

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SEDAR COMMITTEE

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, FL**

June 8, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

SEDAR Committee

David Cupka, Chair
Dr. Michelle Duval
John Jolley
Tom Swatzel

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Jessica McCawley
Duane Harris

Council Members

Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Dr. Wilson Laney

Tom Burgess
Mac Currin
LT Robert Foos
Charlie Phillips

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
John Carmichael
Dr. Mike Errigo
Anna Martin
Andrea Grabman
Roger Pugliese

Gregg Waugh
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Brian Chevront
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Bob Gill
Martha Bademan
Dr. Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Brunello
RADM Baumgartner

Phil Steele
Dr. Luiz Barbieri
Otha Easley
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Andy Strelchek

Other Participants Attached

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, June 8, 2012, and was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: We'll go ahead and start with our SEDAR Committee. Everyone should have an agenda for the meeting. The first order of business is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda for the SEDAR Committee? Seeing none, that agenda is approved. Next is approval of the minutes from our last meeting in March. Are there any changes, corrections or additions to the minutes? Seeing none, then our minutes stand approved. The next item is SEDAR Activities Update. John, do you want to give us an update on that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, sir. A couple of things to bring to your attention regarding SEDAR activities; we're underway on an assessment for South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico cobia and Spanish mackerel, otherwise known as SEDAR 28. The data workshop was in February. The assessment workshop was in May. There has been a bit of snag there.

They didn't get as far along in the assessment as they had hoped; part of it being we're dealing with two jurisdictions, four separate stocks, a lot of data challenges with these assessments that just brings to light sometimes that when you have less data you actually sometimes have more to do in dealing with it.

Obviously, they have been trying to bring in more recent data within these assessments, so they didn't get as far on the assessment workshop as they had hoped. As a result, we're going to be delayed and they have delayed the review workshop. Instead of it happening I think it was mid-September or so, it is being delayed until I think it's like the first week of November, the last week of October, depending on how you want to call it.

Now, the consequence to us, therefore, means that these assessments won't be ready to come to our SSC at their October meeting as we had hoped, which the plan was the SSC would get them in October, you would see results in December. The question before you is how would you like to handle the SSC review of these assessments given this delayed timing?

We could wait and do it at their next meeting, which at this point isn't scheduled but we expect it to be after the March 2013 council meeting given how we have been scheduling SSC meetings the last couple of years or you could ask that we hold a special SSC meeting so that you can get this assessment earlier.

We could try to do it so that you got them by December or we could give us a little more time and try to do it so that we got them by March; or alternatively we can proceed with our regular expectation of SSC meetings and you get these assessments in June. So really what it comes down to is when would you like to get these assessments and when do consider a critical timing in which you should get these assessments?

MR. CUPKA: What is the pleasure of the committee? Do we need to convene a special SSC meeting to review this or wait until later? I don't think there is the same sense of urgency with this particular assessment as it would be if it were some other species being working on. If I

don't see any desire to move on this with some urgency, John, I guess we'll just schedule it and let the March SSC meeting handle the review.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay, thank you, sir. The next item I want to bring up is that we did a workshop in cooperation between SEDAR and NOAA Fisheries with the MRIP Program to consider calibration of the MRFSS and MRIP recreational catch estimates. This was held in Raleigh, North Carolina, the end of March.

This is added into your overview because the document became available after we had sent the first version out, but it is good we have the final report. You have been given the report of that workshop to look at and see their recommendations. The gist of it that the group really focused on was recognizing the need to maintain apples and apples comparisons and that things like ABCs and ACLs that were constructed within the data represented by the MRFSS Program should not then be judged for purposes of evaluating ACLs or applying accountability measures using data that was in the MRIP Program.

A lot of species really didn't show any type of major changes over time and changing these different programs, some of them did, and even when the changes were slight the scientists with those group believed that it was important to maintain the consistency, so they have come up with a variety of calibration approaches which really depend on whether the references are based on an assessment or if they're based on just catch.

Obviously, if they're based on just catch, then the recommendation is to do a ratio calibration to adjust that; and then if they're based on assessments, the recommendation is generally to evaluate in a bit more detail when you do the assessment than do the assessment using MRFSS/MRIP calibrated data so that in the future as we're working with the MRIP Program you don't have these problems. I just wanted to bring that to your attention and see if anyone has any questions on that.

MR. CUPKA: Questions for John? I guess not, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right, the next item we're going to bring up is called the SSC ORCS Workshop. What ORCHS refers to is Only Reliable Catch Stocks. This was a process that was developed as a result of the ongoing National SSC Workshops which were held over a number of years and then try and come up with a cohesive national way of dealing with these stocks that have not been assessed when you're setting ABCs and ACLs.

A group of representatives from the around the country got together and called it the ORCS, Only Reliable Catch Stocks, and our SSC has reviewed the report. As I've mentioned before, they believe that there are principals within this report which should be brought into the South Atlantic Council's ABC Control Rule.

They intend to do that through a workshop that is going to be held the first week of August, and our plan on that is to work on applying this approach to the South Atlantic stocks at that workshop, come to you in September with an update, get the process approved and the

modifications to the ABC Control Rule approved so that then at the SSC's meeting in October they can then go and make ABC recommendations that reflect this new approach.

We wanted to begin the discussion with you because part of that is there is a risk tolerance component to applying the ORCS to get from catch of some historic period to ABC, OFL and ultimately then you will get to ACLs. We want to just begin the conversation with you about how we get that risk tolerance accommodated. Luiz Barbieri of our SSC is going to give you brief presentation on the ORCS approach and what the SSC's intentions are. I'll pull that up and Luiz will come up and run away with the show.

DR. BARBIERI: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and committee members. John already gave you a very good background on what the ORCS approach is about and what the SSC intends to do going forward, but I thought it will be helpful to refresh your minds about the ABC Control Rule process and then walk you through how this ORCS approach is in concept and how you apply it to come up with an estimate of OFL, the overfishing limit; and ABC values for non-assessed stocks.

If you'll remember, your ABC Control Rule, which was developed by the SSC in cooperation with you and your approval, is composed of four tiers. Those tiers reflect the level of information that we have to conduct quantitative assessments and come up with all the quantitative information that we need to give you catch level recommendations.

Tier 1 is our most informative tier and it is composed of the high-yield stocks that support larger fisheries for which we have better data and we have fully assessed stocks using dynamic stock assessment models and we actually can come up with a good estimate of OFL, the uncertainty around OFL; and because of that we can actually use what is called the P-star approach.

You gave us a range of risk associated with those P-star values that we then applied to the control rule to generate that buffer between OFL and ABC; so the larger the uncertainty the larger the buffer between OFL and ABC. Those are the better stocks that are assessed with fully dynamic models.

