

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18 Public Hearings

North Charleston, SC
November 2, 2009

Summary Minutes

Council Members:

Tom Swatzel

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood

Mike Collins

Kim Iverson

Dr. Julie Neer

Anna Martin

Gregg Waugh

Rick DeVactor

Kate Quigley

Julie O'Dell

Tom Swatzel: Kerry, if you would recognize yourself.

Kerry Marhefka 17A: One would think I would know that. One would. Kerry O'Malley Marhefka. I'm going to speak on Snapper Grouper Amendment 17A, today. In fact, I say that right here. And I'm gonna use my time here today to discuss the economic impacts of the Red Snapper management measures in that public hearing document in Section 2.3, specifically as they relate to Alternatives 4, 6 and 10, the closures of the entire Snapper Group of fishery in order to meet the Red Snapper objectives.

I am gonna read straight from my statement 'cause I ramble. As you know, Mark has been fishing for Snapper Grouper for over 30 years. Over those years, as the fishery has changed, Mark has adapted and worked harder to stay in business. And for the people in the room who don't know, I'm speak of my husband, who is Mark. My husband's a Snapper – a commercial Snapper Grouper fisherman.

In the past, Mark would just simply fish harder and longer and in worse weather. Later in the years, Mark moved to Charleston in order to become involved with, and make extra money from, research through the South Carolina DNR. In the most recent years, through his work with the council, serving on advisory panels and giving up time on the ocean to attend various SEDAR meetings, he saw the writing on the wall.

And he knew that, ultimately, he would need to figure out a way to catch less fish, yet still find a way to provide for us. With great help from the Sustainable Seafood Initiative at the South Carolina Aquarium and through even harder work on his own behalf, Mark has been able to expand his business from simply catching fish and putting it on the truck to New York and Canada, to selling his catch directly here in Charleston, which I believe you know.

We now sell fish directly from our boat on Shem Creek to over 20 Charleston area restaurants. And I've attached a list. When I hand this in, anyone that wants to look at it can. We also sell fish to local retailers, retailers at the Columbia's Farmers' Market, to the dinner group, Coyola Cuisine. We participate in the South Carolina Aquarium Sustainable Seafood Dinners. We donate fish to many local fundraisers.

In addition, we still truck fish to Murrells Inlet that gets cycled through the economy in the Grand Strand Inn North. Mark's catch,

through our wholesale company, Abundant Seafood, alone has an impressive impact on the local economy. On average, we sell 5,000 pounds of whole Snapper Grouper species. Primarily, we sell over a million Snapper, Triggerfish, Red Porgy and Gag Grouper a month to local restaurants.

Estimating that those whole fish yield about 50 percent when filleted, then approximately 3,000 pounds of local caught fillets of Snapper Grouper species are being out by the chefs at Charleston's best restaurants, allowing for an average portion size of about a-half a pound, which is actually pretty generous. One can easily estimate that at least 6,000 portions of Snapper Grouper species caught by Mark are being eaten in Charleston every month.

While all of the restaurants we sell our catch to are consider end, prices can vary from about \$19.00 to \$29.00 a pound, and higher for nightly specials per entrée. Mark's fresh, locally caught fish accounts for \$144,000.00 a month or over \$1.7 million a year in revenues to our local economy. Of course, that's not taking into account the appetizers, drinks, desserts and everything else they buy when they're out to dinner eating his fish.

Obviously, our business also contributes to the local economy by employing three additional people, buying ice at the Maritime Center, buying fuel from National Oil, groceries at Piggly Wiggly, and we won't even talk about how much I contribute to the local economy. *[Laughter]*. However, it's not only about the money. Charleston and South Carolina as a whole have really embraced the concept of eating locally and buying responsibility harvested and grown food.

Chefs put Mark's name on their menu, and I've actually included some examples. They have bios and pictures of him up in their restaurants. We also have people coming to the dock trying to buy our fish and it's basically changed the way people are buying fish in Charleston.

If the entire Snapper Grouper fishery closes off in South Carolina due to the Red Snapper regulations, it goes without saying that Mark will either have to get out of fishing – which is not really an option for a 48-year-old man with a high school diploma – or move the boat to North Carolina and compete with all of the other boats that will undoubtedly move there.

He will do it and he'll make a living. He will, again, have to fish harder and longer than anyone else. He'll catch any and every fish

that's available to him. He will also continue to risk his life in dangerous weather. It is unlikely that Abundant Seafood will be able to remain in business, which is our wholesale portion of our business, with so much more time needing to be dedicated to traveling and fishing.

I'm here to argue that the local economy will be hurt by the absence of local Snapper Grouper fishermen. I realize at some point, the restaurants will have no choice but to use imported fish, but I doubt it'll bring the same **cash in** and demand the same \$24.00 a plate price tag as fish fresh from the dock.

I'm gonna close in asking that the council, and specifically our South Carolina Council members, look very closely at the economic impacts associated with all of the options contained in 17A. I know you're mandated to do what you need to do with Red Snapper and I understand you're going to do that.

What I'm asking is that I believe there is a way to make sure the regulations address overfishing on Red Snapper in a way that's proportional to each sector's impact on Red Snapper, as we've done in the past with every other species.

Tom Swatzel:

Thanks Kerry.

Eric Heiden 17A:

I'm Captain Eric Heiden, 65 years of ocean fishing. The largest and oldest bottom-fishing competition in the United States is named after my father and it still persists, 28 years of it. I'm here as an individual representing several hundred people that were advised not to show up and take up time from council for bitching, and complaining and being upset because that doesn't accomplish anything. So they've requested me to represent several boat manufacturers, tackle manufacturers that are the largest in the world.

I represent Eagle Claw Manufacturing and they know I'm here today. They even sent me some hooks and some things to demonstrate what I'm gonna talk about. I represent individual shops like Haddrell's and people that are renowned in the fishing profession. Mike Abel, Dave Tilley, the operator of the largest head boat in North Carolina, called the Continental Shelf.

So I've gone from Moorhead City all the way through Charleston, talking with, meeting with, people, getting their ideas and compiling a solution for our problem. This solution, I hope, will

be addressed by council. And it involves even more than Amendment 17A because we are admittedly into a lot of problems concerning all of our fish. So using the Red Snapper problem and the alternatives that we've seen presented, we would like to take it another step.

But this addresses the Red Snapper industry. Being a doctor, I've attended a lot of healthcare reform meetings. I've been a speaker at several. And all we hear at health reform meetings – and that prompted me about two months to do what I'm about to do. At these health reform meetings all we hear is complaints. Nobody, to this very day, has offered Congressman Brown or Senator Lindsey Graham a solution as to what we should do. Complaints don't accomplish anything.

Taking that into consideration and watching council, South Atlantic Council, their frustrations of looking at the alternatives that are illustrated plain and simple, and having no real alternative solutions that they would be happy with to carry out the mandate of our U.S. Congress that says council has got to come to grips with Red Snapper. If they don't, things will just get shut down. And council is searching for better alternatives. It is very difficult.

We've laid off six members of South Carolina DNR in the last six months and we are short staffers. When we're full staff we can't enforce the laws. Tracy Woodruff is the only law officer we have to enforce our federal laws. He banks on state DNRs helping him. Tracy Woodruff does not even own a boat; therefore enforcement issue – and it's ludicrous to think that what has been proposed will work and can be enforced.

Four or five years ago, Jim Boenheim and I spoke at length. Research scientist, marine biologist in Florida, and we talked about the MPAs. And I was the first proponent of doing MPAs. He did all the research on that and was the most avid proponent of doing that. We passed MPAs. I was very important in all of the fishing clubs supporting the closed sections that we now have – we've only had them a year – how to enforce them, to publicize them and have the recreational and commercial people abide by them.

We've not had a chance to develop any data off of that. But South Atlantic Council got their foot in the door and they have a marine protected area. Well, what the heck, if we can do that, we'll do from 90 feet to 140 feet. If this persists, next thing you know it'll be from shoreline to 200 miles. And if that doesn't stop council or the federal government, we'll probably not be allowed to fish for

the majority of fish within our bay, and probably no catfish in the rivers.

So, the people that I've talked to have said, "Eric, we have drawn a line in the sand. We have talked to congressmen, as you know. John Mica in Florida – and I have his bill here – can stop all actions of the South Atlantic Council and our Secretary of Commerce. Anybody would like to see the bill, I have multiple copies here, House Bill 3307. And that will pass. But that doesn't accomplish what my heartfelt needs are, and that is we need to fix the problem.

The problem is overfishing or everything. We have no restrictions on the majority of fish, and as the Darwin theory was, for every action there's a reaction. If someone that has \$1 million boat or a \$400,000.00 center console can't fish from 90 to 140 feet, he's gonna fish where he can. And the next thing you know, there won't be a Spadefish, there won't be a Bluefish, there won't be a Trout where he can fish. So we should address the whole issue of overfishing. It's critical.

So I am grateful to council, and the research people brought to Crabtree, for bringing it to the forefront so that it makes the headlines as you saw. The Sun News has never put a fishing story, ever, on the front page. And here the Sun News has the front page, the whole page, and one full page afterward, saying that we got a problem. Yes, I was a part of this, and you will see more series of these articles because it is important for the economics that you just heard.

What will Murrells Inlet do? Forget fishing, but what will 50 restaurants in Murrells do for fresh seafood? They won't. And I know what you're saying. "Well, we're only shutting down fishing from January through April." Well, next year it'll probably be January through October, and then maybe the whole year if the data collection people continue with their false observations. I can document it's false, false. Read my lips.

The data can be proven as false. The council has not been given the best available data, and that can hold up in court and stop everything. I am not in favor of that and I'm not debating whether the data is good or bad. But we need to do something. Hence, I went on this quest to develop – I went to Denver. We spoke with people in the hook industry. I know what we did in Costa Rica. And what we're proposing here has brought everything back in Costa Rica.

And for you that have never been there, you ought to go there and see where they are now; unbelievable. The House Bill by John Mica, I'm not in favor of. I'm not in favor of raising money and stopping the whole process. They've even developed the Carolina Saltwater Anglers Alliance. The RFA is developing major lawsuits with major dollar backers to stop everything the South Atlantic Council is trying to do.

