SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE

Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel
Wilmington, North Carolina

DECEMBER 4-5, 2012

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION

December 4, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Snapper Grouper Committee:

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chairperson
Martha Bademan, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
Dr. Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Pres Pate

Council Members:

Dr. Wilson Laney
LCMDR Scot Gibson

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Gregg Waugh
Kim Iverson
Amber Von Harten
Roger Pugliese
Myra Brouwer
Anna Martin
Dr. Mike Errigo
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
John Carmichael
Mike Collins
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Jason Walker
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Luiz Barbieri
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Scott Sandorf
Phil Steele
Monica Smit-Brunello
Karen Raine
Tony Austin
Mac Currin
Dick Brame
Otha Easley
Doug Boyd
Chip Collier
Jim Atack
Zack Bowen
Dr. Nick Farmer
Jim Kelly
Mike Merrifield
Kenny Fex

Other Observers/Participants Attached

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- - -

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Cape Fear Ballroom of the Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel, Wilmington, North Carolina, Tuesday morning, December 4, 2012, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I'll call the Snapper Grouper Committee to order. The first item is approval of the agenda. I know that there are a few items under other business that we will be discussing tomorrow, but are there any modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved.

The next item is approval of our September 2012 committee minutes. Are there any changes to the minutes from our last meeting in September? Seeing none, those minutes stand approved. The next item is the status of commercial catches versus quotas, and I think Jack is going to take care of that for us.

DR. McGOVERN: The snapper grouper commercial landings are in Tab 5, Attachment 1B. These are updated landings that we got at the end of last week. They include landings through November 27th. They're not up on our website yet, but they will probably be up later today. I will go over some highlights in here.

The deepwater complex, we're at 107 percent on that. That closed on September 8th. Golden tilefish, that is at 80 percent and that is based on the new ACL of 541,295 pounds. That reopened on October 9th. Blue runner, going back up a little bit, that is at 104 percent. That went up from 89 percent at the last meeting. We will be closing blue runner. We have closure package that I think will be cleared today.

Gray triggerfish, that closed on September 11th. That has been at 94 percent for quite a while now. We have asked the science center to give us a projection to see if we can open that up for a few days. The porgy complex, that is at 117 percent. That closed on September 8th. Going down to snowy grouper, that is at 94 percent and wahoo is at 90 percent.

Both of those the science center indicates in the projections or the report we just got that they probably should close. We have requested projections from them, and there are also projections in what they have given us, but it looks like they need to close at the end of this month, maybe the week of December 16th or something like that.

Red snapper, about 4,600 pounds have been landed and we're looking at reopening red snapper for seven days as well. If you move back to the bottom, look at yellowtail snapper. We have a new ACL for that. We did an emergency rule to increase the ACL based on the new stock assessment and we're at 77 percent of the new ACL.

Black sea bass, we are at 104 percent of the black sea bass commercial ACL, and that closed in July. Vermilion snapper, that closed on September 30th and so we are at 162 percent of that. I think that is pretty much it for the summary of the landings.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions for Jack about any of the commercial landings information?

DR. McGOVERN: Gag, I didn't talk about gag; if you look at gag we are at about 98 percent of gag. You remember that opened for eight days on I think it was November 3rd that was the reopening, so it doesn't look like we can reopen gag.

DR. CRABTREE: And I'm sure all of you heard that the weather was terrible during the eight days we reopened gag; yet we still end up that close, so probably the lesson from this is had we opened it up where we were and the weather had been good, we would probably would have gone over by a fair amount.

MR. HAYMANS: I was going to make the same comment about red snapper in that we opened for – we're still not there after two seasons so you said that is a seven-day season now, the next one?

DR. McGOVERN: In the original letter we got from the council, they indicated that red snapper should open in seven-day increments, so we're looking at opening it for an additional seven days.

MR. HAYMANS: And that is within the next few weeks or when?

DR. McGOVERN: Well, we're looking at possibly opening red snapper and gray triggerfish together so we're waiting for the projections from the science center for gray triggerfish to see if we can do that together. Hopefully, we will get that today.

DR. CRABTREE: There are a couple of things with red snapper; one of which was after the first initial opening we wanted to get the dealer reports all in and that took a substantial amount of time. The second thing is if we wanted to really catch all that up, in retrospect we probably set the trip limit lower than we needed to. We will open red snapper again for one more seven-day season and that likely will be it for this year. There just will probably be quota that was not caught, which isn't really a bad thing. I think our main goal in that one was to try and not go over.

MR. CUPKA: I just wanted to ask Jack the percentages of the ACL that you gave us in all cases were higher than what was in this table, so obviously there were late landings that have come in since you got the initial report from the science center. The percentage ACL that is in this table was what you got on November the 7th and represented what had been reported as of the date it closed? Well, I guess it was as of November the 7th.

DR. McGOVERN: The landings we got from the science center, yes, they're reported as of that day from the science center and they sent it to us on that day.

MR. HARTIG: The overage in vermilion is concerning. That is quite a bit; that's 62 percent. Did we go over in the first half of the year as well?

DR. McGOVERN: We did. You can see it there; we went over by 122 percent. The landings were coming in very rapidly and they were coming in two-week intervals. The whole commercial landings monitoring system was still being developed, and so now we're going to go to a one-week reporting. The science center has everything worked out with how the projections are done and everything like that, so I think it is going to be a lot tighter from here on out.

MR. WAUGH: Specific to vermilion, we will get into this a little bit more tomorrow in the Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee Meeting. We did have the live demonstration of the system and the system has tremendous capabilities. One of the examples we asked them to do on the fly was to look at that second period of vermilion and forensically let's look and see why we went over so much.

The system allows you to look at landings by dealer, look at when those dealers report those landings, and it clearly shows that the problem with vermilion is late landings coming in. There are five different projection methodologies that are used; but even with all of those when you have dealers not reporting or reporting late, it is a problem. It is a small percentage.

There are many dealers – and you can see it – that are reporting on time and meeting the new requirements very well. This is going to be a continued problem until we get 100 percent of the dealer reporting implemented as was laid out in the Generic Gulf/South Atlantic Dealer Amendment. We will talk a little more about that tomorrow.

DR. DUVAL: Before I go to Roy, Mr. Atack, who is our Snapper Grouper AP Vice-Chair, just had a quick comment that he wanted to make.

MR. ATACK: At our AP meeting we talked – let me go back to gag for a minute – we talked about how the gag ACL being that would shut down the shallow water grouper fishery, but even when the gag limit is met on the commercial side the overall ACL is still way below the limit from the optimum yield standpoint.

In managing the fishery, there is still a lot of fish that could have been landed that is not being landed so we're pretty conservative from a fishery management standpoint. The commercial guys would like to see some type of smaller trip limit later in the year because they're tied to the shallow water right now.

There is a lot of grouper still left out there on the commercial side that is not landed. I think it is about 300,000 pounds below the ACLs for the scamp and the red grouper and the black grouper. Shutting down the fishery has left a lot of grouper that could be landed and still a properly managed fishery.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that is right, Jim, but the council needs to – and we've got a framework action we're going to look at along those lines, but it will take some action by the council to address that. I just wanted to say I talked to David and Bob about I want us to have a

discussion at this meeting – and I think we're going to do this in Executive Finance – about the criteria for closing and reopening these fisheries.

We get in situations where we've caught 93 and 94 percent of the quota and then there is pressure to reopen. I would like to have some discussion of just how close to these quotas can we reasonably expect to be and how do you decide whether there is enough fish left to justify reopening or not. I'm just trying to get all of us on the same page, so be thinking about that, and I guess we will come back to that later.

DR. DUVAL: Are there anymore questions regarding the status of commercial catches? Seeing none, the next item on our agenda is the status of recreational catches, and I believe Dr. Ponwith is going to take us through that.

DR. PONWITH: This is Tab 5, Attachment 1B in your briefing books. Just an update on the progress relative to a couple of key issues; the council and NOAA Fisheries Service are still in the process of converting the ACLs and quotas based on the MRIP estimates so note that all of these numbers that you have in percentages are all going to be presented in terms of MRFSS numbers.

The landing estimates were updated to be consistent with the ACL monitoring, so this includes post-stratification. We're going to have a discussion about post-stratification. A question on that was raised and we're going to deal with that in data management and go into that at some length. With no further ado, on to the numbers.

You will see a table here that looks very much like the table Jack has used to present the commercial landings, and this is the way that we plan, based on our discussions at the last meeting, to represent sort of a one-shot look at the status of the quotas. You will see the species complex on the left.

The season is there and that is really critical because you know our fishing years are different for different stocks. The total reported landings and the ACL next to that and then also quite important the actual units that are used for monitoring the ACL; and then where we are in terms of the percentage of the ACL at that point in time.

It is really important to also note the caveats at the bottom; and then also if there was a closure, what that closure date was. Just one none; you will see for golden tilefish right there in that table it is reported as being over by 225 percent, and that actually is incorrect. The golden tile quota was raised from what you see in the table to 3,019 fish and then also the – so that changes the percentage overage to 117 percent.

Here you will see a continuation of that table; again with the fishing season; basically the calendar year. And go to the next table, please, and this is a continuation again, and these are for stocks that have fishing years that are different than the calendar year, so make a note of that, and where we are in each of the percentage ACLs.

Now, the proposal going forward is that we show these tables, which are pretty information dense, on a meeting-by-meeting basis; so for every single meeting you get these tables. If we go to the next slide, then we have the traditional historic catch and the graphs of what that looks like, the historic catch along with the present year catch thus far and the effort species by species. Our proposal going forward is that we use those tables on a meeting-by-meeting basis and then once a year, when the data become final, go through and look at the stock-by-stock time series.

I just think it is more informative to do that once a year when the season is over and the data are final. What I'm going to do is walk through these tables and then we can talk about that and get the committee's input on that. Here again you saw black sea bass landings in that first table; the percentage of the landings that shows the historic trend.

Again, the gag grouper landings; this shows the trend; next slide for greater amberjack and the next slide showing the trend; yellowtail snapper landings. If we could go back up to those tables with the percentages again; what I'm interested in is your viewpoint on the merits of going back to on a meeting-by-meeting basis showing the table that again shows the now year or now season status relative to the ACL and then once a year showing those time series data so you can see how the final closeout of that year compares to the trend going backward. I would appreciate your input on that.

MR. CUPKA: Madam Chairman, if I could, just a couple of questions for Bonnie. We're working on an amendment now to go to electronic reporting for headboats. Once that is implemented and we go to that new process, then hopefully the little footnote about the headboat landing is not included will be able to be erased. In regard to some species it is probably not that much, but it is very important in regard to other species so we should have more current data; is that correct?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, and to that point we will be able to do headboat estimates on a sub-year basis. The limiting factor on that is going to be how dense the information is. If you do the estimates over too refined a time period, for the rarer species you have to account for empty cells where you don't have observations and you need to borrow data from the surrounding areas.

When you get to a point where you're at such a fine scale of granularity, that borrowing of data to deal with empty cells becomes – it contributes to a lot of uncertainty in the estimates. We're talking about right now about what level of reporting on headboats can we do that gives a good snapshot of where we are relative to the ACL without doing it at such a fine scale that it actually is less informative. I will be able to share a little more information on that with you after we go through and do some analyses to address that question, but the answer is yes.

MR. CUPKA: Okay; and my second question has to do with the bar graphs. I think it is good we show the ACL, but as that time series increases, if the ACL should happen to change, we're still going to show what the ACL was in that particular year; so that if we look at that graph we should be able to tell when it changed and to what degree it changed just from a historical perspective; right?

DR. PONWITH: Correct; and if you look at the table you can see – I'm sorry, not the table, the graph you will see the ACL in the legend down there is depicted as a dot on the bar. If we do show these graphs once a year when the data go final, you will be able to see the trend in landings which are the bars, effort are the lines, and that is really important to be able to interpret changes in landings as it changes in CPUE because you're seeing both change or is one or the other and then also where they are with respect to the ACL.

MR. BELL: On the private boat data or just MRIP in general, are we looking at through Wave 4 or Wave 5 or are we looking at halfway through Wave 6? We're in Wave 6 now so it can't obviously be the whole Wave 6.

DR. PONWITH: That is a good question and usually I require them to have what wave is complete that is included on there, and I don't see it on there so I will double-check on what wave is the last wave. Wave 4 is the last one. A lot of it is a timing issue. If this report is due for the briefing book at a time before the wave came out and early enough to be able to actually incorporate it in the table, it will miss that wave.

MR. BELL: I like the presentation of the data; I think that is great. That was just something we need to make sure of.

DR. PONWITH: So the real question is, is looking at the table satisfactory and then showing those graphics once a year when the data go final? Is that a satisfactory approach to you?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I think that is. I think that is fine with me. I don't need to see the graphic representation. I just need to know the percent ACLs. Additionally, it would also be helpful to add those to those tables. As we go through these ACLs year after year now, it would be nice to have what percent of the recreational ACL was caught in each of those years. That would be helpful.

The other thing I wanted to ask is – and it is pertinent to landings but when we do assessments, the stock assessment panel, they occasionally change values in the assessment of the recreational landings. If there is an outlier – and they done it in several assessments – if there is an outlier, they will go and actually change the value.

In golden tilefish, for one, and I can't remember what the other one was, but when they change those values will you go back and change the landings statistics in your time series if they change since that becomes the best available scientific information. If they change the value of the landings, it does, so to me you should go back and change your landings time stream in the recreational fishery based on the changes made in the assessment.

DR. PONWITH: I just want to make sure I'm understanding your question. Are you saying if the landings are updated and changed or if –

MR. HARTIG: Well, yes, there are values for specific years. Tilefish is a good example where they went and looked at each side of a real giant peak in the recreational landings. It was not

believable, and at the assessment they changed that landings value for that year. Now, does that become the best available science and now that is the best available landings estimate from the recreational fishery for that year?

DR. PONWITH: What I can say is that if we do a benchmark assessment and we do some sort of a smoothing for the landings and those landings are used as an element of the stock assessment, that is locked in as the data inputs for the following update assessments going forward. Whatever decisions are made on how the data are handled as inputs into the stock assessment for a benchmark, those carry forward into the updates going forward.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, that is all well and good, but the problem is if they're not carried forward into the information that we're using for landings from you directly, when we calculate allocations based on those numbers they're going to be different based on the assessments. What I'm saying is if the assessment makes a change in a specific year for landings, that should be the new number for that year in your landings history. That is what I'm saying.

DR. PONWITH: So another way to approach that is if you are contemplating changes to allocations, you can direct that the allocations be used based on the stock assessment time series that are used as the input for the stock assessment.

MR. HARTIG: That will work.

DR. CRABTREE: Ben, you're getting at a problem we have struggled with for 15 or 20 years, and that is we have got lots of data bases; and if you go pull the landings up you get different landings. MRFSS landings are MRFSS landing. They don't get readjusted because the assessment guys smoothed something out so it is confusing.

Bonnie, could you back up to the table that had the actual landings number on it? You see right there we have got – where is the one that had golden tile on it – 225 percent; we went over substantially. I think we have a similar issue with snowy grouper. The commercial quota for golden tile now is 541,000 pounds. We have an ACL of about 15,000 pounds, which I don't know how big the average tile is caught recreationally.

Let's say it is ten pounds, so you're saying 15,000 pounds, it is an insignificant quantify of fish in comparison to the overall quota. That is too small of a number for us to be able to manage a fishery on. We are largely looking at sampling error and statistical variation. I'm not sure what the consequence of this will be for next year's recreational golden tile, but it may be that there isn't much of a fishery next year.

We have got the same situation in snowy and a number – and I looked just now on the MRIP page for wreckfish landings and there aren't any. We had a recreational wreckfish season this year. We have set up some recreational fisheries that simply have unworkable numbers for ACLs and that would be a tiny amount in comparison to the overall.

We ought to think about going back in and just having one ACL for the whole fishery somehow or another. We need to readdress this at some point because it is going to end up with some of these small recreational fisheries getting shut down potentially for a whole year even though I don't think the amount of fish they're harvesting has any significant biological impact on anything. I think it is something for us to think about and that we need to readdress at some point.

DR. DUVAL: We will get into this a little bit later, but there was a suggestion made by the Snapper Grouper AP that the council actually explore the idea of having a snapper grouper stamp akin to some of the other programs we have heard about like the snook stamp from Florida and try to find some way to – because that would at least give you a universe of anglers that you could sample, that you know are going to fish in the snapper grouper fishery. That was one suggestion from the AP to try to help I think with some of that information and to try to bring some additional certainty into the MRIP process. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it comes up all the time and has for a number of years. The snook stamp analogy comes up and they do have a snook stamp in Florida. It is not used in any way to estimate the recreational catch of snook. It raises money for the state of Florida, which they use for things.

If we had a snapper grouper stamp it will cost us money. I will have to take money away from other activities to pay for issuing the stamp, and we won't get any of the money that comes from the stamp. It will all go into the General Treasury. Unless MRIP goes in and changes how they do the effort estimation and sets up a whole new survey for effort based on that stamp, it won't do anything to improve the catch estimates.

It is one of those things that sounds like a good idea, but it is way more complicated than that. It will be a costly thing that the agency doesn't have any budget to deal with, and it is not all clear to me how MRIP would use it. My worry is that we end up in the worse of both worlds. We end up costing fishermen money for a stamp they have to pay for.

We end up costing the Fisheries Service money because we don't get the money that is raised from it, and then they don't use it anyway in the catch estimates. This is an idea that might have some merit but it has got a lot of problems with it and we need to be very careful about proceeding with that. I understand the AP and where they're coming from. It has come up in the Gulf and all kinds of other places, but it is complicated and we need to be awfully careful with how we do that.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, did you have anything you want to add to that? Okay, I think Gregg wanted to say something.

MR. WAUGH: I apologize for asking some of these questions. We weren't aware the center was going to propose this change to what you all get to see, but I think there are a couple of considerations you should be aware of. This table is available from the website on an ongoing

basis. The utility of getting the more detailed report at the meeting is then you can look and see how the various sectors are doing, how charterboat is done and how headboat is doing.

You won't have that. The other consideration that comes to mind is when is the cutoff? If you want to wait until landings are final, you won't see the 2012 numbers until the earliest your March 2013 meeting. When we get questions and you see on the website that a closure has occurred or you're very high and you want to know, well, what component, has something shifted in the makeup of the harvest? We won't be able to advise you on that. You won't be able to look at that at a council meeting. Those are just some of the considerations to this new idea of changing what gets reported to you that come to mind.

DR. DUVAL: And that is a valid point. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I'm not on your committee but I just had a follow-up question I guess for Bonnie or Roy relative to Ben's point in that if during a stock assessment a number in the time series is determined to be inaccurate for whatever reasons and is changed or deleted from the time series, so it is not possible to change that number then in the data base? I think that was the point Ben was trying to make. It seems like if that is done by the stock assessment committee, there ought to be some way to track those sorts of changes. I don't think they happen very often, though. That is my perception, anyway.

DR. PONWITH: It is sort of like when the weather service predicts it is going to rain and it is a beautiful sunny day. The prediction is still the prediction. That is the prediction and it is the same way with MRIP. The MRIP protocol and the MRIP algorithms generated a catch estimate, and those landings estimates, unless they find an error – if they find an error, then certainly it is changed and it is incorporated into the data base as part of the time series.

If a landings estimate is extremely high and the reason is because of – I mean one case might be there is a rare species and for some reason here was a harmonic convergence where the sampler who was assigned to do random sampling that day went to a place where six people who were there caught that species and that is all that was caught for the rest of the year, your estimate of that species based on the protocols will be extremely high.

The stock assessment scientists can make an informed decision to do smoothing for that data point, but the estimate remains the estimate. The bottom line is if an error is found in MRIP they will make the correction and the data base for MRIP is changed to reflect that correction. If the estimate is odd for some reason and the stock assessment scientists choose to do smoothing to make a correction for an outlier in the data, that number is recorded in the stock assessment data base and used from that point forward for all stock assessments based on that time series, but they would never go back and redo the assessment using the odd data.