Tiers 2 and 3 actually involve the use of less certain methods, less informative methods because they don't require as much information as Tier 1 does, as the methods that we use in Tier 1. We don't need to get into the details of these two methods, but they were developed specifically to circumvent some of the problems they run with data-limited stocks and try to provide a sensible, quantifiable way to come up with estimates of OFL and ABC.

One of them is this depletion-based stock reduction analysis that is widely used on the west coast of the U.S., as well as the DC-AC, the depletion-corrected average catch. We tried to apply these methods if we don't have enough information to apply the Tier 1 P-star approach. Unfortunately, there are several stocks that we have to deal with that fall under this Tier. 4.

You may remember that for Tier 4 we have the stocks that are considered data poor; and for those stocks we have really nothing to go with other than landing streams. We have landings data; and from those landings data we have to come up with some structured way to estimate

OFL and ABC. The SSC has used several approaches and have tried to experiment and explore several approaches to handle the process for these Tier 4 stocks.

We considered those approaches to be interim, to be preliminary approaches that we would be using until this ORCS approach was ready for show time; the reason being that the ORCS approach, as John explained, was developed by a group of people; all of them I believe – no, most of them SSC members from different SSCs throughout the country, but also representing all the science centers and several state agencies, so it's really representative of a national picture of the science effort towards this estimation of ABC for data-poor stocks.

We thought that this would provide us with something that would be consistent and have a peer-reviewed process that we could apply better than some of the other approaches that we have been applying. So as John explained, we're going to have this workshop in early August, that the SSC would then go for all the stocks for which we don't have ABCs yet, and all of those are ORCS stocks for which we only have catch series information, and we're going to apply the method.

I will explain to you how the method works because the SSC has some input in that process, but we need information from you as well about your risk tolerance level. That's the background. I just thought I would put here a copy of the cover of that report; the only reliable catch stocks, and for you to see that it involves a number of people.

Three of the authors, including myself, are members of our SSC, but there are representatives from throughout the country, really all the different regions, and I think that it adds all the different perspectives and skills that we get from all the different science centers in providing input in the development of this method.

This process started in late 2009 and took about a couple of years to be completed, and this NOAA Technical Memorandum was published in early 2011. Okay, in terms of the ORCS Working Group approach for our Tier 4, what we do here is apply a method that is trying to derive catch level recommendations based on some criteria.

Those criteria are the exploitation level of the stock, the stock status and the vulnerability of the stocks. Related to more or less productive species, you're going to have different levels of vulnerability to overfishing, so we tried to integrate all of those components into this evaluation process.

And then by applying this process, we assign basically a stock status as a semi-qualitative method that is relying heavily on expert judgment, but we tried to make this as objective as possible for stocks to be classified as lightly exploited, moderately exploited and heavily exploited possibly undergoing overfishing.

The idea here is if a stock is lightly exploited, then there is no reason really for us to decrease the current landings because there is no indication, no high probability that this stock is being overexploited. Instead of coming up with a regulatory process that might disrupt your management intentions, we basically either maintain current catch levels for those stocks or

allow even for some potential increase in landings because there biological reason for us to recommend a reduction in landings.

For the stocks that are moderately exploited, the idea is if they are moderately exploited, the probability of overfishing is already occurring and there is some level of exploitation already is fairly small. In that case we don't allow any increase in catches, but the intention is to cap the current landings, not necessarily reducing them from current levels, but just cap them at that level because the idea is not let them expand anymore and get into a heavily exploited state that might lead to overfishing. So moderately exploited, we just cap them at current levels.

The heavily exploited ones, because there is a likelihood of them already undergoing overfishing, we're going to reduce catches to some lower level to then end overfishing. This is the general rationale, the conceptual framework that we use for applying the method. We accomplished this really by following these three steps.

Step number one is we assign stocks to one of those three exploitation categories I just mentioned in the previous slide. There is an evidence-based scoring procedure that we use, and the report, one of your attachments there, has all the details on this. We used this table to try as objectively as possible to apply expert judgment to score the stocks in those three categories.

Then step number two, after those stocks are already grouped in these separate categories, we obtain an OFL by multiplying a statistical measure of historical catch by a scaler or a multiplier that depends on the exploitation category. Basically, it is following that same principle that I explained in the slide before.

If it is lightly exploited, you keep it there or allow a slight increase. If it is moderately exploited, you just cap it and you keep it there. If it is heavily exploited, we try to reduce it to end overfishing. Now, the measure of historical catch, the statistical measure could be mean landings, could be median of landings, it could be maximum landings or minimum landings.

So depending on the situation and the judgment call that the SSC and this expert group is going to apply using this evidence-based scoring procedure, we will choose a measure of historical catch to be used, and we're going to choose a scaler to follow the principles that I explained in the previous slide.

And then the final step is really the step that involves your input heavily; because to reduce the catch level recommendation from OFL to ABC, we need to apply another scaler. We reduce that statistic from OFL to ABC by multiplying another scaler to the OFL and create that buffer between OFL and ABC, so there is that additional reduction from OFL to ABC, and that reduction should be based on your risk tolerance level.

For species that you feel you have the ability to a higher risk, you're not as concerned about the probability of overfishing and you can be a little more liberal. For species for which you are really concerned about the possibility of overfishing, you're more conservative and you reduces catches and you create a bigger buffer. Any questions so far?

MR. CUPKA: Questions for Luiz? John.

MR. JOLLEY: I see your thought in the precautionary approach to getting at some of these things. Do you have an example of one that you've run for a stock yet that we could look at?

DR. BARBIERI: No, not today, not yet. In September you will see them.

MR. CURRIN: Luiz, how do you determine the level of exploitation; is that best judgment or scientific judgment or is there a more quantitative approach that you guys have talked about trying to use?

DR. BARBIERI: No, it's really fairly qualitative here at this level – and understand this is why I put that first slide trying to explain. When you get to this level of information, you have already realized that you cannot apply Tier 1m you cannot apply Tier 2, you cannot apply Tier 3, but you have to do something with those Tier 4 stocks.

Here when we tried to do some research on methods that are used in the medical field; for example, when they have to apply some professional expert judgment to situations where you don't have a lot of quantitative information, you can use this evidence-based scoring procedure. We have a table that we put together that provides some of the criteria that we're going to be using to classify those stocks into those three categories. But, no, it is very qualitative and expert judgment based.

MR. HAYMANS: So it's Table 4 in the report; is that right?

DR. BARBIERI: Correct, yes.