They are doing what we need to have done. They are only volunteers given a tough assignment, and nobody has given them a very good solution. A couple of discrepancies the South Atlantic Council needs to get into – and that will be in my proposal letter. And I wrote this so that it can be passed throughout the council, as well as the news media. And this is a culmination of six or seven weeks of investigating what the commercial, the head boat people, would like, as well as the average Joe, the recreational fisherman.

And I've made copies so that I can leave them with you. But I will confess that everybody on the South Atlantic Council I've already spoken to, and they've seen this letter and they welcome my presenting it. And hopefully, it can be carried further in the way of honest evaluation and discussion because this is not from a public hearing. This is from one-on-one conversation from the gut wrenching problems that we face.

I'm gonna read you this and I'm gonna expand on certain sections that I think are very important. Solutions to rebuild the Red Snapper fishery and others, which is I'm assuming, Amendment 17, correct, 17. I'm writing these recommendations as a founding board member of the largest and most-active fishing club in South Carolina, the Florence Blue Water Fishing Club.

The following statement was approved unanimously on October 7, 2009 by several boat manufacturers, tackle manufacturers and all, every member that was present at that Florence Blue Water Fishing Club; that was present at a meeting held at Marshall's Marine in Lake City, South Carolina, approximately 150 in attendance.

The alternatives and recommendations presented to the South Atlantic Council of the lottery idea of who fishes and who doesn't, as well as the raggedly designed inshore no-fish areas described are totally unenforceable. It can't happen. The transponder idea sounds good in theory, but it's only for the rich who can afford it. The no-fish zones that have been discussed are almost impossible to identify when you're on the water.

And I've spent my hours – remember, we already have MPAs in areas that are already in place that are being enforced now. Three arrests were made last month from people fishing in those areas and they have been – they're going to trial. This new directive, the new MPAs, was supposed to help our stock replenishment, but no data – because it's too early – has yet even been collected from these areas. And now, council wants to shut off more areas.

The council's research staff that states, "Released Red Snapper that swim away die fairly soon at an 80 percent rate or higher," is highly suspect. And I can tell you, it can be disproven, but that's not my concern right here. The economic impact of higher fuel costs, the severe and confusing, "no longer in business," of the head boats; Charleston does not have a head boat.

Captain Dick's has only got one boat running. Varaine's Marina and the Hurricane Fleet are gone. The last trips made on the Continental Shelf were made last weekend. That has not been taken into consideration. The restrictions on most fish sizes and limits are enough to confuse anybody and force anyone in the boating and recreational industry just to give it up.

The fact that no head boats are no longer in business, that go daily or twice every day, has not been considered in this biological marine research that council has that is supposedly the best available data. With what I'm telling you, and the testimony you can get from the marina I work with, Georgetown Landing Marina, there are only – in the last month there's only been two trips taken to bottom fish.

When I was chartering and doing bottom trips, we were going one boat five times a week. No boats are doing that. This was not considered in their data research and collections. And John, the new manager there, is trying to change things around, and no one is there. And not that it matters, but because of all of the above, the oldest one of the biggest seafood restaurants in our state, Lands End, is no longer in business. They shut their doors down.

Tom Swatzel:

Eric, we're about 15 minutes right now.

Eric Heiden:

All right, I'll consider on target, okay. Anyway, the fishing pressure on Red Snapper, as well as overall bottom fishing, has not been taken into account. So considering these statements, I'd like to suggest either of the following recommendations to be considered seriously by the South Atlantic Council. I have two

solutions, two recommendations. One – and this has been approved by hundreds – simply shut down all bottom fishing from three miles and beyond to all boats, recreational and commercial.

There would be no fishing beyond three miles unless further notice, and the situation would be reviewed every year, with honesty and integrity being very transparent in the scientific reports and data. Each of the four states involved can utilize their enforcement personnel more easily and effectively.

This is simple to understand and should be quite effective in accomplishing our goals of replenishing all fish stock as well as the Red Snapper that are currently being depleted. I certainly do not recommend this choice, but it is better than any of the alternatives that the South Atlantic Council that has been presented to them.

The second solution is to allow everyone to fish as usual with some major changes that I believe would accomplish our replenishment goals and keep everyone, hopefully, satisfied and not affect the economics of the entire boating and fishing industry as severely. We should consider realistic and conservative boat limits for all fish. Maybe no fish, for instance Red Snapper, that would be harvested. Maybe, also review the size limits for all the bottom species, specifically Red Snapper.

Also, educate the industry that the MPA areas already in place will be enforced and ask for cooperation from the recreational fisherman to help patrol these areas to make replenishment happen quicker. Realistic, meaningful public hearings should be had for fishermen's input. The high mortality rates of released fish, especially the Red Snapper, comes into question with the Amendment we're talking about.

Rather than rebuke or believe the scientific research data that has been published, we would all have to agree that something has to be done now to protect and replenish all our disappearing fish stock. Therefore, I would like to suggest that J-hooks be abandoned immediately and made illegal for any bottom fishing beyond three miles, and that non-offset circle hooks be mandated by federal law, subject to very severe penalty if not used.

Now, I have brought samples of the newest of J-hooks – of the circle hooks that are non-offset that Eagle Claw wanted council to see of where this technology has gone to prevent mortality. If this law or these laws are broken, we should, for the first time ever,

have very severe penalties if these laws are broken. This excludes circle hooks that are wide bend and the offset circle hooks that are also known as circle hooks.

That only circle hooks that you would work would be the non-offset circle hooks of which you will have some specific hooks to dispense. I presently work close with Eagle Claw as senior pro staff, and can document that these non-offset circle hooks can lower mortality rates to less than 10 percent on most species of bottom fish. I firmly believe 85 percent of the higher mortality of released Red Snapper discussed would not even be a factor again.

Included in these recommendations further, to aid in reducing the released fish mortality would be mandating the education and use of the hookers, not only to have them on board subject to a severe penalty, but to be quizzed as to how to use them as well as bending tools, all of which would be subject to severe penalty. That is not hard to do, and State Wildlife has agreed. And they were part of this input.

Also, the elimination of any fast-retrieve, deep-water, commercial bandits or electric reels with high gear ratios. And I've brought with me the newest in technology, which is this reel made by Fish Winch. This is a reel that is the newest in technology that retrieves fish at four times slower rate, with a red-face pin five times slower rate than any other electric-reel combination. Therefore, the elimination of the bandit reel could be replaced with this reel which is designed to fish in up to 2,000 feet of water.

It cost half what the Electramates and other electric reels cost. It weighs half as much and costs half as much. It has a full two-year warranty. And it's on the market and everywhere but, would you believe, the South Atlantic. And it's made in Newbern, North Carolina. And I even brought a battery for someone that's in this room that would like to test it. Half the price. The best part is, it makes no noise, none – two-year full warranty.

Regardless of which way South Atlantic Council decides, my fishing club and I will abide by your decisions. Also, what I have suggested may be solutions to prevent the destruction of other species of fish besides Red Snapper that haven't even been discussed yet, but may be quickly targeted at council that some of the solutions now being promoted. Remember Darwin's theory, "With every action, there is a reaction," some of which may be very counterproductive to our ultimate goals.

The commercial boat that I run, called the Frenzy, we are targeting a fish that has no quotas. It's called Triggerfish. We have 25 designated areas that if this goes into effect, not to be misconstrued as a threat, but out in Georgetown, there will not be a Triggerfish left by this time next year because we can do it. And we have an \$800,000.00 boat that we're not gonna let sit idle. So for every action, there's a reaction.

The best available data has not been received as mandated by our federal government through the Magnuson Act. And I think that needs to be considered. One other data here I'd like to show you, if I can find it, and that is we have research – I have it – from Karen Burns in 2003, a document describing almost no mortality on Red Snapper, no mortality on Red Snapper, if just circle hooks are used. Her testimony would obviously be used in any type of lawsuit or action. And I would like to demonstrate that and show you that before I'm complete if that's okay.

Tom Swatzel: That's fine, if you could wrap it up; maybe just a couple of minutes.

Eric Heiden: I was told that barotrauma was the problem. And utilizing this reel type and circle hooks from the Atlantic States Marine fisheries Commission, which two of your board are at today. On Page 5, Karen Burns gives us specific data that council had not been apprised of, as we speak, concerning the mortality rates of Red Snapper when circle hooks are used – by a marine biologist, Karen Burns, who you have worked with.

But no one asked her about what is a solution. That is a solution by one of your own marine biologists. And if you'd like to ask me any question out of the audience, I'll be glad to answer them.

Tom Swatzel: Thank you Dr. Heiden. We'll move on to our next speaker, Fowler Del Porto. And if anybody else has got any –

Fowler Del Porto 17A: Okay, I guess I'm here to talk about mostly 17A, but I figure it could brush on 17. My name is Fowler Del Porto. I grew up in Charleston. I've been fishing my whole life; I'm 33. I fish Gulf Coast; I fish all the way up and down Florida, from here up to North Carolina, down to the Bahamas. I mean I've covered, primarily, every place that South Atlantic fishery Management Council covers. And it's mostly recreational, but sometimes a charter fisherman.

I don't fish for Red Snapper. I've probably caught about ten Red Snapper in my entire life. But what you're proposing to do here could seriously impact a lot of the other fishing that I do in that I basically am a zero bi-catch fishery, but this does not impact Red Snapper. And yet, what you're proposing to do will greatly impact a lot of my fishing, and I don't see that could possibly help anything. I don't see how it will ever help a Red Snapper.

I fish off Charleston – I do a handful of bottom fishing trips a year and primarily target Gag Grouper, and I don't seem to ever have any Red Snapper interaction out there. I think I could catch Red Snapper if I wanted to. I know places they hang out. I don't tend to frequent those places. I find the Gag Grouper tend to follow the bait around, and so pretty much when you can find the bait, the cigar minnows moving around the bottom, the Gag Grouper usually are under them.

And the Red Snapper, it seems to me, like to stay on the ledges and stay on the hard reefs. But I don't usually fish those places. At least I don't target them. But what I do know about them is you've got these several alternatives here. I don't agree with any of them, but I know where you are right now and what you're up against. Closure Alternative 3, I think is way more than what is really needed, but it gives the least impact, and it certainly gives the least impact off the coast of South Carolina.

You know most of the Grouper and Snapper that come up here, as you probably know, or should know, you know they migrate up and they migrate back down. I just tend to – I definitely notice that I tend to – my good is, like, in May, June, a little bit in July, and then it picks back up again in, like, October, November and then it kind of slows down, you know 'cause the fish either move out to very deep water or they move back down South, so I don't really think extending this permanent closure all the way up here is gonna do much.