They would use the time series they created. If management decisions are going to be made with respect to allocation or anything else, it becomes then a choice of what time series do you use to base that decision on, the MRIP landings data or the time series used in the stock assessment, and all you have to do is specify which one you want to use.

MS. BECKWITH: Bonnie, I like the more detailed presentation. I find it useful and refer back to it on a regular basis even between meetings. I would like to see if possible once the Wave 6 information comes through for this year the tables via Ben's suggestion to add the ACLs to the individual years on the tables for the individual species to be added on and then include the final wave information if that was possible.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I like that as well. I do like having the more detailed information. I don't know how other committee members feel, but, for instance, in those tables that accompany the graphs, if we could have a column that does say ACL so that we're able to make a better comparison when looking at the numbers. I realize you have that in the graph as well, but I think just knowing what the exact number is would be helpful in the table, too.

I guess in the summary tables, Bonnie, I noticed that for most of these species – and I'm glad David asked the question that he did about headboat landings because I think I brought this up at the last meeting, a concern that we're just not seeing those, and it looks like in the summary tables that they're only included for black sea bass. That is the only species for which they were included.

I sincerely hope that once the electronic reporting goes through for the headboats that we will be able to have – at least for those non-rare event species that we will be able to have those headboat landings included in there. When I look at where some of the ACLs are like spadefish or cobia, I think it would be really useful, as those quotas increase, that it allows for the council to better evaluate where we are with those species. Are there other comments on what folks would like to see at each council meeting? What is your preference? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I like the format like it is. If it is not too difficult to do, I'd just as soon see it like we have been doing it with these changes that Michelle is talking about.

MR. ATACK: I have got a suggestion. When you have Wave 4 down there, everybody may not realize what date that is; so instead of showing Wave 4, you might want to just say through September 30th or whatever the date is that the landings are valid through.

DR. DUVAL: Good suggestion. Bonnie, do you feel like you have the input that you need from the committee in terms of the presentation format? Okay, are there any other questions with regard to the status of recreational landings? If not, we're going to move on to our next agenda item, which is the status of amendments under review, and I think Jack is going to lead us through that.

DR. McGOVERN: The first item is the Yellowtail Snapper Emergency Rule. This emergency rule was requested at the September council meeting in response to a new assessment and a chance that the catch levels could be increased. The Gulf and South Atlantic Councils' SSCs reviewed the stock assessment at their October meeting and they provided an ABC recommendation.

Based on established allocations for the Gulf and South Atlantic and sectors, the commercial ACL is 1,596,510 pounds. The final rule that temporarily increased the commercial ACL was published on November 7th and was effective on that date. This emergency rule is effective for 180 days and can be extended for an additional 186 days. Regulatory Amendment 15, which we're going to talk about in a little bit, has an action in it to make this permanent.

Regulatory Amendment 12 is the next item. The final rule for Regulatory Amendment 12 published on October 9th. It increases the annual catch limits for tilefish and it modified the recreational accountabilities for golden tilefish, including an in-season closure for the recreational sector. Regulatory Amendment12 set the annual catch limit of 541,295 pounds gutted weight for the commercial sector and 3,019 fish for the recreational sector.

Amendment 18A, the black sea bass pot endorsement, there was an action in Amendment 18A that allowed black sea bass pot endorsements to be transferred to individuals who held an unlimited snapper grouper permit. Amendment 18A had the wrong preferred in it and so that action was disapproved. This new pot endorsement transferability amendment was approved by the secretary on November 21st. The final rule I think will publish this week, maybe tomorrow or the next day.

Amendment 18B, this proposes an endorsement program for the commercial longline sector for golden tilefish. It has a transferability action in it. It allocates the commercial annual catch limit 75 percent to the longline sector and 25 percent to the hook-and-line sector. It has changes to the golden tilefish trip limit. The Notice of Availability for the amendment published on October 26th and the comment period ends on December 26th.

So far there have ten comments; one that is in support of the amendment; eight commented that the recreational allocation is too low; two indicated that the transferability provision gives a public resource to only a select few individuals; and there are two individuals that are against the endorsement program. The final rule should be going up to headquarters today.

Amendment 20A, this is an amendment that allows for transfer of inactive wreckfish shares to active fishermen. The final rule for this published on September 26th and regulations became effective on October 26th.

The Generic Dealer Reporting Amendment would require a single permit for dealers for a number of different fisheries in the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. This amendment was submitted for secretarial review on October 30th and the proposed rule package is under review in the region. That concludes all those items.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions for Jack? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Jack, I appreciate all those updates. Based on the tilefish going to headquarters today; do you have a ballpark figure of how long that is going to take in headquarters?

DR. McGOVERN: It may be published next week or the week after, something like that.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other questions for Jack on any of the amendments or timing? The next two items on our agenda are the Snapper Grouper AP Report and the SSC Report. Because the recommendations from the AP have been incorporated into our decision documents and the AP had a number of different things and a number of different motions that they made with regard to the SSC Report at their meeting, what I would like to do is have Dr. Barbieri come up here to give the SSC Report and then we can get some of the input from the AP on the SSC Report and kind of do a little bit of a tag team. We will have Jim Atack up here with us as we go through some of these amendments to remind us of some of the AP input on these things, if that is okay with everyone.

DR. BARBIERI: Would it be inconvenient if we take like a five- or ten-minute break? I have a short PowerPoint that I was going to provide to staff. It is very short, but I think it will help you in terms of highlighting some of the main items that we discussed and summarizing some of our main decisions and recommendations. I think it would be helpful for the council to see it.

DR. DUVAL: Let's go ahead and take a five-minute break and we will reconvene so we can see the SSC presentation.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. DUVAL: Okay, we will get started again. Like I said, kind of the way I'd like to do this is to let Dr. Barbieri give his report of the SSC meeting and then I'm going to let Jim Atack provide some of the input from the AP with regard to the items that the SSC discussed, and then we can open it up for discussion.

DR. BARBIERI: We had an SSC meeting that was very long. It had a lot of items. I think we had 26 or 27 items on our agenda. What I did was put together a brief summary of the items that I thought would be of the most interest to you, that had more to do with stock assessments or science inputs, and then give you the opportunity to ask questions.

If you have additional questions over the other items that I'm not going into detail in the presentation, I will be glad to pull up the actual report and go over that at your pleasure. The first item would be the discussion on assessment possibilities for shrimp. You may remember last June we discussed the possibility of using the stock synthesis modeling approach for South Atlantic shrimp similar to what was done in the Gulf of Mexico.

Dr. Rick Hart came to the SSC meeting and gave an excellent presentation. It was very well received by the committee. Although we still perceive a few challenges in applying this approach to South Atlantic stocks, the SSC felt that there was promise there. The possibility of using stock synthesis to assess South Atlantic shrimp stocks is there and we recommend proceeding with this exploratory phase hopefully through a SEDAR-like process.

The idea would be we need to really go into more detail into looking at our data sources for shrimp in the South Atlantic and this modeling environment stock synthesis and see how that whole thing fits; so developing a workshop or some kind of SEDAR-like process we feel would the most appropriate way to proceed.

We are requesting the SEDAR Steering Committee, in discussions with all of you, to then provide us some guidance at your earliest convenience on how to structure this workshop and this process for moving forward with shrimp stock assessments. In a nutshell that is the issue for shrimp. Are there any questions?

Seeing none, we will go to the next item. We also dealt with the P-rebuild for black sea bass. The issue came up as the council requested a P-rebuild above a 50 percent probability of rebuilding the stock. Whenever you are actually rebuilding the stock at the F-rebuild, the probability of rebuilding that stock is 50 percent. I believe it was Amendment 18A that the council had requested the probability of overfishing above that 50 percent default value.

The SSC then decided to apply the ABC Control Rule, your control for Tier 1 stocks, and we came up with a P-star of 37.5 percent. Part of our control rule involves calculating this P-rebuild whenever you don't want to use the default 50 percent value.

The P-rebuild would be the 100 percent baseline minus the value of the P-star, so we came up with this 62.5 percent probability of rebuilding for black sea bass. The science center has provided us with those projections, and you can see over here the F value and here the value of landings starting in 2013 associated with this probability of rebuilding. Are there any questions?

MR. HARTIG: You've got two different figures for landings there; which one are we going to be using?

DR. BARBIERI: The landings in thousands of pounds there; the sum is just a cumulative of the cumulative landings year after year. It is the next to the last –

MR. HARTIG: Well, in one column you have got 973 and in the other column you have got 726.

DR. BARBIERI: The one to the left is in thousands of fish.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, thank you.

DR. DUVAL: And I think the AP had a motion recommending that the council go back to a 50 percent probability for P-rebuild, right, Jim?

MR. ATACK: Yes, they would want to go back to 50 because I think on the black sea bass they're thinking that the stock has really rebounded due to the number of fish being caught versus the effort. Originally you could do a 50 percent; and if you went back to a 50 percent, your ACL would be much higher.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other questions or comments on this right now before Luiz moves on? Jim.

MR. ATACK: Yes, your first L column is 973 and your second column is 786,000 pounds, I guess, right?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes.

MR. ATACK: So you're looking at roughly 0.8 pounds maybe per fish is what we're looking at there?

DR. BARBIERI: That sounds about right, yes. The science center has provided a natural report, which, of course, can be made available to you to go into those details on how the actual projections were built. They basically just used the same – my understanding is that they just used the same procedural steps that they had used before for putting together those projections with the exception of changing the probability of rebuild from the 50 percent, the F-rebuild, to that 62.5 percent.

DR. PONWITH: To that point, that is exactly correct. They changed the probability of rebuilding. The other thing that they did was included as much of the actuals for 2012 landings as we had and then used those modifications to rerun the projections.

DR. CRABTREE: And, Luiz, those landings are whole weight, I believe, correct?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, I think so.

DR. CRABTREE: So bear in mind when you look at this the current quotas are in gutted weight, so they're not directly comparable without making a conversion, if you want to look at what this says versus what is on the books.

MR. ATACK: Most black sea bass aren't gutted so I don't know why we're looking at gutted weight versus whole weight. Has anybody gone back to look at the way the stock has rebounded versus the model? It seems like our model is not really keeping up with what went out there. With the early closures and the long period of no fish being caught and the life cycle of the black sea bass and how fast they grow, that is what a lot of fishermen are asking me is it is like the catch per effort is way up, the average weight per fish is way up.

So if we're catching a thousand fish, most of them are in the two to three pounds and not 0.8 pounds so it seems like this whole model ACL needs to be looked at and maybe it should be changed to reflect what we have learned based on how the stock has rebounded versus what has happened.

DR. DUVAL: I think Dr. Ponwith is going to address that. I will just note that we do have a black sea bass update scheduled starting in January.

DR. PONWITH: Just so we understand, this is a rerunning of the projections based on the last assessment going forward with those two changes; the substituting actuals for much of 2012 as we have for landings instead of using projections or assuming that 2012 was identical to 2011; so basically updating the landings and then modifying the probability of rebuilding. These are projections based on the last stock assessment. This isn't a new stock assessment. All the things that you talked about would be incorporated in a new stock assessment and a new stock assessment is schedule.

MR. BELL: Just so I understand this, right now we're still operating under a P-rebuild of 66 percent, right, and this was just what we asked them to look at and 62.5 is what it came out at. Has a similar table been constructed for 50 percent or does that exist?

DR. DUVAL: Didn't that come out of the assessment, Luiz?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, the previous assessment included projections at the F-rebuild. The value of F expected to rebuild is in that maximum timeline and that is at 50 percent probability of rebuilding, so those values are in that last assessment or the projections document that were produced thereafter.

DR. DUVAL: And just remember when we voted on this – I think it was this meeting last year – the council voted to maintain the probability of rebuilding at 66 percent, which is what had been established under the previous assessment. Jim.

MR. ATACK: One more comment. The other thing we talked about when we talked about black sea bass is the way we understand it most of the females are like ten or eleven inches when they switch to males. We proposed as a panel last year of going to twelve inch minimum size commercial, and in this panel meeting we suggested going to thirteen inches across the board to match the recreational.

We felt like if we did that, that you're really not touching your spawning stock females and particularly with the pot industry, also. What used to happen years go, when you were culling everything from ten inches and larger, you were taking out a certain percentage of the female spawning stock which affected your recruits and your MSY.

If we can get to a thirteen inch across the board and the pots changed their mesh size from two inches to two and a half inches or whatever that needs to be, then you really wouldn't be taking out any of your female spawning stock. You could really manage this fishery a lot different than the other fishery and get an MSY and optimum yield much easier because you wouldn't be taking out our females. Then you're still leaving a certain percentage of the males out there to repopulate the females.

MR. HARTIG: To address Jim's question a little bit about what people are seeing, we have a time period between assessments which becomes problematic at times, and very often our assessments get behind on their rebuilding. It is evident from the fishery-independent sampling

that Bonnie has initiated that is going to be able to be used in the assessment, the independent samples show exactly the same thing the fishermen are seeing now.

They didn't before but they are now, so that information will be incorporated in the assessment. Hopefully, this next assessment will show those results. We are seeing the same kinds of things. It is just that the lag between the assessments is complicating the issue.

DR. DUVAL: And also, Jim, I know that suggestion for a 13-inch size limit came up when you all were discussing Regulatory Amendment 14 which the council isn't going to review until we get to our March meeting next year due to the analyses involved. That recommendation will be brought forward in that amendment as well. All right, I think I would like to let Dr. Barbieri move on.

DR. BARBIERI: Moving on to the vermilion snapper assessment update, this was a very thorough update that came up with the outcome of stock not overfished nor undergoing overfishing. The assessment was done in a way where we were able to use the MSY estimate directly, the estimate of MSY instead of an SPR proxy, which to some extent decreases the uncertainty that we have about that estimate.

The SSC felt that the assessment actually had handled uncertainty in general very well and more thoroughly than the last benchmark. When we applied the ABC Control Rule, we actually came up with a value of P-star that was higher than the last time around. It came up with a P-star of 40 percent given the fact that the assessment actually accounted for the uncertainties more thoroughly and had an estimate of MSY, a direct estimate that was reliable and we didn't have to use the SPR proxy.

Based on that, we have asked and the center has provided those projections with a P-star of 40 percent, you can see right here in the beginning of 2013 the P-star value of 40 percent, and that gives us a different ABC estimate there for vermilion snapper. Another issue that we were asked to look at was potential impact of discards, if there were any concerns regarding discarding of vermilion snapper.

We could not detect from the results of this assessment any major impact from discards, nothing that raised any red flags. However, we felt that it would be good to have the following assessment for vermilion snapper in 2015, if at all possible; and if not, hopefully no later than 2016.

DR. CRABTREE: I think I heard you say that because you switched away from the proxy into an estimate the uncertainty was reduced, so are you telling us that you have confidence in the stock-recruitment relationship and that it is well described and well known here?

DR. BARBIERI: Well, a couple of things; number one is the ABC Control Rule is actually structured in a way that it penalizes you for not taking uncertainty into account. Whenever you have to have use an SPR proxy, you are operating on basically a per recruit basis. You cannot really fully account for that recruitment variability into the assessment, so that is not as good a

way to account for uncertainty. Having the MSY estimate directly provided a better accountability of that uncertainty.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I understand that there is the penalty in that so if you don't use the proxy the penalty goes down, but that is kind of a contrived thing we have set up to be that way. The real question comes do you really – it seems to me as we shift towards estimates of MSY rather than proxies, we're putting more emphasis on the stock-recruit relationship that drives that and yet that is probably one of the things that is most poorly estimated in these assessments and that we don't have a good handle on, and so that is a concern to me.

The way we have set up these penalties it may reduce uncertainty, but I'm not sure in the real world of things that we aren't actually injecting more uncertainty in these assessments by relying on the stock-recruitment relationship. It seems to me at the minimum if we move in the direction of using estimates, that we're likely to have stock assessments that are going to bounce around an awful lot more than they do when you're relying on a proxy.

DR. BARBIERI: Well, again, a couple of things. The MSY estimate, the direct MSY estimate, yes, that relies on the stock-recruitment relationship. We looked at the diagnostics the assessment provided for that steepness estimate, and we felt that it was actually reliable. It was estimated with a degree of confidence that we felt could be directly used instead of the proxy.

But keep in mind every time they make a choice to use an SPR proxy, you're actually not fully accounting for the recruitment variability. Keep in mind that the idea is if there is a certain degree of uncertainty and variability in recruitment, we have to take that into account. Every time they use a proxy you don't fully account for that variability and uncertainty.

So, yes, in a way the MSY estimate involves a higher degree of uncertainty and a higher degree of variability in recruitment; but if that is actually representative of the true recruitment in the population, if it is highly variable, we need to account for that. Expressing your reference points on a per recruit basis doesn't fully account for that. As we progress to use this P-star method, we are trying to more and more make sure that we have that uncertainty properly accounted for, including that recruitment variability to the extent possible.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, the only thing – and I will let you move on, Michelle – the only thing I would add here though it is very difficult for management to deal with assessment results that bounce around a lot because an assumption has changed. It also I think has a really bad impact on the public's perception of what is going on.

I hope you all bear in mind the need to have some level of continuity and consistency in these assessments. I think in some cases we have gotten so involved in having the perfect assessment that we lose sight of the need to have some continuity in the scientific advice. Otherwise, it becomes very difficult for management to react to.

DR. BARBIERI: I understand that, Roy. The thing is this latest reauthorization of the Act and what the agency's guidance that comes through National Standard 1 is for us to build that buffer

between OFL and ABC based on the scientific uncertainty. Measuring the real amount of that uncertainty becomes a key issue for us in building that buffer.

The P-star method actually assumes that uncertainty is properly accounted for. Every time you have a reference point result that comes out as an SPR on a per recruit basis, you end up with a distribution that is actually artificially narrower than it should be and it is not then accounting for that uncertainty. Yes, I understand the management constraints that brings in a way because it adds a degree of uncertainty into your assessment scenarios that may not be desirable. On the other hand, we find that is the only way for us to account properly for that uncertainty and apply the P-star method.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other questions or comments about the vermilion update? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I noticed that you recommended an assessment in 2015 or 2016 and we kicked that yesterday.

DR. DUVAL: We did.

DR. CRABTREE: We kicked an update; were you recommending an update then or a new benchmark at that point?

DR. BARBIERI: I don't actually remember what we discussed regarding update or benchmark; but considering the quality of this update, the fact that the model seemed to be well suited for the data, I don't envision a need for a benchmark this next time around. I think an update might be sufficient. It is hard to tell once you actually start putting that all together.

MR. CUPKA: I just noticed in the SSC report in our briefing book it refers to a vermilion snapper update and not a benchmark.

DR. DUVAL: So that might be something that we reconsider when we go through the SEDAR report. Jim, you had a comment?

MR. ATACK: Yes, a couple of things. The P-star at 40 percent gives you a P-rebuild of like 60 percent, right, and in black sea bass we're looking at 62.5. Now, are you looking at the average weight per fish in the landings; because as the stock rebuilds – here you're looking at probably close to one pound per fish, right – as the average weight goes up, if we're looking at ACLs and we hit the limit and close the fishery, we're leaving a lot more fish out there than what maybe the model is saying if we're using one pound per fish because now we're saying we're only pulling 600,000 fish instead of 1.3 million fish. Are we really looking at what is actually happening there? I've got another question after that.

DR. BARBIERI: Right, but to that point first, Jim, this update is fairly recent and I think you used data through 2011, right; so the landings data and the indices and the age composition, all of that is fairly recent and it should represent the reality out there. Now, of course, as the stock rebuilds and the average weight increases, this is why we're asking for another update in 2015

and no later than 2016 so as the stock rebuilds we can actually catch up. It means basically what Ben was talking about. There is a lag between the time that we do the assessment and then there are a few years that a stock rebuilds and then we do another assessment and it goes like that.

