pack; they're not the giant headboats but they're in the in-between size where they take a number of people, and we have those people that pile on board and then they commercial fish. I don't know that they're paying a fee at the time. We have a definition of three people for at least of the portion of that. How do we define a headboat; what is the headboat difference? Well, we have got a headboat captain right here so maybe we'll get some light on this.

MR. SWATZEL: Well, a headboat is going to generally have a U.S. Coast Guard Certificate of Inspection, and that inspection is going to define the crewing or manning requirements, so I would just assume that you'd go back to that.

MR. HARTIG: Otha, if you had the definition of a headboat when they were on a commercial trip, if you defined it that they couldn't have more than the crew-manning requirements on the coast guard licensing requirements; would that – because each headboat is going to be different and they're going to have different licensing and crew requirements. Is that the way it works, Tom; is that how you've seen it in the history of your headboat fishery?

MR. SWATZEL: Yes, generally it just depends on how many passengers the vessel is certified for. Obviously, it requires more deckhands the more passengers that you have. I think in most cases most manning requirements are not generally beyond three or four, but I think that is a good way to define it.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, Otha is going to think about that one. That doesn't have to be done today particularly. That is something that is a definition that we have for our crew requirements throughout this for charter and headboat. We need to deal with it. Otha has brought up a good point and I think Tom has answered that we can deal with it with the coast guard inspection and licensing requirements for the crew requirements for that vessel. We could have a number tied to that so I think that is a good start trying to help you get to that number.

MR. EASLEY: I will discuss it with the coast guard representative, also.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, that's great. Okay, there has been some significant discussion. Monica, is there anything –

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I can always think of something; you don't want to give me that open-ended of a question. I think for now we have pretty much covered it.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, so we've got the definition for now to be addressed later. Under Alternative 5 we have the prohibit sale of cobia caught under the bag limit, which would prohibit all for-hire and recreational sales. I think that is pretty simple and right to the point. I think we have cleared that one up. Is there anymore discussion on that motion? Go ahead, Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Just so it is not lost in there, if we could add a note, Kari, maybe that the intent is to prohibit for-hire as well as private recreational sales there; just so it is not lost; and in the future if somebody looks at it more closely and they say, well, this is not exactly going to do it, I hope that the committee and council will work toward developing some alternatives that will address that.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, and we have added the two options for the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction and the Gulf Council's jurisdiction. Any more discussion?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Is this a motion?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, this is a motion to add Alternative 5.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman, I'll make that motion to add another Alternative 5 to this action.

MR. HARTIG: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded by Duane Harris. **The motion is to prohibit sale of cobia caught under the bag limit for for-hire and private recreational with Option A, South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction; Option B, Gulf Council's jurisdiction.** Any more discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.**

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So now you have five alternatives for this; would you like to select any preferreds?

MR. HARTIG: I don't see any hands going up.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I tried to go back and address this if you want. This is in Action 1, the caught in federal waters; do you want to take that out?

MR. HARTIG: I think it would be appropriate with what we did under cobia, Monica. That would clear that up and it would be specific to the bag limit, and then we could also put that wording in that Mac had. It would prohibit the sale of both private and for-hire sales.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So now both of these in the king and Spanish action and the cobia action have the same language. Okay, Action 3 is the tournament sales of king mackerel. Alternative 1, no action, so there is no federal permit required to sell or donate king mackerel caught during a tournament.

Sale or donation of king mackerel harvested during a tournament is allowed for tournament organizers in accordance with any state laws and regulations in the state in which the tournament is held. However, if a commercial closure has been implemented, the sale or purchase of king mackerel of the migratory group, subzone or gear type is prohibited, including king mackerel harvested during a tournament.

Alternative 2 would establish a federal king mackerel tournament permit to be obtained by tournament organizers in order to sell or donate the tournament caught king mackerel. Sale is prohibited during a commercial closure. All fish sold or donated shall be counted against the recreational allocation of the ACL.

Alternative 3 would prohibit the sale of tournament caught king mackerel. Alternative 4 would create would create a set-aside from the recreational king mackerel ACL for tournament sales. Tournament organizers would be required to report all king mackerel harvested during the tournament.

The Gulf Council did not change any of these or select a preferred. The Mackerel AP recommended to add the following wording to Alternative 4; "Any sale provision of these fish should be left up to the state" and select that alternative as the preferred. The rationale was that this would allow tournament catch to be counted as part of the recreational ACL and let the states decide how and if sales are allowed. For example, in South Carolina these are not allowed.

MR. HARTIG: I know Roy had some concerns with this one, but he is not here currently.

MR. JOLLEY: I know this is important to the commercial sector to some degree, and I don't know how significant it is, but the recreational harvest and then sale of recreationally caught fish should never go against the commercial allocation. In the fishing clubs' estimate, it should come off the recreational.

MR. HARTIG: Let me ask you a question. In your KDW tournament what happens with the king mackerel in that tournament specifically?

MR. JOLLEY: I don't know all the points. We donate a lot of that fish. Not all of the king mackerel are donated to us, but a lot of them are and that gives them a chance to get another prize when they donate that. I believe there is some economic return as well. You'd have to have to talk to Tom Dwi Fort.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, per the Mackerel AP recommendations, I move that on Alternative 4 we add the following wording "any sale provision of these fish be left up to the state."

MR. HARTIG: We have got a motion by Charlie; second by John Jolley. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Charlie, would you and John consider making that a separate alternative so that you had a choice because I can envision some problems with states administering that and choosing how to administer it. I'd like to be able to make sure that we have an option to prevent those fish under all circumstances from entering the commercial market and being counted against the commercial quota. I think if you separated those two – created those two alternatives, that would allow for at least a very clean prohibition of those fish entering the commercial market.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a problem with making that as – I guess that would be Alternative 5, then.

MR. HARTIG: So it would be the same wording in Alternative 4 with the added wording from the AP. Is that all right with the seconder?

MR. JOLLEY: That's fine.

DR. CRABTREE: So if we decide in Action 1 to prohibit the sale of fish caught under the bag limit, then the state in my view has absolutely no jurisdiction or authority to allow such sales. I don't see how that can work. If you guys prohibit it from federal waters by federally permitted vessels, then I don't believe the state has any authority to regulate it. I don't think you can just punt this to the state depending on what you decide in the earlier actions. Do you see what I'm saying, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, I understand what you're saying and I guess the council will have to choose whether that is the way they want to go. I guess this is making just a more clear pronouncement on what you want to do with tournament harvested fish, right? I guess you have to think about whether you want to carve something out to allow for tournament harvested fish to

be sold if you earlier you said the fish harvested under the bag limit could not be sold. I think you have some flexibility, but you're going to have to pay attention to the previous action and what you select when you're looking at this action.

Dr. CRABTREE: I think she is right; I think you could craft it in a way where you could say except for tournaments that are certified and run by a state and that the state has to submit a list of such tournaments to the RA or something like that. I think you can work around it somehow but I think it takes more than just putting a sentence like that in.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So I guess my question is in Action 1 does there need to be actually in the alternative "with the exception of tournament sales"? I guess I'm confused because if the committee and both councils are going to actually consider allowing tournament sales, then I think we should go ahead and put – at least consider some provisions to allow tournament sales and then go ahead and put the language into Action 1, into the alternatives "with the exception of tournament sales".

If the committee and the councils are not going consider this, then we can go ahead and just work it under Action 1 it will apply. I guess you haven't made that decision if you're going to allow tournament sales. I guess my question, Monica, is do we need to go ahead and put the language in Action 1?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think it is going to depend what the council does, and you just don't know at this point because you're going to take it out to public hearing. Maybe you will get a clearer picture after public hearing and when the council sees it again as to what they want to do. I know what you're talking about; I'm just not sure when you – if the council decides, no, we're not going to allow the sale or if the council says we are going to allow the sale, then you're right, and you'd go back in Action 1 and say "except for tournament harvested fish". I'm not sure when to tell you to put that in there at this point.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and that gets back to my comment a minute ago about you're going to need some language in Action 1; because if we create a tournament king mackerel permit, then that is another exception that would apply in the alternatives there. Somehow you're going to have to connect them. Exactly what is the best way to do that, I'm not sure.

MR. CURRIN: I don't see any difference in trying to do this in one action and the council passing Amendment XY and then coming back in at a later date and making an exception to a regulation that was in place in Amendment XY. We're just trying to accomplish this in one fell swoop here. I don't quite understand why there can't be just language under Action 1 that says further Action 6, whatever the number is here, is going to consider establishing an exception to the total prohibition of sales. I see your point, Roy, but I think it is just a semantics thing and I hope we can handle that in the description.

DR. CRABTREE: I do, too, Mac, and that's what I brought up earlier that there needs to be some language under Action 1 to explain that Action 3 creates an exception to it depending on what we choose.

MR. CURRIN: But you're not suggesting that we need to mess with the alternatives that we've established in Action 1 necessarily, but it could be handled by some language under that action?

DR. CRABTREE: Not right now I'm not suggesting that; I think it can be handled by some additional language. But with the motion on the board, that part of that last phrase and how that would work, I'm not at all clear. I don't think the state can create an exception to the prohibition in the federal regulations unless we figure something out there.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I don't remember exactly – I would have to look up the minutes – what their intent was, but I feel like it was to make sure that, for example, South Carolina doesn't allow tournament sales and to maintain that I guess to make sure that there is not a loophole created. I don't know if that was the intent, but I don't think it was to in some way create a loophole for a state to allow it. It was just to make sure that if the state – yes, that the state could prohibit it if they want to.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, why would we allow it in one state and not in the other state?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I think it was to let the state decide if they wanted to allow it or not.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So the idea is if you want to leave this in, you take it out to public hearing, some problem is going to be perhaps the analysis that will have to be done because this is a joint amendment and you've got a lot of different states. On the other hand, I think Roy is probably right, if we had said earlier that you cannot sell these federally caught fish, then if you can't sell the federally caught fish and the AP was concerned about South Carolina and making sure that you couldn't sell – South Carolina wouldn't allow the sale of those fish, I think that is already taken care of.

We're saying right up front you can't sell these federally caught fish. Maybe we can just put that in the discussion and make it clear, and that might take care of the AP's concerns. If you're right, Kari, that they weren't proposing that different states allow sales, they were more focused on, hey, you can't do this in South Carolina. We just need to tell them, hey, you can't do this in any of the states; so if we make that clear in the discussion, that's fine. I guess it's up to the council if you want to leave it in and take it out to public hearing or not. I don't know if it will be more confusing or less confusing.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't want to speak for South Carolina and I know some of the SKA organizers that at times had tournaments in South Carolina and I got fish from them a few years ago, and what they told me was they didn't have a mechanism for they didn't want to do bag limit sales.

I think a lot of it probably had to do with charging against the commercial; but we set the set-aside – and I'm not sure which mechanism we would do that – that would be something that maybe Roy could explain, because one these says counted against the recreational allocation, and I thought I remembered at some point in the discussion you couldn't count a commercial – something that was sold against the recreational allocation and I'm thinking we may have to do a set-aside.

But if we do that so everything is counted where it needs to be counted, then I think that makes it clean enough where those tournament fish can then be sold, the money go to charity and what has been going on. Again, I've had tournaments say, well, we needed to come get the fish and write the check to the Rotary Club; and then, no, we're going to give them to charity; and a week later they say, oops, sorry, the Salvation Army or whoever else said, no, we only want filleted frozen product, we don't want a fresh fish, we can't handle it, so come buy them and then we'll send the money to them. But, anyway, I think we need to figure out how to allow this and whatever works cleanest.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, one way I could see to allow the states to be involved in this is you could decide that you're going to issue the tournament permit to the state so the state applies for a tournament permit and then the state essentially sets up the rules for the sale and how all that is going to work for the tournament. And then if a state doesn't want to do it, they don't have to.

Now, I can see some of our friends at the state director level shaking their heads because that is more load put on them, so that would be the problem. I don't know if the states would want to do that or not. The other thing I think you've got to do in this, I don't believe there is anywhere in our regulations the definition of what constitutes a tournament.

I don't want to be in a situation where some guy and his three brothers send an application and say we're going to see which one of us is the best fisherman, and that is a tournament, and we get a permit. I think there are going to have to be some criteria about what constitutes a tournament and how they apply and all those kinds of things.

It looks like there is a definition of a tournament in HMS which says tournament means any fishing competition involving Atlantic HMS in which participants must register or otherwise enter or in which a prize or award is offered for catching or landing fish. Then they define a tournament operator.

I guess they have regulations on this that, Kari, I think it would be worthwhile for you guys to look at. We're going to have to figure that kind of thing out. Then there will be some reporting complexities here. I think we do want these fish – at least as I understand what we've talked about is we would want these fish to come out of the recreational ACL, so I think we have to specify that.

But, once we do the tournament amendment and all, they're going to sell these fish to a licensed – I mean the dealer permit, they're going to sell these fish to a licensed dealer who then is going to be required to report these in the quota monitoring, so we're going to have to have reporting requirements in here for the tournament because the tournament is going to have to report to us who they sold it to and how many fish there were. We could then go in and back those out of the recreational quota monitoring system.

Then the question becomes should we take the fish they catch and add that to the recreational catch estimate because I don't think these tournaments have much chance of being counted in the MRIP survey. I did ask Dave Donaldson that question I believe at the last Gulf Council meeting,

and he told me, no, they wouldn't be caught up in that. Probably we need to, Kari, have some discussions with the MRFSS people about whether it would or not. But if we did that and had the reporting requirements, then we could back it out of the commercial landings, add it to the recreational landings and it would be accounted for.