I don't have any problem with a closed season. I don't have any problem with tight bag limits. I don't have any problem with a lot of things, but just outright closure of these areas, especially to a fisherman that doesn't impact Red Snapper, I do have a problem with. And I speak for a lot of fisherman when I say that. The other two alternatives, 5 and 6, bring us all the way into state waters. And Alternative 6 looks like it runs all the way out into the wreck fish fishery out there. I mean I don't see how that's gonna work. *[Laughter]*.

But anyway, you know we've got a lot of artificial reefs in those areas in there that – as recreational fisherman and people who have donated money – that we built to be proactive for our fishery. To think that I can't go to the Charleston 60 reef and put a piece of squid on my hook and drop it down is ridiculous to me. But some of these alternatives would not allow that, and I – you know that's unacceptable.

I really think a better idea with these alternatives would be to kinda segment them, maybe create a larger section of MPAs out there. But you know I routinely fish. In fact, I went – I haven't been in October. The weather's been funny this October. But I went in September and we went everywhere from about 70 to 80, 85 feet, caught a lot of fish; didn't see a single boat out there all day 'cause there was just not that many people out there bottom fishing, really.

There's really not on our coast. I mean we're not like Florida. You know you go right out there and the reef's right out there. It's just a lot different here. But I used circle hooks. I didn't injure a single fish that we didn't take home. I didn't catch any legal size Gag Grouper. We caught a couple of smaller Gag Grouper, but you know, circle hook, you pull it out, you stick that thing in the water and he swims off just like a Bass, you know, when you let him go. I mean even in 80 feet.

I mean I'm just using stand-up gear, pulling them up like the gentleman said earlier. You know a lot of these fast retrieve bandit rigs and all that stuff, you know they really do injure the fish. I mean if you're fighting a fish up, I think they acclimate much better. But those Grouper were in great shape, you know. I mean you let them go and they went down like bullets, you know. And like I said, I had caught Grey Triggers, Black Sea Bass is what we kept, a couple of short Grouper.

No bi-catch, zero, none. I mean I don't have bi-catch when I bottom fish. I just don't. Before they changed the Snowy Grouper rules, people – I killed Snowy Grouper because you had to. You know but, fortunately, that's changed. And that's been a good change. But I don't tend to go out there anymore. If I do go that far, like most people here, I'm out there to troll and catch Platy Fish. So some of these alternatives greatly impact fishing I do that's not Red Snapper. I mean they all basically do.

This one that brings – Alternative 6 – I mean right outside of three miles, you know that's where we fish for Cobia and Big Bull Redfish and stuff like that. And again, that's another zero bi-catch fishery, where if you're not keeping a fish, you know you let it go and everything's fine. And there's also – there's really no – I rarely – about 60 feet's the shallowest I think you probably ever see a Red Snapper around here really.

But I don't think you really have a problem releasing fish until you get out to, like, 120, 130 feet, provided that you're not yanking them off the bottom, you know, with 80-pound braid and a winch, you know what I mean. I mean that's really what kills them. So I think limiting some of that type of gear should be a consideration before you start wholesale closing stuff down out there.

I submitted a letter to the council. I want to reiterate a few points. Obviously, the economic points have been iterated enough. We all know what that is. I think that ending overfishing for a lot of bottom fish can be done by implementing a reasonable recreational bag limit, a reasonable commercial quota, a spawning season closure, gear restrictions in certain areas and a reasonable implementation schedule.

I mean I originally – I'm for the original series of MPAs. I think it's gonna take about five years to see any real effect from the last four – from the last several Amendments that put those in place and changed things. I mean I know what the plastic long line, when all that was changed and they made the moving zones and the seasons out on the hump, we started seeing, about five years after that – we started seeing Blue Marlin and Sailfish really coming back.

And if you looked at the year class of fish we were seeing, they were 5 to 6-year old fish. And same with the restrictions that were put on the Redfish inshore, whenever that bag limit was dropped from five, or whatever it was, down to two or whatever. You know, after about five years, I mean shoot, they're all over the place now. You know I mean I really think you're gonna have to give this five years. You may be surprised at what you see come back. I think it's way too soon is what I'm saying.

As far as the 40 percent recreational mortality on Red Snapper, I'm not sure where you get that number. I really think you need to look at – I don't think there's any data available, really, that's very good on recreational discards and what effect they have on the fish here off the South Carolina Coast. I can't speak for Florida and

elsewhere, but there's just not a lot of recreational fishermen out there bottom fishing, you know. I mean with the limits the way they are and the run you gotta make, it's almost not even worth it.

And the price of fuel – and the price of fuel's gonna go back up. I mean you could basically do whatever you want. You could let us all go wide open next time fuel hits \$4.00 a gallon, which it will again. People are gonna quit fishing you know. I mean I think that that alone is gonna be a very significant factor. But anyway, the point is not many people go way out there just to bottom fish. You just don't catch enough fish to do it, really. You're not allowed to keep enough fish to do it.

I fear that the South Atlantic fishery Management Council is gonna marginalize themselves and is gonna cause the general public to turn against them or lose trust in their judgment on a very large scale. I mean if you've lost – if you've lost my support and the support of the middle-of-the-road kinda conservation-minded angler, then you know you really kinda lost the battle.

There's always gonna be people that don't want you to tell them what they can fish for, and when they can fish and all this stuff. And there's always gonna be people that think that, you know, every little fish is precious, you know what I mean. And you're never gonna please them. But most of us don't think that, but I fear you're really gonna turn the vast majority of people to really start questioning your judgment and I just don't think that's gonna help anything.

You need to be very wary of that with what you're proposing. And I understand that Congress is handing this down to you. But anyway, I have some recommendations for the current limits; 15 Black Sea Bass per person is too many, particularly if you start to close these areas. The Black Sea Bass tend to be much closer to shore. If people can't fish for Grouper in January and April around here, they're gonna fish for Blackfish, you know. And at 15 a per –

Fowler Del Porto 17B:– that's just too many fish. You know for a recreational boat with four people to go out there and come back with 60 Black Sea Bass, I just think that's too many fish. So I think that should come down to about eight. I think both the commercial and the recreational minimum should be 12". I think the Dolphin fishery at ten or whatever, yeah. What is it? The Dolphin should come down from ten fish person to six. I think you're gonna see a shift into that as well, probably not so much here, but off Florida, you know.

I mean there's no six-pack charter boat that needs to come back with more than 36 fish in their box, you know. I mean that's plenty of fish, you know, I mean that's a lot of fish to clean, I can tell you. I have some questions for the council – well, concerns. Let's say we do this when we close this down and everything. What happens when it reopens? I mean do we just go right back to what we were doing.

I mean I really think you kinda need to get to the middle of the road and stay there, and then allow nature to sorta catch up. You know I mean you can outlaw all fishing today. Tomorrow, there's still gonna be the same amount of fish in the ocean, you know. I mean, like I said, you gotta let nature kinda catch up. You might want to look at some shallower MPAs if you think it'd help the Red Snapper.

I really think, though, in a lot of areas in there in 100 and 120 feet, you could create some marine parks by building some reefs that people weren't allowed to fish on. And that way, you could kinda set up a dive industry where people could go out and dive and see the fish on the reefs and everything, and not have to worry about other fishermen out there dropping gear on their heads and stuff like that. And I think there's ways this could be done that wouldn't affect the economy as much.

It would give the fish safe havens. And they need safe havens; I definitely agree with that. You know I've been in the Bahamas; there's reefs that are off limits to fishing down there. I think that you could probably definitely move that line out past the 98-foot contour. I just don't see – I've released a lot of fish in that depth of water. And I can tell when they're injured. You know what I mean, their stomachs are sticking way out.

For the most part, I don't see a problem there. The fish that have had strict limits put on them, like the Red Porgy, it's rebounded tremendously. And that was done without a closure. I don't see why our Red Snapper wouldn't do the same thing.

So to be honest, I still don't really understand what the point of all this is. I mean there's a lot of people in this country. We like our boats, we like our cars and all this stuff, you know. You're never really gonna have a pristine environment out there where overfishing isn't occurring no matter what you do. You're just gonna push it here or there or whatever. So I don't – I don't really think that that's a good idea.

I think that we need a tight bag limit, closed seasons, all that stuff. But I don't agree with this wholesale shutting the fisheries down. I've fished in places like Andros in the Bahamas and way up in the Florida Everglades where you almost have no pressure, and there's just fish everywhere. And I can remember fishing around here in the '80s and there was definitely a lot more fish back then.

I don't think we'll ever get back to that point. But I think it could definitely be better than it is now. And I think the current alternatives that are in place have done a pretty good job, and they need to be given a little more time to work. But like I said, mostly I just – I don't impact Red Snapper. You know I don't fish for them. I think these closures would impact a lot of the fishing I do, unnecessarily. Thanks for your time. Any questions.

Bob Mahood: Did pretty good for a sick guy.

Tom Swatzel: We appreciate your testimony. Thank you. Next up is Charles Mims. Is anybody else out here. We're taking testimony on Amendment 17A, 17B and 18. This is your opportunity to speak your mind concerning that – those Amendments. If you want to speak, if you haven't filled out one of the Public Comment Attendance Record Sheets, you need to do so and I'll recognize you. Mr. Mims.

Charles Mims 17A: My name is Charles Mims. I live at Edisto Island, South Carolina. I've lived there permanently for about three years, and came there for one reason and one reason only. Well, we have some wonderful fellowship there, but also, I like to fish. And in my fishing, bottom fishing is the thing that I like to do. We trolled for years, and years, and years and years, and we just don't do that anymore. And then when you – you look at these things and understandably – we understand the logic behind it.

We understand the purpose of trying, what's trying to get done. That is to replenish the stock now. I am a biology major, but I have no way – I'm a marine biologist and no way can I comment on what's being done, if whether that's gonna solve the problems or not solve the problems. But I do have concerns that I would like to present to the council.

The first concern that I have, and I've watched this happen boat, after boat, after boat. I've even watched it happen on my boat, especially with Blackfish. We've got a limit of 12" on Blackfish.

Now, I'm not saying it's wrong to have a limit. You've got to have a number limit. There's nothing wrong with the 15; that you catch 15 Blackfish and you stop there. But I have seen, I can't tell you how many fish, thrown back dead. Little Blackfish like this and the sharks will get them within minutes.