MR. ATACK: Yes, are we actually having the data, though? As we have the electronic reporting on the landings, do we know what the average size is per fish? I think in our area I would say the average size per fish is probably much higher than one pound. That is one question.

The other thing is on the recreational side I guess there are lots of fish being left on the table. Right now we're looking at 8 percent of the ACL. In one of the motions that came up in the AP was why do we have closed season recreationally for the B-liners if we're not hitting the ACL? One of the motions was to just let the B-liners be open year round for the recreational side.

DR. DUVAL: And I think, again, that is something that would come up when we address Regulatory Amendment 14. There were various options in there for modifying or potentially eliminating the closed season for vermilion snapper recreationally. Anna, you had a question.

MS. BECKWITH: The assessment indicated that there was a trend of decreasing biomass and some slowly increasing fishing pressure mortality, so is that one of the reasons why we're looking for an update so quickly in 2015?

DR. BARBIERI: No, that phrase in the actual summary and from the assessment summary is actually looking at the entire time series. They start in the fifties and go forward. When you look that far back compared to nowadays, yes, the biomass has been reduced and fishing mortality has increased, but that doesn't reflect the time period from the last assessment. It doesn't actually – the outcome of the assessment did not show any pattern of overfishing or that the stock is overfished. The stock is actually at a sustainable level now.

MR. HARTIG: I'm sorry, Madam Chairman, I can't leave this steepness argument without having to say at least a couple things. As we got into the weeds on steepness, when you choose a proxy, you actually choose the value of steepness. They're connected so you actually fix steepness when you choose the proxy.

I mean when you could estimate it, it is supposed to be better as an estimated primer and it is supposed to have some relative link to productivity in the stock if it is in the stock-recruitment curve. In black sea bass we had a steepness of 0.6 that came from the proxy and then we estimated a 0.4, so your productivity of black sea bass goes down substantially, your rebuilding program changes and your assessments are no longer comparable and getting to the point where Roy says of some continuity in management between the two.

As we go through this process, I understand your points in better estimating the uncertainties and all, but somehow to have some kind of continuity to look at the assessment to assessment, and we can't even do that. We can't have continuity runs between the assessments to get any idea of where we were between the two assessments. That is particularly troublesome to me. Having

been involved in this assessment process from the beginning and seeing assessments that would build on one another as we went through and there was continuity and we could see the changes in rebuilding, and it made sense. Now the public, as Roy said, is very confused by the changes. When you change the parameters of assessment, especially steepness, you change the productivity and the rebuilding schedule. That is all I have to say, but it is problematic.

DR. BARBIERI: Ben, I don't disagree one bit. As you look at the science of stock assessments, there is absolutely no doubt in anybody's mind that it is a very uncertain science. They are trying to integrate a variety of data sources and age composition of the catch and the population and a number of things that at this point, as we know, we haven't had a long history of measuring well in the southeast U.S., so we are still suffering from some of those data deficiencies that are being corrected now.

More recently we are addressing some of those issues and getting better data that will hopefully give us more reliable assessments. We recognize that there is a degree of uncertainty and the instability results is symptomatic of the fact that we have deficiencies in data over the long time series that create problems.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, just because I can't resist it, but that is the problem and Ben hits on it. As we shift away from proxies and towards estimating these things, which are very poorly known, the steepness, we're shifting towards less stability in these assessments. I think what you're hearing from me and what you're hearing from Ben, we don't want less stability.

We want more continuity and we want more of an emphasis on stability in these assessments. I understand there are reasons for going in the other direction, but I think what you're hearing from our view is those benefits are offset by the downsides of them, which is assessments that one year you're overfishing; oh, you've got a new assessment, you weren't overfishing after all and they bounce all around.

My fear with of these like sea bass, we will get another benchmark and we will get a very different estimate of steepness; because I just think it is one of the most uncertain things that we have and yet it has a huge impact on the outcome of the assessment in terms of stock status. I think that is what you're hearing from us if we're asking you guys to put more emphasis on continuity and stability, understanding there are downsides to that, but it is really important to us that we not have these assessment results bounce all around because of some uncertain parameters. I know we will never resolve all this, but that is just kind of the message I think you're hearing.

DR. BARBIERI: And I understand the message and I know the disconnect. This is historic and you see everywhere managers and scientists will have those points of disagreement because managers want to have fairly certain answers that are basically yes or no, thumbs up or thumbs down, direct guidance that is understandable.

At times, more often than not, we express our answers in terms of probabilities and they are not as transparent or straightforward as they should be. I think what we are trying to do is provide

you with a picture of the status of the stocks and dynamics of stocks that is as true as possible. If the stocks are not stable over time, the assessment could not artificially represent that level of stability. Keep in mind every time that you deal with an SPR proxy and a poor recruit reference point, you are really getting an artificial picture of stability that does not fully represent the dynamics of the stocks. We get into this conundrum and I understand that it creates problems for you. It is the same thing I deal with in Florida trying to discuss this with the management side of the agency.

I know it is not simple but it is very difficult for us to reconcile our assessment procedures with the guidelines that the agency has provided and in building those buffers without properly accounting for that uncertainty in a way that we see is realistic. I understand it is problematic and to the extent possible we are going to try to bring a level of stability that provides you with a more consistent advice.

DR. DUVAL: This is it, Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Luiz, once you have estimated it from a stock-recruit curve, now will it be re-estimated again at some other time? Is that a possibility or will there be stability in the estimated estimate?

DR. DUVAL: It is too early for that kind of talk.

DR. BARBIERI: Keep in mind the fish are being born and fish are dying everyday. Our job is really to represent the dynamics and you have strong and weaker cohorts and the recruitment fluctuates over time, and you have a whole bunch moving pieces there. So to expect that a fish population is simply not biologically possible that productivity value is going to remain constant because there is more prey or less prey, there is cold or warmer water, all sorts of environmental factors that will change that productivity over time.

DR. CRABTREE: That means it will be re-estimated every time, right?

DR. BARBIERI: Absolutely, yes, sir.

DR. DUVAL: I think what Luiz is saying is that you can kind of pick where you want to get your criticism from the public. The public has become increasingly involved in the assessment. We have more folks who are attending the data workshops, who are attending different parts of the assessment. There has been criticism about assumed parameters.

On the other hand, we can get criticism about things bouncing around more as the scientific community tries to account for those different levels of uncertainty. That is something that I think we're just going to continue to struggle with. The message has been delivered that the management side would like to see a little bit more stability so that folks are not wondering, well, what is it going to be this year, the next time we get an update. The scientists are struggling with trying to minimize as much as possible the uncertainty that we face. I think

we're going to have public criticism no matter which way we go. John, I saw you had your hand up. This is it, John gets the last word.

MR. JOLLEY: Just a comment about semantics; maybe we ought to tell the public what it really is. It is the dynamic instability of the oceanic stocks. It is always unstable.

DR. BARBIERI: If we haven't had enough discussion, I guess we're going to have some more now because we are going into the red porgy assessment update. This update actually provided an outcome of the stock still being overfished but no longer undergoing overfishing. You can see here a time series of spawning stock biomass and that we're still below what the MSST value is. In terms of fishing mortality we have reduced it significantly and it has been bouncing around right below the level of MFMT.

There were a number of issues that were discussed during the SSC meeting that we felt were problematic. One is that the estimate of steepness we felt was fairly low, which as Ben pointed out before reflects the fact that the stock is not at a high productivity level. Since this was an update, we felt, well, there is really no way that the assessment team could have fully explored the issues here.

Some of us had concerns about the data series going into this, that instability in landings particularly from the headboat landings series, before 1980 – you know, instability in landings at that time that the model was trying to fit created some challenges with this steepness estimate. One of the questions that came up was what is the degree of certainty that we have with red porgy reporting, whether we had really those early landings representing red porgy; or since porgies way back when were all reported as porgy, maybe we had some identification issues or some reporting problems.

The update was very thorough and very well conducted, but it couldn't really explore that fully given the nature of what it is to conduct an update instead of a benchmark. We are requesting that the next assessment for red porgy be a benchmark and we expect the issue to be explored more fully next time.

One of the troubling outcomes of the assessment was looking at that rebuilding scenario, none of the projections, including projections with fishing mortality set equal to zero, none of them allow rebuilding within the timeframe that we would have to have, the Tmax being the timeframe for rebuilding the stock, which will be 2018.

Here you can see the probability of rebuilding and we didn't have by 2018 a 50 percent probability of rebuilding the stock. That didn't happen until I guess 2021 or thereabouts. The SSC struggled with this issue; and after much discussion decided to take advantage of a provision in the National Standard Guidelines that actually recommends that if a stock is not fully rebuilt within Tmax, that you set fishing mortality equal to 75 percent of MSY or the F-rebuild, whichever is less.

Since in this case F-rebuild was not going to get the job done, the SSC recommended setting ABC equal to yield at 75 percent of MSY. Another convenient outcome of this is that this value of 75 percent of MSY is very close to what the fishing mortality estimated for discards in this fishery.

Basically this would bring a situation where you can remain at this 75 percent of Fmsy level and not have to consider any major closed areas like had to be considered at some point for red snapper. The fishing mortality due to discards is fairly comparable to what the level of ABC is being recommended by the SSC. I think this is it as far as red porgy.

MR. HARTIG: It is really concerning about the discards. If you look at the discard rate in the last three years, you have a threefold decline in commercial in 2009 and sixfold in 2010 and an eightfold decline in discards in 2011. If they're using 2011 value of discards – and I'm asking you because I don't know if that is what used or if they used an average amount. That goes from each fishery. Each fishery shows the same significant decline in discards. That is pretty significant.

DR. BARBIERI: To tell the truth, Ben, I don't remember specifically, but I believe that the F-discards represent a combination of the levels of discard – the fishing mortality that is represented by the level of discards from all the fisheries combined. If you look at the total indirect harvest, the total mortality of red porgy due to discards in all the different fisheries, that value should be approximately to 0.13 F, which is very similar to 75 percent Fmsy.

That is why we felt that would provide a fairly non-controversial stopgap until we can have a benchmark for red porgy. The red porgy benchmark would be needed. There are issues that need to be further explored that could not be explored in an update, but in the meantime the discard mortality would not further compromise the rebuilding.

DR. DUVAL: Yesterday we did request that red porgy be included for a benchmark in 2014 during the SEDAR Committee meeting. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Just to clarify this in my own mind, this means that we would not have to change our current ACLs for the commercial and recreational? We would be at status quo or we would have to shut the ACL down and accommodate just for discards?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, right, the directed fishery would have to be shut down and you fishing mortality coming just from discards.

DR. DUVAL: And a reduction in the ACL.

DR. BARBIERI: Right.

DR. DUVAL: I think it is like a 70,000 pound reduction or something like that. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: So the ABC you're giving us for landed catch is zero.

DR. BARBIERI: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Do you have a graph that showed the fishing mortality rates? I think you did, didn't you, in your presentation?

DR. BARBIERI: Not in the presentation, I don't think so, no.

DR. DUVAL: Table 24 that is in the red porgy assessment update has all the projection results with the fishing mortality rate fixed at 75 percent of Fmsy, if folks are interested in looking at what those F rates are. Gregg is going to clarify something regarding an ABC for us here.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, the ABC that we have received from the SSC has already been adjusted for discards, so the ABC is the landings that can be realized. It does mean we need to lower our ACLs and look at whether or not you want to change your management. It doesn't mean that the ACL is zero landings.

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, my misunderstanding there – my understanding from the SSC meeting had been that value of 75 percent – John Carmichael, right. John was there and since he is the staff that usually helps us with the SSC, my understanding is that the level of 75 percent Fmsy was approximately equal to the fishing mortality that is associated with the discards. Am I incorrect there?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think so. I don't believe that is how they discussed it. They discussed it about being not really a directed fishery; that there would be removals and they recognized the 75 percent Fmsy level as being basically not something that people were going out and necessarily targeting on, but they're encountering with the relatively low trip limits you have now at kind of a bycatch offsetting type level, which is very different than, say, you had a very high trip limit and you encouraged them to go out and catch those fish over a particular period of time.

That is my understanding of it and I think that is what they were trying to reflect in their recommendation because I think that is part of the guidance about if you're not progressing and then to try and hold it down to like a bycatch level basically, but not that it is in any way landings are zero.

I think the numbers that the SSC recommended were the full landings and discards because the projection tables included the column of both. I was just trying to pull up the report and see which number they actually put in the report, but the assessment tables show you landings, discards and the total.

As we know, it is the discards based on the discarding patterns that are current; so anything you do that changes the regulations obviously changes those discard patterns and would have an impact, but at least it gives you an idea of given your status quo regulations what is discarded and what has been observed in terms of discarding over the last couple of years.

DR. DUVAL: Myra is going to go ahead and put Table 24 from the red porgy assessment update up on the screen just so that folks can see the projections of discards, landings and the totals at that 75 percent Fmsy level. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we get confused sometimes by the word "bycatch"; and under the statute "bycatch" means discard; throw them back. A fish that is incidentally caught and retained isn't bycatch. We talk about bycatch allowances a lot and so I am still not exactly clear where we are and what the ABC is right now.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You will see it here in here the table what the SSC recommended. Now, this stock is under a rebuilding plan so the ABC is going to be based on the rebuilding plan that you choose. The SSC is recommending that they would be comfortable with the rebuilding maintaining at 75 percent of Fmsy, which is what at least they thought and what I thought is consistent with the guidance that we have.

DR. CRABTREE: And it is and I'm good with that. The question is, okay, so how many pounds of fish can we land; what is the landed catch ABC? That is where I think we're confused because I don't know what that number is.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's that number in the table. As I said, it is your choice essentially. You see the far column, which is Sum L; that is the sum of the landings and the discards from this projection. That is what I believe the SSC was recommending for the total ABC.

DR. CRABTREE: So in 2013 we can land 306,000 pounds of fish? This is the confusing thing about these projections. When we pull up the red snapper projection, we're told we can't – we get the same sort of table. It has a big value for landed fish but we're told, no, you can't land that because the discards are actually much higher. That is where a lot of the confusion is coming from is how these are laid out, and it is not clear to us when does the discard and landed catch actually mean something and when does it not.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think part of it is when you have to take it within the context of when this projection is done and whether or not you change your management from that. In the case of red snapper you greatly changed your management approach so then therefore the projections that had a separate column of discards no longer were really representative of what you were doing.

DR. CRABTREE: Then why did they give us those tables if they're not representative of reality? It is a problem with how the tables are, but what you're saying in this case, because management has been stable, they think this is representative of reality and so the estimate of L a thousand pounds for each year is what we're allowed to land?

MR. CARMICHAEL; That is correct and it assuming then another amount that would be occurring for discards, which in this case is over the limits are closed seasons or size limits of what have you because you have all of those regulations in place. That gives you an example of

what you can expect those discards to be given the trends that are expected in population abundance if you don't change your regulations.

DR. CRABTREE: And so that leaves us with some reduction in the ACL?

DR. DUVAL: That is what I was referring to you; and just to clarify for folks that final column on the end that is covered up on the screen that says "sum of landings"; that just a cumulative running total of landings, just to make sure everybody understands that. You have your column – I think what folks need to focus on is that column of discards, which says "D" with thousand pound next to it and landings thousand pound next to it. So for 2013 the landed catch would be 306,000 pounds, and we currently have that ACL split 50/50 I believe between the commercial and recreations sectors. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Using that column, the decision, when you get to talking about this, is whether you're going to allow the ACL to change each year from – it could be as high as 306,000 pounds in 2013, and then you can see how that number increases over time to get to 401,000 in 2018; whether you use each individual year or whether you use the average of that. Right now hour ABC and ACL is 395,304 pounds, so there needs to be a slight reduction in your ACL. Then you will need to determine whether or not you want to change your trip limits and bag limits.
DR. DUVAL: So is everyone relatively clear on this at this point? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Luiz, what is the total MSY we're rebuilding back to? It was in metric on that earlier slide.

DR. BARBIERI: It should be in this document. I don't remember really what the value is, but I'm sure that there was a table here before the projections that will have – here it is. It is PDF Page 43, so MSY is 834,000 pounds.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And, Michelle, before we go too far, it would be very nice if the council would make a motion as to whether or not they support the SSC's recommendation for continuing on the rebuilding plan of the 75 percent of Fmsy. As I said, that is a recommendation and it is up to the council. The F-rebuild and all that stuff, that is a council choice. If you support that, it would be helpful down the road to have a motion so we know exactly what the advice is based upon.

DR. DUVAL: So that said, is there anyone willing to put forth **a motion at this point to accept the SSC recommendation for red porgy, which would be set the F equal to 75 percent of the maximum fishing mortality threshold.**

MR. HARTIG: So moved, Madam Chairman.

MR. WAUGH: And while you all are thinking about this, we also need some guidance on which amendment you want these changes to be included within. I don't know whether Myra had anticipated this being discussed as part of the SSC report or when we get to those amendments. We're going to be talking about a potential emergency request for vermilion and we would need

to know which amendment that is going into as well. We're suggesting perhaps Amendment 27. I would think that you would want to do red porgy at the same time. That would go out to public hearings in January and you will finalize in March.

DR. DUVAL: And just a reminder, Amendment 27 is the one that has the actions for blue runner, I believe, and Nassau grouper, I think.

DR. CRABTREE: And that is a plan amendment; correct?

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: It seems to me what we need here for red porgy is a framework action because all we seem to have to do is to adjust the ACL and maybe we want to look at the trip limit; I don't know. Depending on what you want to do with vermilion, whether you do an emergency rule or you don't, you're going to need a framework action to come in and make an adjustment there to the ACL. It seems to me we could do another framework action that make appropriate adjustments for vermilion and red porgy.

MR. WAUGH: And we have this laid out for you to discuss. Roy is absolutely right; we could do a whole 'nother separate framework, which is yet another document. Our feeling was since we had one that was going to be on that same time period, maybe save some administrative workload. Right now we're tracking just on our side eight – well, we got rid of shrimp so we have got seven amendments right now, and so each one you add is just more. Whether it be done as a separate one or folded into one that is already on track, we have that asking you for your guidance.

MR. HARTIG: That is not the only option. We can do it through emergency action and then set the amendment time back by 300 and some days. In red snapper, when you had to close the fishery, you did it by emergency action. We use emergency action to do those things. This is unforeseen and we didn't know this was coming and we didn't know we weren't going to meet the rebuilding timeframe. You could use emergency action to do this; therefore, giving the staff more time to work on an amendment over time.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, just remember, though, it doesn't give the staff more time because it actually puts more work on them because now they have got to do the emergency action. In the case of vermilion maybe we have some justification. In the case of red porgy it wouldn't be an emergency action.

It would be an interim rule. I guess you could do that but it seems to me that the – I don't believe we have ever hit the ACL for red porgy; so if we did hit it, it is likely it would be late in the year, and I think you could potentially get a framework done in that amount of time before it became an issue.

DR. DUVAL: We have a motion on the floor to accept the SSC's recommendation for red porgy ABC set at 75 percent of Fmsy. That is a motion by Ben; seconded by David. Is there more discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: We need to wordsmith that a little because you're setting the ABC at a fishing mortality rate, so it would be the yield that corresponds to that. You might want to indicate what that number is and what table given all the discussion we went through so that we're clear about it. I guess we're talking about the table in the SSC report; is that what it was?

DR. DUVAL: That is correct; it is Table 24, which is PDF Page 50 of the red porgy assessment update. Roy, does that give you a little bit more comfort in terms of what the numbers are going to be? I think the concern on the part of staff is that we have not given any direction with regard to whether or not we're going to continue to use the projected landings that are in that table which increase each year if we're going to use some average for setting the ACL.

MR. HARTIG: We can deal with that as well. In my opinion we're having an update next year. I'm comfortable with using the numbers that are coming out from the projections as they are until we get the update.

DR. DUVAL: We're doing a benchmark in 2014.

MR. HARTIG: Benchmark, excuse me.