MR. HAYMANS: It's the table of attributes for assigning stock status?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, so it's one point if it's lightly exploited; two for moderate; and three for heavily; and you score a species for each one of those attributes and then average it; and that's where you get lightly, moderately, whatever, right?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, most likely. Now, the way that the method was developed, it really gave each one of the SSCs discretion to make some choices there. When you form that expert panel to go through that table, you're going to have to make some choices on are you going to weigh some of those criteria differently than others? Are we going to weight some of them higher than others?

At this point, the way that the table is developed, they're all at the same weight. They all have the same value and you could just come up with a simple mean. This is part of the reason why we asked you to have the specific workshop in early August so we can spend a few days dedicated to this process.

MR. HAYMANS: Right, and I guess I'd really like to see at least the fishermen component of the council involved in that process. They would be part of that workshop? I mean Ben, Charlie, those guys who are still fishermen with this group will be part of that process?

DR. BARBIERI: Well, sure, I don't have any concerns personally. We actually are in the process of right now developing the terms of reference for that workshop and choosing our list of experts beyond the SSC. What we thought thus far is that we already have a lot of scientific, biological, socio-economic expertise within the SSC, and what we need the most really are fishers' input.

We are trying to pick folks from different areas that can come and help us with the fisheries issues. If council members are willing to attend, my feeling personally – at the discretion of the chairman, but my feeling is absolutely no concern whatsoever. It will be excellent to have them there.

MR. CUPKA: We have certainly heard that several times this week about the desire to have fishermen have more input into the process, and this is certainly an opportunity for them to do so. We do need to follow up on that. John.

MR. JOLLEY: As a fisherman, I'd like to be there, Mr. Chairman.

DR. BARBIERI: And by the way, I think this would be excellent, John, but when you look at the text that is associated with this part of the report you're going to see that forming expert group, the panel that is going apply that number one there to the stocks, you should have scientists, managers and fishers so it's not simply a scientific process. Having the management input and having the stakeholder input is really critical.

MR. CUPKA: And there is obviously a lot of information on the part of the stakeholders that need to somehow be incorporated in this process, and again this is an opportunity to do that to take advantage of all that on-the-water expertise that is out there. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: What I'd like to see you do is take some stocks without any identification, mix in some of our stocks that have been assessed and see what comes back out of the feedback so we see how this approach works for species in the South Atlantic.

DR. BARBIERI: Absolutely, yes, that is part of the plan. Some of the other centers have actually done all of this ahead of time, you know, before the expert group and conducted some of those simulation approaches to better inform the panel. By the way, folks, I don't mean to interrupt, but this is just the first third of the presentation. I just decided to give you the opportunity to ask any questions about the first part.

MR. CUPKA: I was just going to say that we need to move on.

MR. CARMICHAEL: There is a final slide here where Luiz brings up the next steps and we can talk about this workshop, and that is a good opportunity for you guys to put some of these ideas on the table. Just keep in mind it's the 1st of August; the hotel cut-off is the first week of July;

and we're thinking of getting some representatives from the APS, and the SSC is talking about inviting some people, so we don't have time to drag this out. Just keep that in mind when we start thinking about bringing people in.

MR. CUPKA: Do you want to continue, Luiz?

DR. BARBIERI: So you remember step number one, the expert group classified those stocks into those three exploitation stock status categories. Then for number two we obtain the OFL. The SSC applies a scaler, chooses a statistical measure of historical catch and applies this scaler to that statistic to come with the OFL. This table here provides an example of that process. For each one of those stock categories, lightly, moderately or heavily exploited, if you consider that the biomass of the stock is fairly high, is really in their healthy stage, then you could double the catch statistic in determining your OFL.

Okay, if you put your OFL higher than the current levels of landings, by the time that you apply your ABC you're going to be at the level that is average or maybe a little above, but you don't cause the stocks to be reduced any further. Now, this value here, there is a lot of discussion among SSC members now on whether doubling that catch statistic is appropriate or using some other scaler.

The SSC is actually at this point leaning towards developing ranges, instead of just one value here to multiply it by the catch statistic but ranges of values; the same here for the moderately exploited and the heavily exploited, so you can have ranges there that will allow us to develop OFL values that are consistent with that whole principle that I presented in the very beginning.

If the stock is lightly exploited, you keep it there or allow a little increase. If the stock is moderately exploited, cap it and keep there; and if it is heavily, reduce it a little bit. The application of that Table 4 that Doug mentioned with the criteria and application of this is going to be part of our workshop in August.

But then to go from OFL to ABC, there is another reduction process because you have a buffer now. OFL is really our proxy there that statistically we come up with a proxy for MSY for what we consider is a sustainable level of catches, but we need to build a buffer now between OFL and ABC, and to do that we need your input.

There are several alternatives here that are presented as examples in the report for low risk, stock that have high productivity and for which the council is not really concerned about overexploitation; moderately productive stocks that have moderate risk of overfishing; and the high risk of overfishing stocks.

DR. CRABTREE: Under this scenario, we've had a lot of discussion about Warsaw grouper and speckled hind and our landings of them over the past decade or so, and I assume we would consider them high risk, low productivity, but it looks to me if we apply this we would not come up with an OFL of zero. We would come up with an OFL, some fraction of whatever the landings have been, but it wouldn't be zero.

DR. BARBIERI: Possibly. Again, depending on your risk tolerance level you could make a recommendation to handle those two stocks differently, but that scenario, of course, it's possible because you're applying your risk tolerance level there. Here in this case if we apply consistently a fairly conservative recommendation where for low, moderate or high risk, you reduce landings by 25 percent, but you can apply something different. You can be conservative and extra conservative for the high risk or you can be more liberal over here and reduce for the low risk just a little bit, less even for the moderate and not as much for the high risk compared to over here.

DR. CRABTREE: Right, but even as you characterize I guess as extra conservative, you still wouldn't come up an OFL of zero there. You would come up with 50 percent of recent landings.

DR. BARBIERI: Right.

MR. CUPKA: Is this the second set of scalers that is applied so this would be a further reduction on top of the scalers that you mentioned before. So it wouldn't just be 75 percent; it would be 75 percent of what you reduce it to.

DR. BARBIERI: Well, yes, but keep in mind that here you're not necessarily – in coming up with the OFL, you're not necessarily reducing the landings. This is why here in the OFL, if you multiply it by two – I mean the method is already trying to put the OFL at a level potentially higher than current landings, so by the time that you apply that scaler of the ABC you would be a little above, right at current landings or a little below.

The SSC applies this first set of scalers here in an attempt to develop the OFL that is the SSC role of this and give you those OFL figures. At this time here it is really a judgment call about the exploitation level and the stock status, which is similar to the process that we go through with the regular stock assessments.