They've been brought up from the bottom, they're moving slow. You throw them back over; they may be living, but then they're preyed upon virtually immediately. Whereas if maybe, you could let some of these smaller fish being kept, people wouldn't kill 30 or 40 of these Blackfish trying to catch something that's 12" long. That's a thought. Maybe it's no good, but it's a thought. It would leave – save many a fish that the ones that I've seen thrown back.

You know, usually, "Well, that fish doesn't measure. Get rid of him. This fish does." Or you know, and course the way the law is, you can't bring those fish back in and say, "All my fish was gut hooked." And that Game Warden will say, "Well, that's fine. So while your fish was being gut hooked, we're gonna take you to jail." So there's a problem there.

Another thing, in looking at the closure areas, Alternatives 3, 4, 5 and 6; a couple of them are virtually impossible. They just about close everything down. They close the artificial reefs down. They close everything. It would just about be impossible to bottom fish at all. A couple of them a little bit more reasonable, that is with the contours on there.

We have one with, I think, it's a – two of them with a 98-foot contour on the interior. If that could be moved out a little bit and maybe go from 98 feet to 120 feet, it would allow bottom fishing and it would also allow the boats to spread out a little bit and you wouldn't – you'd have less concentration of boats trying to bottom fish. And the gentleman before me, I'm like him, too. You don't see that many boats bottom fishing in South Carolina.

I don't when I bottom fish, and I bottom fish where everybody else fishing is _____ in common. They go out all there all day long and fish and never see another boat. Trolling you see boats, but not bottom fishing. Another problem that I have and this is just a problem with me. This is not anything that's gonna help replenish the species, but I think it's wrong to have a commercial limit on a size and a recreational limit on the size.

For example, the commercial people are allowed to keep 10" Blackfish if I've read the current regulations. Now, I

understand these things can be superseded. If they are, then I apologize; I haven't kept up with the rules. But as the current rules as I understand it, the commercial guys are able to keep 10" Blackfish. We, as recreational fishermen, are not allowed to do that. Our Blackfish have to be 12" long.

There's another situation that exists regarding Vermillion Snapper. We're limited to, I think – I recall – I think the Vermillion Snapper to recreational fishermen is currently closed as I understand it. The – again, the commercial guys can keep right on until that – whatever the poundage limit is, they just keep right on fishing.

I just think it's wrong to have something for one group but something different for another group, regardless of whether it's more restrictive on the recreational fishermen or more restrictive on the commercial fishing. I just think that that's – it's just I just have a problem with that. Another suggestion that I've got that may limit some fishing. *[Laughter]*.

I don't have to tell you, I'm an old person. And when I retired I came to Edisto Beach as old. In fact, I'm through buying fishing licenses 'cause I have a permanent fishing license now. And you can't help but wonder – you go to the state park, and at age 65, the state park cuts your annual dock – your annual **route** fee from \$50.00 to \$25.00. In other words, they recognize that this man's not gonna be around long, so he can't even buy green bananas at the grocery store. So let's let him fish, put his boat in for \$25.00.

Maybe there's something that you could do for us older people, you know, to allow us to do a little something that – the younger guys will be around when this stock is replenished. We came from the hearing next door and they were talking about the year 2035 and the year 2045. That's great. I won't be here. I won't see any of that. My days of fishing are numbered. I got, maybe hopefully, another couple of three years and it's all over with.

The – I just hope – and I think this is summing up everything that I'm trying to say. I hope the SAFMC – and again, I have talked with you people. I've been on your mailing list probably for ten years and talking to – I've talked to Bob on the telephone a couple of times. I've talked to Kim. I don't think I've ever dealt with a nicer group of people as far as being accommodating and as far as giving you the information as best they possibly can.

But in closing, I just hope that it doesn't exist that us old folks can't go fishing anymore. I hope something is done to where we can

still say to ourselves, "Well, if we want to go fishing and be conservative and do what the law says, then we're allowed to go." I hope that will take place. And appreciate all the other – the gentlemen what I've heard say in here. A lot of good points have been brought up.

And again, I want to thank both of y'all. It's good to meet you Mr. Mahood and Mr. Swatzel, and I appreciate your time. And with that, that's all I have to say. I just that we, as old folks and retired people, can still go fishing. That's what I'm after. If you like, I have a copy of this written up. I'll be glad to give it to you if you'd like to have that. And with that, that's all I have to say. And thank you very, very much. And it was nice to meet both of you gentlemen. Thank you for your time.

Tom Swatzel: Thank you Mr. Mims. We appreciate your testimony. Anybody else out there that's going to put any comments on record. If not, we'll just take a break until somebody else shows up that wants to do so. We'll be here for a few more hours.

Tom Swatzel: Once you get your glasses on, we're ready.

Wayne Mershon 17A: Okay. All right, I'd like to thank the council for allowing us to come voice our opinions and suggestions once again first off. I'm Wayne Mershon, owner of Kenyon Seafood in Murrells Inlet, South Carolina. I'm here representing myself and a few fishermen who are out at sea and cannot be here at this time because of – they've been at the dock for bad weather and – which is Mother Nature's natural closures for us. And with the closures coming up, they cannot afford to be here at this time to speak for their selves. I'm here to address the new Amendments, 17A and 17B, and also, Amendment 18.

Wayne Mershon: I'm getting ready to, getting ready to. On Amendment 17A, closed areas are a hard thing to manage, with little law enforcement, thousands of recreational fishermen that go unchecked and are not required to have the new lottery and systems that the commercial vessels will face and be required to have, and allowing commercial spear fishermen to harvest from these areas, but not the commercial, recreational rod and reel and bandit reel.

To us, this seems to say to us, "That you'd better learn to dive if you want to continue to commercial fish," if these closures are put into effect in these big areas. Most of all, I feel that's unfair to punish most of us and only allow a few who want to take the risk,

when most of our men are probably in the 40-to-60-year-old range; nobody behind us to take our place.

They either have to go risk their lives more than they already do now to learn to dive to capture these fish in these closed areas or just probably, you know, not be allowed to fish. And to allow people to go into these areas just because they dive seems a pretty unfair thing to do, all right.

If allowed Sea Bass pots in these closed areas that you all are proposing, they should only be allowed to have Sea Bass onboard the vessel while in these closed areas fishing because most people who trap, they throw the traps out while they're soaking; they move over to other spots and Snapper and Grouper fish.

So if they're not allowed to harvest Snapper and Grouper from these areas that you all are proposing to close, how would you be able to tell if they sit there and said, "Oh, I caught these over here in this other area, but I've come in here to trap." How would you – I mean, who's gonna say that this is true and prove them wrong?

So I honestly feel if you're allowed to trap in that area – I'm not saying all trapping – just in the closed areas, you should only be allowed to have Black Sea Bass onboard. All right, the closed areas already in place are fished regularly by many boats. I mean all commercial fishermen out there see – unfortunately, commercial boats and plenty of recreational boats in these areas.

And that's gonna be pretty tough to monitor these areas. I think a closure, like with the Grouper species, would be a better answer than a closed area. Trip limits, like with Red Porgy, and Greater Amberjack and Snowy Grouper would be even a better choice. I mean it's worked in the past on many species. And I still advocate, very highly, trip limits, opposed to a lot of these closed areas. All right, Amendment 17B, Speckled Hind –

Wayne Mershon 17B:– Grouper doesn't need an ACL of zero. I feel you are not getting much dispute on that matter from anybody. Snowy Grouper has been making a very good comeback with only allowing 100 pounds per trip limit, and Mother Nature only allowing number of the days per year to allow fishing, we have seen many more fish in areas that were overfished. And we believe, just like the council did with Red Porgy, you will be allowing a bigger trip limit in the near future, if a reliable study is done.

People at our closures are gonna even be a harder thing to manage. They're much further offshore and I believe different alternatives should be sought. The Golden Tow Fish, as the council knows, is a deep-water species. It is a hard fish for recreational fish to catch. And giving 50 percent of the ACL to recreational and taking from the commercial, I feel to be very unfair.

Giving 50 percent to a group who will not be able to hardly fish for this species just seems to be an unjust way to limit the vessel owners, who have invested a lot of money, to harvest this species on a commercial level. Knowing the recreational fishermen will not be able to catch his quota seems a sneaky way to do things, considering what the records say the recreational people have caught in this fishery in the past.

ACL's for Gag, Black Grouper and Red Grouper would also be much easier with setting trip limits like those proposed in the September council meetings. We still feel many of these Amendments could be fulfilled with earlier proposals of trip limits, which has worked for other species, Red Porgy, Greater Amberjack that this council manages also. But the little credit to this proposal with trip limits is given – and I ask again, for the council to consider trip limits would be a stronger alternative to a lot of these measures.

Amendment 18 on action –

Wayne Mershon 18: – extending the range north of the – northward of the FMP will help include the fish that are harvested in North Carolina by vessels who travel into our fishing areas and return to their Northern ports.

Action 2: Limiting the participation of the Golden Tow Fish, where we seem to say that a commercial fisherman who are not in this fishery are not allowed to still fish for a living when other fisheries close. But if I'm not mistaken, those who fish for Golden Tow have a Snapper Grouper permit and are allowed to fish for Snapper Grouper when the Golden Tow fishery closes. How's that fair to the other fishermen.

Action 3: Black Sea Bass pots are used in an excessive way. Mandating the amount of traps to be used, not allowing to be left unattended or left at sea when they return to the port, will bring down the amount of lost traps and will make more selective fishing rather than a bombardment of an area, which will catch and kill

many other species that cannot be sold or have very low market value.

Action 4: Snowy Grouper quotas should be separated into region states because of the access to fishing. Some regions in states have better weather and conditions, and most of the quota before the – and catch most of the quota before the other areas have the weather to fish safely for this species. Action 5: I would leave it up to the recreational fishermen's side to give comments and I'll turn it over to this issue because I am on a more of a commercial level.

Action 6: Again I feel the fishing here for Golden Tow should be the one region that does not have the advantage of better weather to catch the quota before other regions, just like the Snowy Grouper. Action 7: I could on for hours about the downfalls of accuracy, timing and quality of the statistics that are compiled. With the being almost the year 2010, the computer world and the scientific knowledge has advanced in great bounds.