MR. JOLLEY: Maybe to Bonnie; we're monitoring billfish; we get them all in the United States now. Is there any mechanism to monitor these? As these kingfish tournaments proliferate, and they have in the last 30 years, unbelievably so, are you only getting the information via MRIP now? Is that the only way to get it or do you have other access?

DR. PONWITH: I think the answer to that is that it depends. I know that we have got a group that specialize in monitoring tournaments and it is mainly for the highly migratory species, billfish, that are run out of the Headquarters, Highly Migratory Species Division. We do that to actually shift – it would have to be a coordinated discussion to make sure that we didn't end up with double-accounting somehow. We can take that up.

The main thing is that tournament sampling is a specialized sampling protocol, so the way they handle expansions are likely different. Also, they're given pots of money for each and so it would be a negotiation in terms of taking on more tournaments for these species financially as well. I don't know the details of where the division of labor is on where they start and stop doing the tournaments, but we can talk with them about it.

DR. CRABTREE: And as I think about this, I think we are going to have to – I think the definition of tournament in the HMS language isn't very useful. I think we're going to have to get – now envision this scenario. I'm a charterboat operator in the Florida Keys and there are 25 others just like me at our docks.

We have historically sold our king mackerel and we're really ticked off that you guys won't let us sell them anymore; so, well, let's have a tournament, guys, and it is going to be a 12-month-long tournament and the winner gets a hundred dollars who can catch the most king mackerel and we're going to apply for a tournament permit and then we're going to sell our fish.

I think it opens up for a lot of those kinds of things and somehow we have to figure out what type of tournament are we talking about, because I don't want to get stuck with a hundred different groups of fishermen applying for a tournament so they can sell the fish. I think the devil is in the details with one, but I think there is a lot of work to do to figure out the intricacies of it.

MR. BELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on the committee and I guess to be consistent we have some problems with tournament sales. It kind of goes back to some of the same points I made earlier about crossing those lines. The tournaments, of course, represent a real significant pulse of a product onto the market that is a fairly minimal commercial fishery for us, so it really does – there are times when it is even hard to find a dealer that will pay for them or wants them. We have some of the same issues. There is nothing in South Carolina law the way it is constructed that would allow us to allow this to be conducted legally.

That is part of our problem and that is just the way our laws are constructed. We couldn't legally allow it to happen in some way. We sat down with some of the tournament directors and law enforcement and others and tried to figure out could we come up with some mechanism and get the legislature to allow us to do that.

Basically what we came out of that with was just tell the tournaments – basically the directors to tell the folks you catch the fish you take them home with you. That is where we sort of left that, and so that's where we are right now. I don't think there is a strong desire – I mean, obviously if you talk to some of the tournaments they would like to be to do this and some folks would like to be able to do it.

But, for some of the points that Roy made and other things, it was a lot simpler for us just to do that way, so there is not a strong desire I guess on our part to necessarily make it easy to do. The other thing is it sort of promoted some behavioral things in terms of the harvest of a lot of these fish; and if you permit it you encourage the activity.

If you encourage the activity, there is more and more of it. Aside from what it might be doing to king mackerel stocks or harvesting a lot of fish that are spawners or whatever, we're kind of getting more and more to the philosophy we like catch-and-release type tournaments. That's partly me and that's part of the department as well. We do a lot to promote catch-and-release tournaments and the big kill tournaments are just something we have kind of steered away from I guess philosophically in more recent years, but we've certainly been part of that in the past. But, that's just sort of where we are with it right now.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, I'm going to throw one thing in here. The commercial fishery, we have to operate under FDA and HACCP control. That is the law; that is what we have to do due to the histamine levels in king mackerel and Spanish mackerel. I don't know how you can allow a tournament if they don't operate under those controls to put commercial fish into commerce. I don't know how you do that. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, as somebody who has bought some tournament fish, not lots but a dozen I guess, when we're called to a tournament we're there are weigh-in. Those guys are bringing those fish in those big bags cold. The last thing they want them to do is start getting hot and losing weight. They're day fish.

It's like six 'til; weigh-in starts at three; and shuts off at five or something. The quality of those fish, and when I get them straight from the scales, they're going straight to the truck on ice. As bad as I hate to say it, in a lot of ways they're handled better than commercial fish, except for the commercial/commercial king people that really know how to handle them, but a snapper boat king mackerel, they don't approach the quality of a tournament king.

I also have to fill out – I do all the histamines and HACCP. It's doable; we can track that. If I thought it was a problem, I'd be one of the first to say so. Actually, if you want to think about it, it could be actually be more of a health hazard to give these fish to fishermen that are often going hundreds of miles back home and then they're giving away a 30-pound fish to somebody because those guys really don't want a 30-pound fish. Those fish probably have a much higher

likelihood of being mishandled and given to somebody even though they're not entering commerce and causing a health problem than them going to a dealer that is going to take care of them and enter commerce. It's just my feelings.

MR. HARTIG: I have to sign a paper every year that tells HACCP that I keep my fish at a certain temperature, and the state occasionally checks those temperatures. If we did the same thing, if we would require those same kinds of regulations on tournaments, then we wouldn't have a problem. All right, where are we? We have been all around this one.

The motion was to add the wording recommended by the AP to new Action 5, Alternative 5, create a set-aside from the recreational king mackerel ACL for tournament sales. Tournament organizers would be required to report all king mackerel harvested during the tournament. Any sale provision of these fish would be left up to the state. Is was made and it was seconded by John Jolley a long time ago. Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, **this motion is approved.** We're behind, but there has been a lot of good discussion so just be apprised of that.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Does the committee want to select a preferred alternative?

MR. PHILLIPS: **Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the motion that we have Alternative 2 as our preferred.**

MR. HARTIG: Second by Duane. Discussion? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I'm not sure I can support this. It's unclear to me. We already have a permit system in North Carolina for tournaments. I don't see what we stand to gain from this, and I really see it as probably just adding up to be more work on us. I'm sorry, Charlie, I'm not going to be able to support your motion.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee, but for the other three states I think it would be not more work. It wouldn't be adding any additional work and it would certainly level the playing field across the states. It would allow South Carolina to be able to handle this without having to go through their legislature, and it would make basically Florida and us do the same. I thinking having a federal permit similar to the HMS tournament permit is the best way to go.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think if an exception could be made for if we have a permit system that is sufficient and already in place to have an exemption from being subject to that federal permit requirement, then I would be okay with it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: By the next council meeting I think that I will work at my office about coming back with a definition of tournament perhaps, because I think that's probably important. Otherwise, I'm not sure what we would call a tournament or not a tournament. There is no regulation on that; so for the next meeting we'll bring that in.

MR. HARTIG: I certainly think that is important, for sure. Otha.

MR. EASLEY: This question might be related to the definition of a tournament, but is it the council's intent to have all tournament caught fish surrendered to the tournament organizer and then they conduct the sales or will each and every tournament participant have the opportunity to go their separate ways and sell their tournament caught fish?

MR. HARTIG: Well, I don't know that all the fish – well, I guess that we did have that all fish be reported, but I don't know that all fish have to be turned in. If they are turned in, I think it was our intent to have them turned into the organized tournament, the tournament director, whatever that is, and have them go to one central group that is then able to have disposition of that catch through commercial channels. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that is the way it would have to be set up, that the permit would be issued to some responsible tournament organizer and then they're responsible to get all the fish that come in at the end of the day, conduct the sale, report the things. If you let every vessel run off and do it, then it seems like you're going to have to issue a tournament permit to each of the vessels, and I don't think that works.

DR. DUVAL: I think if we could add some language to Alternative 2 to say "except in the case where a comparable state permit exists, establish a federal king mackerel permit", then I could support it.

MR. HAYMANS: And again would that then allow for that North Carolina sales to still come out of the recreational allocation? How does NMFS know without the permit being federally permitted – without the tournament being federally permitted, how do they know to go back and look at North Carolina tournaments and remove that from the commercial as we were talking about earlier?

DR. CRABTREE: If we prohibit bag limit sales, it won't matter if there is a state permit or not. If the vessels are federally permitted or fishing in federal waters, they're not going to be able to sell the fish even if the state allows it. I don't really understand how that language works or what it really means.

MR. BELL: Just clarification; and again I know it is not about us or about our laws, but the way we're set up if any fish are sold or enter commerce, they have to go through a licensed wholesale dealer. The wholesale dealer can only purchase from a licensed commercial fisherman. We'd have to change and that is part of the problem we have been having with this, and that is just our problem, I guess, but we would have to change something.

Who is the commercial fisherman, licensed commercial fisherman? The wholesale dealer part is okay. We would have to license a tournament as a commercial fisherman. That has come up in the past and law enforcement had some big issues with that, but that is just the way our laws are set up. But that directs all commercial products into that system, which is tied to our reporting system, and that is how it all ties together nicely. That is just the way we're set up.

MR. HARTIG: Where are we on this one? Roy has got questions about it. Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: What if we kept it as is for now with whichever one of these we're going to pick, because it seems like there might be issues in multiple actions for this, and then maybe we can kind of discuss this before we get to full council and maybe resolve those issues and come back with some language that could fix multiple actions.

I just don't think that right here right now we're going to be able to solve this problem for multiple actions; the whole state permitting and state versus federal and can a state permit a federal tournament; I'm just not sure we're going to solve that right now.

MR. HARTIG: I think you're right.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I would like for you to think of these separately for now. Action 1 is just for-hire and recreational and this one is tournament sales, so just keep it separate for now. As you make your decisions about how to deal with these separately, we'll fix it. The next meeting we'll have language ready for however you want to do it; so just to not worry about the language right now.

MR. HARTIG: Charlie, do you want to withdraw that motion as the preferred?

MR. PHILLIPS: No, I think I'd still like to send it out to the public as a preferred while we work on our definitions of tournament, our definitions of what we want from the tournaments. I think it is our intention that we'd like to do this if it's possible. I think it helps the public if we know where we're going. Now if we want to pick a preferred at full council, that's fine; but if we're not going to pick a preferred at full council, I'd just as soon pick it now.

MR. HARTIG: I don't think we're going to have all the wording and the analysis and the tournament definition and everything by full council. I may be wrong but go ahead, Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: To that point, I'm concerned that we haven't picked preferreds on Action 1 and Action 2. I really think that we should be picking preferreds so that this can go out to public hearing and the public can react to the preferreds that we have chosen. I'm just concerned about going out to a public hearing with no preferreds chosen or only a couple of preferreds chosen on some of these actions. I really think we should be trying to pick them on all of them.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and over time we've had different approaches to these, but for Action 1 I think we've got an established – we've said what we want to do. We want to try and professionalize the commercial fishery over time, and we've already taken action to do that, so maybe a preferred would be appropriate under that one and this one as well. From my perspective, if you have a preferred you should have everything shored up in it before you go out to hearing, have all your questions solved.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Right now we have Charlie's motion to select Alternative 2, and that is the top Alternative 2. That is what the current is. In the bottom one here I've added what Michelle mentioned that she would support I think the motion if this thing was just included in

there. I think if you want to select the second Alternative 2, then we need to amend the motion to say select Alternative 2 as the preferred as amended. That's where we are right now.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I would accept Michelle's additional verbiage as a friendly amendment.

DR. CRABTREE: Can you explain again, Michelle, what that language means, "except in the case in which a comparable state permit exists".

DR. DUVAL: Well, if you set up a federal permit, then anyone in North Carolina is going to have to go and get two permits, and they're not going to be happy about that.

DR. CRABTREE: But if we prohibit bag limit sales, even though you have a state permit they won't be able to sell the fish legally because we've prohibited.

DR. DUVAL: I thought we were considering those actions separately. I think Kari had the right point in that we should consider these actions separately because if you start tying in what decisions may or may not be made with regard to Action 1, then it makes this whole action completely moot.

DR. CRABTREE: The way I'm reading that is if a state has a comparable tournament permit, then we can't issue them a tournament permit, but it doesn't allow the state's tournament to actually occur. You're just prohibiting us issuing a tournament permit to that state. Isn't that what it says, it says except in the case in which there is a comparable state permit you're going to have a federal tournament permit, blah, blah, blah. That means if you have a comparable state permit, they can't get a federal tournament permit.

MR. HAYMANS: Is that only a North Carolina king mackerel tournament permit or is it a North Carolina fishing tournament permit?

DR. DUVAL: It is a fishing tournament permit and it is only required for tournaments where there is intent to sell the fish. If you want to have a catch-and-release tournament, you don't need the permit. It is only a permit to sell the fish.

MR. HAYMANS: So on Big Rock or any of those tournaments, any of the HMS tournaments there are no sales?

DR. DUVAL: I think there are sales, yes.

MR. HAYMANS: So they're dually permitted; an HMS federal tournament permit and a state tournament, then.

DR. DUVAL: If you guys don't want to include that language in there, Roy has confused me as to exactly what the impact of this would be because it sounds like he is saying he is issuing one permit to a state for any tournaments, which doesn't make sense to me. I will just abstain from voting on it.

MR. HARTIG: Well, your abstention doesn't really solve the problem.

DR. DUVAL: All I'm saying is that if you want to remove that language because it is creating confusion, go ahead, that's fine. I just won't vote in favor of the motion, and that's okay.