DR. DUVAL: We hope. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: So with this motion you're saying that the yields are going to increase each year?

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: And then you're going to have to build in here that is contingent upon not going over in the previous year and all those other kinds of things, but I guess that can be done in the framework action when we finally actually do these things.

MR. WAUGH: And I'm not sure we have decided that we're going to use the individual years. It is just referring to the table because the ABC recommendations are that column of numbers for thousands of pounds landings for 2013 through 2018. That is the stream of ABCs until we get another set of numbers.

If we're talking about only specifying it for 2013 and 2014, I would suggest we deal with all of that in the framework document or the plan amendment, wherever we're going to do it and determine at that time what values you are going to use. Are you going to average those two or how do you want to do it?

DR. DUVAL: It sounds like we don't necessarily need all of that verbiage that is in the motion right now; is that what you're saying?

MR. WAUGH: Well, no, I'm saying all the verbiage is doing is trying to tell you what the ABC is, because that is what the SSC has recommended as an ABC to you. That ABC in 2013 is 306,000 pounds; 2014 it is 309,000 pounds; and the question is then when you set your ACL, how are you going to set your ACL?

Are you going to let it increase each year or are you going to average some set of years? Right now what we're doing is accepting the SSC's recommendation on ABC, which is that column of numbers for the years 2013 through 2018, and 2018 is the end of the rebuilding period and that is why it is cut off there.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, I'm sorry, I was just confused thinking that you wanted additional detail knowing that really would come in whatever vehicle we choose to use to do this. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I'm okay. I guess the motion is essentially just accepting the ABCs we have.

DR. DUVAL: Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Just know that we're going to have to have some conversation a bit later in the meeting with regard to what vehicle we want to use for this. **The motion is to accept the SSC's recommendation for red porgy ABC set at the yield at 75 percent of Fmsy based on Table 24 of the red porgy assessment report, using landings in thousands of pounds for 2013 through 2018.** Is there anymore discussion? Any objection? **Seeing none; that motion stands approved**. I would like to let Dr. Barbieri continue with the rest of his SSC report.

DR. BARBIERI: By the way, Madam Chair, I think I'm going to have to go into the SSC's documented report because my misunderstanding is now represented in the language that is in that report. I will revise the language and actually add this table to the report to clarify the issue. Okay, moving on to the wreckfish analysis, you may recall that not having a full quantitative assessment for wreckfish in the South Atlantic we had an ABC recommendation that came out of an analysis that was done with one of the data poor methods, DC-AC, depletion-corrected average catch.

We received from you direction to evaluate two other analysis that were brought to your attention regarding wreckfish and proposed as alternative analysis and potential ways to revise the existing ABC recommendation for wreckfish. We had a presentation from Dr. Doug Butterworth. He presented a statistical catch-at-age analysis for wreckfish.

Then we had Dr. Alec MacCall that presented another analysis that he conducted that would be basically a DBSRA, depletion-based stock reduction analysis, for wreckfish with some analytical adjustments there. To make a long story short, the outcome of those presentations and the discussion with the SSC was that both analysis actually were presented more in the light of being exploratory in nature and not fully completed at that point.

At least from Dr. Butterworth we actually were told that he was expecting the SSC to evaluate those preliminary documents that he brought to the committee and then perhaps come up with some suggestions for additional runs that would be conducted overnight and presented to the committee again the next day.

We in general felt that those analyses did not have the proper level of documentation. We did not have in front of us as a committee from those reports that they brought up really any way to evaluate the data sources that were used in the analysis or a full set of diagnostics that would let us really evaluate the quality of the products and outputs of the analysis.

We thought that what had been presented was not sufficient for us to then proceed and revise our existing ABC recommendation. We did not re-evaluate an ABC recommendation for wreckfish, and we suggested a follow-up workshop using some kind of a SEDAR-like framework. Ideally they would have Dr. MacCall and Dr. Butterworth involved and providing the main analytical expertise there, but this would be done through SEDAR or through some version of SEDAR that would be able to then assimilate this external analysis, but something that would vet the data, vet the methodology in more detail and allow further documentation of the analysis for the SSC to review.

We're requesting your guidance and the SEDAR Steering Committee's guidance in how this would be structured going forward. We felt that the analyses were informative. We thought that the discussion was good, but it wasn't really the full product ready for us to use to make a revised ABC recommendation.

DR. CRABTREE: Luiz, I think when we had the original DCA analysis, the SSC had a subgroup that worked on it. Would a possibility here be to have an SSC subgroup meet with Dr. MacCall and Dr. Butterworth, spend a day on this or so, two days if it took it, and come up with some recommendation for a catch level out of that that would then be presented to the full SSC as a less costly and less time-consuming alternative to a SEDAR Workshop?

DR. BARBIERI: No, that is not what the SSC intended, and I will explain why.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I can understand it may be not what they intended. I am asking you why couldn't we do it that way?

DR. BARBIERI: Well, I think we could if that is the council's recommendation. I think the SSC would be ready to proceed from your guidance, but what we felt would be the most value to you is to have a process where the data and the analysis were vetted and discussed in more detail. What we did before with DC-AC analysis was a lot simpler.

DC-AC is a data-poor application methodology that doesn't require really the level of analysis and the level of diagnostics that it would have to have to use a statistical catch at age for wreckfish when we don't really have good information on the age composition and catch.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I understand. I'm just trying to find a way to get to a catch-level recommendation without having to give up a slot on SEDAR or without having to wait two or three years to get it done. If we want to get something done in a timely fashion here, I think we would be talking bumping an assessment off, which we don't get enough assessments as it is so that is difficult.

DR. BARBIERI: To that point, Roy, the idea would not be to have wreckfish go through the usual SEDAR process. The SEDAR would have the possibility of expanding its framework that exists to accommodate situations such as this, similar to what was done, for example, with the yellowtail snapper assessment, which FWC conducted.

We did not actually conduct a data workshop or assessment workshop. We did the assessment in house. We vetted with our own assessment group and then we brought that to a full review by CIE and we requested the center's assistance and the agency's assistant with that, but we had a full assessment that was done through SEDAR but did not follow that calendar. But still it was reviewed by a panel of independent experts before it came to SSC. That would be the idea.

DR. DUVAL: I have Bonnie and then David, and I will just note that this prompted the discussion at the SSC about what we discussed yesterday in the SEDAR Committee having guidelines or parameters for some kind of process that is SEDAR like. Bonnie and then David.

DR. PONWITH: That is really my point; the decision on what to do with this information on wreckfish is bigger than the decision about what to do with wreckfish. It is how do you deal with third party stock assessments and that is a huge, huge discussion. But just for the point of illustration I'll use this very specific case.

We have been working really hard to devise a system for conducting stock assessments that is as limber as it can be, balancing with that the desire for it to be fairly inclusive and as transparent as possible. The fact of the matter is because of those combinations of things, it is not particularly limber. In other words, it takes a long time to get a stock assessment done in a way that meets the standards we have established for best available scientific information.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center and I believe the SSC and the SEDAR team, which resides within the South Atlantic Council's staff, are all pushed pretty much to the tipping point in terms of through-put right now as the SEDAR process is currently devised. My question is that as you contemplate how to deal with third party stock assessments, that if you're considering alternatives that require the time of the SSC, that time then has to be subtracted from what is available for carrying out the SEDAR process as it is current devised. You have to be really, really careful about saying, well, let's create an SSC sub-team for two days to look at this, because all of that in a zero sum balance then are two days fewer that the SSC has available to apply to benchmarks and updates that are currently on the docket.

The same thing is true of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center in terms of being able to evaluate a third party product and determine whether it does represent best available scientific information. The main point of this is making this decision plays into the broader decision of

how we want to handle those third party assessments. I urge you to be very, very careful about how you weigh the costs and the benefits of this. Thank you.

MR. CUPKA: Bonnie made some of the same point I was going bring up. This issue that we're talking about here is specific to wreckfish, but it is a much bigger issue than just wreckfish. Part of the problem is that we don't have a policy in place for how we deal with third party assessments, and we're going to have some discussion on this issue at the Executive Finance Committee.

It was my understanding that the SSC or maybe it was Bonnie's group was working on some kind of requirements or specifications that people would have to go through if they wanted to have an assessment done under this system. There was a lot of discussion I think, Luiz, at the SSC meeting about the fact that if the SSC was going to be involved in this they needed to be involved from the very beginning and not when somebody brings them a document and says here it is.

Somebody has got to develop those guidelines that would have to be followed if we set a policy for accepting third party assessments. Right now we don't even have a policy for dealing with that so we need to discuss that at our Executive Finance Committee meeting. That is not going to help with this issue with wreckfish which we have before us now. I'm not sure how we're going to proceed with that, but we do need to address this larger policy issue also.

DR. DUVAL: I think Luiz would like to say something about what the SSC plans to do at this meeting in April.

DR. BARBIERI: Right, and just a point of clarification. What the SSC was trying to do here is not simply say, well, okay, we don't want to deal with this. Here are reports that are too short, not thorough enough, not presenting all the details that we would have to have so we're going to simply not even consider them.

We looked at them, but we're trying to come up with some suggestion to help the council understand that for us to provide you with the best scientific advice we need to have the opportunity to look at these documents thoroughly. We feel that sometimes getting this after the fact reports like this don't really allow us to vet and evaluate and review those documents properly.

We actually during this last meeting we put together a little subcommittee that is developing some recommendations and suggestions. It is trying to provide the framework that Dave brought up that would then give you a starting point and some suggestions and recommendations on how to handle these third party scientific products or assessments and consider that you and the SEDAR Steering Committee would take it from there.

We wanted to get started and do something that we feel would be productive and offer some suggestions on how to get that resolved. We should have that report ready before the next SSC

meeting, potentially for action before then. But if not, at the latest at the next meeting in April we will revisit and discuss this issue.

DR. DUVAL: And I think that is an appropriate approach. This is potentially a precedent-setting thing and I don't think we want the SSC to rush into doing something because we do have these two other third party assessments that have come through. Are there any other questions or concerns about this? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So where does that leave us. I think it is great that the SSC is going to look at this and provide some advice and recommendations to the council for future third party analyses that they receive, but where does that leave us, Michelle, with these particular two analyses and what the SSC recommended?

DR. BARBIERI: Just to clarify, Monica, basically the SSC felt the content – and this is more explicit in our actual full report, but the content of these reports were not sufficient for us to have a full evaluation of the outcome of those analyses. We decided not to use those analyses to make any recommendation. We considered them to be preliminary.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I understand that and I think it is clear and you made it clear. I also wanted to say just overall I appreciate the PowerPoint presentation that you provided, too, and hopefully Mike will distribute that by e-mail or something to all the council members. I guess then my question is to Michelle where does that leave us with these two analyses and how is the council going to deal with what the SSC has recommended?

I guess there should be some discussion as to whether you want to wait until the SSC provides you some sort of framework or now that you have these two analyses, although they may be incomplete and too short for the SSC to provide a revised ABC, whether you want to take some sort of action along the lines of what the SSC said and do some additional SEDAR-type analyses or what.

I guess you could kind of use this – on the one hand you could use it as an experiment, I guess, just to see how this process would work and that might further inform the SSC subcommittee. I think you have got a couple of different ways you could go and maybe we need some more discussion on that.

DR. DUVAL: I think what you were saying right there at the end, that is kind of how I envisioned this and I think potentially how the SSC envisioned this as well is that – you know, right now we depend on the SSC to provide us with the scientific recommendations for our catch limits and right now they don't feel comfortable doing that.

They have indicated they're already moving forward on developing a strawman for options of handling third party assessments. It was my assumption, certainly, that wreckfish would be the pilot for whatever process the SSC recommends. Obviously, that is going to require council input and approval of that process, but I think that is what we would want to do. Bonnie has some comments in that regard.

DR. PONWITH: I think we have all the moving pieces here and it is just a matter of sequencing. What I'm hearing is, just as you have said, the SSC got the presentations but the presentations weren't complete enough for them to feel comfortable changing their advice on the ABC. The SSC would be interested in looking at those more deeply; but before doing that, the SSC believes that establishing a process for how we would do that not just for this stock but generically, so building a generic process for how we would look at third party assessments, presenting that to the council and making sure both the SSC and the council and the steering committee is comfortable with that process. And then once the process is blessed, then use that for dealing with these two assessments. That is kind of the pattern that I see developing here.

DR. DUVAL: Bob has come up the table and I'm going to let him address this first.

MR. MAHOOD: We have an agenda item on the Executive Finance Committee and it is to develop a policy for this very issue. Now, it doesn't address what we have in front of us on wreckfish, but I think it is the council's decision of how the SSC policy will reflect this type of assessment coming before the SSC.

The SSC may have a totally different idea of how they would like to address, which I think they should have that input, but it is a council policy decision. We're going to have that discussion so we're really kind of cutting into the snapper grouper discussion and getting a little bit behind here, so we may want to talk about that on Thursday at the Executive Finance Committee meeting.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I agree it is the council's decision; and if you'd rather put this off until Thursday, that is fine. I just want you all to think about whether you want to wait – to deal with these two wreckfish analyses whether you want to wait until the process is developed or the recommendations are developed by the SSC on how o handle these kinds of third party assessments, whether you want to deal with these two analyses until that policy is developed or whether you want to put this through some sort of process like the SEDAR-like process like the SSC recommended before that policy is developed. I'll be quiet; I'm just kind of pushing you; because as you know there is litigation going on and there are all kinds of things in the works. The more we can define how you all want to proceed, the better it is for everyone. I will leave it at that.

DR. DUVAL: I don't anyone is necessarily happy with where the ABC for wreckfish ended up, and I think we're aware of the legal proceedings. I guess it is my sense that we need to recognize that what we do here sets the stage for what we do in other situations. I'm certainly not trying to put off anything. I just want to make sure that we're making an informed decision and that is something that we can defend I think down the road. David.

MR. CUPKA: I was going to ask Luiz, you know, wreckfish could be kind of the first test case to go through this process; but even at that, based on the discussions I heard at the SSC meeting, it is not just going to be a matter of taking these and looking at them. It is almost going to involve redoing those analyses because the SSC wanted to be involved from the beginning.

They wanted to know about the data and what was used and the whole nine yards. It is going to be a little bit more involved. It is essentially going to be starting from scratch, I think, and we're not going to be gaining anything by looking at what is available now.

DR. BARBIERI: I agree, Dave, that is pretty much – the level of analysis that was presented requires a lot of evaluation. There are several parameters there, choices and how you handle the analysis that would be critical and that we're going to have to look through in a lot of detail.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I'm inclined to maybe try something or at least what Roy was talking about and if we can do something that is abbreviated that will help us possibly put some more fish on the table, understanding that we're going to try this and see if it works and then go from there. I kind of like what Roy had in mind.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I am not as sensitive to the litigatory – whatever it is, the law, the case timeline, but I am sensitive to the timeline for fishermen and the result from this. We have those two studies and if there is any way from Roy's suggestion that we could move forward with the SSC and all their documentation and all their problems they have with it and rerun the assessments based on what they want to see done, that is the way I would like to proceed.

DR. DUVAL: Well, it is up to you. If somebody wants to make a motion to direct the SSC to move forward with some kind of abbreviated process before they develop potential options for a policy for dealing with third party assessments, you are all free to do so.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think it is probably premature before the Thursday conversation.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so we're going to let folks mull about this and you will have some informed discussion on Thursday. Thank you.

DR. BARBIERI: Well, that was pretty much it in terms of details, Madam Chair. Here are the other items that the SSC discussed. Those are fairly simple discussions and recommendations and all of this is provided in the actual report to you so you have all of that and staff has all of that in writing. I did not feel that we needed to review those in detail here in the interest of time.

DR. DUVAL: And I also think that a lot of the decision documents have those SSC and AP recommendations within them. Does anyone have any questions for Dr. Barbieri with regard to any of the remaining agenda items that the SSC discussed? You will be around here for at least a little while this afternoon?

DR. BARBIERI: This afternoon, yes.

MR. HARTIG: Just one short comment; on the update on the ORCS Workshop, the SSC did want to include the APs in that again, and that is a good thing.

DR. DUVAL: I agree. Okay, I was just conferring with Jim Atack here to see if there were any of the other business items from the Snapper Grouper AP report that he felt we needed to bring

up here and just know if folks have questions about that, Jim is also here with us the rest of the day, but the AP's input will be reviewed when we go through all of our amendments. I think the next agenda item is a discussion of a potential emergency action request for vermilion snapper, and I believe is Gregg is going to review that for us.

MR. WAUGH: I asked Mike to send this around. You have got it, but unfortunately the subject line said "Dolphin and Wahoo Committee Report" again, so it is the second one. It has a spreadsheet attached. I will run through this. This is based on some analyses Jack has done. What I want to focus on are the numbers and first talk about the increase and then jus make some points and open it up for what you have to discuss.

It says the attachment is copy of vermilion table. I have got it projected. Looking at the current year, our commercial ACL split into seasons – and there was an adjustment in 2012 to address post-quota bycatch mortality. The SSC values for the ABC are shown here beginning in 2013. These come right out of the information Luiz just presented to you. The ABC is 1.372 million pounds in 2013; and then declines down to 2016 it is 1.269 million pounds.

And we have our allocations in place; the commercial allocation is 68 percent of that; the recreational is 32 percent. Then we split the commercial into two periods; January through June and then July through December. Since we are now using the ABC just based on landings, we don't need to make post-quota bycatch mortality adjustments because that has already been accounted for in the ABC value that we're using.

On the commercial side, that commercial ACL is split equally between these two six-month periods. In terms of the questions – just to orient you to the questions that we have to address and then I'll give you a little bit more in terms of the numbers – the first question is the timing to implement these changes. Do we request an emergency rule with a categorical exclusion as was done for yellowtail snapper or do we delay the increases until it is implemented through a regulatory amendment or a plan amendment?

Then you need to specify your ABC and more importantly the ACL. Do we allow that to change by year based on those average values – and you will see the impacts of that in a moment – or do we average 2013 through the 2016 time period? That would give you your commercial – depending on how we do that, it would you your values for the commercial and then the recreational ACL as well.

Then the final question is what do you want to do about that recreational closure? This was raised earlier. Right now there is a November through March 31 recreational closure. We could request that be removed through the emergency rule and then follow up with a regulatory amendment or a plan amendment.

In looking at the numbers here, if you specify your ACL beginning in 2013 based on the ABC and not averaging, then your increase in the first six-month period, January through June, is just a little under 105,000 pounds. In our conversations with a dealer, they expect to pay the same

price next year as they did for vermilion this year, on the order of three dollars a pound, so that gets you a potential increase in that first six-month period of $314,000.

If you look on the commercial side in terms of impacts to how long the season would run, we have got a table here looking at whether you set your ABC based on the average, which would give you an increase of 86,000 pounds in that first six-month period, or whether you set your ACL to increase each year would give you an increase in that first six-month period of almost 105,000 pounds.

If you look at various catch rates – and Jack pulled these from the values that were used to do the projection analysis earlier this year – you have got a flat rate at the start of the season of 77,415 pounds. You have got the January high rate of 7,607 pounds. You have got the low rate of 7,222 pounds and then the February daily rate was 4,212 pounds. It is just looking at if that amount is caught each day when would you expect the season to close.

There would be no extension anticipated in the first six-month period next year under any of these 7,000-plus daily rates. If however the daily rate was more on the order of 4,000 pounds, then you would extend the season by 37 days if you used the average method; by 40 days if you used the annual increase. It shows that you do get a little bit of an extension depending on whether you use the average value or the total.

I know that is a lot of numbers to throw at you. Let me make one other set of points here. The value in increase I said is from speaking with a dealer. The increase in the commercial fishery could be implemented similar to what was done for yellowtail in that the commercial landings were allowed to go over the commercial ACL on the books while the newer, higher ACL was being implemented.