With all the data required in a timely manner by fishermen and federal dealers, the amount of our quotas that has been caught should be able to be updated bimonthly, which would allow many business decisions to be made wisely. With all the new scientific data available for the last few years of study, the words, "best data available," should never be spoken and used by a council who holds so many people's livelihoods in their hands.

No court would send you to prison if there was any reasonable doubt. And if there is reasonable doubt to the fisheries' statistics, why should this council make a final rule without getting proof positive information? I will close with asking, once again, for the council to consider trip limits to address many of the actions involved in most of the Amendments. They have worked before and will work to keep a future for the fishery and the fishermen.

With the economy being what it is, putting so many people out of work, will this council also manage the grants that's needed to be created to help retrain the fishermen in other fields of employment? When you outlaw fishing, only outlaws will be fishing. I thank you once again. Wayne Mershon, Canyon Seafood.

Tom Swatzel:

Thank you, Mr. Mershon, for your public testimony. Again, we're taking public comments on Amendment 17A, 17B and 18. Is anybody else at this time that wants to make a public statement. If not, we'll be in recess until somebody comes forward.

Okay, let's get started. Again, we have another person that's gonna start their public testimony. If you go ahead and start, and give us your name when you start.

Frank Blum 17A: Frank Blum, Director of South Carolina Seafood Alliance. In today's Myrtle Beach paper, the Sun Times, there's an article titled, "Council weighs what to say: Fish or jobs." From past exp –

Frank Blum: We know that this is not true. If you have told us once, you have told us a thousand times. The Magnuson-Stevens Act mandates our actions, and it has taken a long time for this to sink in. I now believe that most of us have got the message. We can testify until the cows come home, and the council would do what they're going to do, to mandate time constraints of Magnuson-Stevens Act and mention the best available science, and it will be regurgitated as usual.

The only relief for the commercial fisherman is a change in the national standards or compensation for the government's taking of a person's ability to provide for their family. In the article, council weighs what to save: fish or jobs. And I quote here. This comes from the paper. "David Cupka of Charleston, a member on the council, said red snapper is so badly overfished that not even shutting down the fishery is going to save it and that other action will also have to be taken. That is why the proposal includes closing off fishing in some areas for almost all fish. 'Many red snapper are killed while people are trying to catch other fish,' Cupka said."

"The council is aware of the economic impact of the move. It's own analysis by its oversight agency, the National Marine Fisheries Service, shows that under two of the proposals, South Carolina commercial fishers could see a 5 percent revenue increase, but revenue would decrease up to 34 percent under the other two proposals. The recreational fishery in the state could either gain \$600,000 or lose \$2.4 million, depending on which closure plan is adopted. These figures do not take into account further loses from the proposal to limit catches of nine other snapper-grouper fisheries." I guess that's 18. Also in this article Holly Binns, B-I-N-N-S – is that the way you'd pronounce it? Is that the way I pronounce it, Holly? Huh?

Holly Binns: Binns.

Frank Blum:

Binns. Excuse me. “Manager of Pew Southeast Fishery Campaign said, ‘I think there’s a lot of reason to be optimistic. Even though the shut down will be painful for some, I think it’s in the best interest of everyone long term.’” An interpretation of this statement that relegates the fisherman as some. Some most mean not important, insignificant, not worthy of consideration because Pew Foundation’s Holly said so, and this echoes the council’s sentiment using the Magnuson-Stevens Act as a crutch.

Now back to Cupka. Remember he said the council is aware of the economic impact of the moves. Its own analysis by its oversight agency, the National Marine Fisheries Service, shows that under two of the proposals, South Carolina fishers could see a 5 percent revenue increase, but revenue would decrease up to 34 percent under the other two proposals. The recreational fishery in the state could either gain 600,000 or lose 2.4 million, that’s dollars, depending on which closure plan is adopted.

And remember, those figures do not take into account further loses from the proposal to limit catches of nine other snapper grouper fisheries. Now, it so happens that I’d been working on a project to determine the amount of money that the commercial fishermen stand to lose next year because of closures. What I have here today is my fourth revision to come up with numbers that truly represent the facts, and if possible, are compatible with those of the council. My numbers crunching has produced result showing 29 to 37 percent reduction in commercial fishing revenue for next year.

The analysis I have here shows a base reduction of 29 percent, but does not show the loss since 2005 for snowy grouper and the most probably significant loss in catches of other grouper after the gag quota is reached. The reaching of the gag quota early is to be expected because of derby fishing resulting from the drastic mandated quota reductions. Some small addition can be calculated because of the slightly increased red porgy quota. Maybe this is where NMFS got their five percent figure.

I will continue to crunch the numbers as we see compensation for the damage being inflicted on the commercial fishing industry by the mandates in the Magnuson-Stevens Act. I am saddened by the total disregard for the human element that is so essential to the basis of our freedom and liberty. The common people are and have been the backbone of this country. They produce, fight foreign and domestic wars, and vote.

To the Pew Foundation folks. They are not some. They are

necessary. They feed you and they shed their blood for you. How dare you or anyone else diminish their value. Now they know how the Indians felt. They are walking in their moccasins. The government, in this case, is taking, not serving. And thank you for your time.

Tom Swatzel:

Frank, thank you for your testimony. Any other comments at this time?

Paul Godbout 18:

Hi. My name is Paul Godbout, and it's G-O-D-B-O-U-T, local recreational angler here with a background in commercial fishing, and I was also a wholesaler for seafood. Again, I come here to address the council. As usual, I feel my words are gonna fall on deaf ears. I've fought you guys in vain over the years on many, many subjects. I watched as you gave away the lion's share of the snowys and the tilefish the commercial sector, even though they're the ones entirely responsible for the decline of the species.

I watched as David Cupka cheered for the formation of the Edisto MPA, and he got it even though this is the closest pieces of ledge bottom off our coast for the small boat angler. Therefore, these boats have to make a longer trip now to continue bottom fishing. I've watched as you have cut my gag grouper by half and then have it shut down for the winter months. I saw vermilion snapper closed to recreational fishermen for six months and then cut my limit by half.

This effectively put all the head boats out of work, and also, that takes away a lot of fishing for people that come to visit this coast, which in turn is also hurting a lot of jobs along the coast. I mean that's a lot of the recreational fishing that most people from inshore get a chance to do. They come here to the coast. They want to go fishing, and the main fish has always been vermilion snapper. Yet, the commercial boats can still harvest vermilion until they reach a gutted quota weight.

Now as this council meets again, I see that the plans are to either take away the red snapper or, worse, close all bottom fishing off my coast from, I believe, it's 90 foot to 240 foot. Just yesterday we went offshore. A group of us had a few divers and a boat. We released numerous vermilions that we would have been keeping. These were two- to four-pound fish.

We also released quite a few small reds, but then again we also caught a limit of reds. One of the divers came up off the second

dive, and on one rock he said there were a hundred shooters down there. When he says a shooter, it's a 20-inch plus fish, and these are red snapper. I don't know where you're gettin' your stock assessments from, but I've got divers that are down. I'm catching fish like this.

This summer alone I've taken 10 red snapper over 20 pounds, 5 over 25. This is the one my son just won the Trident tournament with right here three weeks ago, 29 pounds 13 ounces. But yet I'm told time and time again by the council that these fish don't exist, the numbers are low, I'm getting a year-class fish. I disagree with the assessments. Many times – I mean I can't tell you how many trips we go out where we catch a limit of red snappers, and they're not all either big sows or just 20-inch fish. They're all ranges: 15, 18, 12, 8.

I'm seein' all size-year fish. I propose – I'd love to take your divers, South Atlantic Fishery Management divers, DNR divers, any other researchers. Get 'em in touch with me. I'm easy to find around Charleston. I'm on all the local websites. I'll take 'em out. I'll let them do a count here.

Probably my biggest problem with all of this and the closures that are being announced are I resent being looped in with Florida. In Florida you can go in an inlet and catch snapper and grouper. You don't need fancy equipment. You don't need a GPS. You go right to any inlet and you catch snapper right in the – within sight of land you catch snapper.

Here you're talking 25 plus miles to get to decent snapper bottom. I'd like to see ideas on captive breeding similar to what they're doing with the red drum or even with the cobia. I mean both of those have been very successful program here to the point where red drum are almost a nuisance on the inshore side. We laugh about them being dolphin food 'cause during the winter when we're oystering we're seeing dolphin eating red drum, just knocking 'em up the beach and eatin' 'em.

Maybe somebody could get some program, some idea started on doing a captive program for red snapper. I know they're doing it in the Gulf of Mexico, but I don't have the specifics on how it could be done here. What I always see with the council, it always seems like you guys are hell bent on the strictest form. Whatever comes down the pipe as the strictest proposal, that's almost always what goes into effect.

Time and time again the recreational angler takes it hard. Takes it harder than anybody else, yet I don't see people in here from tackle shops. I don't see the seafood industry, other than Frank Blum. I spotted him back there. But where's the public outcry with the restaurant owners because they're only gonna be gettin' foreign fish. I mean this is a really slippery slope.

I'm on both sides. I support the commercial guys. At the same time, I don't think there's a problem with our stock. I really – I mean the stock in South Carolina seems fine, and I'm out there a lot. I fish a lot, all summer long. If you read the Trident fishing tournament, I'm holding both groupers, was holding both snappers, trigger fish, black sea bass.

This past spring I was approached by a member of the Pew Foundation, and they wanted to use this picture that they had seen on another website. They wanted that for their pamphlet, and basically it's a propaganda pamphlet that they're sending to members of Congress and to the Senate, and I expressed to them absolutely not. Do not use anything of mine, any of my photos for any of your propaganda. They've got billions of dollars behind them, and they hide behind the ocean conservancy.

I would really like to see them step up. If you really want to put the money out there with the Pew Foundation then buy up the commercial boats. Do a buy back program like they did on the cod fishery up in New England. Buy the land, build the hatcheries. I mean it's easy for anybody with the money to back closure, just say, "Here, just close it." That's the easy way out, but again like I said, I don't see the problem here, and I have an open invite to any diver from your group, National Marine Fisheries, or DNR that wants to go down and do a real stock assessment. I'd be more than happy to take them offshore and show them that the red snapper are here. Thank you.

Tom Swatzel: Thank you Paul. We appreciate your testimony. Anybody else in the room that desires to speak?

Tom Swatzel: Just push the button there and state your name.