MR. HARTIG: If that's okay with Charlie?

MR. PHILLIPS: That's fine with me. If Michelle wants to put an Alternative 2A, which would include her verbiage so that could go out to public hearing, that would also be okay and it might take care of her issues, but at least we could go ahead and vote on this and move on.

DR. CRABTREE: I think what Michelle is wanting is that the state permit functions in lieu of the federal permit; so if you have a state permit, you're permitted and you don't have to have the federal permit. That is not what it said, and I think you could set that up. Whether it is another alternative or whatever, you could put something in there that if there is a state permit then they're exempt from the prohibitions, but I think there would have to be some criteria in there and everything else that the state would have to meet to do it, but I think you can come up with something.

MR. HARTIG: Michelle, does that meet your needs; I think it does?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that would be great.

MR. HARTIG: **Okay, the motion was to set Alternative 2 as the preferred and that is the original verbiage we had in Alternative 2. Alternative 2, establish a federal king mackerel tournament permit to be obtained by tournament organizers in order to sell or donate tournament caught king mackerel. Sale is prohibited during a commercial closure and all fish sold or donated shall be counted against the recreational allocation of the ACL.** Anymore discussion? Any objection? Objection by Tom Swatzel. **Motion approved with one objection.** Michelle, do you want to make a motion to add the wording that you requested that if you have a state permit – well, whatever it is. I didn't have it.

DR. DUVAL: I think it was something along the lines of if a state has a tournament permit that is comparable to the proposed federal permit, that state permit could serve in lieu of the federal permit or something along those lines.

MR. HARTIG: Where would this go; that's what I'm trying to figure out. It is another motion because we got too confounded in the other one. Is it attached to the last provision or is it another alternative?

DR. DUVAL: It seems to me like it would almost be another alternative, but I don't know what Roy and Monica think about that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think so, too; it could even be a subalternative under the other one and both could be chosen or you could make it a separate alternative. Then we're going to have

to come back in I guess at the next meeting and give you some criteria of what comparable would mean and how that would work and all that kind of thing. We could do that along with the definition of tournament as well.

DR. CRABTREE: I think Monica is right; you're going to have to lay that out and then there would have to be some sort of determination made that the state permit is in fact comparable, so the state is going to have to come in and provide information and details on their tournament conditions and what they require, and then we'd have to send a letter back to the state making a determination that, yes, this is comparable.

To me comparable means that the state is going to count the fish, require reporting, and they're going to count against the appropriate ACL and et cetera, et cetera. Then we'd write back saying, yes, your permit is comparable; therefore, you are exempt from the bag limit for sale prohibitions for this tournament or something like that.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, we can lay that out. That's good; we've got it on the record and we've got a good way to move forward. Yes, it will be another alternative then, Alternative 5 under Action 3.

MR. JOLLEY: Do you need a second?

MR. HARTIG: Yes. **We've got a motion by Michelle and a second by John Jolley and the motion is add Alternative 5; and Alternative 5 is if a state tournament permit is comparable to the federal tournament permit, the state permit could serve in lieu of the federal permit.** Any more discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.** We need to take a break so ten minutes.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. HARTIG: I think Action 4 is the next thing we're going to discuss, elimination of latent endorsements in Gulf Group King Mackerel Gill Net Sector. That really doesn't pertain to us. We're not going to have a whole lot of input except approving what the Gulf does on this. Unless there is any intent on this committee that they want to delve into this one, we'll skip over this one. I don't see any burning desire to get into the Gulf's portion of this so we'll move on. This brings us to Action 5, elimination of latent permits in the king mackerel hook-and-line sector, and that one does pertain to us, so we'll go through the options.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The king mackerel commercial permit is a limited entry, but I guess there may be some latent permits that aren't used. Under this are just some different ways to basically define some kind of qualifying landings during a certain period and everything that would separate the latent and active permits.

Alternative 1 is no action. Alternative 2, there are average landings and different kinds of thresholds, so you can see those averages; the best so many out of 12 years, one out of 12 years. The IPT had some recommendations. There are a lot of subalternatives here; so if there things that you're not interested in necessarily, we can get rid of those.

Then we can also use ten years' worth of data and then also different thresholds so for your average reported landings would have to be at least a couple of these; 1, 100, 500, 1,000. Under Alternative 2 the councils would have to select under Option A or B, whatever the qualifying period is, and Option C what these minimum number of pounds, average pounds.

And then we have Alternative 3 that would renew the king mackerel permits if they have reported landings in a certain qualifying period in the 2009 fishing year, and then one in five years and two of five years. June 30, 2009, is the control date for the Gulf and the South Atlantic control date is September 17, 2010 – so basically any landings within a qualifying period.

There are a couple of tables in the document that I have in here, also, that would meet the various landings thresholds under these different options – I'm sorry, that would not meet. These are the number of permits that would be removed from the king mackerel fishery. In general the larger your threshold is the more likely it is to eliminate some part-time folks or people who don't fish every year. Table 4 shows the current distribution of king mackerel permits and the regions and the states. Florida, as usual, has the largest number in both of the regions.

At the Gulf Council meeting in April they removed an option to consider a landings minimum 2005 through 2009, and then they also moved the action for a passive reduction similar to the snapper grouper two for one. They moved that to the considered but rejected. The Mackerel AP reviewed this and they recommended to add another alternative and selected as the preferred in that do not allow sale of the permits except to family members. You can transfer to family members but do not eliminate them.

Basically you would have to define what is a latent permit under your qualifying periods and your qualifying numbers of pounds and then those cannot be sold. Then the AP also made a recommendation to put that two-for-one passive reduction back in there. This was its own action, but we could put this back in as an alternative, I think.

The AP also passed a motion to ask the council to address latent permits since they potentially would be a problem and that the council should define what a full-time commercial fisherman is and use this definition in preference to addressing latent permits. At the scoping meetings about half of the commenters did not feel that any action was necessary to address latent king mackerel commercial permits and then about half were in support in some kind of action to remove them. Some also brought up the two for one, requiring the permit transfer to be two for one.

The IPT had some recommendations for removing some of these different qualifying periods, just to really think about what it is that you're looking for exactly; are you looking for long-term participation; are you looking for a high level of participation; historic versus more recent participation. You can just also talk about these and we'll be able to incorporate them into an alternative.

If you're going to in some way eliminate some permits and take them away, there needs to be an appeals process added into this – or an additional action. I just have a couple of questions. The Gulf Council did – there was just using five years worth of landings to look at this. As under

Alternative 2 in the options, it uses all years of available data and then ten years and then five years, so that could be something that you are interested in and you could add that back in.

And then what about the passive two for one action alternative, and then if you would like to accept the IPT recommendations. I know that is a lot to talk about. What I would recommend to the committee is just kind of talk about who do you want to keep in, is this a problem; do you want to require a high level of landings like basically your full-time fishermen in order to keep it; or, do you want to be able to keep the part-time fishermen and folks who have the permit but maybe don't use it all the time.

MR. HARTIG: What is the pleasure of the committee on this? I'm sitting in the wrong seat on this one. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, unless there is a real good reason not to, I think we should track the actions that the Gulf of Mexico has taken with respect to this issue.

MR. HARTIG: Roy tried to tell us that he was going to give us a presentation on the two for one several meetings ago. He was never able to do it; we never had the time. I have been getting a lot of pressure from the mackerel fishermen to keep this in there because they think it is going to work, and it would certainly be important for the people in the room to hear what Roy has to say about two for one and why they're not working in snapper grouper and why they may not work in mackerel.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I can be quick. It creates all sorts of loophole problems and that is what bothers me. One, if you incorporate, then it is not subject to the two-for-one. You can sell your corporation and pass it around. Then we had to go in and create all these exceptions to allow people to incorporate. It is very burdensome for us to keep track of who actually owns the corporation and is it a family corporation. Remember we went through all of that stuff.

That is burdensome. I think it makes the price of acquiring a permit so high that it stifles permits and things like that. The main problem I have with it is it is just not very difficult to get around it by putting things in a corporation and then sell the corporation to someone. I just think that undermines it. I think we heard that from – I think it was Ron Meyers last night, wasn't it, about the two for one and all the problems it created. If you think you have too many permits, I think going in and eliminating latent permits makes more sense to me than the two for one and all the issues it creates. That is my problem with it.

MR. HARTIG: The question I've always had is you have fisheries law and corporate law, and I guess they're different and they have different legal interpretations. If you do something under a fishery's law, it doesn't necessarily impact the corporate way things are done. Go ahead.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And mostly that is because if a corporation owns a vessel and then the corporation is bought and sold, the corporation continues to own that vessel so it is not a transfer of your vessel permit. You've just transferred the corporate ownership and the person who buys it accepts all the liabilities, the assets and everything of the corporation, so the Fisheries Service

never hears about it because you have bought and sold the corporation but the vessels remained with that corporation. That is the corporate loophole, if you will, that Roy was talking about.

DR. CRABTREE: And the last thing we talk about how are new people going to get in the fisheries and young people and all that, and I just think it puts another financial burden on them that now they've got to buy two permits or they've got to figure out how to play this corporate kind of game and all. It's like the income requirement; it sounds good but it is just not effective, I don't think.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that discussion because I wasn't clear on the differences. We always sat back and said, well, why can't you just exclude the corporate permits, and I guess under the legal thing you cannot do that. You don't have that type of power to be able to just say, hey, you know, this is fisheries law and the corporate law doesn't apply, but it does. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, to move us along I would move that we track the Gulf Council motions which are to remove an option to consider landings minimum in 2005 through 2009 and move the action for passive two-to-one reduction to the considered but rejected appendix.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Duane; second by Charlie. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Just a question I guess for Roy, Ben; I was under the impression that all the corporate allowances and the like and certainly some additional language that has been – or a regulation that has been passed since I have been on the council regarding the corporate snapper grouper permits only applied to snapper grouper permits; is that the case or not?

We currently don't have a two for one in mackerel and I guess the point I would make is that if we wanted to consider that, we could set it up such that there were no corporate permits and they would have to be a straight individual permit. I don't know, maybe there are complications because mackerel fishermen are incorporated and that creates problems.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm sure a lot of the fishermen are incorporated because there are lots of liability reasons and other reasons that fishermen ought to incorporate. I think it would be a problem to decide all of a sudden that they can't be incorporated. I don't really know but –

MR. CURRIN: Okay, just a point.

MR. HARTIG: And it was a good one. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee but just a question about the action to remove the passive two-for-one reduction, and I'm sure I'm confused, but which action is that?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: It confused me, too. It was in there and then it has been removed. I don't know, but I knew that I wanted you guys to say that it was okay to get rid of it. The South Atlantic has not gotten rid of it yet.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roy, I have been sorting through these alternatives, and I saw something in there about latent permits that could be used but not renewed or not sold. The AP had made something about that; yes, do not allow sale except to family members of latent permits but do not eliminate them. Do we have any idea of how many king mackerel permits with, say, zero landings are corporate?

MR. HARRIS: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Can we discuss the motion first and then get into these other issues?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, we could. **The motion is to track Gulf actions to eliminate the option to consider minimum landings from 2005 through 2009 and move the action for passive two-for-one reductions to the considered by rejected appendix.** Anymore discussion on that? We had some discussion on the two for one. Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that **motion is approved.** Now, Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Sorry to get off base, Duane, but you know how I am. Roy, do we have any idea of what this might do?

DR. CRABTREE: I don't know how many corporate permits there are. I have no idea but I assume we could figure that out. No one has ever asked me that.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Well, if the two for one was the issue for the corporate, you have removed that one. I wanted to point out when you're addressing latent effort, in the background, like the rationale behind this is that there are permits. Some historical king mackerel fishermen are concerned that the permit holders that have not been fishing or have been fishing at low levels may participate more fully. The question is here like here are the total numbers of active king mackerel commercial permits – I'm sorry, not active but valid, so up to date on everything.

They can harvest right now; so a little over 1,400 total on both sides. The question is if everybody kicked into gear; would the fishery be able to support it? If not, then this is where you need to talk about who you want to keep in. Is it just anybody who has reported landings at all? Table 3, these numbers show how many permits would be eliminated.

The 500 pound threshold will eliminate half right there. That gives you kind of an idea of the activity level basically of all the permits. About half of them are harvesting with an average under 500 pounds a year from different qualifying periods.

MR. CURRIN: This is just a point for consideration. Table 3 to me confuses me and it may just be my brain. I would rather see the numbers expressed as the number of people who would remain as opposed to the number who would be eliminated. If everybody is okay with the way it is, that's fine, but it confuses me. I guess that's the way I'm looking at it or used to looking at it.

MR. HARTIG: One of the things I liked in this regard, and the AP brought it up, is that what happens in these fisheries is when we get good year classes and fish are easy to catch, people jump in. They get a transferable permit; they jump into these fisheries. The problem we have is that we've got a number of people in other fisheries that use these permits as insurance.

One of the fisheries or two of them in particular are the fishermen in the Keys who primarily lobster and stone crab fish; and then in times when hurricanes wipe out their gear, they have to come in and use not only their mackerel permit but also their snapper grouper permit to actually make money to put their traps back in the water.

This is going back 20-something years that they've pounded this into me, and this is why they have these permits and this is why they need to keep them. The beauty of the AP's proposal is you could set up two different kinds of – you could set up a transferable permit and you would get there by using the threshold.