This assumes that we would go forward and request an emergency action. The potential increase on the commercial side would give potentially an additional $314,000 in additional revenue during that first six-month period. These are large, positive benefits. The recreational sector is closed. Reopening it would be a large, positive benefit especially for the for-hire sector.

If we implement via emergency regulations, you could do it using a categorical exclusion as was done for yellowtail. The situation and rationale are the same. Then we would need to follow up. If you do decide to do an emergency request, then we would need to follow up and add this either in Amendment 27 or a separate regulatory amendment. I'll be glad to go over any questions you have with the numbers.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, can you back up to the questions you had, Gregg, because one of them is I don't think this is the same situation as yellowtail if you are talking about including removing the fixed recreational season closure. That makes it very different. That would mean it is not going to be a categorical exclusion. We will have to do an environmental assessment and look at alternatives and things, and that will make it take longer.

MR. HARTIG: Gregg, on the February landings time scale do we know what the trip levels were during that time? Those would be very helpful to get at some time to know what the average trip was to slow that fishery down to that level. When you were talking before, weren't you talking about the season extends by – if I understood this right, if you used the 4,202 pound average catch throughout the time series, you would get the 37 extra days; is that correct?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and this is with the 1,500 pound trip limit in place. These daily catch rates are fleet-wide. That is what was landed fleet-wide.

MR. HARTIG: But still what would be interesting to know is to extend this vermilion season the level of harvest during the 4,212 pound timeframe would be very interesting to know to try to get a handle on extending the season over a month. That would be something we need to look at since most fishermen aren't catching the 1,500 pound trip limit, anyway.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and, Ben, you're right, we can certainly calculate that. We could look and see how many trips were made in February and give you that value. But, when we set the 1,500 trip limit, we had various other alternatives that were looked at and the concern was is you didn't want to set it so low that you impacted vessels that needed to make longer trips. That is a part of it as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: Gregg, I guess I'm a little confused. This February daily rate; that was 4,000 per fishing day or it was just 4,000 per day no matter how many people were fishing?

MR. WAUGH: It is the latter; that is for every day in February of this year that is what was caught and landed. Jack can correct me if I'm wrong on that.

MR. PHILLIPS: So if the weather was just worse in February than January, that affects it and that is what I think probably where it came from.

DR. McGOVERN: I just wanted to make a clarification. These daily catch rates are from a projection that was done by the science center to help estimate when the closure should have occurred last February. They look at a lot of different ways to estimate, and so that may not be the true daily rate from last year. That is just looking at different ways to estimate it.

MR. ATACK: The AP discussed looking at different trip limits to help extend the season. The basic thoughts are that they would like to have a longer season. One of the motions was to cut the trip limit to a thousand pounds. I don't know if you can run the numbers on that to see what that would then do to the season extension.

The second thing they wanted to do when it hit 75 percent of the ACL is projected to be met is cut to a 500-pound trip limit. They would rather do a smaller trip limit but a longer season. I don't know if you could write it into the regulation as such but maybe you can have some more flexibility than that so that when you hit the 75 percent, what kind of trip limit would you need to have to hit the ACL at the end of the season.

In other words, if you hit the 75 percent in April and you don't have as far to go, then maybe the 500-pound trip limit could be higher and maybe it could be 700 or something. If we had the rules flexible, they could project what that trip limit might need to be to then – they may not have to be at 500, but the motion was to do the thousand pounds and then cut it to 500 at 75 percent.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg has laid out a few different options here. If we request an emergency rule to increase the ACL, it will not include removal of the existing recreational closure. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, so given that the recreational season's closure is not going to be part of that, I think the real question is are the benefits sufficient to get this done early as opposed to just doing a framework and having all of the increase go into the second season and let them catch it there. We could get this done one way or the other.

The question is, is there enough benefit in adding it into the spring quota as opposed to letting them catch it all out in the fall. Then I think probably if you figure it would take us maybe two and a half months to get this done, so we would be looking at some time in March. It is quite likely the fishery would have already closed at that time.

I'm not willing to make any sort of commitment that we could necessarily just not close the fishery. We could be in a situation where we would have to reopen for – I guess based on that it could be ten days, a dozen days or something like that. That is really the issue as I see it is whether there is enough benefit from catching it early as opposed to later in the year.

DR. DUVAL: So you're saying specifically for emergency rule it could be potentially two and a half months to get that done?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, they're telling me yellowtail took about that long; is that correct?

DR. McGOVERN: That is correct.

DR. CRABTREE: It took close to three months and that was with the CE, so I suspect this – and we do have the holidays and all that compounding this one as well, but I think that it is probably safe to assume two and a half months is the best we could do.

MR. BURGESS: As we are discussing this and this comes with taking two and a half months, I recall that when we had some vermilion snapper left over and when the fishermen responded by saying they would like to have that open at the same time in May that grouper is open. By speaking to fishermen, this seemed to be a tremendous advantage to them.

We have discussed this before and Regulatory Amendment 14 is kind of touching on these things and aligning fisheries. Last year when groupers opened it was a warm winter and reports from fishermen were that the grouper starting biting right away. Now, if we have a cold winter and the groupers aren't biting right away, having this fish available then could be a real positive step and something to consider.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think I might be inclined to just do it through a framework and not have to do the work on the emergency action. Even we don't get these fish until the end of the year, one, it saves a lot of extra work for staff not doing it twice; and, two, if these fish are caught at the end of the year, then you can keep vermilion and grouper so it makes the trips more profitable.

Instead of just going and targeting strictly vermilion earlier in the year, even though we need to catch fish when we can, but I would be inclined to go with the framework; and then in 2014 if want to split the fish out between the seasons, so be it, but right now I think I'd be inclined to go with a framework.

MR. HARTIG: Charlie, is there any price difference in the two seasons?

MR. PHILLIPS: Not much. We used to take pretty good price bits in August. That doesn't happen. What really hurts us is the fact that we've got derby fisheries; and whether it is a two-month derby or a three-month derby, it doesn't matter.

My people up north tell me they have to buy fish out of the Gulf. They pay more money for a poorer quality fish because they've got fish all year. The derby is what kills us more than anything else. Whether it is two months, three months, whatever, we have got so much of a closed season.

DR. DUVAL: Right now we have no – I mean I'm just thinking about the current overages we have had on our ACLs for the past two six-month seasons. We don't have any payback on vermilion right now and that is not one of the accountability measures.

MR. HARTIG: Well, to that point, it is not an accountability measure, per se, that we deal with. It is an accountability measure in the assessment over the long term, though, if you have to look at it. But, having said that, I forgot about the recreational catch. Given it is so low, the total ACL is not being met so we're fine biologically.

DR. DUVAL: Right, I agree. I was just trying to think through how this would work if we don't increase the ACL through an emergency rule and give some fish back potentially during the first six-month season and if that six-month ACL exceeded, how does it affect trying to give some fish back at the end of the year. That is all I was thinking of. We do account for that in the assessment so it doesn't sound like it would make a difference. What is your pleasure? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, unless you feel like there is a significant economic benefit from catching the fish in the first half of the year, then you probably ought to do the framework. Bear in mind we should be judicious when we do emergency rules and eliminate opportunity for public comment in those things. Unless you really feel like there is a significant economic benefit from doing the emergency rule, then I would suggest you go the framework route and do it that way.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other thoughts around the table? I know Charlie has expressed some interest in doing everything through a regulatory amendment. Jim.

MR. ATACK: So if we do the framework and we really don't increase the catch the first part of the year, doesn't that mean you have a bigger ACL in the second part of the year when the framework comes in?

DR. DUVAL: Yes. Ben, do you have a comment?

MR. HARTIG: Well, give me some wording. I'm not sure of the wording. Will we have a number on this framework and things of that nature?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think I would look to staff for that. I think this would either be a new regulatory amendment and I think the other option was Amendment 27, which is the blue runner amendment, but we are slated to approve that for public hearings here, which will go out at the end of January for public hearing. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And if you put it in that I doubt you will get it done in time for them to catch the fish. That will take substantially longer; so if you want to get this done, I think it needs to be a framework action and keep it with as few things in it as you can and put it high on your priorities.

Then the second discussion would be in this same framework do you want to reduce the red porgy ACLs. If you put it in a plan amendment, I don't see that as being viable option to get it done by the end of the year.

MR. WAUGH: And even though we're scheduled to approve Plan Amendment 27 at the March meeting, the plan amendment has a lot more comment period once we submit it so it takes longer to implement.

DR. DUVAL: So this would be a new regulatory amendment with its own number. Yes, this would be a new regulatory amendment with its own number. I'll just point out that there are also a number of actions that are currently in Regulatory Amendment 14 addressing things like the recreational season closure from November through April, the trip limit that Jim referred to that was part of the AP's discussion.

So it would be my assumption that if the committee chooses to increase the ACL through a regulatory amendment, that we would then want to direct staff to take those other vermilion actions and put those in this regulatory amendment as well. It would seem to make sense to lump all actions regarding vermilion snapper together. People are process this, I can tell.

MR. WAUGH: And with the understanding that only things that could be implemented through a framework, which probably everything in there could be, trip limits, bag limits, that sort of thing.

DR. DUVAL: Based on what the discussion has been around the table, I would entertain a motion **to delay the increase in vermilion snapper until implemented through a regulatory amendment**. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I don't like the wording in that motion. We're not delaying anything. We're going through the normal process we would use to do this. I will make a motion to direct staff to begin work on a regulatory amendment to adjust the vermilion snapper ACL. I guess we want to put some other things in it so let's add to the motion "and adjust other management measures as appropriate".

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion by Roy; second by Charlie. Other management measures as appropriate is not necessarily very clear. Would you want to clarify that the intent would be to take the existing measures that are currently included in Regulatory Amendment 14 dealing with vermilion snapper and place those in this new regulatory amendment?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, Madam Chairman, that is exactly what I intended to say.

DR. DUVAL: We have **a motion on the board to direct staff to begin work on a regulatory amendment to adjust the vermilion snapper ACL and adjust other management measures as appropriate.** Motion by Roy and seconded by Charlie. Is there other discussion?

DR. CRABTREE: Do you want to change that wording as you said or was the intent good enough? As long as they know what I meant, then I'm okay.

DR. DUVAL: I think we may wordsmith the motion here, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And I think I might want to change it "and also to adjust the red porgy ACL".

DR. DUVAL: And that was the next question.

DR. CRABTREE: So let's just add that here, too, "and adjust the red porgy ACL". Then if you want to look at other things with red porgy, that is fine and I would accept friendly amendments to that, but I'm not sure what else the council might want to do. That looks good to me, I think; doesn't it?

DR. DUVAL: Right, there are some red porgy measures in Regulatory Amendment 14, but they all deal with increases and I don't think that is appropriate at this time. I'm just clarifying that adjust other management measures currently included in Regulatory Amendment 14 only applies to vermilion snapper. We just took out the wording indicating that we would also adjust the red porgy ACL. Okay, there we go.

The motion now reads direct staff to begin work on a regulatory amendment to adjust the vermilion snapper ACL, adjust other management measures currently included in Regulatory Amendment 14 for vermilion snapper and adjust the red porgy ACL and management measures as appropriate. Is there anymore discussion on this motion? In terms

of timing is it the committee's intent that staff would then bring this back to us at the March committee meeting? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: That is when we would need to vote it up to get it done on the timeframe you're looking at. Our next meeting is June. If we got to June, that is pushing it.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so that is the intent and that will be included in our timing and task motion at the end of the meeting. Is everybody ready to vote on this? Is there anymore discussion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.**

The next item on our agenda that I hope we can bang out before lunch is Regulatory Amendment 13. I think Brian is going to come up here and give us a short presentation on this. This would adjust our existing ACL and sector allocations for our unassessed species with the updated MRIP information. That decision document is Attachment 4A under Tab 5.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, you have this as a PDF file in your briefing books. This is just a quick rundown of what we have got for Regulatory Amendment 13. What we have got here is a revision of the acceptable biological catches, ACLs, sector ACLs, allocations and annual catch targets, the ACTs for the recreational fishery.

Why are we even doing this amendment? There are 37 unassessed species that have ACLs and allocations based on landings data that were put into the Comprehensive ACL Amendment. At that time that the Comprehensive ACL Amendment was being done, the recreational landings that were used to determine the overall ACLs and the allocations and things were based on MRFSS landings.

Well, of course, as you all know now that we no longer have MRFSS; and so to keep things lined up properly, what you needed to do was to compare MRIP landings to MRIP landings and not end up comparing MRIP landings to MRFSS landings. Work was done to convert the MRFSS landings that were in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment to MRIP based on the MRIP data that we have available at this point and then the commercial landings and everything were updated as well at the same time.

These new landings and updated commercial data now represent the best available data so that is what is presented here. This amendment contains one action with only two alternatives. The first alternative is don't do anything, keep the numbers the way they are and you would end up comparing the recreational sector numbers using MRIP to the numbers that were used with MRFSS.

Then the other alternative is then just to go ahead and change them and update the numbers as necessary. If you look at the amendment – and it is all in there – there are some tables and things and actually if you look in the economic section it goes a little – if you're looking at the full document, in the economic section there is a summary of the changes that would occur going from MRFSS to MRIP and updating the commercial landings.

But, what I wanted to do here in this quick presentation is to point out to you the changes that occurred that have the biggest changes that would occur going from one to the other. Most of the changes, frankly, are not very big at all, but there are one or two that I just wanted to point out to you that would happen here.

The deepwater and porgy complexes that closed early in 2012 potentially could have remained open a little bit longer for the commercial fishery had we had these numbers in place for this fishing season. The impact would have been a little bit greater for the deepwater complex than the porgies complex because the increase in the porgies complex was really relatively small.

However, using the revised numbers and if the fishing had remained the same, the jacks complex probably would have closed a little bit sooner, but probably not much at all when you look at the value of the earlier closure. It would have just amounted to only about a $4,000 a year decrease in the allowable commercial catch.

The ACLs for the commercial fisheries for blue runner and gray triggerfish would be revised downward. Blue runner probably is going to make it through this season based on the current ACL, but the size of the new ACL, if the fishing remains the same, might cause it to close down a little bit earlier next year. The big one is gray triggerfish. It closed on September 11th this year and it would be expected to close relatively sooner next year. I believe it is about – if I'm not mistaken, it is about a 10 percent decrease over the commercial ACL that they had this year.

DR. CRABTREE: Brian, I expect that blue runner will end up closing some time next week.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, because when I did this, this was based on what numbers I had available in probably mid-October, so, yes, okay, so the landings continue to be up, then. The recreational fishery for Atlantic spadefish is the only recreational fishery that would probably be expected in the future to exceed its ACL, assuming that fishing behavior doesn't change compared to what has been going on this year.

The recreational reduction for spadefish is really actually pretty big. It is about 37 percent, but this is really a fairly minor fishery in the overall scheme of things in recreational fisheries. I do know that many of the landings for this species occur in state waters. Now, you have gotten some comments and all from the SSC and the AP, but this is sort of one of those things that it was presented to them by Nick Farmer and explained how the numbers changed that went from the Comprehensive ACL Amendment to Regulatory Amendment 13, and there really wasn't much that they could do other than to look at the methodology and the things that were used to develop this.

Both the SSC and the Socio-Economic Panel were fine with the way that it had been worked out. The Snapper Grouper AP did not disagree with the council's approach to Regulatory Amendment 13. However, as part of their discussion of this topic – and I think it may come up later in some of the discussion of accountability measures, which we did talk about briefly yesterday under dolphin and wahoo – the AP members would like the council to consider a change to the accountability measures for all stocks that would allow the commercial sector to

continue fishing until the total ACL was projected to be met. I believe that is all that I had. I think what you need to do is to have your discussion and decide how you want to handle Regulatory Amendment 13. It is just the one action; it is either vote it up or down as I see it at this point.

Dr. DUVAL: Are there questions for Brian? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it wasn't a question; I was going to make a motion. I move that we adopt Alternative 2 as our preferred alternative.

DR. DUVAL: I will just say one thing here. We do actually need to approve the purpose and need for this document as well. We haven't done that yet.

DR. CRABTREE: I would like to amend my motion to select Alternative 2 as the preferred and accept the purpose and need statement. How about that?

DR. DUVAL: That sounds great. Motion by Roy; seconded by Anna. **The motion reads select Alternative 2 as the preferred and accept the purpose and need as written. Any discussion on this? Any opposition to this? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.** Now, we do need to actually have a motion to approve the document for formal review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

MR. HARTIG: So moved.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Ben; seconded by Charlie. **All right, the motion reads that the amendment be approved for formal review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate.**

MR. HARTIG: Can we put the amendment number in there?

DR. DUVAL: Regulatory Amendment 13. Is there any other discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. The next motion we need is to give the chairman editorial license – how do we phrase that, David, give the chairman editorial license to review and make changes as appropriate?

MR. CUPKA: Well, it is usually the staff and the chairman.

DR. DUVAL: So the motion would read to give staff editorial changes as appropriate.

MR. CUPKA: No, it is the staff and the chairman.

DR. DUVAL: Staff and chairman. I would entertain a motion in that regard; John Jolley and seconded by Charlie. I am assuming there is no opposition to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. My clock says 11:53 a.m., and I am inclined to recess for lunch and reconvene at 1:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting was recessed at 11:53 o'clock a.m., December 4, 2012.)

- - -

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

December 4, 2012

- - -

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Cape Fear Ballroom of the Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel, Wilmington, North Carolina, Tuesday afternoon, December 4, 2012, and was called to order at 1:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: All right, folks, we will go ahead and reconvene. The first thing we need to do is actually revisit this new regulatory amendment that is now Regulatory Amendment 18 that we just created right before lunch. One of the things that we did not do was question number two on Gregg's spreadsheet, which was determine how we were going to specify the ABCs and ACLs.

There were two options for doing that. One was by year based on the annual values from the SSC and then one would be based on an average of 2013 to 2016. I think it is probably helpful for folks if you have that vermilion snapper spreadsheet. I would just say we need to do this for both vermilion snapper and red porgy.

We have to determine if we're going to take an average of some sort to determine the ABC and the ACL or if we are going to sequentially use each one of those ABC values that are in the respective tables for both red porgy and vermilion snapper to set our ACLs. Gregg, did you want to say something about that.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, I think it would probably be cleanest if we did the annual values. If you look at the values for vermilion, they are increasing each year; so if the average is below the individual values, then we wouldn't be in a position where the value we're specifying would exceed any one of the individual year's value.

The situation is opposite with red porgy. The ABC value is declining over that time period; and if you were to use the average there, then that average would exceed some of the individual values. I think it would just be cleaner and ensure that when we set our ACL we don't exceed the ABC if we use the individual values for each year.

DR, DUVAL: Okay, with that advice in mind, I would entertain a **motion from the committee to specify ABC and ACL for vermilion snapper by year based on annual values from the SSC.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Michelle, if they will write the motion, I will make that motion.

DR. DUVAL: I think Myra is doing that for us as we speak. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, the SSC specifies the ABC.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: They recommend to the council.

DR. DUVAL: They recommended it to us.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, okay.

MR. WAUGH: I would say that we accept the ABC values because as long as the SSC is using the ABC Control Rule, which they have, we're in good shape, so we're accepting the ABC values recommended from the SSC. Then we're going to specify the ACLs and that is something the council does. If I could, I had the values backwards.

The red porgy is the one that is decreasing and vermilion is increasing, but I still think we would be in easier shape – vermilion is decreasing so I had it right the first time. The value for ABC for vermilion in 2013 is 1.372, then in 2014 it is 1.312, then it is 1.289 and 1.269 so it is decreasing for vermilion. For red porgy the values go from 306,000 in 2013 and then increase each year to 401, so both of them are increasing. Vermilion is decreasing, correct.

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion on the floor made by Charlie and seconded by Martha. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Could you just explain this to me again just briefly? I'm really sorry but I'm having a hard time following exactly what we're doing.