That is the analysts and the SSC working together and coming up with those recommendations. For this other one, now we are applying scalers to go from OFL to ABC similar to the P-star process where those scalers will be proportional to your risk tolerance for each individual stock. This is going to be a fairly complex type of process because you have to think about the risk level for different stocks in this combination of scalers that you decide to develop.

Now, one of the things that John and I were talking about is since the SSC in August is going to be having this workshop and already grouping stocks in that low landings, moderate or high or exploitation level, we can also at that point provide you some recommendations on the productivity level of stocks. We could apply the PSE approach or some other approach and for your September meeting bring you some level of recommendations on how to group different stocks into these different bins here.

DR. LANEY: Luiz, you and I can talk about this more offline, but my question was how do ecosystem considerations enter into your deliberations here? You could have something, I suppose, that is currently being exploited lightly, but it is being exploited lightly because its population has been greatly reduced from prior levels.

I guess we would consider Warsaw – and to use Roy’s example, Warsaw and speckled hind have been heavily exploited in the past, but they’re presently lightly exploited because there aren’t very many of them out there. Does this process involve at some point in time setting a restoration target or a recovery target that you’re trying to work toward in addition to trying to establish what fishing level you’re at here?

DR. BARBIERI: When you go to that Table 4 in the report, you’re going to see that there are some criteria there that try to take those things into account. However, keep in mind that the SSC is not really trying to apply the risk management part of this to the stocks. This is at your discretion as the council.

We come up with those OFL figures and, yes, we try to integrate – that is a very good point and we’re going to have to take those things into account, but then provide you some advice for some of those stocks. If they have importance as ecosystem components that are supporting some of the other species and keep their ecosystem integrity in place, we’re going to advise you to be perhaps a little more conservative for those species for that reason. That is why I’m saying that at that August workshop we can develop a number of recommendations to bring you in September to provide you some guidance on how to proceed in making these choices.

MR. CUPKA: We need to kind of move on here, if we can. Again, this is just the beginning of the process. The SSC will be getting back to us as they further refine it, so we don’t have to make any final decisions today on any of this. This is just kind of an orientation.

DR. BARBIERI: Correct. Now, just to explain in a little more detail, the idea here is really to apply this process similar to the process that you use in the risk analysis framework. It is for you to understand that risk actually involves two components. It’s the probability of an event happening, like, for example, what is the risk of rain tomorrow versus the consequence of that event. All of that weighs in your judgment values.

If you’re going for a walk around the block, you may say, well, if the risk of rain tomorrow is 70 percent, I don’t mind, and you take that risk, anyway. If you have a big party planned with caterers and a band and all of that, you want to have a probability of rain below 10 percent before you choose that date. The consequence of an event integrates with the probability of that event happening to give you the full sense of risk.

The SSC functions as part of the risk assessment process. We measure or try to measure uncertainty we have to look at those assessments and give you an idea of the uncertainty associated with those assessments and the information that we put in front of you. You as risk managers, you apply policies and you apply your value system.

You know, similar to what Wilson mentioned in terms of if you really feel that the consequences of overfishing a lightly exploited stock are actually higher consequences because it represents an important ecosystem component, you may want to be a little more conservative for those stocks than you would otherwise. On the management side of things you really apply that value judgment.

And as you look at our ABC Control Rule, the ABC Control Rule really integrates those two components. The SSC comes up with the OFL on this side and the council comes up with their risk tolerance level on this side, and the two of them get integrated into our ABC Control Rule, so we have the OFL and we have ABC integrating both of those components.

Again, we are holding that workshop in August to apply the ORCS approach. We need your guidance on risk levels. We're going to bring you some recommendations for your September meeting, but start thinking about productivity levels of stocks and what risk levels you want to apply to different stocks and please inform us of what that is before our October meeting.

DR. CRABTREE: One of the problems, Luiz, is I think the council needs a lot more information relative to consequence. I think of that as two separate things. One, what is the consequence if overfishing occurs? You can look at a stock like red snapper, speckled hind and Warsaw; the consequence of overfishing could be all these discard issues spill over to choke stocks and shutting down.

And then you look at something like dolphin, the consequence of overfishing, unh, overfished, it would probably rebuild in a year or less, it would come right back. I think congress, when they did ACLs must have looked at – because I'm sure they thought this carefully, they must have looked at annual crops and said the consequence of overfishing is so little, we're not going to require annual catch limits for that, and so they made that decision.

I think we need something like that that would indicate to us based on some information and productivity and levels of discards in other fisheries so we can evaluate that. Then the other aspect of consequence that I think about is what is the consequence of the risk level you choose? For example, it's easy to come in the abstract and say, "Well, I'm a very risk-averse guy; I'm going to think of the fish first and we can't accept much risk."

But then you may find out to get that risk you're choosing, it means you've got to shut virtually everything down and have almost no fishery. And so that is the other component of the consequences; if you make this risk judgment, what is the consequence in terms of what that means to the fishery because you may decide, well, wait a minute, I'm going to accept a little more risk because I have to in order to maintain a viable fishery, and in my judgment the benefits to the country of having a fishery are enough to justify a little bit higher level of risk.

Those are the two things that I think we need, but I don't really think those have ever been laid out in a very useful fashion to the council, and I think that's why we floundered around in trying to come to any judgments about risk. We've got to see those two components so we know the consequence of making the choice.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments or questions? Thank you, Luiz. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And so one of the things you heard from Luiz a lot is there is a lot of judgment that goes into this and judgment calls. Of course, that always starts getting into the gray area of who should be making the judgment calls, scientists or managers and all that. I think that is something that we need to be careful about because when you're making judgments

on these things, there inherently usually is some component of risk involved in making that judgment call.

I think ultimately the council needs to be careful to make sure that in the end you're ratifying these judgment calls and looking at them and where they're made and that the judgment calls are being made in a fashion that is consistent with your views about risk. I think if we don't watch this and make sure that those judgments are being made in a transparent way so you can understand what the decision was and do you agree with it or not; you could lose some of your ability to manage risk. That is something else I think we need to give a lot of thought to and be vigilant about.

MR. CUPKA: John, what else do you need at this point?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, I think if you guys are comfortable with that – and I'll point out we are working through this and it is a work in progress in a lot of ways. And as Luiz has presented it here it lays out a little different place for the council to be bringing in their risk tolerance than when we discussed it at the SSC and our workgroup and just kind of had lumped all that together at that point and it is good to get back now and bring you guys in at that clear scaler between OFL and ABC.