You'd have some threshold to get to a transferable permit; and that transferable permit, based on the threshold of landings, that would be one that you could transfer. The rest of the permits wouldn't be eliminated, but they would become non-transferable so the people who have had that business plan could keep that in their portfolio, but they couldn't sell it into the time when people are getting back in.

You would be ratcheting down the number of people who actually participate in this fishery over time. You would be able to smooth those numbers out. I think that has got a lot of pluses at least from my perspective. It takes away some of the controversy. Sure, you're going to have some people that are going to complain, well, I can't sell my boat with that permit.

Yes, but that permit – the non-transferable one would be able to transfer like we do in other permits to your immediate family. You could keep in your family; and if you have family coming up that works under that same business plan, you could still do that. That is what I like about the AP's motion in that regard, and it takes some of the controversy out of the permits.

MR. BURGESS: Ben, I did read the minutes of the AP and got that impression and I do support that direction. You made a great point about the fishermen cannot sell their permit, but I think we're going in a direction where the real value of these permits to the individuals is not going to be to sell the permit but the income that provide them. That's where the value comes in just like somebody says your boat, well, it's worth so much, but I make a living with it, so I think it is a great direction to go in.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to make a motion to add new Alternative 4 as recommended by the AP to not allow sale of latent permits but do not eliminate them and allowing the transfer to family members.

MR. HARTIG: Second by David Cupka. Charlie, discussion?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would support Michelle's motion. I guess we're going to need some description of what exactly a latent permit is. I'm concerned that if we get rid of a lot of permits all of a sudden, that they just can't renew them, that we pick a 500-pound trip limit or something, then the rest of the permit prices are going to jump, which is going to make it really hard for somebody new to get into a fishery.

As we all know, all these permits are going up in price. I'm not sure totally what drives it but they're definitely going up in price. Snapper grouper, and I think, Ben, you told me king mackerels were slowing going up, too. Yes, I would support the motion.

MR. HARTIG: Any other discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? Okay, the motion is approved with no objection. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we accept the IPT recommendations to eliminate Suboptions ii, iv and v under Alternative 2, Options A and B.

MR. HARTIG: Seconded by Charlie. Discussion of these removals? Any objection to removing those? Seeing none, that **motion is approved**. Okay, that brings us to – well, there are two different ways to do it. Go ahead, Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we establish an appeals process similar to the appeals processes that we have established in other plans.

MR. HARTIG: Seconded by Michelle. Any discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, **that motion is approved**. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Going back to the motion before the last one that Duane made to remove those alternatives, that's fine, but I want you to look at full council what alternatives are left to see if it is a reasonable range. Right now one thing I'm looking at is, if I understood you correctly for one of the options, a suboption would be the average of all years; another one is one of the twelve years. Maybe that is fine; but just take a look at that for full council once you see this.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, have we got all the wording straightened out that we need?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: If everyone is okay with – it's particularly the options to define what is latent so what is going to be put into the no sale allowed. Do these capture different things that they want to think about as far as long term and different levels and everything, and don't forget that this permit has an income requirement, just for a certain percentage of income from commercial fishing. Anybody who has been able to renew their permit has met at least the income requirements for commercial fishing even if it wasn't necessarily king mackerel; so just to make sure everybody is – everything they need is in there.

DR. CRABTREE: So Alternative 3 which bases qualifying on June 30, 2009, which I believe is the Gulf control date, but the South Atlantic control date, if my memory serves correct, is September 17, 2010; is that a problem?

MR. HARTIG: I don't know; you're the one to tell us if that is a problem. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So you should have some discussion I think as to whether that is an appropriate date or not, the Gulf control date. Control dates are put out to give notice to the world and particularly new entrants into the fishery that after a certain date you may not be

guaranteed participation in this fishery, but there is always a caveat that is added that says the council may use this date or they may choose to not use this date, so it's just kind of a caution yellow flag waving around that this could happen. I think Roy is right, I think it would be good to get a little bit of discussion as to whether you think that is an appropriate date or do you think that the South Atlantic date is more appropriate.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and here we're using an earlier date than the control date we've put out.

MR. HARTIG: That's a good question.

DR. CRABTREE: Ben, of course, I'm not on your committee, but it seems to me you've got a lot of different alternatives for getting rid of latent permits; do you really need Alternative 3?

MR. HARTIG: Well, we've got some fishermen who prefer using control dates to do that. I don't know how critical it is to this, and then we'd have to make a decision on which date we wanted to use. It does introduce some problems. You're right about the discussion; we do need to talk about it because you'd have to come to a date certain in that alternative. What is the intent of the committee? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: I think it would be inappropriate for the South Atlantic Council to use the control date for the mackerel fishery established by the Gulf Council. If you want to keep the option in, and I have no strong feeling one way or the other, we should set it up such that it is the 2009 control date associated for the Gulf fishermen and the 2010 data that is associated for the South Atlantic fishermen.

DR. DUVAL: I was just going to say something similar to Mac. I was wondering if it was appropriate to perhaps either restructure this alternative or add another alternative that uses the South Atlantic control date for the South Atlantic fishermen.

MR. HARTIG: And I think it gets more complicated and I think we're going to hear that now. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Remember it is one permit and a lot of these guys from the South Atlantic go over in the Gulf and fish at times; so if you revoke their South Atlantic permit, they'd still get to keep – I don't know how that would work because it is just one permit. It seems like you and the Gulf have to get on the same page with it and come to a common date. I don't think you can make it region specific.

MR. HARTIG: I was well aware of that. Go ahead; you've got a suggestion?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Well, next week the Gulf will talk about this so we're going to send it over quickly. Maybe Bob wants to comment on this. Here is the alternative as it is now, and basically the difference with this one is you're talking about a qualifying period and a level of landings. You're talking about any king mackerel landings in preceding years.

Maybe there could just be an option in there to use the South Atlantic's control date, because maybe the Gulf would be okay using the South Atlantic control date. I mean, the control date is going to have to be the same.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And it's not that the control date has to be the same, but you mean the date that is chosen to be used here is going to have to be the same, and I agree. I think that it's perhaps more appropriate to use the later date, and I think that the Gulf Council – if you want to make a motion to use that date, then that lets the Gulf Council know that you want to use that date. If you just leave in as is and perhaps take that alternative out later, that is great; but if the alternative stays in, then you would get kind of stuck with the June 30, 2009, date unless you put another option in there or another alternative in there.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, Mac, do you want to add an alternative that does that; is that your intent?

MR. CURRIN: No, Ben, I'd rather take Monica's suggestion. I think it is most appropriate. Then the Gulf can react or maybe Bob has a input now for us, **but I would move that we change the date in Alternative 3 – all the dates in Alternative 3 to September 17, 2010, which is the later of the two control dates of the Gulf and the South Atlantic.**

MR. HARTIG: All right, we have got a motion by Mac and second by Charlie. Anymore discussion? Go ahead, Bob.

MR. GILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee and I appreciate the recognition. This might be a moot point and it would be helpful I think to come to this decision so we don't get to, hey, I want my date, I want your date, whatever. The difference in time whether it makes any difference in terms of the number of permits is significant; my suspicion is, no, it doesn't. But if we could have that, I don't know how fast it could be gotten, it could make it real simple; and if it makes no difference, who cares.

MR. HARTIG: That is a very good point. Any other discussion? Go ahead, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I would just second the earlier comments that Mac made about Table 3. I also found it a little bit confusing. It took me a while to sort of sort through what was what. Kari can talk with you offline about that, but maybe it's just that it's late in the week, too.

MR. HARTIG: The other thing that I failed to mention, in talking to Sue Gerhart, she wanted me to pass it on – and it's in there – that the data is preliminary. Any other discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.** Go ahead, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This goes to family, allowing the transfer of the other – kind of making a second tier kind of permit that you would allow to be transferred to family members. I had to step out of the room real quickly, but did you talk about who family members are, what they would be comprised of?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, however we define those in other ways that we transfer permits, I think we should move here, and we do define it in other permits, so we will add that to that option where we –

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The only one I'm aware of, just off the top of my head, is snapper grouper. Just for the record that is husband, wife, son, daughter, brother, sister, mother or father.

MR. HAYMANS: And I'll just mention from the state law at least that we've now changed that to be lineal descendants, and that gets those plus it gets a grandson above if someone wants to give it to a grandson. Otherwise, that wouldn't get a grandson. That is the situation we came under.

MR. HARTIG: Do you want to add that? Well, I never heard that before and you've had that come up in your requirements and how did you define that last one, that last addition?

MR. HAYMANS: Well, our we changed the law to read lineal descendants because it was a grandfather who wanted to give it to his grandson, but we had the same wording that is there in federal law and we couldn't allow that, so now it does go lineal descendants and that allows grandchildren or great grandchildren.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So we could add grandson or granddaughter, but I'm assuming then we could get into a great grandson or something like that.

MR. HAYMANS: And that is where lineal descendant takes care of that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, whose grandson would – never mind. Okay, lineal descendants might be –

MR. CURRIN: You start transferring stuff back up the tree it can go anywhere. They're related but as long as people are alive in previous generations then it can go to uncles and aunts and cousins and second cousins and third cousins. I think that is getting a little bit too far afield. I kind of like what we've got here now. If you wanted to transfer it to a grandson, you could transfer it to a son and then he can transfer it to his son. That's two transfers.

MR. HARTIG: Well, that's a discussion I wanted to have, but we're getting too far afield. The committee is comfortable with where we are for the most part with that description? Okay. thank you. That brings us to the next action item if there is nothing else to come up under this; the next action in this amendment.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, Action 6 is the federal regulatory compliance in which the federally permitted vessel would have to comply with the more restrictive of the state or federal CMP regulations when fishing in state waters. Alternative 1 is no action, and Alternative 2 is to put this into place.

The Gulf Council did not change alternatives or select a preferred. The Mackerel AP recommended Alternative 1 as the preferred. And then at the Gulf scoping comments, most

commenters supported no action. One commenter was concerned that gill nets would be prohibited in federal waters as well as Florida waters. He was one of the Keys guys who works in the gill net fishery. That's all of this.

MR. HARTIG: That was a question I think from George Niles and he is fishing in the king mackerel gill net season. King mackerel gill nets are banned in state waters; but his fishing is actually done in federal waters so he would not be precluded from doing that because he is fishing and it is allowed by federal regulations so he would be allowed to do that. There are conflicting regulations in states as far as trip limits go with king mackerel as well. There is 50 fish in state waters; but as long as you caught them in federal waters you would have the 75 fish.

MR. CURRIN: Ben, I'd just like to make sure that cobia is included in there. If we go with a separate cobia permit, then that's included as a separate permit. If not, if it all ends up lumped into one CMP or whatever permit we have that includes cobia, just make sure that the language reflects that.

MR. HARTIG: That is a good point, Mac, I'm glad you brought that up. We need to include that and we will. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: And to your moment just a moment ago and just for the record, the state of Georgia does not allow gill net caught fish to be landed in Georgia no matter what jurisdiction they're caught in.

DR. CRABTREE: You understand that many would argue you're not allowed to do that if they're legally caught in federal waters.

MR. HAYMANS: Until the court decides otherwise.

MR. PHILLIPS: And I haven't decided if I'm going to take him to court yet on this.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, so you're comfortable with what we have under this action with the wording and adding cobia to the Alternative 2? Okay, did you want to pick any preferreds? We already changed the language. I don't see any intent to do that. Okay, that brings us to Action 7, modify or eliminate income requirements for Gulf and South Atlantic commercial coastal migratory pelagics.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Currently there are income requirements for the king mackerel and Spanish mackerel commercial permits that requires the applicants submit information that 25 percent of their income comes from fishing or \$10,000 from commercial or charterboat fishing activity in one of three calendar years of the application. Alternative 1 would be to leave those income requirements in place.

Alternative 2, this language will need to be fixed because we have reordered the actions, but Alternative 2 is if there is a cobia permit established also have an income requirement for that that is consistent with the king and Spanish mackerel income requirements. Alternative 3 eliminates all income requirements from the king and Spanish mackerel permits.

Four replaces the current income requirements for king and Spanish mackerel and cobia if applicable with a CMP landings requirement, such that in one of three years preceding the application landings must be greater than – and then you have some different levels and four different options.

Then Alternative 5 would modify the current income requirements to allow the Gulf or South Atlantic Council to suspend the renewal requirements by passage of a motion specifying an event or condition triggering the suspension, the duration of the suspension and the criteria establishing who is eligible for the suspension, so if something happens that would affect their income such as a hurricane or the oil spill in the Gulf.

Alternative 5 can be selected alone or with one of the other alternatives. Basically, Alternative 2 would just tie the existing income requirements to cobia. Alternative 3 would eliminate all the income requirements for the CMP. Four would get rid of income requirements and replace it with a landings requirement. Five is to allow some flexibility in case something happens.

The Gulf Council did not select a preferred or change the alternatives. The AP recommended Alternative 1 as the preferred, just leaving the income requirements in place. During the Gulf scoping, most of the commenters were in support of an income requirement instead of a landings requirement. Some commenters suggested increasing the required percentage income requirement to 40, 50, 75 percent. That is all the public and AP input.

DR. CRABTREE: Just so you understand what the income requirement really amounts to as you discuss it, what we do is when you apply to renew your permit we ask you do you meet the income qualifier, yes or no? If you say yes, then you qualify. If you say no, you lose your permit. That's how it works.