William Houston 17A: My name is Bill Houston. I live at Edisto Island and fish off of Edisto. I went to the presentation over there. I've been trying to keep up with this with the documents that have been put out, and the biggest thing that bothers me is a lot of the decisions have been made on assumptions. And we know, that with a lot of other

things, that these can be off in the long run. I think size limits, if you get rid of size limits, and they do this in Alaska fisheries up there, and put a bag limit, you catch two fish, you keep the two fish and that's it. Now you're not gonna be throwin' fish back and having the bycatch die on the way down.

Circle hooks, we use almost entirely circle hooks, and very seldom do we ever get a fish that's not just lip hooked so that you can release 'em and make sure that they're fine when they go back in the water. People need to know how to use the tools to release the bladder if you happen to pull one up too fast, and that's the other thing. If we use slow speed reels, you're not gonna have that problem with the fish coming up from the depth. Hatcheries, we had a fellow down at Edisto when the red fish were in short demand. He had shrimp farms down there, and they raised over a million red fish in those shrimp farms in about three months, and when the customer only wanted 100,000 of 'em, he asked permission to release the other 900,000 in the waters, and these farms are fed with waters from the creeks down there. They were denied.

But I don't know – I know that they're doing some offshore hatcheries for species like snapper, and that might be something that they'd consider to bring the species back. That's all I would like to say. I hate to see all of bottom fishing stopped out there because of one or two species.

Tom Swatzel: Thank you Mr. Houston. Appreciate your testimony. Anybody else who wants to step forward? Okay. We'll wait for somebody else to show up.

Tom Swatzel: Okay. Go ahead and start public testimony again with Kenneth Fex.

Kenneth Fex 17A: My name is Kenneth Fex, owner and captain of fishing vessel Raw Bar, South Atlantic Advisory Panel member. I made a comment the last meeting in Charleston about the bycatch mortality of the red snapper. I went to the SEDAR Stock Assessment Meeting. Talked to a girl named Karen Burns, she does the stock assessment for this. The bycatch mortality, Mark Robson was there. He witnessed it.

There's a lot of points that was made about my presentation that she made to the council on October 7th, Wednesday at about the approximate time 10:00 it's on the record. She made a couple

points about how gear interaction really makes the difference on their survival rate, which I made a point that I only interact with fish for 25 seconds, maybe 30 seconds in the water and that time on the deck – deck time makes a big impact on their survival rate. Your bycatch mortality was done out of the Gulf. They do different types of gears.

Predation, it was a impact on survival rate, bycatch mortality rate, and the Gulf has different predators: dolphins, amberjack, barracudas. We have ‘em here, but they’re only seasonal in some places. We don’t have them smart dolphins that take the red snapper off our gear. I’ve never seen a dolphin take red snapper off our gear.

One point was made at the council meeting that barotrauma might be the cause. She made exact point of opposite that red snapper are not prone to barotrauma; so my point to the council is that the 90 percent out of 100 percent of commercially caught red snapper is not a correct bycatch mortality. And like Mark Robson acknowledged that there should be a bycatch mortality rate from the commercial handline sector to be done for our areas because it is different than the Gulf is; so I just wanted to make that point at the beginning.

As for the closed areas, I’m really not for ‘em, but it seems like they’re gonna happen. I think alternative three would be the best one. It’d be the smallest amount, but it would probably be the most effective. I would suggest that maybe go out to 110 foot. Allow a little bit more inshore bottom. The reason being that you’re not bringing them through that deep of water. One hundred ten foot’s still reasonable, and the fact that you’re gonna draw the line at 240, I think it should go out to 300 foot because you’re about ready to put that line of the 240, which was considered by the scientific committee and the council to go out to 300 foot because of the longline line at 300 foot.

So I would suggest that they go out to the 300 foot. The reasoning I would suggest to go out to 110 foot is that would allow for the black sea bass fisherman that pretty much fish up in that shallow – the deepest they go is about 100 foot. I’ve talked to Tom Burgess. I’ve talked to other black sea bass fishermen, and also that the spearfishermen, they go to 120 foot under natural air; so I think 110 foot would be a reasonable amount to go out for allow for them to spearfish within that. So then you would pretty much leave it a closed area all together, and then if you did allow alleyways, which was considered by the council at the Charleston

meeting, that you would allow it to the people that are in that area.

So it wouldn't just all of a sudden open an alleyway and then people out of North Carolina can run on out into that closed area in that fish in that 'cause it would be unfair because they weren't the ones taking the closed area brunt; so I would suggest if you did allow alleyways it would only be allowed to the people in that area that are being affected. They've talked about bycatch mortalities using circle hooks. I would suggest maybe use that as one thing inshore of that bottom to use to get away from the bycatch mortality.

Maybe suggest they go north and south of that closed area about ten miles. I can't personally advise it to be circle hooks to the whole EZ because I catch great trigger fish. I couldn't catch them on circle hooks; so I don't advise it up in North Carolina or north of that line that you guys want to draw for that closed area. And that's what I had to do on this Amendment 17. As for 18, the golden –

Kenneth Fex 18:

They're talking about wanting to make the starting date in August. I could see the reasoning behind that because of the problem with the weather. The weather's bad in January, and if you're out there, it's kind of hazardous to your health. Extending management measures up to Virginia, I'm really not for that, but if they're catching some of them fish in that area, I would see reason to do that, but I would see reason to maybe put in some kind of exclusion that since you did put the management measures up that far that they could not all of a sudden become part of the South Atlantic Fisheries. It's not like you could just draw the line and say, "Okay. Now you're part of the South Atlantic," and then all of a sudden you got more vessels in the South Atlantic Fisheries.

As for the black sea bass pot trap limit, I think 25 should be plenty for a boat. I don't think 50 or 100 traps. I think 25 is plenty for a vessel at work. If you work 'em efficiently you can make a living at it. And I'd like to make another point not on these amendments at all. I've talked to several people through all these meetings I went for the last couple of years. I've talked to advisory panel meeting people. I've actually made a comment to a guy named Richard Malinowski out of NOAA.

It seems like a lot of fishermen talk about getting ready of some of the people and the efforts that's gettin' involved in the commercial sector for federal permitted vessels. I would advise the council to

maybe consider a voluntary vessel buyout system, where on your NOAA permit throw in \$100.00 towards your permit. Everybody if they want to. It's voluntary, and at the end of the year get that money together, put it in a kitty, and start buying out some of the federal permits.

Right now you can buy one for \$12,000.00. If you could buy two each year, you'd be gettin' rid of some of the effort. 'Cause what I worry is some of these people in these closed areas are gonna sell their permits, and they're gonna be bought by people in my area. And they're gonna make these latent permits or these small permits into a commercial fishing vessel that's a big vessel that's gonna be able to fish just as hard as I can; so then all of a sudden the efforts are actually gonna increase. You might limit the amount of permits, but you will still increase the effort 'cause you'll get a more professional effort done. So I would consider the council maybe do that, especially because I pay \$50.00 for my federal permit. It's worth \$12,000.00.

I pay \$250.00 a year to renew my state permit, and it's only worth \$2,500.00; so I think my federal permit's worth a lot more, and I would be willing to pay a little bit extra to try to buy out some of these extra fishermen that are in it or maybe just want to get out of it. And I'm trying to buy 'em out personally that way it's not asking the government for no money. It ain't asking for nothing. I am not trying to kick people out of the fishery, but if we could buy these permits that are on the market and get 'em at a fair price, it would be nice to get rid of some of the extra effort. That's all I have to say. Thank you guys.

Tom Swatzel:

Thank you, Kenny, for your testimony. We're taking public testimony on Amendment 17A, 17B, and 18. Anybody else out there want to make a comment? Mark?

Mark Brown 17A:

My name is Mark Brown. I have a charter head boat business here on Shem Creek, and I've been in the fishing business my whole life, and my dad was a fisherman. And I grew up in the Florida area around Daytona, and I moved to Charleston, South Carolina in 1986, and I've been fishing here ever since. I've seen a lot of changes over the years in the fishery, and I've always been a proponent of fishery management. I've always tried my very best to work with the fishery managers and be involved with it as best as possible, but I just feel like over the last couple of years that everything has seemed like it's on a fast track right now for fishery management that's being made in a hurry. It just seems like

everything's just being done without a whole lot of thought being put into it, and it concerns me the way it's going right now.

It used to be that the economics was a real big factor in the way that fishery management was studied and what the outcome was gonna be, and now everything is being pushed pretty much towards these timelines of ending overfishing. I know that this is not just specific to our area because I've talked to people from all over the country and even in republics of the US, and they're experiencing the same thing in a lot of different areas of the country. And it seems like the – if the fishery science is solid and it can justify the necessary management procedures that is being put forth to us then that's more acceptable to us.

The layman fisherman trying to understand this and to wrap his mind around it and understand what's going on, it's kinda difficult when we can't really understand why this is happening. And so we've had to put our heads into the books and to read the data, and a lot of it's coming back just with unknowns and with not a whole lot of conclusion to what actually is taking place. So with the red snapper fishery particularly, when this all came up and we were talking about the closed fishery areas, at the very beginning it started out as wanting to be the least economic impact. And now it's kind of evolved into this compliance issue with staying compliant with the law to try to meet that mandate, and because of that it has increased these closed areas.

Now it's starting to be considered to have a bigger impact as far as the economics of it and be a bigger closed area; so I'm trying to understand how we can have some sort of a medium here. How we can try to work this out to where everyone can survive and we can still have closed areas. And circle hooks are definitely an option. I mean I've used circle hooks for years, and because we are rod and reel fishermen primarily in the recreational industry, we don't see any – very little mortality rate; so we're being told that there's a high mortality rate and this happens to be one of the factors that is justifying this closure of the red snapper fishery and along with the age and everything.

As far as 17A goes, I feel compelled that to say that I think the – first of all, I don't think that it's justified to close it upon the science that is being provided, but if there has to be a closure then I would suggest that we use the least amount of economic impact on the coastal communities. And I would suggest to go towards alternative three, which would have the smallest area and have the least impact. And be able to explain to the public exactly why

you're doing that and try to minimize any other things that would have to be implemented such as any expensive monitoring equipment.

If we have to use something then try to make it the least expensive or some other option to where we can come up with some better data. I know that – for me, I'm already participating in a monitoring system, electronic survey system that was put together by NOAA, and it speeds up the paperwork, and that seems to be a big issue. I've been in a lot of conversations with the people at NOAA here over the past month, and the biggest problem was the paperwork, and they said that they're behind as much as a year to a year and a half on paperwork. And that seems to be a big issue to is just not being able to keep up with all the data. So we're in this fast track for a closure based upon data that could be as far as a year or year and a half behind, and the law is not structured in a way to where it really is helping the fisherman right now.