I think in a lot of ways – you know, Roy mentioning what you guys need is some feedback on consequences, something tangible we can bring into our workshop, and if you guys believe that, you know, having some sense of those consequences will help you pick the risk levels and you're okay with the range in those scalers of 50 to 90 percent, then I think we're in pretty good shape and we can move on.

The only other thing is there has been discussion about who actually participates in this workshop, so this is our opportunity to get some guidance. We've talked about bringing in people who have really been involved in a lot of life history research or done monitoring and stuff at the state and federal level who might have a good overview of what is going on with these different populations and have a good reflection of what has happened over time.

We have considered reaching out to our APs, maybe through the AP Chairs to get representatives from, say, snapper grouper, dolphin and wahoo, mackerel. To bring in a couple of folks there would probably be helpful. Keeping in mind that this is the 1st of August, what can you guys say about who you would like to see participate in this workshop.

MR. CURRIN: John, I suspect this is the way it is going to go based on the presentation, but I'd strongly encourage the SSC to develop those scalers on a continuum rather than in boxes. That is one of the biggest problems I had with that PSA analysis. Everything was black or white and you don't think there is a lot of difference in one and two; but when you start adding and summing and averaging, then there is a heck of a lot of difference. And to provide those values, some mechanism to provide them on a scaler I think is very important.

MR. CUPKA: Additional comments? John, I know some of the council members expressed an interest in attending this. I guess if you're interested, we need to know that. We can reach out to

the APs, as you suggest, through the chairmen, depending on what species you're actually going to be working on.

You've already got I guess the group of scientists and stock assessment or life history people involved, so it is mainly just reaching out to the appropriate APs and giving council members an opportunity, if they want to participate, to let us know that they wish to do so and then getting the information out to them. Do you know where this workshop is going to be; where is it scheduled for?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It is going to be held in Charleston the first week of August. I can even see a scenario where the SSC goes through this and we put out those rankings from that Table 4 that you see in the ORCS Attachment, Attachment 2, for APs to perhaps review during the meetings that they have.

As we've seen, these things continue to change over time and the scoring that you might get now can change as more information comes to light. I think people should recognize that these are not locked in stone just because this is the value that came out of this version of the SSC's attempt to work on this.

MR. GILL: Mr. Chairman, it occurred to me during this discussion that there might – and I'm not looking to overpopulate your workshop, but there might be value if you would be so kind as to keep the Gulf Council informed and perhaps a staff member or a council member – now Luiz is on our SSC as well, as you know, but in terms of understanding and perhaps progressing along with you, that someone from our side might be valuable from the Gulf Council point of view to participate in that workshop. If you could keep us informed, we may or may not do it, but I think it would be very helpful and I would make that request.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we would be glad to do that, Bob, and I'm sure staff will make sure that the information is sent to you and you can make that decision on whether you want someone to participate in that. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Roy mentioned speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, and obviously two very high-profile species right now, and I guess I would just encourage that if there is a way to incorporate those two species into your discussions, that would be wonderful.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee, but just from what I've seen, if they were to run wreckfish and golden crab through this, we've got ACLs on different ends of the spectrum, but I think if they were to run both of those through this, they may very well end up with a common answer. I'm really interested in seeing how they're going to work things like that out, and I'd like to sit in on this if possible.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments? Okay, John, do you want to move ahead to the research plan. Each of you should have had a chance to review that. It is behind Attachment 3. Are there any comments on the research plan as it stands? Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: I just from the science side want to be able to commend the council for the work that they put in to developing this plan. Having a notion of what the council views as the science, monitoring and research priorities is very, very helpful for us going forward in trying to balance our portfolio, understanding that we have more than just one client of our science.

To that point, the timing of this is really ideal because the science center is in the process of developing a strategic plan for our science going forward right now and availability of an approved plan updated by the South Atlantic Council is very, very valuable for the inclusion of the council's view in our priorities going forward.

To that end, we're in a drafting stage of that science plan right now and our goal is to be able to vet that among our clients and obtain their input and feedback on it to enable us to make sure it is as inclusive of those views as possible. The timing on that is that we're working on the drafting of it right now and our first stop will be to consult with SERO. Once we've done that, we want to be able to run it through the SSCs of each of the councils that we serve and then ultimately through the SSCs to the councils. Again, the timing of this is wonderful and I appreciate the well thought out input.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you for those remarks. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee either. I was pleased to see that golden crab was listed in the priority species list and just make a suggestion that maybe we ought to include it in the special needs stocks as well. It's a different kind of circumstance to try and assess a benthic organism like that.

I mentioned yesterday during the Golden Crab Committee Meeting that there is some potential there to be able to assess one existing management measure, which is putting back all the females and also some of the males using some of the acoustic tagging approaches that have been developed.

If we could stick it in that special needs category, maybe it would get a little bit more attention. I think I can continue to work with the fishermen to see if there are some university researchers who might be interested in doing some of that work, but I think that would be very informative for the next stock assessment as well.

If it turns out that those animals that are being released have a relatively high mortality, then we may want to consider whether or not those animals should just be retained instead of just tossing them back if they're all dying, anyway. That is something I would like to see – one slight change to the report to the report I would like to see made.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, are there other comments on our research prioritization plan? John.

MR. JOLLEY: And just identifying the specifics of the research priorities; I think under biological sampling collections you ought to also say in that heading "Biological Sampling Analysis and Reporting". I'm always worried about file cabinet research. The stuff can get collected but it doesn't get analyzed and then disseminated.

MR. CUPKA: All right, the chair would entertain a motion for approval. Do we have to approve this, John, our 2012-2016 Research Plan? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we approve the 2012 through 2016 South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Research Plan.

MR. CUPKA: Seconded by Tom Swatzel. Okay, the motion before us is move to approve the 2012-2016 Council Research Monitoring Plan – that is actually Research Prioritization Plan. **Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.** John, that brings us down to our final agenda item; I think the steering committee report and guidance.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, David, the normal last business we typically do at this committee is discussing the steering committee and what guidance you guys wish to provide to them. The committee met via webinar on May 18th. You've got the report of the committee in Attachment 4, and one of the things you typically like to see about that is obviously what stock assessment plans there are for the coming year.

I will point out that the next meeting planned for the steering committee is probably going to be in October, but it will be after your September meeting, so we will be looking for very specific guidance. You will need to provide your specific guidance at that time, so now is just a chance to bring up any questions you may have about the steering committee or any issues you wish to raise before them in advance of September.

MR. CUPKA: Any comments? Obviously, we will have a chance to review it at our September meeting and we will need to finalize that so that we can get everyone working on that. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: We have a bit of a wrinkle and the wrinkle is with the 2013 schedule going forward. A couple of things are coming into play in this. One is that we conducted a Gulf Menhaden Assessment and the peer review came back with some strong recommendations on the way some of the data were handled that is going to require some revisions.