On Alternative 4, if you want to go on the pounds route, I think it would be very burdensome to do it. You need to be clear, though, I guess you're talking about logbooks and I think you would have to set up an appeals process like we've done with qualifying for permits and things. Again, there is no verification of what anybody puts in their logbooks; so obviously in order to qualify all a fisherman would have to do is write down the amount of pounds that is required and hand you the logbook. That has really been the problem with this whole sort of thing. In my opinion it is fairly meaningless.

MR. HARTIG: Well, you could crosscheck it with the state trip limit to make sure that they had that landing requirement, if they met it.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess you can. We've tried using trip tickets in the past for qualifiers and run into problems because fishermen don't file the trip tickets, dealers do. Well, sometimes a couple of fishermen's landings can get lumped into one trip ticket and there are disparities and then you've got to sort that out. I think if you wanted to do that you would have to have an appeals process where the fishermen can come in and say, wait a minute, I've got records that show I did land it and the trip tickets aren't filed right. It's just a can of worms.

MR. BURGESS: I know that the AP did want to keep the income requirements. As I fill out my stuff and I sign that piece of paper applying for a federal permit, I think about it in a serious way and not to just who cares, I'll just sign it and no matter what, but I think there is a serious aspect to it, also. I don't think everybody just says I don't care; I'll just put down anything.

I think there are a lot of people that are conscientious of it. I mean, if they've got any sense and have anything about them where they want to do what is right and follow the rules. Is there anything that we could put in there that says this might be subject to investigation to try to deter people, as you say, just putting down anything in any way, shape or form to try to put an importance on lying or not lying?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I guess I'm gong to ask a question of Roy. What was the Gulf Council's rationale for removing the 50 percent income requirement in the Gulf reef fish fishery? I think that is in an amendment that is still being reviewed. I don't know that it has been approved or anything, but I know the Gulf Council went forward to remove the 50 percent Gulf reef fish requirement.

DR. CRABTREE: Bob, help me if I'm wrong, but I think there were a couple of things. One, we're in an IFQ fishery for a lot of the reef fish so we don't quite need it, but I think the larger part of it was just recognition that it is not effective and there is no way to verify it. I asked this question of how many people failed to meet the income qualifier, and I believe the answer I got was virtually nobody. I think that all played into it, but it is just not effective. I don't think we have any ability to – I mean we can't go to the IRS and say give us this guy's income tax returns, and so we really have no way of knowing.

MR. HARTIG: Well, we used to do that, but, Monica, to that point.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we never went to the IRS and got income tax returns. We used to ask people to submit an income tax but we had no way of know whether that was the tax return they actually submitted to the IRS because we can't see those. They're private.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I just wanted to point out what Roy just pointed out with the IRS. We did require people to do more work to show that they met the requirement.

DR. CRABTREE: Another part of it is it is earned income and so say I'm a dentist and I've got a commercial boat. Well, I'm going to incorporate it, anyway, because I'm not going to have the liability because I've got a captain on my boat. Once I incorporate, my income as a dentist isn't part of this anymore. It's just the income to that corporation. Even if you could figure out how to get around this, I don't think it really does what anybody intends it to do to begin with.

MR. CURRIN: I was just going to ask a question; is there a penalty or a penalty in the penalty schedule from OLE for providing – my question is, is there currently a penalty in the penalty schedule for falsifying information on a federal document or application or whatever? I asked that because if there is, then perhaps on the permit it should be in bold letters that falsifying information on this permit application form is subject to a \$10,000 fine or whatever it is, the maximum, pick it out, knowing – well, I'm not going to say that on the record. Anyway, that

would be a good suggestion to perhaps encourage compliance with truthful information on applications and the like.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My point was going to be I believe a person could be charged and prosecuted for submitting false statements if it is under the threat of perjury, I think. If you lie while you're under oath, that is a bad thing. I think the Supreme Court right now is deciding on a case whether it's against the law to lie or not, but that is another matter. I think on the permit application there may be such a requirement at the bottom of the application. I'll check that out and by full council I'll be able to tell you whether that statement is there.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong, but I don't think landed pounds are going to help you much either because that is going to come from a logbook. That doesn't mean you have to sell them to a dealer, so all you've got to do is say I made a trip, caught X amount of pounds and then we took them and ate them at a fish fry or something, so you may or may not have a dealer report or a trip ticket to go with that. I don't think logbooks and landings is going to make it any better than the income requirements.

MR. HARTIG: Karen came up and she can shed some light maybe on this particular situation, providing false information.

MS. RAINE: Okay, the penalty schedule does provide for basically either providing false information or providing inaccurate information. Of course, it is going to depend on the regulation and the facts as to where a particular violation would fall within the penalty ranges, but there is a provision in the penalty schedule for those types of violations.

MR. CURRIN: And, Karen, do you have the maximum penalty available? I understand it varies, but let's just take the worse case scenario.

MS. RAINE: It does vary. The way our policy is set up now, for example – and I'd have to look at the regulations to be sure how they were set up, but there are provisions for submitting inaccurate or false data, statements or reports. Again, depending on the fishery or other factors, the intentional violation, depending if it was – for example, if it was a Level 3, intentional violation, the range is 20,000 to 40,000 generally.

According to the policy, we're going to start in the middle of that range and different factors may have us go up or down. There could be a permit sanction of five to twenty days for a second violation. Many of these penalty provisions are actually lower than that, so it just depends on a whole host of factors.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, and I understand that, but I think it would be great to have on there as punishable by a fine of whatever the maximum is, \$40,000 or imprisonment; and if we can get the technology to make it flash when they fill it out, that would be real good, too; you know, let people know that they're subject to potentially a very, very large fine or imprisonment and make them think about it.

MR. HARTIG: I think there was a case in our area for providing false information on getting a permit at one time. I think there was one case that I remember. There has been, if I'm not mistaken, a case made on false information to get a permit. Kari had the affidavit up there that you have to sign. If you sign an affidavit, Monica, does the perjury part of it kick in or is that independent of that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, it says under penalty of perjury.

DR. CRABTREE: And I can tell you because I reviewed it, there have been cases made when people to qualify for a permit submitted false information and were caught. They were prosecuted under a felony and fined a lot of money and there were criminal charges.

MR. HARTIG: So it's not without enforcement; it can be done in some cases. That gives us some rationale for keeping those in.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, except that we have no way of knowing whether they meet the income requirement or not, and that is the issue there. You can say, yes, they're lying, there are all these penalties, but the problem is there is no way to verify any of it. Like I said, virtually no one is failing to qualify for these permits.

MR. HARTIG: Well, if the cases were made there had to be some way.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, the case wasn't made over renewing a permit on the income. It was made on a limited entry program and qualifying in the initial thing.

MR. HARTIG: All right, what do we want to do? The way it looks we're going to come back and complete this – I haven't talked to the chairman – as a Committee of the Whole when I give my report.

MR. CUPKA: We've still got another whole amendment plus the framework to go through, so we're going to have to finish up this committee meeting as a Committee of the Whole. If we didn't have the public comment period, we might could work on it some tonight, but that is not going to happen. It's going to be a long day tomorrow. It's just pushing us back further on the agenda, but we're going to have to finish up the rest of this as a Committee of the Whole. We've got too many other things this afternoon that we need to get to.

DR. CRABTREE: Or this committee could meet early in the morning.

MR. CUPKA: We're already scheduled to start at eight. If you want to start earlier than that, we'll start early. It's up to you.

MR. HARTIG: I'm not going to do that to staff.

MR. CUPKA: We're going to pay for it one way or the other.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I think the Committee of the Whole idea is appropriate, but let's get this action done and then we'll go to lunch. Go ahead, Tom.

MR. BURGESS: Just as far as the Action 7, I say leave it in there.

DR. DUVAL: So does that mean we're stating that our preferred alternative is no action? Tom, was that your –

MR. HARTIG: Not without a motion.

MR. BURGESS: No, it wasn't – I mean the whole Action 7 as the Gulf Council had no preferreds and I don't necessarily need a preferred right now, but my intent is to –

MR. HARTIG: Okay, if that is how the rest of the committee feels, we'll move down that path. All right, the last action in this document.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, this is an action establish an Atlantic Group Spanish Mackerel Gill Net Endorsement similar to I think the Gulf Group King Mackerel Gill Net Endorsement. Alternative 1 is do not establish this endorsement. Alternative 2 provides some different qualifying periods that we would actually need to talk about if you want to pursue this.

Five, ten or fifteen years prior; we can set those up as another subalternative; and then three options for a different level of landings. The Gulf Council did not take any action on this. The AP recommends Alternative 1 as the preferred. The Gulf scoping, most commenters did not think a Spanish mackerel gill net endorsement was necessary.

MR. HARTIG: And I'll just preface this; I brought this in and I've talked to a number of gill netters over time, and basically it is very similar to what we did with the longline endorsement and with the sea bass pot endorsement. When you have a gear that is substantially able to catch more fish, I think in this case the gill net is much more efficient at catching Spanish mackerel than either cast net or hook and line.

In the past these gears have been pretty much in balance with the way the quota has been and we've able to get through the season in most years having everybody competing at about a certain level. If you get a significant increase in that gill net fishery, you could significantly alter the balance of power.

Especially if you have say some people from another management jurisdiction, say New England wanted to move down here and gill net Spanish mackerel for that period of time, you could have that kind of effort come into this fishery, and that's the kind of thing. I'm looking at future effort and future changes in different fisheries that may impact us.

We've got some New England guys in it now so that certainly could happen more. I think the council is better served at capping this now and then having a way to allow those to be transferable so the endorsements stay in that gill net fishery.

MR. CURRIN: Ben, just a comment; and I agree with you, I think capping it now is a more reasonable thing to do before we end up with problems and new people getting in it and the word gets out that, boy, there is a neat fishery down here, it is open access, and here we go! Then you've got people coming to you, you can't kick me out, I did real well in this fishery last year, so it creates problems. I would be in favor of putting some limitations on it before the problems develop.

MR. HARTIG: I see some heads nodding around the table. No motion for a preferred and I think that is probably in order. Go ahead.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I would like for you to decide on some options for the number of years. Right now it just says during the recent five, ten or fifteen years prior to the control dates. Are these okay and we'll make them into options as the qualifying periods or do you want different years?

MR. HARTIG: Well, I don't know that you need to go back 15 years. Did we go back that far in the hook-and-line latent permit?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Those are 12 years, 10 years and then two or three years before the control date, so this was the qualifying period.

MR. HARTIG: Given the effort has increased in this fishery to the point it has now in the last probably five years, I think if you went back ten you'd have the historical and then you'd know what you got to in the last five, so I don't think you need to go back fifteen. I think we can eliminate at least that one.

DR. DUVAL: Then I assume that when you flesh out those options and this goes out to public comment, that you would have a table with – okay, thank you – just illustrating how many people might not able to renew and that sort of thing. Thank you.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Well, it would –

DR. DUVAL: Who would qualify; sorry, you know what I was trying to say.

MR. HARTIG: And I'm sorry, Michelle, I neglected to think about North Carolina's part and it's big. You guys have a lot of people that participate sometimes at very small levels but they do participate in this fishery, so the North Carolina perspective is good. Is 15 years okay with you to remove that; is that going too far back?

DR. DUVAL: I think 15 years would be fine. I guess more of my concern is that Spanish mackerel are everywhere in state waters, and we have a lot of folks who fish for them commercially. We don't require the Spanish mackerel permit of our fishermen to sell when they're harvesting in state waters.

I would suspect that there are quite a few of the guys in the ocean, who are fishing in the zero to three miles state waters, that probably do have the South Atlantic Spanish mackerel permit., but I

doubt a lot of guys who are fishing in inside waters who are seeing them in pound nets and stuff like that are – well, who are fishing in inside waters happen to catch them in gill nets are getting those permits, so that's just something I will have to look into.

MR. HARTIG: Do you have any feel for what portion of your Spanish mackerel landings are caught inshore and what portion are caught offshore; do you have any of that?

DR. DUVAL: I don't; I will be putting in a landings request obviously after this meeting to see what that looks like. Thanks.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I want to make sure that they have the right options, so right now the qualifying period options will include five years prior to September 17, 2010, and ten years prior to September 17, 2010. Okay, and then average landings during the qualifying periods with gill net, correct? Okay, and then we have the 30,000, 20,000 and 10,000 and everybody is okay with that?

MR. HARTIG: And I'm just looking from the North Carolina perspective we may have to add a smaller qualifier in there, and I don't know what that is.

DR. DUVAL: Can we add 5,000 in there, too, please? Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Right now we're using it as direction to staff; do you concur with that?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So chatting quickly with Andy and Sue, doing an analysis to look at how many permits will qualify for the endorsement with these different time periods and different landings and then specifying it was gill net landings may not be ready in time for a public hearing in August, just because it will take some time to put the data and link it to permits and separate it out, so just so everybody knows this is actually kind of a complicated analysis.

MR. HARTIG: But basically the fisherman knows his poundage qualifier and they should be able to comment at least on that, if our qualifiers are too high or too low or whatever. No preferreds. Do we need a motion to move this for public hearings? **Okay, a motion to move this Amendment 19 to public hearings? Jessica.**

MS. McCAWLEY: So move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Jessica; second by John Jolley. Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Thank you very much and I guess what you say is what will happen. In the Mackerel Committee Report we will confer as a Committee of the Whole and go through the remaining sections of this document.