DR. DUVAL: The SSC made recommendations to us based on a P-star of 40, I believe, and they requested those projections from the science center. Those projections were received. That is what we reviewed during the SSC report this morning. The numbers that you are seeing up here in the second column that says "ABC" gutted weight" is based on the SSC's recommendation and those projections.

Right now what we failed to do before lunch when we decided to create a regulatory amendment to increase the ACL for vermilion snapper and to adjust the ACL for red porgy was we failed to specify the ACLs basically and we failed to specify if we were going to have the ACL change on an annual basis or if we wanted to perhaps look at some average of those numbers. Gregg can probably add a little bit more detail to that.

MR. WAUGH: And we do this routinely and we have done it both ways where we have specified the value changes each year and we have averaged. Looking at the vermilion numbers here, if you look at the value for 2013 it is 1,372,000 pounds. It declines through 2016. That is the ABC value for each of those years that we got from the SSC.

You can see that in 2016 the ABC is 1,269,000 pounds. We can't specify the average of that whole time series because the average of that time series is 1,310,500 pounds and that would exceed the ABC value recommended by the SSC for 2015 and 2016. What we are saying is the ABC will be 1,372,000 pounds in 2013, 2014 it will change, 2015 it will change, 2016 it will change, and then remain until modified.

DR. DUVAL: This motion only refers to the ABC values. I think it will be cleaner to do a second motion to adopt ACLs, which could be on an annual basis as Gregg has laid out whereby the ACL would change each year or we could do an average. That's right, we can't do that because that exceeds ABC; never mind. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And you are in this discussion getting into something that would be properly treated as alternatives in a regulatory amendment, which means it is not going to be a CE. If there are decisions to be made about whether to average or not average, then it is going to end up being an environmental assessment and you are going to have to go through alternatives.

Now, the straightforward thing is you already have ABCs so I don't really know what this motion does. The SSC gave you ABCs; they are annual values. If you want to come in and apply your control rule, it would apply and give you annual values. In that case you're not making any decision that you haven't already made; but when you start getting into discussions like this, now you're getting back into NEPA territory, and I don't think you will be able to go through with a CE on it.

DR. DUVAL: This is actually a regulatory amendment so it is a categorical exclusion already, correct?

DR. CRABTREE: Whether it is a regulatory amendment or not doesn't affect the NEPA document so much. It comes down to whether there are decisions that are being made. It is only a categorical exclusion if you're just automatically applying a formula that is already predetermined and so there are no decisions to be made. The fact that we're sitting here having this discussion is convincing me there are decisions to be made; and if that is the case, then it is not going to be a categorical exemption or exclusion, I don't think.

MR. WAUGH: I don't believe we want to average. To me this discussion was to clarify and give us guidance that we're accepting the ABC recommendations from the SSC that are based on the control rule. Those values are what were shown in the spreadsheet. We just wanted to make sure that we weren't going to get to the March meeting and someone is going to say, hey, let's average them, so there is no choice there.

DR. CRABTREE: Right, so if you want to try to do this with a CE, then it is just straight apply the control rule. What we have traditionally done is specify the TAC for three years. I'm assuming that is what we will do. We have got three ABCs. We will apply the control rule, get three ACLs. They will be allocated according to the existing formulas and there is no real decision to make.

MS. BROUWER: Sorry, Roy, I'm confused. We're talking about Regulatory Amendment 18 because I thought the committee talked about bringing some of the actions that are currently in Regulatory Amendment 14 so that we take care of vermilion and red porgy in one document. There was never any intention of it being a CE.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, then I got confused because earlier we had talked about doing a CE but maybe that was the emergency rule.

DR. DUVAL: We were all confused. Okay, so everybody is clear that this is the only motion that we need. We're just accepting the ABC values that the SSC has given to us. Is there anymore comment on this motion. **The motion is accept the ABC values for vermilion snapper recommended by the SSC based on the control rule. Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

Okay, we already did this for red porgy earlier during the SSC presentation so we should be good on that. So now Myra is going to go back and review the actions that are currently in Regulatory 14 that have to do with vermilion snapper and red porgy.

MS. BROUWER: Regulatory Amendment 14 as you know has not begun to be developed. We have right now just a list of actions and alternatives. The last time the committee met they gave us guidance to put in actions to look at changing management measures for both vermilion snapper and red porgy.

Now that we have a developing Regulatory Amendment 18, you can take some of these action out of Regulatory Amendment 14 and put them in this new amendment so that we take care of both vermilion and red porgy all at the same time. What I would like to do is go through the actions as I just mentioned that are in Regulatory Amendment 14 and then you can choose which ones you would like to see developed in Regulatory Amendment 18 and which ones you would like to remove.

The first action is to modify the trip limit for vermilion and here are the alternatives that are currently in Regulatory Amendment 14. Alternative 2 would remove the trip limit and there would not be a trip limit. Alternative 3 would reduce it to a thousand pounds and Alternative 4 would reduce it to 500 pounds.

DR. DUVAL: The AP had a few comments on this and I am going to ask Jim to review those.

MR. ATACK: Yes, we went with the Alternative 3 as our preferred alternative where we have the trip limit at a thousand pounds; and then once the 75 percent of the ACL was projected to be met, revert to Alternative 4, which is the 500-pound limit. Like I talked about earlier was if there is a way to write it into the regulations to where if it looks like the season has run long enough to where if you dropped it from a thousand to 500 and you wouldn't hit the ACL, you wouldn't be able to get your optimum yield that way, maybe we could have a trip limit somewhere in between based on the projections versus a set thousand and 500.

In other words, if you have got one month left in the season and you're at 75, you're not going to hit the hundred percent ACL if you drop it to 500, but maybe you could drop it to 750, but is there a way to write it to where that reduced trip limit is adjustable to try to make the season run out to the end of the year without dropping it below 500.

DR. DUVAL: Jim, I don't know if there is actually a way to write something. Roy might have some thoughts on that, but it seems to me that when we have tried to do things like this in the past, having sliding trip limits that are triggered based on hitting a certain percentage of the ACL, is it even possible to write a regulation that would allow you the latitude to adjust the trip limit based on how much time is left in the season.

DR. CRABTREE: I think you could. I think you could write it in a way that says if you hit some percentage of quota by this date, then the trip limit is this; if it is this date, the trip limit is this. As long as it was laid out and analyzed, I think you could do it.

We have had trouble with these triggers in the past; but if the dealer reporting gets more accurate and more timely, then we will do a better job with it. I think as long as you laid it all out you could do it.

MR. WAUGH: We will get into this a little bit in the Data Collection Committee, but there is no doubt the system can now collate what data are reported – this is the quota monitoring system – and tell you and project when you hit 75 percent. That is going to get more accurate over time as the dealer amendment regulations are more fully implemented.

Remember, we have had some triggers before where if 75 percent is met the trip limit drops. I think that gets at what Jim is suggesting. We have had this in the past and removed it because we had difficulty tracking the quotas. The system can do that now. It will get better as we move to 2014 and then into 2015. That is one way to structure it.

MR. ATACK: Yes, and it could be projected to be met just like we projected gag to be hit by a certain day so we came up with a closure date. If we project that 75 percent being met by such and such a date; that is when we drop it. Now, I don't know how the bluefin fishery does it, but I know they change their daily limit on the giant bluefin based on where they are on the landings.

They decide just one giant bluefin per day and sometimes it is three. Somehow they have it and no regulations where they can notch that daily limit up or down based on time of year or based on whether they think they're going to hit their quota. That is kind of where the idea came from, so somehow the feds do it.

MR. BROUWER: I guess just to bring us back to what the committee needs to do right now is to give the staff guidance to either keep this action with the current alternatives or keep this action with these alternatives and maybe add the one that the AP has recommended.

DR. DUVAL: I think at this point I would entertain a motion to keep the alternatives in Action 8 and add an alternative as recommended by the Snapper Grouper AP. Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: I will make it so I would make a motion to move Action 8 from Regulatory Amendment 14 to new Regulatory Amendment 18 and include all those alternatives in that action and add the recommendation from the Snapper Grouper AP. Does that cover everything?

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second to that motion; Tom Burgess. I was just asking Myra if it is clear enough to just say as recommended by the AP, so we're going to note that Alternative 6. Okay, discussion. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Since there is a split season right now, I believe this would apply in both seasons at any time?

DR. DUVAL: Jim is nodding his head yes, so that was the intent of the AP. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: We do it in king mackerel all the time. It is nothing new for us, but the beauty of this is if we get to 500 pounds, we should be able to monitor better and we should be able to get closer to the ACL and not have some of the overages. When we combine all these things together, I think it will be a much better package with the monitoring from the science center. From this kind of management in concert, I think it will be a better way to get closer to the ACLs.

MR. BECKWITH: Would it be possible to put a time restriction in the sense that if 75 percent of the ACL has been with over a month left in the season, then it drops to 750 pounds; and if it is less than a month left in the season, then it drops to 500 pounds. I think that would get more towards what you were trying to figure out. Once it drops to 75 percent, if there is an extensive amount of time left in that season you may not reach that ACL with 500 pounds; you know, if there is some balance in time there.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think you do need some time factor built into this because you don't want to get to December 10th and 75 percent of the quota is caught and then you kick in this really low trip limit and then they won't be able o catch the quota. You probably need some time things.

Remember, we want to get this done and take action in March. You really need to be very sparse with these alternatives and not put anymore in here. I don't think any of us are seriously considering going to 500 or 400 pounds year-round as a trip limit. After you dispense with this motion, you ought to take some things out.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Roy's point, there are boats that make week trips. They would be sore pressed to make a profitable trip at a thousand pounds. There is no way they will make – if it drops to 500 pounds or 400 pounds, they're done, they tie up. The little boats get to go fish; short-trip boats get to go fish. The big boats are done.

This is highly selective right here and I am going to vote against it. I don't mind taking it out to public hearing, but you're killing anybody that wants to work very offshore or make a long trip

short of we figure out a way to put daily trip limits in or something, which we could do if we go with VMS.

DR. DUVAL: Well, that is a conversation for another committee. I will note that I think there has generally been support for doing something like sliding trip limits. Now that the infrastructure is in place to be able to get the data in such a time that would allow us to do something like this, I would think that we would to take this out for public comment.

But in terms of addressing the point that Anna brought up and that Roy spoke to; do we want to add some additional wording to this alternative to address that? Anna, you had suggested adding something along the lines of when 75 percent of the ACL has been met or projected to be met and if there is one month or more left in the season, something along those lines? Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: What would be your suggestion that you guys would need in order – how much time will you need to reach the ACL, let's say, with a 500-pound trip limit?

DR. DUVAL: I think Roy has some input on that.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, what you did with golden tilefish is you set September 1st; so if 75 percent of the quota is caught before September the 1st, the trip limit kicks in. If you get past September the 1st, the trip limit doesn't kick in. The basis of that is that is three-quarters of way through the season so if you get there and you're right at 75 in the catch rates, you are going to probably fish through it. That is what you have done in the past.

DR. DUVAL: The only thing I would note is that the intent was that this particular measure applied to each of our two six-month seasons. I just want to make sure that whatever time trigger is built into this alternative takes that into account; that three-quarters of your season isn't going to be September 1st. Three-quarters of Season 1 is going to be May or something like that. Perhaps if 60 days remains in the season; is that enough of a time period, Roy?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it is complicated here because the quota is being caught so fast. Now, it may be in this case given what we know the quota is going to be that there is no reasonable expectation that the trip limit is going to kick in too early and keep you from catching the quota. If everyone is comfortable with that, then maybe it is okay without the timeframe in it.

I don't think we have any – Jack, do we have any reasonable scenario under the increased quota that would have us not catching it in either season? And could we be confident if we kick this trip limit in that we would still catch the quota; I guess we have never analyzed that.

DR. McGOVERN: Yes, I think we would.

DR. CRABTREE: If you're confident you're going to catch the quota, then I don't guess you need the time thing. Well, I asked Jack if there was any reasonable scenario under which we wouldn't catch the quota for vermilion and his answer was no. He said he thought that even with

a trigger like this we would still likely catch it. I am not quite sure how to figure that out given the catch rates that we're seeing now.

MR. BADEMAN: My concern with setting the time of it, I like the idea but my concern kind of goes with what Charlie said. If we set it too early, then we might be pushing out some of those boats that take longer trips and it won't be worth it for them.

MR. WAUGH: I know there is an intent probably to come back and remove some of the alternatives. I wouldn't if it wouldn't be cleaner right now to just drop the alternatives from this motion that we don't want to see in here rather than approve this and then in a subsequent motion you're going to come back and delete some of those alternatives. We certainly don't want to go off and analyze alternatives that you're not going to be considering. I have a question about Alternative 2, why that is even in there.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, are you suggesting that we modify the existing motion to include removal of Alternatives 4 and 5?

MR. WAUGH: And I would suggest 2 as well

DR. DUVAL: Would the motion maker and seconder be okay with that?

MS. BADEMAN: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: I was going to ask if 75 percent is the magic number in this scenario; would 85 percent of the ACL be more appropriate if we're going to drop to a 500-pound trip limit to assure that the ACL is caught. Is it just as easy to monitor 85 percent than 75 percent?

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie is nodding her head yes, and I would actually like her to address that on the record.

DR. PONWITH: The system is designed to customize the ACL, so basically, yes, if you want a warning when you're projected to hit 85 percent, you can set it up so that you will have advanced knowledge of when you're projected to hit 85 percent. And then if the notion is to reduce the size of the trip limits to sneak up on the quota at a higher level of granularity, that is certainly something that could be done.

MS. BECKWITH: I would be comfortable with that as an option if Martha would concur and if Jim was comfortable with that.

DR. DUVAL: Let me just get another comment from Charlie before we do something like that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I was talking to Gregg so I might have missed something. I am afraid Alternative 6, even though it is well intentioned and I would like to see it work, is going to put us in the same box that we were with golden tile with those step-downs. Even though we are going to have some quicker reporting, when you go to 500 pounds, the big boats are out for the most

part. I would be more inclined to leave it at Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 and that would be what I would like to see.

MR. ATACK: I think the AP was concerned that a lot of times when the percentage is like 90 percent or something like we did on sea bass, that by the time the projection is to be met, whatever it is, the season closed. The original intent there on black sea bass was 90 percent. By the time they hit 90, they hit a hundred and it just shut down.

The closer that gets to a hundred, you have got a higher probability of if you blow through it that you are not going to do what you're intending to do. That is why I think the AP came up with the 75 percent. They're looking at years where B-liners are closed for so many months a year. Now that is changing a little bit with the bigger ACL – that is what we're hearing – but that is why they came up with the 75 percent. If you go to 85; a projected to 85 versus an 85 net are two different things.

DR. DUVAL: We need to finish our discussion and vote on this motion. I certainly appreciate Charlie's concerns. I think we have heard from the science center that the system that they have now does have the ability to monitor things this closely. It is up to the committee; but I don't see a problem with taking this out for public comment. That doesn't necessarily mean that is going to be the eventual motion. I think if there are a lot of guys who are not supportive of this for the very reasons that you've brought up, Charlie, we can certainly do that. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: We're planning to vote this up at the March meeting and so there will be a public hearing at the March meeting, and that's it. It is not like we're going to get public comment and then have a lot of time to revamp things. With this fishery, the center can track this stuff; but typically when we get a report from them showing 85 percent of the quota is caught, we're putting the closure package together because we're likely to be at that point eight or nine days away from closing.

We would earlier than that have to project the trip limit and all; but things happen pretty quickly and with the need to give notice to fishermen about what is happening and all, that means you have got to project what the catch rates come in and it is all pretty exact. We can try it and see but the closer you get the trip limit shift to the closure date, the more chance there is that we're off on it.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, are there any other comments on this motion, anymore concerns? David.

MR. CUPKA: I was just going to say the mechanism is in place for the science center to do this, but we still haven't fully implemented the reporting part of it, which won't be in place until 2014 the way it is currently envisioned. We aren't quite there yet, but we're getting close. It is only a year, I guess, and we could take a chance with it and see what happens, but we aren't there yet. We're pretty close but we have still got a ways to go.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, but it is a good point. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm going to put this out there. I would like to make a substitute motion that we go forward with Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 and keep it simple and change this later as needed.

DR. DUVAL: A motion by Charlie; second by Doug to move forward with Alternatives 1 and 2 in Action 8. Are there comments on the substitute motion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think then what you have got to do is make the case that is a reasonable range of alternatives and that there are no other reasonable alternatives to consider.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, as Chairman Cupka says, we are getting close to prime time on bringing this data in. We're not there yet. We do know what happened with golden tile. If you were to drop a trip limit to 500 pounds, you're going to take out all the big boats and all the boats that work a long ways offshore and make long trips. To say that they can possibly go catch grouper or something else is a possibility; when B-liners closed this year, my boats quit. They didn't try to go catch grouper; they were done. It is a good intention and I appreciate the effort, but I don't think we're ready for this right now.

DR. DUVAL: I think what Roy is saying, Charlie, is that you might want to think about including another alternative because having just a no action alternative and an alternative for a 1,000 pound trip limit is not a reasonable range. You could consider something like 1,200 pounds; you could consider something like 800 pounds. I think the point was made that it just needs to be a reasonable range of alternatives.

MR. PHILLIPS: Michelle, let me see the alternatives again. We have got Alternatives 1, 2 and 3. That would be the alternatives that I would go forward with.

DR. DUVAL: So is the seconder of the motion okay that modification? Okay, is everyone clear on what those alternatives are? Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: I was just going to say that since the new data collection isn't going to be in place, that is just further reason to do this, stepping down to the 500-pound trip limit when 75 percent of the quota is met. We're not going to be able to track it as well so bringing in that lower quota will help. This is a recommendation from our AP. I have gotten a couple of e-mails from folks that are in favor of looking at something like this. I understand where you're coming from Charlie, but I think we should leave what is written on the board as Alternative 6 in the mix.

DR. DUVAL: Here is where we stand in terms of procedure. **We have a substitute motion on the board to move forward with Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 under Action 8.** Is there any more discussion on this motion because I think it is going to be cleanest to just go ahead and vote the substitute motion up or down. If it passes it then becomes the main motion and we vote on it again. If it fails we're back to the original motion that was made by Martha. Is everybody ready to vote? Are there anymore comments on this motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: You were taking 2 out, too, right?

DR. DUVAL: No, Charlie made a modification to add that one back in based on Roy's comment that we really needed to have a reasonable range of alternatives. Is everybody clear what is in Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? Is everyone ready to vote? All those in favor of the substitute motion would you please raise your hand, 3 in favor; all those opposed to the substitute motion, nine opposed.

The substitute motion fails, which means we are back to the main motion, which is to move Action 8 from Regulatory Amendment 14 to Regulatory Amendment 18; remove Alternatives 2, 4 and 5; and include an additional alternative as recommended by the Snapper Grouper AP.

New Alternative. Reduce the commercial trip limit for vermilion snapper to 1,000 pounds gw. When 75% of the ACL has been met or projected to be met, reduce the trip limit to 500 pounds gw. Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Could I please see a show of hand of those who are in favor of this motion, 10 in favor; opposed, 1. Motion passes.

MS. BROUWER: The next action that is currently in Regulatory Amendment 14 that we would need to move to Regulatory Amendment 18 if you want to retain it is an action to modify the bag limit for vermilion snapper. The current bag limit is five per person per day. There are several alternatives to reduce it down to three, four; increase it to six, increase it to eight and increase it to ten.

MR. ATACK: We talked about this and the motion that AP went with was no change on the bag limit. They want to leave it at the five. Also, we wanted to try to go to an open recreational season, figuring if we had a longer season we would keep the five per person. We would much rather have a smaller bag limit and a longer season is what the AP came up with.

DR. DUVAL: Myra has copied those alternatives and is getting those up on the screen for us.

MS. BECKWITH: Would it be appropriate to move this to the considered but rejected appendix if we're not interested in changing the bag limit, if it is a no longer a recommendation from the AP to change the bag limit?

DR. DUVAL: It would be; other committee members might have some thoughts on that, though.