It's hurting the fisherman, and I think everybody knows that. So I just ask for all the people that are involved and trying to push for these closures and to end overfishing by this specific timeframe to please take into consideration the people that are in this industry that are using the resource and try not to drive 'em out of business. Because we've been doing it for a long time, and we just simply want to try to stay in the business if we can. But if we have these massive closures to where it ends all fishing then it inevitably will drive us out of business and we'll lose everything: our homes and our businesses and our boats. And that's just – to me that's to destructive for just trying to stay compliant with the law; so that's all I got to say.

Tom Swatzel: Thank you, Mark, for your testimony. Appreciate you coming out. Anybody else that wants to step forward?

Tom Swatzel: Clay, if you'll just push the button and state your name.

Henry Duffie 17A: My name's Henry Clay Duffie, and I live in 530 Reed Street in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina. Mark's done a terrific job of laying out the issues, and I will try not to repeat them too much. I'm gonna speak on 17A, and my observation is – I'm an engineer and worked in the utility business all my life and understand regulations, the natural environment, and how to try to take regulations and work them in the natural environment, particular the water environment. I work in that industry, and it's – you can take the science and the mathematical models and come up with

some very precise information and very precise calculations, but the natural environment doesn't report that way. It doesn't live that way; so it's very difficult to take all that high-end science and then turn it into something manageable and something that's common sense. And that's one of the things that's difficult here, to understand the common sense application of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

And I understand once a law is passed, the administrators have a difficult time having people understand how are we going to implement measures that make common sense and then help the natural environment that's driven by this legal, rigid requirement. I would hope that understanding all that that we would try and gather better science and better information to be able to make good decision. To apply the high-end science to these mathematical models and not use these regressions to come up with previous stock assessments as opposed to actual information and make good decisions based on the actual data. I would hope that you would consider the economic impact, the devastating impact on the recreational fishing business.

I'm trying to retire, and I've started a charter boat business and trying to hopefully one day be able to take a few people fishing as something to be able to do in my retirement years. Certainly not to the level that some of these other professionals do, but you'd hope to be able to do something like that. And it seems that the law is gonna make it more and more difficult for us to be able to enjoy that type of thing in the future; so I certainly want you to consider the economic impact. To be able to minimize the effect of the closure, I certainly think that alternative three is the better way to go.

Hopefully you can monitor the data over the next two to three years, and understanding it will take about two to three years to gather enough data to determine whether the closure has made any difference. I would suggest, and I think a lot of people have suggested, some common sense type methods of circle hooks, venting tools, and those types of things to be able to minimize the electronic reels and that type of thing; so you could hopefully improve the mortality rates of some of the releases. So I think we're all here to try to do the same thing, and that's to find a way that we can improve the fish stock, helping the fish stock recover, and then set up a management system that the fish stock can be a sustainable fishery.

I think that's big word today is sustainability, and we would hope

that at the end of the day that is the intent of this law and the administration of this law. So I just ask that you try to apply some common sense application of this law and at the same time understanding that sometimes it's quite difficult the way laws are written. But appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak, and thank you all for taking the time to conduct these public hearings and listening to the people that it will affect. Thank you.

Tom Swatzel:

Thank you, Clay, for taking the time to testify. Do we have anybody else in the room that wants to step forward at this time? Holly?

Holly Binns 17A:

Hi. My name is Holly Binns, and I'm here today representing the Pew Environment Group's End Overfishing in the Southeast campaign. And wanted to first thank both of you and the staff for the opportunity to provide input to the South Atlantic Council Snapper-Grouper Fishery Management Plan and to Amendment 17A, and I also want to thank you guys for all the hard work you've put in to bring it to this point. I know it's been a pretty daunting task, and hopefully it will lead to rules that ensure a sustainable red snapper fishery for the future.

After about 40 years of fishery management in the US, one in five fisheries are in trouble in the South Atlantic. As you all well know, we have ten fisheries that are undergoing overfishing, and that's one of the highest numbers of any region in the country. And as a result, we have fisheries that are yielding a fraction of their potential value, and that makes vulnerable both the resource and the folks who depend on it. Amendment 17A to the Snapper-Grouper Fishery Management Plan is looking to end 40 years of overfishing of red snapper and to do it within the stricter confines of the law. And one of the new requirements is that you account for uncertainty. Uncertainty is obviously just when you have limited knowledge and you don't know the exact current conditions or future outcome, and this requirement has been, in some cases, likened to walking near the edge of a cliff.

If you are blindfolded and you didn't know exactly what was out there, you wouldn't want to walk too close to the edge. You'd want to have some distance between the edge of the cliff. In the law there's two kinds of uncertainty that the council has to consider. The first is scientific uncertainty, which is measured and offset by the council scientists and system of scientific review. And the second kind of uncertainty is called management uncertainty, and the National Marine Fisheries Service has

identified to parts of that management uncertainty.

The first is the uncertainty and the ability of managers to constrain the catch and then uncertainty in quantifying the true catch amounts; so in other words, the management uncertainty has to account for both how sure we are about compliance and enforcement and how sure we are about the reported catches and discards. And in the case of red snapper, the council is considering a preferred alternative that assumes a 90 percent or higher compliance and enforcement rate with the proposed closed areas, and I think everyone knows that that's pretty optimistic even under the best of circumstances. And the assumptions for the council's preferred alternative also assumes pretty high accuracy in terms of reporting and pretty timely reporting as well, which with the current recreational data collection methods, is pretty close to impossible.

I think it's just vitally important that if we do this, we're talking about some pretty big management measures that are gonna have pretty big repercussions; so I think it's just absolutely critical that we get it right 'cause I don't think we want to do something this big and use overly optimistic assumptions and end up having to come back to the table and go through this again. I think that's probably the worst case scenario. So I just urge you all to – for the future of the red snapper fishery and the folks who depend on it, to really step away from the edge of the cliff and make sure that the assumptions that you're using are reasonable, common sense, realistic so that we can get this right, and we have the opportunity to rebuild the red snapper fishery to its most economically valuable level. That's it. Thank you guys so much.

Tom Swatzel: Holly, thank you for your testimony. Anybody else wanting to testify at this time? If not, we'll just wait for – oh, go ahead.

Tom Swatzel: Go right ahead.

Tim Scalise 17A: I hit this button?

Tom Swatzel: It's already on. You need to hit it one more time.

Tim Scalise: My name's Tim Scalise. I've been a recreation – well, a charter boat captain for 25 years now. I'm primarily out of Charleston. I am currently employed by a charter boat, Gusto III Charters Inc, out of Mount Pleasant. We have two vessels. I also run several other boats including the Teaser sometimes for Mark Brown.

I've always wanted to do what's best for the industry. I think if we look out for the industry as a whole, and of course we need to look out for the fishery to ensure a future industry. That's why I primarily charter fish and not commercial fish because I found out a long time ago that charter passengers are a renewable resource. Fish are not a renewable resource. You can book charters over and over again. You only can kill a fish one time.

That being said, I have a lot of problems with some of the data. I think what you all are basing, like the stock levels years ago, defies logic to me. Especially this one here with the biomass. If you look from 1950 to 1970 it pretty much just goes down and then starting probably in '75 you have the advent of technology, of lowrance, of color fish finders. Technology expounds greatly, but then the biomass levels off. I just don't understand that.

But that being said, I know there is a problem with the red snapper, but I don't want to see close down a whole fishery, whole industry just thinking that's gonna cure one species. I think what you're not really looking at is the methods of fishing because when you look at the mortality rates, you're looking at commercial boats in over 200 feet of water. I primarily fish inshore – bottom fish inshore of 100 feet of water, and as far as mortality rates, it's comparing apples – not even apples and oranges. If I made you swim up from 200 feet or made you swim up from 85 feet, what do you feel more comfortable with?

I mean it's pretty much that simple. Another thing that hasn't been addressed as far as electric reels. A lot of the head boats where this data's coming from have been using electric reels, and they bring the fish at a more rapid pace than you would on manually. I think if you looked at implementing some kind of regulations on that, you would see a significant decrease in your mortality rate. And if you did it in shallow water, that would decrease the mortality rate.

And also I think with recreational fishing boats or six-pack fishing boats, you can ensure a much healthier survival of fish 'cause you're at water level. You're not in a head boat that's ten feet above the water. The fish bangs up against the side of the boat three or four times. You take the hook out of it and you throw him over board and he's pretty much discarded.

I think if you look at the methods of how you can catch, revive, and healthy release the fish, the mortality rates you would see

would be drastic, diametrically opposed to what you're basing your data on. So I would like you to see – take those ideas into consideration when you look at this and just not look at it as it's all one – and not latitude and longitude lines. It's different depths and different habitats and different methods of fishing. Thank you for you all's time.

Tom Swatzel: Thank you Tim. Anybody else want to step forward at this time? If not, we'll wait for somebody else to come in.

Tom Swatzel: Friend, if you'll state your name and start to testify.

Cameron Sebastian 17A: Cameron Sebastian, operations manager Coastal Scuba and Little River Fishing Fleet. I'm gonna start off with just some general comments and then go to specific amendments. We operate Little River Fishing Fleet. Been in operation in the Little River area since the mid-1980s, and in my opinion right now we're really going through the perfect storm of economic disaster for the fishing industry. We're getting hit by a down economy, worst in 30, 40 years. Nobody can argue with that.

Increased competition from smaller vessels, which have of course a lot less overhead, and then of course the federal restrictions on our fisheries. As new competitors come in, they take more share of the fish, and it really is just a recipe for disaster for us. The bottom line is, for our businesses as in any other business, is we're here to make money, and that's what it's about. It's we're in the business to make money. We're in the business to generate a profit for our investors, and in doing so we also take a lot of people out and show 'em a good time.

I'm seeing a lot of people coming into the business, smaller boats that have no overhead or very little overhead. They're cutting into our shares; so one of the things that I'm just touching on here is since the government is closing down fisheries, reducing the numbers of fish we can take, they should also limit the competition that we have so that we can still run at a profitable level and continue our endeavors and keep taking out. The larger companies are just a few in South Carolina that still even run what we'd consider a fishing fleet. Two or three, four maybe, and only a couple of 'em run larger boats further out.