In requesting that at the steering committee meeting, the Gulf States Commission's representative discussed the possibility of the Gulf States carrying the lion's share of the water on that effort and that it would require minimal input from the science center. To kind of expedite the discussion, we agreed that we would hold a deeper discussion of what the division of labor would be offline.

When we did talk with them in greater detail, it turns out that the demands of rerunning that assessment are going to be much, much higher than were originally thought. In addition to making the analysis adjustments that the CIE review put forward, the states are also requesting that the update be done with the addition of the terminal year of data.

In addition to the analysis procedure being changed, they want the data updated as well so it is fresh. That's a logical request and I can't argue with the logic of that. If we do that update, it

basically is the equivalent of a brand new assessment, and it would take a slot because it would take one of our lead scientists out of pocket to be able to conduct that. That's new information.

The other one is sort of a lingering thing and that is the inclusion of the red snapper evaluation. As you know, that red snapper evaluation is a little bit different than running a projection based on a last assessment, which is mainly substituting assumptions with actuals. This is taking a brand new survey and for taking a first cut at the analysis of those data to evaluate those patterns.

That is going to be a very high stakes and I think a very analytically onerous job, and I want to make sure that task receives its due. The result of that is that it puts pressure on the rest of the schedule. Just looking at what that means is if we did the red snapper evaluation at the level I believe it needs to be done and if we were to agree within the steering committee that additional Gulf Menhaden Assessment were to be done, we would have to actually drop two assessments to be able to accommodate that.

Just speaking hypothetically, from the science center's perspective if that were to be the decision, the assessments that we would propose dropping would be to postpone two of the updates. We would keep the benchmarks on board, which are the gray triggerfish and the blueline tilefish. We believe that the snowy grouper needs to stay on there as a standard.

The assessments that we would propose dropping would be the gag grouper and the red grouper. That's not any reflection on their importance, of course, but red grouper was the stock that was assessed last – the last assessment was in 2009. Gag grouper was assessed in 2006. Certainly, from a timing perspective they're due, but it is a matter of being able to weigh the pressures. I raise this to the attention of full council so that if the council has input on this, it can be carried forward into what I think we're going to have to have, which is an interim steering committee meeting to discuss this.

DR. DUVAL: Well, just to I guess maybe add another wrinkle, I see speckled hind and Warsaw grouper in a box with no number assigned to them. I know I made some pretty strong comments the other day when we were discussing marine protected areas and my desire to see some kind of an assessment of those two species being more of a region-wide thing, so in conjunction with the Gulf.

I know that there has already been a request made from the Gulf side to SEDAR for those two species to get on the schedule I think for the Gulf assessments. I want to urge that we don't forget that. I know there are no numbers by those species, but there were some pretty strong comments made last night with regard to the council wanting to base its action on science and that there is a really strong measure of judgment in what we're doing with MPAs moving forward, and I think we need as much science as possible when it comes to these two species.

MR. HARRIS: Bonnie, how does doing HMS through SEDAR affect the schedule for the Gulf and the South Atlantic and Caribbean Council stock assessments? I've always wondered why that is assigned to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and why it takes up slots that we don't seem to have.

DR. PONWITH: The Southeast Fisheries Science Center serves three fishery management councils, the Gulf, the South Atlantic and the Caribbean. They also serve as the science advisors to a fourth quasi-council and that is the Highly Migratory Species Division, which is the equivalent of the council for coastal highly migratory species.

We conduct the stock assessments that they use to manage those species, so they're basically another client of ours. What we have done to try and manage – for better or for worse what we try and do to manage the competing demands on our stock assessment scientists is to have semi-permeable membranes between the working groups.

We can cross-pollinate by taking a scientist from one group to another, but in general we have a Gulf Group, a Caribbean Group, a South Atlantic Group and an HMS Group. The HMS stock assessments are done by shark specialists who specialize in that life history and have a strong a background. Those folks work almost exclusively on shark species.

The conduct of those assessments don't impact you other than the fact that if you wanted to poach across that membrane and grab one of them, you could if they weren't doing something else. Where it does cost is a SEDAR slot, and that is the review process.

MR. CUPKA: Bob said he had the short answer for that, Duane.

MR. MAHOOD: They give us money to do it.

MR. CURRIN: Out of curiosity, Bonnie, how many assessment scientists are there that concentrate on sharks for HMS?

DR. PONWITH: We have two scientists that are doing shark assessments now.

MR. CUPKA: Any other comments? Obviously, this is something the steering committee will be wrestling with either in a special meeting or at our regular scheduled meeting. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just looking ahead, Bonnie, and talking about doing work on Gulf menhaden in 2013; does that alleviate the work on Gulf menhaden in 2014?

DR. PONWITH: I think that is correct. I think the inclusion of Gulf menhaden there was working on the assumption of if we didn't do it in 2013; and again I think it was a placeholder because rather than having a long, involved conversation one on one with Larry during the steering committee meeting we opted to do that offline. That offline discussion sort of revealed that the assessment was going to be pretty demanding.

DR. CRABTREE: I know this throws a monkey wrench into everything, but I guess the most troubling thing to me is I really wish we could find a way to move the black sea bass update to 2013 even if we had to give up quite a bit. It seems to me that is our most urgent need right now. I understand, Michelle, with speckled hind and Warsaw, but I honestly believe that we will expend a benchmark and a year of time on it and then come out with results that are so uncertain that they won't provide us much of anything.

I simply don't believe the data is sufficient to do an assessment. I know a lot of people disagree with me on that, but I think it will be subject to so many assumptions in order to get there that I have not been persuaded that the benefits of it are such that it justifies putting the time and given all of our other needs. I do wish we could find a way – and I would be willing to give up gray triggerfish, snowy, gag or red grouper to bump the sea bass update up sooner.

MR. CUPKA: Well, this comes up every time we look at this and we start juggling and changing and all. It is obviously something the steering committee is going to have to make some decisions on. Michelle, real quick because we need to move ahead here.

DR. DUVAL: Roy, I understand that and I guess that's why I also spoke to the need for something that is more SEDAR like for some species for which we might have enough information to do like a surplus production model or something like that where it is not the Beaufort Assessment Model, and I think there are a lot of species for which we're not going to be able to use Cadillac of the assessment models.

DR. PONWITH: Very quickly to that point, our assessment scientists believe that a speckled hind stock assessment is possible with the data that we've got. The Warsaw grouper is more challenging. An assessment is possible but it would be in kind of a different form, doing something like a per-recruit analysis as a means of a stock assessment, and so that's possible.