MR. HAYMANS: How about the comment about leaving the season open year round?

MR. ATACK: Yes, I guess if we don't go with the year-round season, then if we don't change the bag limit, then we will be leaving a lot of fish on the table. We won't be hitting the ACL I guess is the point made. If we go forward with the longer season, then leaving the bag limit where it is we will be approaching that optimum yield for the MSY.

DR. DUVAL: So with that point being made; is anyone willing to make a motion to move Action 9 from Regulatory Amendment 14 into Regulatory Amendment 18?

MS. BECKWITH: I will be happy to make that motion. **I move we move Action 9 from Regulatory Amendment 14 into Regulatory Amendment 18 and make Alternative 1, no action, our preferred.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Anna; seconded by John Jolley. Discussion. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I am comfortable with this just to see how it is going to proceed with the four-month opening, but I am sensitive to the fact that most of the vermilion snapper fishing occurs in the heart of the area that really is impacted by weather during those four months. We need to be cognizant of what happens and possibly look at this after even one season and then increase the bag limit if we have to.

MR. WAUGH: I may be confused here but if we're not interested in changing the vermilion snapper bag limit, then perhaps we shouldn't move it in here because your staff and regional staff are going to have to analyze all these alternatives.

If the idea is not to change the bag limit and to get rid of the closure – I think what Ben just said is you want to operate a year or two and see what your catch is going to be without that closure – then do we really want to include this in the regulatory amendment?

MR. HAYMANS: What if the closure isn't agreed upon in the amendment?

MR. WAUGH: So you want to keep the closure in place even though the ACL has not been met; why would we want to do that?

MS. BECKWITH: What I mean is if we want to take care then of opening the season in Amendment 18, we can leave Action 9 in Amendment 14. In case it doesn't pass we always have this still in play and can deal with it in Amendment 14. I would withdraw my motion to move it.

DR. DUVAL: Does the seconder agree to that? Is there any objection from the committee to the withdrawal of this motion? I see no objection so **the motion is withdrawn**. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Just for my clarification, what you would like to see then is for this action to remain in Regulatory Amendment 14 and for us to go ahead and analyze all of these alternatives to bring to you whenever that is.

DR. DUVAL: If we leave this action in Regulatory Amendment 14 what we're going to see in March is an options paper; and so I think when we deal with Regulatory Amendment 14, that is when it would be appropriate to decide if we want to remove some of these alternatives from that action. Are folks okay with that? Jim.

MR. ATACK: Well, Alternatives 2 and 3 I don't think we need to waste any time doing an options paper on those, so would it make sense to just take them out of that now?

DR. DUVAL: If folks want to go ahead and do that, then someone is free to make a motion to do so. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I'll make a motion that we remove Alternatives 2 and 3.

DR. DUVAL: From Action 9?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug; second by Ben. You might want to clarify that is in Regulatory Amendment 14.

MR. HAYMANS: In Regulatory Amendment 14.

DR. DUVAL: **The motion reads remove Alternatives 2 and 3 from Action 9 in Regulatory Amendment 14. Is there any discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

MS. BROUWER: Okay, the next action then that you would have to decide what to do with is Action 10, and that is to modify the opening of the second commercial fishing season for vermilion. We have Alternative 2 with two subalternatives, and that's it.

DR. DUVAL: Jim, remind us what the AP had to say about this.

MR. ATACK: Yes, the AP motion was the AP supports Alternative 1, no action, on changing the start of the second season for vermilion snapper, and that was approved.

DR. DUVAL: If you recall some of our discussion at our meeting in September when we were going through and putting all these actions into Regulatory Amendment 14 was that it would potentially be beneficial to align the second opening of the vermilion season with the opening of the black sea bass season.

If folks recall this year black sea bass was pushed back a month and had a July 1 opening, the same as the second vermilion season. There was certainly feedback from some fishermen that this allowed the black sea bass season to remain open later as well as vermilion. There was interest from the committee in trying to align those seasons down the road. Are there comments on that? Tom.

MR. BURGESS: Jim, I think when this also came up it was discussed that this would eliminate a lot of vermilion snapper discards during the month of June. Was there any discussion around the AP about something like that or any reason behind not moving it in the relationship to regulatory discards?

MR. FEX: My name is Kenny Fex. Yes, there was and that was a good point actually opening both of them at the same time. I think there was probably more ideas going towards opening the black sea bass maybe in July; because vermilion, cutting it back earlier would even have closed our season on vermilions shorter towards October and November like we have seen this year. Aligning the seasons was definitely a good idea.

Last year showed real promise in it and so I think some way of maybe even transferring the black sea bass from one more back might be a better alternative on that. But, either way would work, but I think that was more of the concern that way, just go with what we had with vermilion and maybe setting the black sea bass back one month.

MR. BURGESS: What about the discards; there wasn't too much about the discards of sea bass for another month, you know, during that month of June and having to throw the sea bass back. It was a concern and fishermen have brought this up to me in one way or the other trying to address this problem. I kind of would like to see them in there and just get some feedback on it.

MS. BECKWITH: Tom, were those concerns for the commercial discards or recreational because recreational opened June 1st last year so the discards were in the commercial industry?

MR. BURGESS: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: So is there interest in the committee in moving this action into Regulatory Amendment 18? Tom.

MR. BURGESS: Yes, I make the motion that we include Action 10 in Regulatory Amendment 18.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Tom Burgess; seconded by Charlie. Discussion? I think folks have said everything that they want to say about this. Is there any objection to this motion? Anna; one objection noted. The motion passes.

MS. BROUWER: The next action deals with medication of the recreational closed season for vermilion snapper. There are two alternatives; Alternative 2 with various subalternatives for different lengths or different start dates.

DR. DUVAL: Jim, do you have anything more that you want to say about the modification of the closed season? You have already indicated that the AP would like to see this removed given the results of the vermilion snapper assessment. If we move this action into Regulatory Amendment 18, we might want to consider adding an alternative that reflects the input from the AP. I would entertain a motion to move Action 11 from Regulatory Amendment 14 to Regulatory Amendment 18 and take it from there. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Sure, and include an additional alternative to remove the season closure for the recreational.

DR. DUVAL: **The motion reads move Action 11 from Regulatory Amendment 14 to Regulatory Amendment 18 and include an additional alternative to remove the recreational season closure. Motion by Doug; seconded by John Jolley. That would be Alternative 3, so let's just give Myra a chance to get that up on the screen here.**

Right now there are a series of subalternatives under Alternative 2 that would simply modify the seasonal closure and shorten it. Well, one actually lengthens it. I think Subalternative 2C would lengthen it. I don't think we want to do that so we might need to consider removing some subalternatives or modifying them. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: I know we have to take a reasonable range of alternatives, but here I think we can build a good case that the no action has the closure. We have been way under our ACL, so the only other reasonable alternative is to get rid of the closure.

I think we can make a good argument for that case because the recreational sector has not been achieving their ACL and that prevents us achieving optimum yield. It just extra work to analyze these alternatives so we can say we have more than two alternatives, but it is not reasonable for anyone to pick a closed season when the sector is not reaching its ACL.

DR. DUVAL: I have Doug, but I'd also like some input from Monica as to would this be okay if we were to remove basically Alternative 2 and the subalternatives that just modify the recreational closed season. I think it is fairly well established that the recreational sector has not been catching their ACL. We have an improved assessment update. Do we really need to include any alternatives to modify that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I was having a slight sidebar, I'm sorry, and so the question is do you need Action 11 at all?

DR. DUVAL: No, the question is do we need Alternative 2 at all under Action 11? New Alternative 3, which you cannot currently see on the screen, would simply be to remove the recreational closed season of November through April.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My question would be is to why was the recreational closed season put in in the first place. You all had some reason for doing that and so I think that we ought to look at that and then put that in context as to why now you want it removed. Maybe it would be appropriate to just have those alternatives, but I'm not sure.

MR. WAUGH: It was put in to end overfishing, and that is a carryover from Amendment 16, I believe it is, and the latest stock assessment update shows it is no longer overfishing. We have switched over to ACLs and the recreational sector has not been harvesting its ACL, and so that argues for the reasonable range of alternatives being no action and then to remove the November through March closure.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And so it didn't have any spawning season closure context or anything? All right, if the answer is no, then, yes, it seems fine right now to just have action or no action there.

DR. CRABTREE: I believe with vermilion we only have in-season closure authority if it is overfished. Jack is nodding that it is right. Do we have any analysis that would indicate that without any seasonal closure would they stay underneath the ACL? It seems to me that gets us as to whether this is reasonable or not. I guess if we were confident that with no seasonal closure they still wouldn't exceed the ACL, maybe this isn't reasonable, but I don't know if we know that or not.

DR. DUVAL: I don't think that analysis has been done yet. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: No, the analysis hasn't been done, but logically the weather is horrible in the north end in the heart of the vermilion range. Basically only Florida is going to be able to participate with any time; so looking to see a really large increase in the recreational catch of vermilions in that four months is probably relatively low. That is not an analysis but it is based on –

DR. DUVAL: Common sense.

MR. HARTIG: – some logic.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chairman, for the reasons mentioned I think I would make a motion to remove Alternative 2 from Action 11.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug; seconded by John Jolley.

MR. CUPKA: Why don't you go ahead and vote this one up or down and then have a separate motion to take the action. I think that would be the cleanest thing.

DR. DUVAL: I agree. Is there anymore discussion on the motion to move Action 11 from Regulatory Amendment 14 to Regulatory Amendment 18 and include an additional alternative, Alternative 3, to remove the recreational season closure. Any opposition? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**.

MR. HAYMANS: So now I think I would make a motion to remove Alternative 2 from Action 11 from Regulatory Amendment 18.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug to remove Alternative 2 from Action 11 in Regulation Amendment 18; seconded by Charlie. Is there anymore discussion on this? Any opposition to this? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Phil.

MR. STEELE: Just a point of clarification, earlier I think there was some confusion. The mandatory dealer reporting will occur early in 2013 when the final rule is published. It is the universal permit that will be phased in and it could last until 2014.

DR. DUVAL: Right, and that was what – I wasn't confused on that, but knowing that the final rule is going to publish in early 2013, but the permits office staff had come by previously and presented a phase-in approach for when everything would finally be in place, and it was apparent that would be really effectively 2014 with getting all the new permits in place.

MR. STEELE: That is just the permits but the dealer reporting will occur in 2013 as soon as we get the final rule published.

DR. DUVAL: So what you're telling me is that even though the phasing in of the new permits is going to occur throughout 2013, that dealers as of the effective date of the rule in 2013; that dealers with existing permits that are still valid will be subject to the new reporting requirements?

MR. STEELE: That is correct.

DR. DUVAL: Well, that is great. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That is assuming the amendment gets approved, correct? It has got to go out for public comment and all that sort of thing; so if the amendment gets approved and if the final rule gets issued, then that is exactly what will happen.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, well, that is a pleasant surprise. I think Gregg has one question.

MR. WAUGH: And so there is a four-month period where someone who doesn't have an existing permit, by the end of that four-month period they either have to have the existing permit or the new universal permit; and so four months after the final rule, then everybody has to have a permit and everybody has to report weekly electronically. Then the remainder to be phased in is the switch over to the one permit.

MR. STEELE: That is correct.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, now that is clarified, the next two actions that are currently in Regulatory Amendment 14 that deal with red porgy, Action 12 would provide several alternatives to increase the recreational bag limit and Action 13 would increase the commercial headcount for red porgy. Given the assessment update that we have received, I think it would be prudent at this point to get a motion from the committee to remove these two actions from Regulatory Amendment 14 so that staff does not have to do the analysis. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Madam Chairman, I would like to make a motion to remove Actions 12 and 13 from Regulatory Amendment 14 to the considered but rejected appendix.

DR. DUVAL: Just a clarification; we actually don't need to move them to a considered but rejected appendix because technically they haven't actually been considered, so just removing Actions 12 and 13 from Regulatory Amendment 14 is sufficient, so seconded by Doug. Is there discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. I think that takes care of all of the actions that were in Regulatory Amendment 14 dealing with vermilion snapper and red porgy. I am going to suggest that we take a ten-minute break right now.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. DUVAL: We are reconvening. We do have a housekeeping item with regard to black sea bass. If you will recall, Dr. Barbieri covered this in the SSC report, but at the last council meeting or was it the June council meeting we requested that the SSC review the P-rebuild for black sea bass and provide recommendations in that regard.

At their October meeting they did review that and their recommendation for P-rebuild was 62.5 percent. What John Carmichael has informed us that we need to do is for the upcoming black sea bass update to the assessment we need a motion to adopt the SSC's recommendation for the black sea bass revised P-rebuild of 62.5 for the projections that will coming out of that assessment. We have not done that so I guess entertain a motion from the committee to adopt the SSC's recommendation for the revised black sea bass P-rebuild at 62.5 percent.

MR. HARTIG: So moved, Madam Chairman.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Ben.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, in order to adopt it and make it the P-rebuild that we're managing based on – you have to amend the plan. Now, I think what you're talking about here is just asking for a set of projections that use that, but the 66 percent probability is in the fishery management plan and you will have to amend the plan to change that.

DR. DUVAL: Right, so what we're talking is just asking for projections at that level. The motion is seconded by David Cupka. **The motion reads request that the black sea bass update to the assessment contain a projection at the revised black sea bass P-rebuild of 62.5 percent. Motion by Ben; seconded by David. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

The next item on our agenda is Regulatory Amendment 15, and this contains actions with regard to yellowtail snapper and gag and the shallow water groupers.

MS. BROUWER: This is Attachment 5A in your briefing book. The first order of business for this one is to approve the purpose and need.

DR. DUVAL: Can everyone see the purpose and need up on the screen or does everyone have the purpose and need in front of them on their computers.

MS. BROUWER: This is on PDF Page 4 of your Attachment 5A.

DR. DUVAL: If everyone is comfortable with the purpose and need, I would entertain a motion from the committee to approve the purpose and need. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS**: Madam Chairman, I would make a motion that we accept the purpose and need statement as printed in the Yellowtail and Shallow Water Grouper Regulatory Amendment 15 Decision Document.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Doug; seconded by John Jolley. Discussion? John.

MR. JOLLEY: I would just like to thank Myra for prompting us, and I think it would be beneficial because sometimes we don't about where to go, the exact location of things. Especially those of us who haven't been on this long, we wind up hunting and pecking through all this stuff and we lose part of this along the way. If everybody would commit to that methodology and not assume that all of us are on the same page at the same time, it would be very helpful. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Duly noted. All right, we have a purpose and need; let's move on. Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none; **the motion stands approved**.

MS. BROUWER: The first action in Regulatory Amendment 15 is to revise the ACL and the OY for yellowtail snapper. This is in response to the recent stock assessment. This is on PDF Page 5 of the attachment. Alternative 1 is the no action alternative. The no action alternative includes the emergency rule that became effective on November 7th that increased the commercial ACL for yellowtail snapper.

Alternative 2 contains that same adjustment where the commercial ACL would go up to 1,596,510 pounds and then recreational ACL would be 1,440,990 pounds; and then we have the ACT, which is calculated the way that you approved during the development of the Comprehensive ACL Amendment using the proportional standard error. Then Alternatives 3 and 4 would set the ACL below the ABC; Alternative 3 setting it at 90 percent and Alternative 4 setting it at 80 percent of the ABC. What we need from the committee is to select a preferred alternative for this action.

DR. DUVAL: And I will just note that the AP recommended Alternative 2 as their preferred.

&&MR. HARTIG: I will move Alternative 2 as our preferred alternative.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Ben; seconded by Doug. Discussion on the motion? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: This was also the recommendation that came out of the Keys, the yellowtail fishermen as well.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have a question. What was the rationale for selecting this particular alternative? I think Ben just said something and I'm not quite sure if we all heard it or not, but I don't if that's enough so if you want to discuss why this is a good choice.

DR. DUVAL: I think Ben noted that this was the alternative that was also supported by the fishermen, and this was the AP recommendation as well. I think if folks want to have a little bit more discussion about Alternative 2, certainly the council has set precedent previously by setting our ACLs equal to ABC in the past, which we have done through several other amendments. Jim, did you want to add something to that?

MR. ATACK: Yes, the AP – there was a mixed vote on it. We had four opposed and one abstention. I guess the difference between Alternative 2 and 3; 3 is 90 percent of 2. Alternative 2 gives you your highest ACL. I guess some people felt like we needed to be a little more conservative than a hundred percent ACL equals OY equals ABC.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other comments? We have a motion on the floor by Ben to accept Alternative 2 as our preferred. Monica, do you feel like we have enough discussion here?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes. If there is anything anybody else wants to add in, that is fine but I think I heard enough.

DR. DUVAL: If there are no other comments on this motion; is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motions stands approved.**

MS. BROUWER: Action 2 is on PDF Page 8, and this is to consider changes to the commercial and the recreational fishing years for yellowtail snapper and consider establishment of a spawning season closure. No action would do none of those things. Alternative 2 would modify the commercial fishing year, and there are several subalternatives for you to consider.

Alternative 3 would modify the recreational fishing year for yellowtail; again with the same subalternatives in the commercial changes. Then Alternative 4 has subalternatives for a spawning season closure for the commercial sector. Again, the action that we would need from the committee is to choose a preferred or actually a couple of preferreds. On the screen are also the recommendations from the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel.

DR. DUVAL: Jim, do you want to just quickly review those for us?

MR. ATACK: The first motion was that they wanted to go no action for changing the fishing year. The second one was no action on a commercial spawning season closure. Basically retain the calendar year as the commercial and recreational fishing year for yellowtail snapper. Do not establish a spawning closure for the commercial sector for yellowtail snapper. If the council considers implementing spawning season closures, it should apply to both sides. I think they were talking about no spawning closure because I think they spawn multiple times a year. I didn't think there was really a set spawning period is from what I remember.

MS. BROUWER: I will also add for the record that the SSC did discuss proposed modifications and they noted that changing the fishing year would make stock assessment work more difficult. They recommended that the council wait and not take action on changing the fishing year until the effect of the new ACL can be further evaluated.

DR. DUVAL: At this point I would entertain a motion from the committee for a preferred alternative for the fishing year. David.
MR. CUPKA: Madam Chairman, I would move Alternative 1, no action.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by David; seconded by Ben. **The motion reads select Alternative 1 as the preferred for Action 2 in Regulatory Amendment 15.** Is there discussion on the motion?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, the main concern I have with it is I'm concerned if we get on one fishing year and the Gulf remains on a different fishing year, then I don't how that is going to work. Remember, we're all fishing off one OFL that gets subdivided.

I would be fine with changing the fishing year at the end of the day, but it seems to me we need to resolve these issues with the Gulf and try to get to where we're working on a single ACL. Because I'm not sure – getting them off kilter like that I have a feeling is going to make some accounting problems.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, it could, Roy, and remember now we have created this two-council committee to begin looking at South Florida management issues, and one of the first ones I suspect we will be looking at is yellowtail and mutton snapper. We will certainly keep that in mind and see what would be the best way to proceed with that so that we don't keep crossing wires with them. I think that will be addressed here in the coming year.

DR. DUVAL: Just out of curiosity what is the Gulf's current fishing year for yellowtail?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, they're all January years right now; and so if we went to August and if theirs stayed January, that is going to get squirrelly, I think.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, I just want to make sure that as of now we're not changing anything. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, two things. David, do we have a date when we're going to meet with this committee yet?

MR. CUPKA: I don't Bob and Steve have come up with a date, but we will shortly. We have identified the participants. I have talked with Martha a little bit and Jessica, and I think Florida is going to obviously have to be lead in this as far as coming up with a list of actions they would like to see considered or management actions. I think we're moving ahead but we don't have the date set yet, but hopefully it will be before the next meeting, I'm sure.

DR. DUVAL: I think Bob is going to enlighten us on that.