MR. CUPKA: That is correct, so we'll go ahead and break for lunch and reconvene at 1:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:20 o'clock p.m., June 14, 2012, and reconvened as the Committee of the Whole on June 15, 2012.)

MACKEREL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

JUNE 15, 2012

MR. HARTIG: Okay, now we are moving to Amendment 20. Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, Attachment 8B and there are ten actions in this. The first three are Gulf Group King Mackerel, talking about subzones and allocations. Do you want to go through these?

MR. HARTIG: Well, some of these are going to have an impact on our fishermen, and I have to look at which ones. Okay, why don't see what the Gulf comes up with theirs at the next meeting and bring them back in September, these options especially, and then we will go over them then; how does that sound? Does that sound better?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: For the first three?

MR. HARTIG: For the first three.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, Action 4 establishes a transit provision for king mackerel harvested in the EEZ off Monroe County when the rest of the west coast of Florida is closed. There are three alternatives; no action; Alternative 2 establishes the transit provision for fish harvested in the EEZ off Monroe County when the rest of the west coast of Florida is closed; and Alternative 3 establishes the transit provision and the fish have to be landed in Collier County when the rest of the west coast of Florida is closed. The Mackerel AP recommended Alternative 2 as the preferred. The Gulf scoping meetings, all of the commenters that spoke about this supported a transit provision.

MR. HARTIG: What is the intent of the committee?

MR. HAYMANS: I would make a motion that we select Action 4, Alternative 2 as our preferred.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Charlie. Discussion? Otha.

MR. EASLEY: Well, purely from an enforcement perspective, which is not reality, but Alternative 1, of course, is the preferred. Any of the others is second or Alternative 2 or 3. The majority of this enforcement will be done at the dock. In effect it is similar to one of the situations where a fishery is allowed in state waters and not in federal waters.

If they come into Monroe or any other county north of that with their catches prohibited in the Gulf, they can just tell us, yes, I caught it over in the South Atlantic, in Monroe or further over,

and there is little chance where we would have any rebuttal to that. I just wanted to share that with you.

MR. HARTIG: There is nothing in here that would change any of that, in any of these options.

MR. EASLEY: Other than Alternative 1, that's it.

MS. McCAWLEY: I need to go back and look at the language that the commission just adopted, but I think that the commission adopted something that is more like Alternative 3. I'm going to vote against this motion because I think that Alternative 3 is more what we want because we just made it so that people could do this in state waters. I thought that this action was to complement what we were in the process of doing.

MR. HAYMANS: Doesn't that force landings into just a handful of dealers if you're only in Collier County?

MR. HARTIG: I don't know. This was to really fix a specific problem in the Gulf. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think Jessica is right that Alternative 3 is what the FWC took action to fit. I don't know what to do with Otha's comment that it is going to create enforcement problems.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think it solves an enforcement problem and creates one at the same time.

MS. McCAWLEY: In order to fix the problem for the fishermen, yes, it does create an enforcement problem, but there is no other way to help these fishermen that are having to travel a hundred miles or more to get to a dealer and an area that is open. This was the only way to do that. **I would like to make a substitute motion that we select Alternative 3 as the preferred.** When I come back the next time, I'll have the specific language for what the FWC adopted.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Jessica; second by Michelle. Further discussion? Otha.

MR. EASLEY: If you have to pick between 2 and 3, enforcement would prefer 3.

MR. HARTIG: Anymore discussion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Okay, that motion becomes the main motion. Is there any discussion on the main motion? Any objection to the main motion? Seeing none, **the main motion is approved.**

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, moving on to Action 5, these are restrictions on fishing for king mackerel in multiple zones. From my understanding, this is more on the Gulf side in which a permit holder would either have to be assigned or they would select a zone or subzone, and that is the fishing area they would fish in and the quota they would fish under. Do you want to do this one?

MR. HARTIG: Do we really want to get into the weeds on this one?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Yes, the only thing I want to know on this is from the Gulf, when you guys discuss it, Bob, is how many zones are you all married to in this one; how many zones are you defining under this option? I don't need to know it now. You guys need to decide in the Gulf. Are you going to include the zones on the Atlantic, also? That wasn't clear to me.

MR. GILL: My sense from the buzz is that it would be no more than one and it is likely not to pass at all. It is in there because it was requested by various fishermen as what they perceive as a solution to some of the problems, but I don't see a whole lot of support for it. I think it will be at best one but maybe not supported.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, Action 6. Thank you, Bob.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I just wanted to point out that I did put in like all the questions. This is another one that is actually really complicated and there are a lot of questions. In the decision document these are all the questions that at least the Gulf will have to think about. This one Gregg may have to come up to talk about the cobia ACLs for Action 6. The boundary for the stock assessment is different from the boundary used to set the ABC and the ACL. These are alternatives to change those based on the boundary. I'll let Gregg get into this.

MR. WAUGH: We set in Amendment 18 the council boundary as the boundary between these two migratory groups. The stock assessment is still ongoing but it looks like they're going to use a biological boundary at the Florida/Georgia Line. That is not final yet, but we tried to build in some alternatives here that would allow us to deal with that event.

Now, whether we set an ACL that applies to our council area and the Gulf sets one that applies to their council area or we do similar to mackerel where they will be getting an ABC – if it goes as it is indicated now, they will be getting an ABC for the Gulf stock that includes the entire state of Florida, so they could then allocate a portion of that to the Florida east coast and Keys, essentially our area or jurisdiction for us to manage. We tried to build in alternatives to cover whatever might come out of the stock assessment.

MR. HARTIG: So basically just like you said, it would just be like mackerels; we split up whatever the ACL – the total ACL was for the Gulf, we would split that up between the Gulf and the east coast of Florida from our council jurisdiction to the Florida/Georgia Line? Okay. Now the method of determining that value, would you just use the average, would you go to Boyles' Law? Have we used Boyles' Law in the past to separate some of our snapper grouper species? I thought we did at least in one of them. David.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, we used Boyles' Law when we figured out the interjurisdictional allocation on black grouper, I think it was, when we got the assessment on that.

MR. HARTIG: So what you suggested is incorporated in one of these options; do we want a preferred or do we want to just leave it to go out to public hearing as is with the description that at least for black grouper we have done it by Boyles' Law. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: It would seem to me that it would make the most sense to not pick a preferred just because we don't have the information to go into this, and let's hope the stock assessment is completed and we have the results. People really aren't going to have a sense of how they're going to be affected.

MR. HARTIG: Good point. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: If you all want us to look at Boyles' Law, then you should add that because we've got Option D there, and I think that is under Alternative 3 as well; isn't it? So what you would be giving us guidance is to add applying Boyles' Law similar to what was done for black grouper, and that could be analyzed.

MR. CURRIN: I would make that in the form of a motion, Ben. I think it would worthwhile looking at Boyles' Law as an alternative under these allocations.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Doug Haymans. Discussion?

MR. HAYMANS: And then just a question, I guess, let's just say Alternative 1 became the preferred, which is no action – well, no, that is not right. If Florida east coast wound up having a separate ACL with the Gulf; does that mean that the rest of the Atlantic Group, the 1.4 million pounds recreational would be split Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina?

MR. HARTIG: We would get the different area allowable harvest out of each migratory area and then we'd have to deal with that, and we don't have that yet. This isn't based on the stock assessment. This is based on the numbers we had from the ABC from the SSC, both SSCs actually, I think. **The motion was to add as Option D the use of Boyles' Law for the allocations.** Anymore discussion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that **motion is approved.** Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, this is Action 7, establish state-by-state or regional quotas for Atlantic Migratory Group King Mackerel, Spanish Mackerel and Cobia. This is another actually really complicated with lots of questions that you guys would have to answer. We have a couple of alternatives.

One is a commercial quota for each South Atlantic state for king mackerel, Spanish mackerel and cobia or any combination of that under those options; and then a commercial quota for the Mid-Atlantic area. Alternative 3 would separate it into North and South Carolina would get a quota; Georgia and Florida would get a quota; and then the Mid-Atlantic area; and, 4, it would be North Carolina would have a quota; South Carolina, Georgia and Florida would share a quota; and the Mid-Atlantic would have a quota.

The Mackerel AP recommended Alternative 1 as the preferred. They felt that if a quota was tight, this may be a good option. North Carolina supports this more so than the other states. At the Gulf scoping meetings there were just three commenters who spoke on this who did not support state quotas. One commenter supported state quota using historical catch to allocate.

If the zone designations affect the South Atlantic side, it is going to be even more complicated than it already is; so just to keep that in mind. I just have some questions that you guys would have to think about. First of all, if you want to look at are the quotas tight and so I put this table together. It is in the decision document. This is the percent of king mackerel quota landed, and so not always going over Spanish mackerel to go over.

And then I added in the commercial cobia landings and then the percentage of the landings that we have and then the percentage of the current ACL; so getting close, 85 percent except in 2010 it was 125 percent of the current ACL. There wasn't an ACL I don't think at that time. There is actually lots to consider and be very clear about – we want to be very clear about when you're discussing and considering state or regional quotas, you know, what would count towards a state's quota; would it be the landings by some kind of like designated permits or the landings in a state based on the dealer.

If it is designated permits, then how would the fishermen be assigned to that quota; and if you're going to do that, would it be based on their home address or their home port or how many landings they had in that state. Could they select what state or region they wanted to be tied to or would they be assigned to them and then can they change that or is it permanent, forever; once you are affiliated with the North Carolina quota, that is all you can fish on.

If it is landings in a state, so just the landings are counted along the way; you know, you would have to talk about the likely problem of fishermen coming from another state, so if Florida shut down, maybe everybody would move up to an open quota state. Then how would you allocate the quotas, probably based on some kind of historic landings proportion.

What years would you use and whose landings; of the fisherman with the permit associated with that state or would you use the dealer landings; so just lots of things to think about. Could the states or regions transfer quota among themselves? I don't know how that would work or if you would just want to let them work it out themselves.

These are some things to think about; and if this is something that the council wants to consider at this time for this amendment, then you at least need to kind of discuss all of these questions so the IPT has an idea of what kind of options and alternatives to put in. But if this is not something you want to talk about now, then let's not get in the weeds with it.

DR. DUVAL: Obviously, I have a few things to say about this action of state-by-state quotas. I think just given the issues of cobia, I would not suggest – if we were to move with this action right now or taking it out to public comment, my suggestion would be to leave cobia out of it because it would seem to create a pretty big mess just given that we're looking at having to do something similar with cobia like what we're doing for king mackerel on the Gulf and then some of the questions that Kari brought up.

Given that we don't require permits for landing and have not as of now for either king or Spanish mackerel, I would say state quotas – if we were to do state-by-state or regional quotas, that they be based on landings. This is how it has worked in the Mid-Atlantic, so I wouldn't necessarily recommend going with permits.

Again, the way this has worked in the Mid-Atlantic and at the ASMFC is fishermen are not assigned to a state or a region. I think it is just something that everyone accepts is that fishermen move around all over the place. We have guys from New Jersey and even Maine that are fishing on North Carolina summer flounder quota.

I think that is just something that we would all just have to accept as – I don't know if you want to call it a risk but that is just the nature of it. Right now, I think with our fisheries we already have people moving around from other states. There are guys from South Carolina and North Myrtle Beach who come and fish off North Carolina and vice versa.

It is all just regional proximity. Personally I think trying to assign fishermen to a state or region would overly complicate something like this. The way quotas have been established in the past has been based on historic landings; and again like I said not based on permit holders but I think just by going with dealer landings. Certainly, the years, that is a discussion. I'll stop.

MR. HAYMANS: Ben, this is a question I guess for you, but we heard Mr. Snead say last night that king mackerel was lower than it has been in the 31 years that he has been fishing it. If you look at the percentages from the last decade, it is not necessarily that because we have had them just as bad, but have you seen the downturn in king mackerel in South Florida?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I was going to save it for after we got through with these amendments, but I can answer it now or answer it later. But, yes, there is concern, there is room for concern. Mel.

MR. BELL: For two years now we have been getting these calls about where are all the kings, where are all the kings. His comments last night kind of hit home.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess I have a couple of questions. If the fishermen are going to be able to move around and all that and we're going to use dealer reports and everything, I guess one thing that is not entirely clear to me is why do this, then? But, the other bigger question is if we're going to go state by state, that means each state is going to have to take responsibility and monitor their own quota and close the fishery down.

My impression from previous discussions is that North Carolina is the only state that wants to do that, and it may be the only one. I think Florida could do it, but I'm not sure if South Carolina and Georgia have the capabilities, and they're shaking their head no. I know Florida could do it but I don't know if they want to.

It seems to me if all the states aren't interested, then we're not going to have state-by-state quotas, and we ought to strike that from this title and remove the alternative that would go state by state. Where that leaves us then is potentially regional quotas or something like that. It's not entirely clear to me what we gain from this.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Roy, it would be different to monitor the landings in a state and be able to, for example, shut that state down – that is different from the subzones and like monitoring the quotas in the subzones and the zones for these fisheries?

DR. CRABTREE: But then it seems to me Alternative 2 ought to be removed because that would establish quotas for each state and we're clearly not going to do that because at least Georgia and South Carolina aren't going to do it and can't monitor the quotas and deal with it all. It seems to me then that leaves us with we're talking regional quotas but not state-by-state quotas.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Why can't you monitor state quotas?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, number one, how many mackerel fishermen are landing in Georgia? Is it going to be confidential data? That is going to just not be a desirable way to go. It's not that we are not capable of doing that, but why? I don't know anybody who wants to do that. I know North Carolina wants to monitor their own quota, but the other states aren't wanting to do it that way so why talk about breaking it down like that?