We do have some folks in the science center who are looking at using some of these data-poor approaches for Warsaw grouper right now. Again, the challenge with that is how many unknowns we have regarding the recruitment processes, immigration and emigration given that is kind of Pan-Atlantic stock, so it represents some unique challenges. The bottom line is I think speckled hind is doable; Warsaw, we're applying some of those data-poor approaches right now to kind of evaluate how they function with Warsaw grouper as a trial.

MR. WAUGH: I think it would be helpful for Bob and David to have a motion from the committee when they go to negotiate at the steering committee level. What Bonnie has said is they want to trade off gag, which remember that was approaching overfishing, and red grouper that is overfished. If at the next steering committee we're looking at losing those two for Gulf menhaden, I think the more ammunition our council can give our representatives on that committee would be better. Certainly, indicating how willing you are to give those two assessments up would help them.

DR. PONWITH: Just a technical correction to what Gregg had said; the inclusion of a rerun of the Gulf of Mexico stock assessment for menhaden would cost one slot and not two. The other slot, the complication is looking at that red snapper evaluation. What I don't want to do is pay lip service to the amount of attention it is going to take to make sure we do a very good, thorough job on that. By kind of sliding it in as an over and above, I'm fearful that we won't have the horsepower we need to do a really good job in collaboration with the SSC.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, what would we have to give up to instead of doing black sea bass projections to SSC to doing the update next year?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think one thing you have to do, you start with evaluating whether or not age samples and such and survey values can be brought up to speed with those. We've heard the issues about MARMAP; we've heard the funding issues with MARMAP: we know what is going on there. We know that trying to bring in a new species at that point creates a serious challenge, which is what we discussed at the steering committee when we talked about swapping some species in the Gulf. I think we'd first and foremost have to answer that question.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if I could, Mr. Chairman, I guess we're going to schedule a SEDAR Steering Committee phone call or something. John, could you and Bonnie explore that and see if that is an option or if it's just not doable by the time we have the steering committee? I really feel like we're going to have very early closures this year and we're going to look at even earlier closures next year, and it is just getting to be unmanageable. I don't think there is anything in the cards that is going potentially resolve this beyond an assessment.

MR. CUPKA: Bonnie, real quick and then we do need to move on.

DR. PONWITH: It's a very quick question regarding tradeoffs and that right now what is on the table is the possibility of losing those two standards. I just need to understand if the notion is in addition to those things which are under discussion we're exploring the addition of black sea bass at the expense of something else; what would that something else be?

What I'm fearful of is without a discussion of that, we will get to the table and what will be reflected is the desire to add that in without a clear notion of what it costs. It would be helpful to know what your thinking is in terms of the tradeoffs.

MR. CURRIN: I'm not on your committee, but just to express an opinion, I hope it is not gray triggerfish. We have been kicking that one down the road for a long time. I don't know how many times we've heard from folks that at many times of the year that's the only thing out there for them for fish for and they are getting hammered pretty well. I hope they're fine but we need to know.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think gag was not overfished, not overfishing; you're fishing it at the OY level so that is one to consider.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, which ones are we giving up right now or we haven't decided anything we're giving up. Yes, I think we could give up gag. I think we could give up red grouper.

MR. CARMICHAEL: In that order?

MR. CUPKA: Would that be your priority?

DR. CRABTREE: I'd probably give up red grouper before gag, but I don't have much of an opinion about which one.

MR. HARTIG: Well, one thing on gag, we're seeing the quotas starting to be met so we are getting some rebuilding. In South Florida we're seeing them again in pretty good numbers. As

an anecdotal type thing, gag is coming back. I think we could probably hold off on gag, to be honest with you.

DR. PONWITH: So giving up gag and red grouper was the science center's view in terms of the list as it was before we started talking about black sea bass. In other words, if we need to drop something to be able to do a good job on that red snapper, it would be gag or red grouper. If the case for inclusion of a rerun of menhaden is compelling, that would mean the other one, either gag or red grouper, so both of those are gone already hypothetically if the case for adding menhaden is compelling.

I think what we need to decide or what we need to hear from the council is if it were technically feasible to do black sea bass in 2013, which I don't know if it is right now; but if it were technically feasible what else would be on the table to trade out for that above and beyond gag and red grouper since they're already in the running for being dropped already.

MR. CUPKA: Anyone wish to comment on that? Of course, we need to find out if it's even possible to do black sea bass but assuming it is.

DR. PONWITH: We can go to the agers and see where they are in processing the age information and we can go to the video trap folks and find out where they are relative to processing that information, but the council is at the table right now and so we can't answer those in real time. We'd have to go to them and ask for an analysis.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee, but I guess a question for Bonnie. It looks like we're taking the cuts. Is there a possibility that the Gulf could give up one of their slots to kind of even this out?

DR. PONWITH: So there is that semi-permeable membrane; can you poach someone from the Gulf? When we were at the SEDAR Steering Committee, that also came up and I opened the possibility that we could try and poach an analyst from the Gulf. That was before I realized that I have a high probability but not signed on the dotted line yet resignation of one of the stock assessment scientists.

I can't go into the details because the resignation hasn't happened yet, but the probabilities of that happening are better than 50 percent. They are creeping into the 75/80 percent stage right now.

MR. CUPKA: We need to move on here, so if you aren't willing to give us something you're just going to leave in the hands of the steering committee. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: That's fine. I was going to originally say I'd give up triggerfish until Mac, but to me it's triggerfish or snowy. I understand what Mac is saying but I think I still would say give up triggerfish.

MR. CUPKA: Well, in the absence of something from this council, the steering committee will make the decision. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I was just going to say to Mac's point, if we were able to do the black sea bass assessment and get it open again, that would lighten pressure on triggerfish.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, anything else? We'll go from there, then. All right, is there anymore input you need on that, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, sir, and I have no other business.