Most of our guys that were in South Carolina actually moved into North Carolina for reduced tax purposes and things of that nature where they can make it more profitable. Whereas we carry the

fixed costs, a lot of the new operators have very minimal costs whatsoever. If you lose the head boats and you lose the bigger companies, those are one of the draws to the tourists in South Carolina, and that is a huge, huge industry. The tourism industry, I believe is still number one in the state for generating revenue.

So that's sort of the take on the overall status of our operations from the fleet industry. As far as the specific amendments, for Amendment 17A, anything you have stretching out to the longest possible number of years for rebuilding the red snapper fishery is gonna have the least dollar impact on us, and that's definitely what we'd like to see. As far as the allocation for the proposed closed areas, once again, the smallest area that bridges into South Carolina is gonna be the most beneficial for us; so alternative three is gonna benefit our area – or have the least amount of impact on the guys fishing out of our area, which is the northern part of South Carolina.

Now, any closed areas for total closure of fishing, of course, is disturbing to me. All right? So when you're talking about closing huge swaths of area from Florida up into North Carolina to any grouper snapper fishing whatsoever, it's sorta you start here and then where does it end up. Close the whole section for – all the way into the beach? So that is of grave concern to me even though we're not as impacted as much as the areas of, it looks, Northern Florida and Georgia.

With that being said, allowing those areas still to be fished, if you're not targeting the red snapper, would be crucial. Black sea bass pots should be allowed. You're not gonna catch a red snapper in a black sea bass pot. Same thing with spearfishing. Spearfishing should be allowed for sure. We can definitely go down and target the species we want and have zero bycatch whatsoever, don't impact the red snapper whatsoever, which is, it seems like, what 17A is all about.

Law enforcement issues and things of that nature, I'm sorry, they'll have to deal with that at some other point in time. That's not for me to worry about. My job is to make money, and if I'm allowed to do those types of fishing in those areas then I can still generate some income in those areas and still leave the population of red snapper untouched. As far as the spearfishing in the areas, those are gonna be beautiful areas for us to go into, and it'll be exceedingly profitable because they'll have species of grouper in there that are pretty much untouched, which means there'll be lots and lots of 'em down there.

So for the spearfishing aspect, you've gotta keep spearfishing on the table if the whole concern of 17A is prevention of red snapper being caught. Spearfishing catches zero red snapper 'cause we see what we shoot. One shot, one kill. You have zero bycatch whatsoever. To 17B.

Cameron Sebastian 17B: If we run the head boats, the only thing that really affects us in 17B is the total closure once we hit the magical number of recreational sea bass allowed. All right? And if we have to tell our customers, "Hey, we're gonna take you guys out fishing," granted, right now on a half day trip, 80 people, you might catch and keep 10, 20, 30 sea bass, but at least you have the chance to catch 'em. You take the chance off the table all together and that's gonna make it a hard sell for me take somebody out to do a half day fishing trip where they're spending 40 bucks per person for their family, 30 bucks, 35 bucks for their kid and tell them that, "Well, now you can keep ringtails, tomtates, maybe a flounder if we catch one, and dog sharks. Black sea bass will be off the table."

So removing that from 17B or at least allowing us to continue to keep the sea bass on the recreational catch level, even though it's a minimal, minimal number we keep, would be great. All right? And a huge, huge impact to us. For Amendment 18, the number of traps on board a vessel. Most of the vessels in our area are running 25 to 30 traps anyway; so hittin' the recommendation of the maximum number of traps per vessel to 25 seems reasonable to me as a vessel that carries traps. And allowing their soak time to be up to a maximum of 72 hours would be reasonable.

They can go out. They can leave the traps. You get bad weather. There'll have to be some type of determination if they do have bad weather and the traps are out over the set 72-hour period how you factor that in. One thing that limiting the entry into the trapping business. As we close down other species, more and more people are gonna want to trap. It's gonna increase the destruction of the bottom, things of that nature; so maybe looking at a way to limit the numbers of trappers who are coming into the business new versus those who have been in the business for years.

That right there are my comments on 17A, 17B, and 18. Just a side note. From my understanding, in the future we're gonna be talking about allocations to commercial vessels based on possible catch history and things of that nature, and to me it seems like if

we do a for hire and a commercial vessel then we're actually gettin' penalized for not taking more catch out from our commercial vessel because we're using it as a recreational vessel for six to nine months out of the year. So it feels like to me and my view is that we are actually gettin' penalized for taking less fish out because from what I understand our catch would be reduced greatly because we haven't used our permit to its fullest capacity over the last ten years or so. And that's it.

Tom Swatzel:

Thank you Cameron.



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Charles Mims

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

P.O. Box 818 Edisto Island, S.C. 29438

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
 NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Wayne Mershon

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-421-6440

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

P.O. Box 385 Murrells Inlet, SC 29576

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Kenyon SeaFood

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
 (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
 IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

FRANK BLUM

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

(843) 437-0008 (c)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

815 SAVANNAH HWY. STE 204 CHARLESTON, SC 29407

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

South Carolina Seafood Alliance

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

general
comment

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Michael Godbout

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

(843) 926 5137

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1567 Royal Rd SC 29483

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

PAUL GODBOUT

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

926-5137

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1567 Rowe RD

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Kenneth W Felt, JR

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

907 W Yacht Dr Oak Island NC 28465

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Rain Bar owner/captain South Atlantic Advisor panel

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

MARK E. BROWN

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843 881 9735

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

3642 Pandora Drive Mt. Pleasant, SC 29426

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Charter Boat Teaser Inc.

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

CLAY DUFFIE

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

530 REID STREET, MOUNT PLEASANT SC 29464

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

CAPTAIN CLAY'S CHARTERS

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Holly Binns

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

850-322-7845

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

2107 Mulberry Blvd, Tallahassee, FL 32303

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Pew Environment Group

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

REESE HALL

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843 450 1116

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1297 Limestone St Murrells Inlet

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Wallace Jenkins

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

P.O. Box 12559

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

SCDNR

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Gregory E. Johnson

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

*USCG Sector Charleston, BQ 196 TRADD ST.
CHARLESTON, SC 29401*

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

US COAST GUARD

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Allston Leland

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

524 Romain rd, McClellanville, SC 29458

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Kevin Miner

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

770-403-9855

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

148 Jupiter Ln Summerville, SC 29483

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Isabelle Mims (843) 869-2246

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

PO Box 818 Edisto, SC 29438

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Chris Papers

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843 737 4134

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

973 Anchor Rd Charleston SC 29412

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Debbie Salamone

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

321-972-5020

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

PEW

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Robby Sacora

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-860-0905

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

193 Tupalo Dr Summerville SC 29483

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC	DATE OF MEETING November 2, 2009
---	--

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Robert B Thompson	TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)
--	--------------------------------

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)
5241 Hwy 17 Bus. Murrells Inlet SC 29576

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	Amendment 17 A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Amendment 17 B	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Amendment 18	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

SCOTT WHITAKER

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

803-865-4164

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

3037-B McNAUGHTON DR.

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

CCA SC

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Tracey Woodruff

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-377-9116

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

NOAA OLE

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

CAMERON P SEBASTIAN

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-450-6113

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

228 S NORTON LAKE DR

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

LETTICE NUTRITIONALS PLANT

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Adam S. GRAY

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

2903 Doncaster Dr, Charleston SC 29454

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Aberdeen Construction

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Ernest Muhammad

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

(843) 693-3911

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

217 Ft. Johnson Rd.

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

SC DNR

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Sera Drevenak

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

910-685-5705

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

25 Corbett St. Bolivia, NC 28422

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Pew Environment Group

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

NO

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Eileen Downerty

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

919-601-8818

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

EDF Charleston, SC

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE) Charleston, SC		DATE OF MEETING November 2, 2009			
YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Amy Dukes - SCORR		TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE) 843-953-9365			
MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE) 217 Fort Johnson Rd Chas SC 29412					
BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE) SCORR					
DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT? (PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY IF AVAILABLE)	Amendment 17 A	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
	Amendment 17 B	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO
	Amendment 18	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Michael Chukusky

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

267-261-3421

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

4 Toms Turnaround Circle Edisto Island S.C. 29438

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Wesley Covington

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

P.O. Box 111 Norway, SC 29113

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Phil Conklin

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-251-1437

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

P.O. Box 972 Murrells Inlet S.C. 29576

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

24c Seafood - SEVEN SEAS Seafood

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

CHRISTOPHER COX

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-566-4478

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

148 JUPITER LN SUMMERVILLE SC 29483

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Mary Conley Conley

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-937-8807, 20

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

980 Morrison Drive Suite 200 Chas 29403

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

The Nature Conservancy

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Michael L Able

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-881-3644

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1567 Fiddlers Marsh Dr

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Haddre 11+ Point Tract

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

JASON WARD

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

704-488-0478

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

45 Sycamore Ave #111 Charleston SC 29407

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

N/A

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Kerry O'Malley Marhefka

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

452-7358

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1676 Culppepper Cir.

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Chs SC 29407

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

CAPTAIN ERIC HEIDEN

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843 230-7286

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

69 Pinehurst Ln. Unit 3D ~~PAWKEYS~~ Pawkeys Island
SC 29585

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Fish Clubs in COASTAL SOUTH CAROLINA

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Fowler Del Porto

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-568-2095

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

35 Paddlecreek Avenue, Charleston, SC 29412

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

Timothy A Sealise

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

1224 Merganser Ct Mt. Pleasant S.C. 29464

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Gusto III Charters Inc.

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405

PUBLIC COMMENT ATTENDANCE RECORD

Snapper Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B and 18

LOCATION OF MEETING (CITY & STATE)

Charleston, SC

DATE OF MEETING

November 2, 2009

YOUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

William G. Houston

TELEPHONE NUMBER (& AREA CODE)

843-869-9744

MAILING ADDRESS (PLEASE INCLUDE STREET OR BOX NO., CITY, STATE, & ZIP CODE)

PO Box 475, Edisto Island, SC 29438

BUSINESS OR ORGANIZATION YOU REPRESENT (IF APPLICABLE)

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT?
(PLEASE ATTACH A WRITTEN COPY
IF AVAILABLE)

Amendment 17 A

YES

NO

Amendment 17 B

YES

NO

Amendment 18

YES

NO