It seems to me this is about letting North Carolina monitor their quota; and so if want to have a quota for everyone else and then a quota for North Carolina, that is one situation, but I'm trying to figure out what it is we're trying to do here because I don't get the sense that this is an issue with any other state. It seems to just be a North Carolina thing.

MR. CUPKA: I think we got here because it is a North Carolina issue. There was a lot of concern about the fishery closing early before the fish got up there so let's take part of the quota and set it aside to make sure they have an opportunity to fish. That is what I recall as the reason why we started considering it.

DR. CRABTREE: So my point is that is not state-by-state quotas. That is I guess a North Carolina and the rest of the region quota. If that is what we're talking about, then we ought to simplify this down to get to that.

MR. HARTIG: And functionally that is how it works. You include Georgia and South Carolina but the landings for those two states are so small commercially that it is essentially a North Carolina and Florida problem. The only alternative in here that would work because of the infrastructure of the other states would be North Carolina and then the other three states combine together. I think we could do that because North Carolina wants to have separate quotas and they want to monitor them and things of that nature. The way it works, like I said, it's only two states that have most of the landings.

DR. DUVAL: Right now North Carolina monitors our own Mid-Atlantic quotas. The Fisheries Service has nothing to do with it. They receive the landings through the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, but we're the ones who are opening and closing the fishery and monitoring the quota and the Fisheries Service doesn't really have anything to do with it. I realize that other states don't necessarily have that capacity; and if we want to remove a few of these alternatives, that's fine.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think we ought to parse it down to what we're really talking about and what is really doable. I don't want to monitor state-by-state quotas, and I'm fine with

figuring out a way to let North Carolina monitor their own quota and that's fine by me. It seems to me if really what we're talking about is no action or split off a North Carolina quota and have that and then the rest of the states, then that's what we have.

Then we are going to need to develop some allocation alternatives I guess with a different series of years under it. It seems to me that then becomes – and I agree with you, Michelle, about cutting out cobia, but are we just talking king mackerel or king and Spanish?

DR. DUVAL: I think this originally came up really more for Spanish mackerel. I think that was the discussion that we were having.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman, I think it was kings as well –

MR. HARTIG: Yes, it was kings as well.

MR. CURRIN: – and that has always been an issue. I mean early on, and I don't know about now whether the state and the fishermen have changed their minds, Michelle, but early on king mackerel was one of the drivers here as well.

DR. DUVAL: I stand corrected and glad that Mac is still around.

MR. HAYMANS: A question to Roy; if a state did have a separate quota, monitored that quota, they still can't close the fishery, right? They have to request NMFS to close it, yes, or would you be giving them that authority as well?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, to be honest, I'm not sure. We could look if there is a way to delegate authority to close the EEZ off the state. Otherwise, they would notify us when – what do you do in the northeast or Mid-Atlantic?

DR. DUVAL: Louis issues a proclamation closing – so for summer flounder he issues a proclamation closing the fishery.

DR. CRABTREE: Including the EEZ?

DR. DUVAL: Well, not including the EEZ, but those state-by-state quotas are set up in the federal plan for summer flounder, and so it's my understanding – I would have to go back and check, but the states are responsible for monitoring those quotas. We don't issue any kind of closure in the EEZ, but we also have a limited entry fishery for summer flounder whereby you need a license to land flounder in North Carolina. If you don't have that license you can't come in and land your fish here.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I guess the bottom line, Doug, is I'm not sure exactly administratively how it would work. We'd just have to figure that out.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm just wondering if there would be a problem with, say, North Carolina boats catching fish, they are unloading them in South Carolina and saving their quota and then moving

back to North Carolina. I don't know if that is a possibility, but I could see people sandbagging on somebody else's quota until they needed theirs.

DR. DUVAL: That is certainly a possibility. With Virginia and North Carolina having their own state quota shares of summer flounder, most vessels in the fleet are permitted to land in both states. They will go out and load up the boats with their Virginia quota first and their North Carolina quota and drop it off in Virginia and keep on steaming down to North Carolina. Depending on which state is open at which time, I wouldn't call it sandbagging but, yes, there is a possibility of vessels landing catch in South Carolina and then going up to North Carolina and fishing that.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, I just see us heading down to where the Gulf is where then they will to make people declare a zone because everybody will be mad because all the fishermen are coming in and catching up their quota and all that. I guess the thing is if you really feel like this is somewhere you want to go and you think there is a good chance there is a majority vote on the council to go down this path, then, okay, let's develop all this; but if this just isn't going anywhere, it's going to be a lot of work to develop it.

MR. CURRIN: Clearly, the states' interest, Ben, and the rest of the council members is to carve out some quota to be managed by the state of North Carolina for the fishermen there inherent with all the problems that you guys have identified, and, of course, that will come out during the discussion for everyone to consider. but the one thing I haven't heard before is the comparison to the zones in the Gulf.

It's not something that I have thought about before and not aware of most of the problems, but that certainly ought to enter into that discussion and I'm sure will shape the decision here. My suggestion would be to restructure this action such that it carves out a quota regionally with North Carolina being a separate region and all the other states being the other region. Clearly, several of the other states aren't interested in their own individual state-by-state quota. Let's look at it and see where it ends up.

MR. HAYMANS: If we have to monitor it for in-season landings and close it, we're not able to do that because we don't have the resources to put into developing the system to do that. If all things equal, then maybe we would be interested, but we're not at this time.

MR. CURRIN: If I might, my intent there, Doug, with the previous comments was that North Carolina would monitor its quota and NMFS would monitor the quota of the other three states just the way it is done right now. I wasn't trying to get you guys to individually monitor your quotas and then add them up at the end of the month or anything.

MR. HARTIG: Right and that is the only way I see it working. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I'm fine with restructuring this alternative and only having no action or an alternative that would establish a commercial quota for North Carolina and then the rest of the South Atlantic and the Mid-Atlantic Region with only Option A and Option B for king mackerel and Spanish mackerel; take it out; if people don't like it and there is a huge opposition, it doesn't

mean we have to do it. I guess from a philosophical standpoint, obviously we have worked within state-by-state quotas.

They are incredibly advantageous when it comes to some of the regional issues of disparity with things like black sea bass and golden tilefish and the resource being available at different times to different people. I could certainly see us considering down the road state-by-state quotas for black sea bass. Somebody correct me if I'm wrong but I think we did scope this issue of regional or state quotas within CE-BA 3, and there were positive comments in support of it. My feelings aren't hurt, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, don't get me wrong, I don't have anything necessarily against it. It is just if the other states don't have the capacity to do it, it doesn't seem to work. Now I'm okay if you want to restructure this so that it sets up North Carolina and the other states and you have options for king and Spanish.

I think you need to put another alternative or some options in here that would address the allocation because we're going to have to – with some years and things because I think your North Carolina fishermen need to understand there is going to be North Carolina versus the other states in setting the allocation, and then they ought to think about where the votes lie on that and look at some of the consequences.

DR. DUVAL: I know those people.

MR. CURRIN: Michelle, I thought you had made a motion to effectively do that, to restructure this, and I was prepared to second that motion.

MR. HARTIG: She hasn't yet but I think she will.

DR. DUVAL: I'm just trying to get straight what we're going to here. **I would move that we remove Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 under Action 7 to the considered but rejected.**

MR. HARTIG: Seconded by Doug. Discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.**

DR. DUVAL: **Now I would like to make a motion to restructure Alternative 4 such that it establishes a commercial quota for North Carolina versus the rest of the South and Mid-Atlantic for Atlantic Migratory Groups of king mackerel and Spanish mackerel. I would like to remove cobia from that; for king and Spanish mackerel only.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle; second by Jessica. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: In doing that, does that include the South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and the Mid-Atlantic, because right now Alternative 4 has three regions?

DR. DUVAL: Right, right now we have no – it is all one quota. The Mid-Atlantic states fish off the same quota for Spanish mackerel; so if we're just looking at allocation options to see what a North Carolina share might be, then it's just everybody else is fishing on all the rest of it.

MR. HAYMANS: So the southern states and the Mid-Atlantic states and a hole in the middle?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, doughnut hole.

MR. HARTIG: Roy, the question was we have got North Carolina and then we've got all the other areas so you would have South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and the Mid-Atlantic all monitored under one quota?

DR. DUVAL: Don't you guys get those landings?

MR. HARTIG: You get Mid-Atlantic landings, correct?

DR. CRABTREE: I think so.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I think you do. Charlie, what was your question?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I think I heard the answer but just to make sure I heard the answer, so it is not going to be a Mid-Atlantic and then a North Carolina and then Georgia down. It is just going to be two quotas instead of three; so if the Mid-Atlantic gets happy with their landings, I'm not so sure I like that.

DR. DUVAL: Charlie, that is the way it is now. The states are allowed to land in the Mid-Atlantic whatever they want. There is no set-aside right now or separate allocation.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, but I think Charlie's concern is North Carolina vessels could then go into the Mid-Atlantic and unload their catches and not impact North Carolina's quota.

DR. DUVAL: I see, okay, I understand.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think from this discussion staff gets the sense of what is feasible and not, and I would suggest that you guys just get together and come up with a range of reasonable alternatives that meet this more tailored need that we're talking about right now.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, that sounds good. We have got a motion; we've had discussion. **The motion is to restructure Alternative 4 such that it establishes a commercial quota for North Carolina and another for the rest of the region for Atlantic Group King Mackerel and Spanish Mackerel.** Anymore discussion? Is there any objection? Okay, **the motion is approved with two objections.** All right, we're going to take Roy's suggestion and staff is going to flesh this out more and it will come back to you.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Action 8 is to set an ACT by subzone for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia. There are two alternatives; no commercial sector ACT; and then the recreational ACT

you can see there; or, Alternative 2, commercial ACT is 90 percent of the subzone ACL and then the recreational ACT is the sector ACL.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, any discussion on this item? Any problems with it? It's pretty straightforward.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: The Mackerel AP recommends Alternative 1 as the preferred so this would basically just not establish the commercial ACT.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, do you want a preferred here or not? Seeing none, moving right along.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, Action 9 is the AMs for the subzones in Atlantic cobia. Alternative 1 is no action, and so the commercial AM is to prohibit the harvest, possession and sell when the commercial ACL is met or projected to be met. The recreational AM is reduce the length of the following fishing year, so a payback when the recreational sector quota is exceeded.

And then compare the recreational ACL with the landings over a range of years, which is described here – this is what is in existence – and then only adjust the recreational season length if the total ACL is exceeded; a commercial payback of any overage, so pay back only if it is overfished; recreational payback if any coverage from one year to the next only if overfished.

Then Alternative 2, the commercial and recreational AMs for Atlantic Group Cobia applies separately to each of the Atlantic Migratory Group Subzones as determined by the previous action with the ACLs. Alternative 3, the current commercial and recreational AMs for the Atlantic cobia applies separately to each of the Atlantic Group Cobia Subzones as determined, except that the three-year moving average is replaced by the most recent year's landings. This may be something that Gregg would have to speak on again.

MR. HARTIG: Those are pretty normal AMs for the recreational fishery and for the commercial fishery. Discussion? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a real quick question; Action 7, although it doesn't state it in the title of the action, each of the alternatives deals specifically with the commercial quotas. Then Action 9 references Action 7, but we're talking about commercial and recreational ACTs so a question on that.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: That's a typo. However, it is just talking about Action 6, which is the cobia ACL action and not the state quota.

MR. HARTIG: Well, it still doesn't solve the problem that you had of the discussion or does it?

MR. HAYMANS: That is setting the ACL for the whole fishery, so, yes, and it has got the mention of the recreational and commercial sectors there in Alternative 1. I guess it would be the ACTs would be applied to those ACLs, so, yes, I guess it does make sense by going back to 6.

MR. HARTIG: Is everyone comfortable with those?

DR. CRABTREE: May I ask a question? If we set up these quotas in Action 7, would we need a similar sort of action; does it modify the AMs and all for those separate zones?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Well, as it is now cobia is not one that is – and this is specifically for cobia.

DR. CRABTREE: Would we need them for king and Spanish? I guess that would be done in the action itself. Like of North Carolina went over their quota, the payback would be just North Carolina and that kind of stuff.

DR. DUVAL: I think you could specify in the action that the accountability measures that the council has established would apply to any sub-regional quota.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, we've got that straight. Anything else in this action? All right, that brings us to modifying the framework procedure.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, Action 10 is the framework procedure. The modified procedure was adopted in Amendment 18, so there are a few alternatives. One would allow changes to the AMs under the standard documentation process for open framework actions. You see under Alternative 2 the list of AMs; in-season and post-season AMs that could be changed under Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 is similar but it has just two items under each of the in-season and post-season AMs. Alternative 4 would modify the procedure to include designation of responsibility to each council for setting regulations for the migratory group of each species. Alternative 5, make editorial changes to the procedure to reflect changes to the council, advisory committees and panels. Alternatives 4 and 5 could be selected in addition to 2 and 3.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, are we straight on that? Go ahead, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I just want to question – and maybe this is for Gregg because it was something that he and I had talked about and I thought it was going to be included in the list of framework things, and I didn't see it in here. Okay, so this is just modifications to the framework so there is already a provision in the framework for like a seasonal exemption from the size limit. The first thing I see on the framework alternatives is a change in the king mackerel. Okay, I just wanted to make sure that was one of the things that was allowed under framework; that's all.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: What specifically would be allowed under the framework, Michelle?