MR. CUPKA: If there is no other business, we will adjourn the SEDAR Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 o'clock a.m., June 8, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July 11, 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011 - 2012 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011-2012 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

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

CATCH SHARES

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

DOLPHIN WAHOO

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

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

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

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

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

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

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

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

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

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

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

LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

PERSONNEL

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

PROTECTED RESOURCES

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

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

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

SEDAR Committee

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Assistant Public Information Officer

Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Staff Economist

Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Administrative Officer

Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary / Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

BOB GILL

PHIL STEELE

MONICA SMT-BRUNEW

MARTHA

JACK MCGOVERN

RADM BAUMGARTNER

BONNIE PONWITH

ANDY STRELCHECK

LUIZ BARBIERI

OTHA EASLEY

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SEDAR COMMITTEE MEETING
 June 15, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

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

EMAIL
 ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
 PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
 ORGANIZATION

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Joe Klasterman AMV	772-461-6492	GJKJFK@aol.com	32120-9351
Paul Johnson ASH	386-239-0948	ASH2009@aol.com	Southport NC Golden, CO
Ken [unclear]	910-6205847		Felices@verizon.net 500 [unclear] Orlando FL
Deke Baumgartner (Seaton Cow Summer)	GSAAF	qooepts@bellsouth.net	570 510, 400 [unclear] Atlanta, GA 30322
FRANK HETLERS	851-3916	frankhetlers@emil.edu	321 [unclear]
SSS	404-727-6314	frankhetlers@tribune.or	
Tracy Yandle Emory	386-479-1529		
Ludi Lelis			

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

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:18 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name
SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 5 of 5 (Friday)

Webinar ID
650904586

Actual Start Date/Time
Jun 15, 2012 07:17 AM EDT

Actual Duration (minutes)
532

Clicked Registration Link
106

Opened Invitation
35

Total Attended
51

Session Details

stephen,jessica		jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 15, 2012 08:50 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:50 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:33 PM EDT	403.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Clemens,Anik		anik.clemens@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 12:36 PM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:50 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:38 PM EDT	229.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Witzig,John john.witzig@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 11:36 AM EDT

City Gloucester

State MA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 11:37 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:15 PM EDT	38.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Takade-Heumacher,Helen htakade@edf.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 07:59 AM EDT

City Raleigh

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:00 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	459.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:04 AM EDT

City st. petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:09 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 02:35 PM EDT	335.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 51

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

amick,steve **steveamicks@aol.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:54 AM EDT

City savannah

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:54 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:12 AM EDT	137.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

larrison,john **john@beachmarineservice.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:07 AM EDT

City port canaveral

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:07 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	421.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

linville,mike **whateversbitin03@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 01:16 PM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 01:17 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:18 PM EDT	102.03

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 68

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Lloyd,Vic vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:13 AM EDT

City Atlantic Beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:14 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:19 PM EDT	305.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

holland,jack jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:40 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:40 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:03 PM EDT	202.95

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Knowlton,Kathy kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:12 AM EDT

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:13 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	476.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Fitzpatrick,Eric eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:13 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:14 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 10:32 AM EDT	138.62

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 66

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Mahood,Robert **robert.mahood@safmc.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:22 AM EDT

City N. Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:22 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 08:27 AM EDT	5.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 65

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Coggins,Lew **lew.coggins@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:34 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:34 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	454.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

DeLancey,Larry **delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:59 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:59 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:40 AM EDT	100.4

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 65

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Mehta,Nikhil **nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 10:56 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:40 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	508.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 72

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

levy,maria **maria.levy@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:08 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:08 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:18 PM EDT	189.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

c,mike **mec181@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 07:40 AM EDT

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:40 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:59 PM EDT	498.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Michie,kate **kate.michie@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 11:05 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 15, 2012 08:19 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	471.17
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 12:28 PM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 15, 2012 12:31 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:09 PM EDT	41.08
---------------------------	---------------------------	-------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Eich,Anne Marie **annemarie.eich@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 09:29 AM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:23 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:42 PM EDT	439.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Package,Christina **christina.package@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:43 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:44 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:26 PM EDT	182.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:11 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:14 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:51 PM EDT	397.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:45 AM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:45 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:14 PM EDT	148.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Chala,Liliana **lchala@hotmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 03:30 PM EDT

City Melbourne

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 03:32 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:07 PM EDT	35.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 60

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Byrd,Julia **byrdj@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:12 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:12 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:59 PM EDT	286.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Barile, Peter abaco711@hotmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:25 PM EDT

City Melbourne

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:20 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:35 AM EDT	195.27

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 52

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Reichert, Marcel reichertm@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:21 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:21 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	358.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Williams,Erik erik.williams@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 03:31 PM EDT

City MHC

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:47 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 09:49 AM EDT	122.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Player,David playerd@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:57 AM EDT

City Myrtle beach

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:59 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:32 AM EDT	33.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 38

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Miller,Janet janet.l.miller@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:34 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:35 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:34 AM EDT	59

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

gerhart,susan susan.gerhart@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:11 AM EDT

City st. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:12 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:22 PM EDT	265.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 41

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Woodward,Chris **chris.woodward@bonniercorp.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 12:18 PM EDT

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 12:20 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:29 PM EDT	69.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:31 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:32 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:14 PM EDT	221.45

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

beckwith,anna **anna@pamlicoguide.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 07:44 AM EDT

City morehead city

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:45 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	503.62

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 76

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Turner,Steve **steve.turner@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:28 AM EDT

City Miami

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:15 PM EDT	226.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Larkin,Michael michael.larkin@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 01:25 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 01:26 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:52 PM EDT	146.3

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Locke,Melissa mlocke@edf.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT

City Raleigh

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:10 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:39 AM EDT	148.92

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 44

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:16 AM EDT

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:17 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	413.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 47

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:45 AM EDT

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:45 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	200.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

p,b **bprewittjr@hotmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 01:37 PM EDT

City day

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 15, 2012 01:40 PM EDT Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT 149.67

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 71

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Malinowski,Rich **rich.malinowski@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:46 AM EDT

City St Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Jun 15, 2012 09:46 AM EDT Jun 15, 2012 02:53 PM EDT 306.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

izsak,jill **jnizsak@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 02:24 PM EDT

City jacksonville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 02:26 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	103.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:03 AM EDT

City st pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:04 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:17 PM EDT	323.42

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 46

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:31 AM EDT

City stuart

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:32 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:11 PM EDT	105.2

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 57

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Ballenger,Joseph **ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:17 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:17 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:24 PM EDT	247.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

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

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:02 AM EDT

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:02 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:21 PM EDT	139.07

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 45

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

travis,michael **mike.travis@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:59 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:01 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:34 PM EDT	213.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Gore, Karla karla.gore@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:15 AM EDT

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:16 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	473.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

thompson,mary jean mjthompson860@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:54 PM EDT

City titusville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:33 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	157.43

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 60

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Barber,John johnb@revcmpsys.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:46 AM EDT

City longwood

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:46 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:12 AM EDT	145.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

sandorf,scott scott.sandorf@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 03:02 PM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Daniel,Louis **louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date May 25, 2012 02:00 PM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Pugliese,Roger **roger.pugliese@safmc.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 12:03 PM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

FARMER,NICK

nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date

May 25, 2012 10:59 AM EDT

City

ST PETERSBURG

State

FL

Unsubscribed

No

[In Session](#)

Join Time

Leave Time

In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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