DR. DUVAL: I was just asking if an exemption from the size limit is allowed under a framework or changes to the size limit are allowed under the framework procedure. I was confusing myself because it has been a long week that this is to modify the existing framework

procedure and these are not all the things that are in the framework right now. I just answered my own question.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right, it has been a long week and it's mackerel on top of it. Yes, you can change size limits right now.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, are we comfortable with this then for now? This one is not going to hearing I wouldn't – go ahead.

MR. CUPKA: This one is not going to be ready to go to public hearings obviously, and I would also suggest that the other item under mackerel framework, that we just let staff bring that back at the September meeting and that we don't go over it today since 19 and 20 is going to come back to us in September. It has been a long week and a long day, so that would be my suggestion to you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, Mr. Chairman, that is the way we will do it. We are done with 19 and 20. The only other action that I have to come before you is to talk about the Atlantic Group King Mackerel stock and the state of what the fishermen are experiencing. For the last three years in the area where we fish in South Florida where most of the spawning stock comes to spawn we have a significant decline in the fish that show up in that area.

Having said that, there are also extreme environmental differences, oceanic conditions between cold water and then not having any Gulf Stream influence this year for almost a month, which I have never seen before for that long and that time period my entire life. There are other things that are working here, but there is some concern – fishermen have been coming to me for the last two years.

Not only that but I have been approached by people from South Carolina, as you have, Mel, tournament guys last year, they were calling me where is the kingfish, where is the kingfish. We've gone ahead and looked at some of the data and the North Carolina catches are trending down, the recreational catches are trending down.

The east coast catches are trending down, but there is a portion of two years of landings that we've got to look at that were actually late-returning mixing zone fish that will make the story a little more clear for at least the area that we fish in. We catch about a million pounds of fish there in a normal season, so that's a big contributor to this.

We want to go in there and look at those and then have a more true picture. Now, I was going to come to you with some framework actions like David said, but we're not going to do that at this time. What we want to do is have a meeting after August with our fishermen and sit down and have an industry meeting where we bring the landings to them and then have a discussion of how they want to proceed to move forward; bring those recommendations back to you in September and possibly do an emergency action for king mackerel that would be in place for the next season.

That's what we're thinking about now and we'll see how it goes in that meeting in August. August is one of the telltale times because those are the youngest spawners that we see, and August last year was pretty insignificant. Two August's in a row that are insignificant means there is probably not anything coming up in the pipeline in that spawning group of fish that we can rely on for the future. August is going to be the real determinate; it will be the month to really look at in this question. We will bring that back to you in September. That concludes my report. Jessica; that doesn't conclude my report because she has got an option to bring to you.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would like to make a motion to request that the Mackerel Committee from both the Gulf Council and the South Atlantic Council meet – and I'm open to suggestions on the timeframe. Do we want to try to meet in between now and the September council meeting? That would be my preference.

DR. CRABTREE: **I would suggest August and meet with the Gulf Council.**

MS. McCAWLEY: Possibly in August at the Gulf Council meeting.

MR. HARTIG: Well, that is a motion and let's get a second. David seconded. Okay, discussion. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: What are those dates of the Gulf Council meeting?

MR. GILL: It starts the 20th of August. It hasn't been scheduled and agended so I can't tell you when committee is meeting yet. We'll do that later.

DR. DUVAL: That would be difficult for me because our commission is meeting the 22nd, 23rd and 24th, so I would say I think that is great because you are all going to be gathered together. I think if there would be an option for me to participate by webinar or something like that, I would just ask that be considered.

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm also fine with meeting in Tampa in a different week and a different time, which is what Roy had suggested offering their office for a meeting. That might be easier and I think it might be easier if people have to participate via web.

DR. CRABTREE: In our office we have a conference room that could easily accommodate us. I don't think we'd have a large number of the public show up, but we'd have room for some.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, we've got a motion and we have got a way to get at it if we look at a couple of different dates. Anymore discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.** We will get together and look at the August meeting, see what the ability is of the committee members from the South Atlantic is to attend your meeting. In lieu of that we may schedule a Tampa meeting in Roy's conference room at another date.

MR. GILL: And if they all fail, you may consider that the Gulf Mackerel Committee go to your September meeting as another possibility, if all else fails.

MR. HARTIG: Thanks, Bob. That concludes my report.

(Whereupon, the Mackerel Committee of the Whole adjourned on June 15, 2012.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July, 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011 - 2012 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

MEL BELL

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

Tom Burgess
P.O. Box 33
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460
910/327-3528
tbburgess@embarqmail.com

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

Benjamin M. "Mac" Currin
801 Westwood Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607
919/881-0049 (ph)
maccurrin@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Charles Phillips
Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-3149 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011-2012 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

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

CATCH SHARES

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

DOLPHIN WAHOO

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

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

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

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

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

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

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

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

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

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

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

LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

PERSONNEL

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

PROTECTED RESOURCES

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

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

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

SEDAR Committee

David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Vince O'Shea
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: John Carmichael

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

✓ Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Assistant Public Information Officer

✓ Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Goral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Staff Economist

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

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary / Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PHIL STEELE
BONNIE POWWETH
BOB GILL
SUE GEARHART
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
JACK MCGOVERN
ANDY STRELCHECK
JOEY BALLENGER
MARCEL REICHERT
OTHA EASLEY
KAREN RAINE

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.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE MEETING
 June 14, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
John DeVane SR.	772-589-4203	lisbethman@yahoo.com	19055 River Side Dr Tallahassee FL 32309
Mason Bowen Hill	321-795-1038	dykohe@comcast.net	9899 Cetero / Av Sebastian FL 32976
Nicholas Hill	561-351-1904		6365 Graft St Vero Bch Sebastian FL 32976
Sam Nauman	321-505-6311		
James Turner	772-778-5336		
David Stood	843-327-1114		
Kate Quinley	-CEA		
Jeff Miller	-CEA		
Brian Bersker	-CEA		

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.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE MEETING
 June 14, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

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

NAME & ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER

EMAIL ADDRESS

168 Harris Dr. Sebastian FL 32958

Chad Engler (561) 596-0821 Cengler@yahoo.com CCA 511 SW 5 Ave W R 32953, FL

Dick Brown 772-7855348 Merritt Island FL 32957

Ron Rodetsky Jr. 772-634-7770 365 Orange Ave Sebastian FL

Ron Rodetsky Jr. (321) 453-4583 365 Orange Ave Sebastian FL

Barrett Colby (772)-413-1029 Box 222, Fellemer, Fla. 32978

Keith Bowers (305) 481 4081 Box 222, Fellemer, Fla. 32978

Justin Boland 772-571-1538 5950 Main St Grant Fl 32949

Don Ernest (381) 863-8664

Clinton Smith

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

MACKEREL COMMITTEE MEETING
 June 14, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

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

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
FRANK HEULES	65AFF	TAMPA, FL	SSJ, GA
Peter Parile	SEA-EFFS 912-222-9204	abac711@hotmail.com	PO Box 7971 Tynor FL 33468
Suzanne Shogman	561 436 9910	Suzanne.Shogman@att.net	13598 135 Pl, N. Tynor FL 3298
David Fechter	561-310-5287	DRF1183@Yahoo.com	401 N. ALTAIA #1 Tynor FL 32977
Michael A. Sapp	321 403 3035	Tony Sapp @Y mail.com	5866onChalk Str Conard
Gary L. Robinson (SGL)	561 262 5122	garryrobinson31@hotmail.com	919 Riverwood Ln Jupiter FL 32909
JIM BUSSE ECTS	321 403 3035	SueRob@att.net	3293 Palm Bay FL 32909
Richard Sergent	(321) 729-8125	Richiebagman@yahoo.com	3293 Palm Bay FL 32909
DANIEL L. KANE			

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.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE MEETING
June 14, 2012
Orlando, FL 32812

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

EMAIL
ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

16311 W. Ellsworth Ave.
Golden, CO 80401

beaumonts@comcast.net

Susan Shyporek @ att.net

912-222-9200

DALE Beaumont (Age Seafood Consumer)

Susan Shyporek

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

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:15 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)	Webinar ID 764572314
Actual Start Date/Time Jun 14, 2012 07:25 AM EDT	Actual Duration (minutes) 291
Clicked Registration Link 160	Opened Invitation 27
Total Attended 31	

Session Details

linville,mike	whateversbitin03@yahoo.com
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 14, 2012 08:48 AM EDT
City	jupiter
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 11:54 AM EDT	145.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 72

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Eich,Anne Marie	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:29 AM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:00 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	256.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Turner,Jon turnerj1919@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 11:56 AM EDT

City Geneva

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 11:58 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	18.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Stephen,Jessica jessica.stephen@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:25 AM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:26 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	231.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:47 AM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 14, 2012 07:47 AM EDT Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT 269.95

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 64

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Vondruska,John **john.vondruska@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:57 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 14, 2012 09:01 AM EDT Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT 195.8

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 62

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 10:22 AM EDT

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 10:25 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 11:02 AM EDT	36.92

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Takade-Heumacher,Helen **htakade@edf.org**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 10:08 AM EDT

City Raleigh

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 10:09 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	103.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

sandorf,scott **scott.sandorf@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 09:34 AM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 09:35 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	161.7

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:54 AM EDT

City port canaveral

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:55 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	201.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Larkin,Michael michael.larkin@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:39 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:39 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	217.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Coggins,Lew lew.coggins@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:46 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:46 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:04 PM EDT	198.15

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Sedberry, George george.sedberry@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:28 AM EDT

City Savannah

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:37 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 09:30 AM EDT	52.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Beckwith, Anna anna@pamlicoguide.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:15 AM EDT

City morehead city

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:16 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	240.78

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 75

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:41 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:41 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	173.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

BLACK,ED **bigdog91360@aol.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 02:34 PM EDT

City FORT PIERCE

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 10:10 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	126.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Mehta,Nikhil nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 10:56 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 14, 2012 08:12 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	244.9
---------------------------	---------------------------	-------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 68

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Michie,Kate kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 11:04 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 14, 2012 09:13 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	183.63
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

MacLauchlin,Bill **billmac@charter.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:11 AM EDT

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:44 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 11:46 AM EDT	174.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 57

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Gore,Karla **karla.gore@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 11:16 AM EDT

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 11:16 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	60.43

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:56 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 09:00 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	196.3

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

DeVictor,Rick **rick.devictor@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 09:12 AM EDT

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 09:13 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	183.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:29 AM EDT

City st. petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:37 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:12 PM EDT	215.33

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 58

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 12, 2012 12:35 PM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:50 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 08:54 AM EDT	4.4

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Holland,Jack jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:58 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:59 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:02 PM EDT	183.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Kellison,Todd todd.kellison@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:23 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:23 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	232.95

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 09:49 AM EDT

City stuart

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 10:04 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 11:58 AM EDT	65.57

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 72

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:07 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:07 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	250.2

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:16 AM EDT

City St. Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:16 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	241.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:32 AM EDT

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 07:25 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 12:17 PM EDT	575.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

fenske,kari kari.fenske@samfc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:21 AM EDT

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 14, 2012 08:21 AM EDT	Jun 14, 2012 11:45 AM EDT	203.8

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

c,mike mec181@yahoo.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 02:50 PM EDT

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:17 PM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Casey,P. **paige.casey@noaa.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 12:37 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Purcell,Mark **markpurcell310@hotmail.com**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:01 PM EDT

City Palm Bay

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 01:50 PM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Travis,Michael mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 01:17 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Helmick,Emily emily.helmick@gmail.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:32 PM EDT

City Palm beach gardens

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 06:34 PM EDT

City melbourne

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Napier,Toby **tnapier@bellsouth.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:13 PM EDT

City Cocoa

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:39 PM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 04:16 PM EDT

City daytona

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 11:52 AM EDT

City Oak Hill

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:11 PM EDT

City Orlando

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Arrington,Albrey albrey@fishrulesapp.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:31 PM EDT

City Jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

FARMER,NICK nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date May 25, 2012 10:59 AM EDT

City ST PETERSBURG

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Williams,Erik erik.williams@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 03:31 PM EDT

City MHC

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 02:19 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 12:13 PM EDT

City titusville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 04:57 PM EDT

City Orlando

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 02:24 AM EDT

City Hubert

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 06:02 PM EDT

City fort pierce

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Presley,Ron **presleyr@bellsouth.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:08 PM EDT

City Merritt Island

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended No

Registration Date May 25, 2012 02:03 PM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

fenske,kari kari.fenske@safmc.net

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 01:27 PM EDT

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

gillispie,dennis dgledge@gmailo.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 06:05 PM EDT

City fort pierce

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Locke,Melissa **mlocke@edf.org**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 10:32 AM EDT

City Raleigh

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

waltermire,robert **aquahaulit@gmail.com**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:05 PM EDT

City sebastian

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

finucane,sean

finuke@yahoo.com

Attended No

Registration Date

Jun 14, 2012 07:55 PM EDT

City

south daytona

State

FL

Unsubscribed

Bounce

[In Session](#)

Join Time

Leave Time

In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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