MR. MAHOOD: I thinks at this meeting we wanted to set some dates for our group to get together and then I would forward that to Steve. I guess, Doug, you're part of that group, if I'm not mistaken, and they have five folks in their group also. Once we look at the calendar and pick some dates, so be thinking about that, Ben – Martha, did Jessica give you a list of things that she wanted to consider? She had talked about putting together a list that were important to you guys down there, so we will talk about that, also.

MS. BADEMAN: Yes, we kind of have somewhat of a mental list, but yellowtail snapper is definitely at the top of it. If we could address this at that committee, that would be super.

MR. HARTIG: And the other thing I had, Madam Chairman, if I may, the fishermen still ask for the season change, but it doesn't look lime they're catch that new quota possibly. The other part of it, I'm pretty sensitive to the assessment changes now when you change the fishing years having gone through these processes and making much more work for the data providers. There are some overwhelming reasons to not change it and plus Roy's concern with the two change of dates with the Gulf and the Atlantic.

DR. DUVAL: We have not yet voted on this motion, but just to remind folks that the no action in Alternative 1 applies to both the fishing year as well as the spawning season closure, I believe, so by selecting this as a preferred alternative we are not implementing a spawning season closure at this time. Okay, I just want to make sure everybody was aware of that. Are there any other comments on this motion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, just that I know the industry guys that I have talked to – and I have spent a lot time with those guys – want to do this. I just want to be clear. I think we're more than willing to look at doing this. It is just right now is not the time. We need to work some things out and then come back to it.

DR. DUVAL: And I think it is clear that the intent is to do this through this joint committee with Gulf to make sure things are consistent. Are there any other comments? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.**

MS. BROUWER: And the final action in Regulatory Amendment 15 is on PDF Page 11, and that one deals with possibly modifying the accountability measure or taking it away that closes the shallow water grouper once the gag ACL is met or projected to be met. Alternative 1, no action, is a little lengthy because it includes the accountability measures that are in place for the commercial sector as well as the ACL.

Alternatives 2 and 3 refer back to Alternative 1 since that contains the existing accountability measures. Alternative 2 would simply take away the bit that closes the shallow water grouper when the gag ACL is met or projected to be met. Alternative 3 would take away that accountability measure, and besides that it would adjust the gag ACL for a level of estimated post-quota bycatch mortality.

This is something that when the council took action on Amendment 16 to end overfishing of gag and vermilion snapper, the gag ACL at that time was lowered by a thousand pounds to account for post-quota bycatch mortality. The actual ACL is 353,940 pounds gutted weight. The ACL that folks are fishing on is 352,940 pounds gutted weight.

Alternative 3 would reduce that to 326,722 pounds gutted weight. Again, this is to account for the projected discard mortality once the shallow water grouper – well, if gag closes and shallow water grouper remains open. In your decision document this action contains a lot more information than the previous two.

You have a table that shows the existing commercial and recreational ACLs for the snapper grouper species, the various complexes. Then there are also the analyses that were conducted; also a figure showing the mean discard mortality of gag from the discard logbooks data from 2006 through 2012 showing a marked decline in that level of discards.

This is while the shallow water grouper closure was not in effect. What am I trying to say? This decline in discards happened even though the shallow water closure never went into effect prior to this year. It seems that other regulations that are currently in place already have the effect of reducing discards for gag and the shallow water grouper closure is no longer necessary.

The recommendations from the SSC; they noted that red grouper can be targeted without overly impacting gag. There is some evidence from North Carolina. The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries provided some analyses for that area. The region conducted further analyses for the entire South Atlantic and it does seem that red grouper can be effectively targeted without impacting gag.

The Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel was supportive of Alternative 3. In addition they suggested considering an accountability measure that would reduce the trip limit to 300 pounds when 75 percent of the gag commercial quota has landed. It is something that we were just talking about for vermilion. Here again we would need you to choose a preferred.

MR. CUPKA: **Madam Chairman, I would like to move that Alternative 3 of Action 3 be selected as our preferred.** Clearly, we saw what happened this year where we linked gag with the shallow water grouper that there were still quite a bit of shallow water quota left, and so I think we need to do away with that linkage between the two, but we also need to account for that bycatch mortality. Alternative 3 addresses all those problems, I believe, and so that would be my motion.

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion by David to select Alternative 3 under Action 3 in Regulatory Amendment 15 as our preferred; second by Charlie. Discussion. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I would support the motion. I think a couple of things. One, I think that the cumulative impact of all these ACLs closures and others is that effort is down. Discards are directly related to effort so I think discards are down in general. I think that Alternative 3 has the correction to the quota to account for the projected gag discards, so I think we can do this and

still accomplish our goals of preventing overfishing in gag. I think the tradeoff of allowing increased fishing on these other stocks, which are far below their optimum yield now, economically more than offsets the reduction in the gag quotas. I think this is an appropriate alternative.

MR. HARTIG: In the analysis in the post-quota bycatch mortality, is that a combination of years or one, the last year or what was used to develop that number?

MS. BROUWER: The analysis that the regional office did used 2011 and they looked at the level of discards from October 21st through December 21st since the gag closure this year went into place on October 20th. They had several ways of defining a target trip for gag. You can see Table 4 in your decision document has those options.

A gag target trip is defined when gag constituted over 90 percent of the landings, 75 percent, 50 percent and 25 percent. What is currently in the alternative comes from choosing the option with the gag target trip at 75 percent and also taking into account a reduction in the number of trips that would be taken. That percentage was taken from the analyses that were done for Amendment 16, so it was a 20 percent reduction. The Snapper Grouper AP discussed this at their latest meeting and they agreed that indeed that criteria for defining a gag target trip was appropriate, and it is the same one that was used for Amendment 16. That is how that was done.

DR. FARMER: Just a quick point of clarification; for the analysis my colleague, Mike Larkin, he used the 2012 data where it was available and then put in the 2011 data to substitute for the time period we didn't have 2012 data available for. We did a bunch of comparisons to look at the reliability of 2011 versus 2012 as a predictor and it seemed to line up real nice.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other comments or questions? Jim.

MR. ATACK: Yes, I guess after this motion is done we would like to talk about reducing the trip limit after 75 percent of the quota is met.

DR. DUVAL: I would like to dispense with the motion that we have here first before we take that up. Are there any other comments on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. Jim did bring up the point that the AP had asked that the committee consider an accountability measure that the trip limit be reduced to 300 pounds when 75 percent of the gag commercial quota is landed.

What I would say here is that we had quite a lengthy discussion about a similar motion earlier today for vermilion snapper. The one thing I would note is that we are scheduled to take final action on this amendment here because the interest from the committee was to remove this gag trigger for closure of the shallow water grouper complex in time for next year.

If a new alternative is added to this amendment it requires analysis and so we would not be taking final action on this amendment at this time. We would have to come back to it in March. I don't know if Myra or staff have other comments on the level of analysis that would be

required to do something like that. My sense is that it would further delay approval of this amendment. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think that is correct. I think if you want to explore that as an alternative we ought to put it in some other amendment and do it. I think this is ready to go and we ought to go ahead and vote this up.

DR. DUVAL: And, Jim, I would just say in response when you all discussed Regulatory Amendment 14, that would certainly be an appropriate place to consider that and the committee will be receiving an options paper on Regulatory Amendment 14, which includes size and bag limit changes for a number of other species. I think that might be appropriate place to reconsider this motion, if that is okay with you.

MR. ATACK: Sure.

DR. DUVAL: We have dispensed with all the actions in Regulatory Amendment 15, and right now I would entertain a motion from the committee to approve this amendment for submission to the Secretary of Commerce. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: **Michelle, I make the motion to approve Regulatory Amendment 15 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie; seconded by Ben. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that **motion stands approved**. The next motion we would need is to approve the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: **Michelle, I make the motion to approve the codified text as necessary and appropriate for Regulatory Amendment 15.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie; seconded by John Jolley. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any opposition? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.** The final motion that we would need is to give staff and the council chairman editorial license to make changes to the document as necessary prior to submission. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Michelle, I will make a motion to give staff and the council chairman editorial license to make changes to the document as necessary prior to submission.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie; seconded by John Jolley. Any discussion? Any opposition? That motion stands approved and we have finished with Regulatory Amendment 15. The next item on our agenda is Amendment 28 dealing with red snapper management. This is the amendment that would allow for a similar limited commercial and recreational harvest next year or for the foreseeable future using similar openings as to what did this year. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: This is Attachment 6A I believe in your briefing book. The first thing you should do is approve the purpose and need and I have neglected to put that as an action item in

the decision document. If that is okay, you can go ahead and just approve that. That is towards the beginning of the decision document. I apologize I don't have a PDF page for you. It is up on the screen right now – PDF Page 4.

DR. DUVAL: Well, the purpose for the action is to establish regulations to allow harvest of red snapper in the South Atlantic, and the need is to increase the socio-economic benefits to fishermen and fishing communities that utilize the red snapper portion of the snapper grouper fishery.

Regulations should minimize; one, safety at sea concerns; two, probability of overages of the annual catch limit; and, three, discard mortality of red snapper. In addition the fishing season should allow an opportunity to collect information on the life history of red snapper. At this time I would entertain a motion to approve the purpose and need. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: **Madam Chair, I move that we approve the purpose and need to Amendment 28, the management plan for the snapper grouper fishery in the South Atlantic.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Anna; seconded by Charlie. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.**

MS. BROUWER: Okay, the first and only action actually in this amendment is on PDF Page 7. It has several alternatives dealing with various aspects of the red snapper fishery, and so we're going to go a little bit at a time. Action 1, of course, is no action, and it includes what was done to reopen red snapper this year in 2012. It explains how that was done.

Then we have a set of subalternatives under Alternative 2, and those subalternatives detail how the ACL would be calculated from 2013 forward. Subalternative 2A is the same thing that was done this year, 2012, to select the ACL for red snapper. Alternative 2B and 2C use ratios of previous years' removals.

Alternative 2B uses only the previous year's ratio and Alternative 2C uses the previous two years, so that is the only difference between those two. The Snapper Grouper AP recommended Subalternative 2A as the preferred. The SSC looked at this at their meeting in October, and they didn't really understand why in Subalternative 2A the current ABC is being averaged with the two previous years' total removals. The SSC simply suggested that the committee consider choosing whichever alternative is the simplest that would not negatively impact the rebuilding plan.

DR. DUVAL: I know that the SSC and the AP kind of struggled a little bit with understanding these various subalternatives and how they would play out. I think John might have put together a few slides to sort of make sure that we very clearly understand what each of these subalternatives would do. If folks don't mind, I would like to ask John if he would please go through that because I want to make sure that everybody sitting around the table at this hour of the day is clear on what we would be voting on.

MR. CARMICHAEL: After discussing this at the SSC and the AP and seeing the confusion about some of this and I talked about this at the meeting, I've spent a lot of time thinking about it and I can understand why there is a bit of confusion. It seems kind of simple but it is really not. When you get right into it, it gets kind of complicated in a hurry for some reason.

The bottom line is this is really about trying to figure out what the current regulations are doing. If the current regulations, which is the harvest moratorium – that is the primary regulation – if that is sufficient to hold the removals below the target, which is the ABC, then there is some additional fish there that you can call it surplus or what have you – we'll call it an ACL – that is available for harvest.

The council and agency decided that existed last year and they allowed some harvest and they had a method for determining that. But the real challenge then is how do you predict how effective the current regulations will be next year, so how do you determine what that surplus is? It is hard because you're trying to predict into the future and you're looking at the discard data and people have opinions about good that is.

It is a complicated type of regulation to evaluate so it makes it a little more complicated in terms of figuring out what it is going to do in the future. After thinking about it myself and looking at the discussions at the AP and the SSC and looking at the amendment, the first thing I thought would help today is just say a little bit about the language and the wording that is in those alternatives.

The alternatives are listed as equations and sometimes that is a little more difficult to put in terms of words and concepts that you guys can understand and help make a good decision. First of all is the ABC. That is the allowable biological catch; we all know what that is. In this case it is determined by the council through the rebuilding plan, and that was F 98 percent of F 30 percent SPR, and is the values that come from the stock projections.

There was a table that gives you the ABC; that's the target; and you have it projected out into the future. The amendment uses the abbreviation of CSR, closed season removals. That is just what is taken during that primary management action, the moratorium. The closed season removals, what you're getting at there is what is the impact of those moratorium regulations, and it is really discards.

It is the fish that are discarded and the proportion of those that die as result of all the other fishing that is going on while people are fishing for stuff but not keeping red snapper. That is what the CSR is about. The ACL, we know what that is, that is the annual catch limit. In this case it has been defined as the difference between the ABC, which is the overall target, and that CSR, those removals.

If the moratorium is having more of an effect than is minimally necessary to keep landings – and in this case they're just discards – below that ABC target, then there are some fish there. There

is a surplus of fish that is available for some directed harvest. This is just sort of the basic language that we're dealing with here.

In 2012 this was estimated using three data points essentially. There was the discard loss as estimated by the science center for 2010 and 2011, and it was the estimated ABC during 2012. Those three points were averaged together and gave us an estimate of the total magnitude of discards that were expected to occur in 2012 from the moratorium regulations.

You subtract that from the ABC and it gave the ACL in whatever tens of thousands of fish that it ended up being. It seems relatively simple but it is the inclusion of the ABC in 2012 which raised the questions at the SSC in particular. I think thinking about it for a minute it looks like you have the 2012 ABC playing two parts.

On the one hand it is part of the values that are used averaged together to give you your estimate of what the management is doing, but it is also the value from which you subtract that to get your ACL, and that is sort of where the confusion is coming in because you have something that we all associate as a target being included in our estimation of what the management regulations are doing. I think that is where the SSC really took pause in looking at this.

We're using as part of an estimate or a management effect in this, we're using an actual target, and that is really a different use than what we would do with something like an ABC in most situations, but there is a reason that it is being used that way. It was recommended by the science center when we were first setting this up under the emergency action, and the reason is that we expect this stock to be getting better. We expect that there are more fish out there.

That means we would anticipate that the fishermen are likely to encounter more fish, and that means that they're likely to throw back more fish. The intent of the science center in putting this in there was to say you need to account for the fact that there is more fish in 2012, more fish could be encountered so you may have a higher discard rate.

That is very valid and that needed to be included in there in some way, so it kind of brings up the question then of it is the ABC, but in this case it is being used as something different. What I have realized and after talking with folks is that this kind of brings up the separate logic issue where if you think about this as I've got two years of observed discard data and then I've got a target and I'm kind of mixing a management strategy effects data with the management target and that is where this just seems to stop making sense.

It is a valid reason for doing that; it is just the language and the terminology and the baggage that we bring about dealing with stuff in general that makes us question this. The question then it leads me to is, is the ABC really the appropriate estimator of next year's total removals; next year's closed season removals? Well, it may or may not be.

Another question is will the removals increase as the abundance increases and that is what we need to be getting at when we do these estimations. Really, what I think is there probably is a better estimator. It would be great to have a robust estimator of closed season removals that

include both effort and abundance. That is how we would ideally like to evaluate a management action.

The reality is that doesn't exist, so the ABC gave a means of getting at this concept with the information that we have at hand. Now we have a couple of other alternatives to think about so I think we need to put those in the context of this and think if one of those other alternatives such as 2B or 2C can achieve the same end.

What I have got here is a very complicated – I put a lot of money to have this graphic made to just kind of show (laughter) the concept here of what we're dealing with. The black line is consider this a measure of the ABC or the population abundance. What it shows you is that this is a typical exponential growth.

The population starts out pretty flat just like your retirement fund when you're putting money into it, but as time goes go on the magic of compounding interest or in this case fish that are born years ago start contributing and their young start contributing, and eventually you start getting to the exponential part of the curve and abundance starts going up pretty fast.

This is what we anticipate the population to be doing. Now, discards can do a couple of things. Discards may be purely proportional to abundance; that fish can't afford fish any more than what they do at some point in time; and if they're encountering half the population and discarding them, whether the population is at this level or up here at this level, they're going to encounter that same number of fish and discard them.

If that is the case, you get a line kind of like this and that would mean it is just purely proportional to how many are out there. Fishermen continue to fish in the same areas, the fish are of the same relative abundance in those areas, they're not doing anything different. On the other hand, this obviously is not a great situation because even as the stock grows I'm continuing to discard fish.

On the other hand it might be that there are things that let the fishermen be more effective in avoiding fish. Maybe the population is increasing more in an area where the fishermen aren't going as much or maybe they used to go there now but due to the regulations they don't go there. We all hear how you don't allow people to fish for a given species; it changes how they go out and how they prosecute their fishing activities. I know Steve here certainly fishes a lot different now that you can't keep red snapper than he did a couple of years ago when he could. There is a good example of there might be things going on that break this strict percentage relationship.

We really desire that; we hope that as the population increases the discards don't increase as much. This is really what lets us get off of things like moratorium regulations and have more of a directed fishery down the line. But what we're dealing with here is trying to really predict the difference between this black line and whatever discards are going to be.

Whatever this pattern is going to turn out to be, that is this orange color here, and that is the surplus. That is the ACL; that is the amount of fish that we can go harvest during these mini-

seasons. This is the parameter that we're trying to estimate through all of this. What you can see is that if the discards are strictly proportional, this value stays exactly the same. This orange line is going to fit between the green and black no matter what you do.

But if the discards go down a little bit, then this is going to get bigger, and this is where we're hoping we're heading with red snapper, obviously, that over time the population is growing and the landings that can come out of that mini-season can get bigger and bigger and eventually we don't have to have this strict moratorium. We can bags and sizes and seasons.

This is really the concept of what is going on in all of those in kind of a graphic formula. The question then is how do we resolve these situations using the existing alternatives? Well, Alternatives B and C use the ratios of observed discards to the ABC; so in case of this figure it would be like looking at this percentage over – like if we were at this point in time, we would be looking at these years and deciding what that percentage was to get this estimate of what we can actually remove in a future year.

Now, the value of them in terms of what the AP and the SSC have commented on is that they don't use the future year ABC in estimating how effective the regulation has been, and that is the AP and SSC concern. However, as the line shows, the magnitude of expected discards is going to increase as the population increases.

So even if you're using a percentage but you're applying it to the ABC in this year; because that ABC is going to be up with the population increasing, we're saying that we expect a higher number of fish to be discarded from this year as opposed to this early year, but we're still going to base it on the percentage.

So I think that by using the ABC in the future as part of the equation as 2B and 2C, it addressed that concern we expect higher abundance so expect to see more discards in the future as we look down the road. I think in case if the discards follow the red line, then the percentage of fish that is discarded relative to the ABC is likely to decline over time, which would be good, and that would be one reason why we would not want to just fix the percentage at any point in time.

2B looks at using like a one-year average and 2C looks at using a two-year average. You can see if we follow this red line, the percentage is declining over time, but it is still increasing discards because the abundance of fish is increasing. Now, if we're wrong and it is following more like this, we're using a two-year average or a one-year value, it will give us that, too, because we will see that value is not really changing.

But either way we're taking a percentage and applying it to this ABC, which is growing, which means each year we think, okay, there is going to be a few more fish available. If the last two years on average you threw back 90 percent of the ABC, the deaths from discards equaled 90 percent of the ABC, if in that year the ABC was 100,000 fish and then next year the ABC goes to 125,000 fish, you would still say you're going to throw back and kill 90 percent of them, but you're now doing it to 90 percent of 125,000, so overall you're seeing more discards.

That is how those percentage options would work out. The AP commented that they didn't like those. One of the things if they had a comparison of the outcomes – and obviously you're going to be in favor of the ones that show that you could have some fishery and you're likely to have some fishery in the future, but I think that the alternatives of 2B and 2C are a little bit biased in what they really do based on the data that actually occurred during 2010 and 2011.

I've got another high-tech graphic here to illustrate what was really going on in the real world. Just imagine we're at the lower left-hand side of that other graph where the population is really relatively flat over time, and the predicted ABC in 2010 was like 64,000 fish and it was like 65,000 in 2011 and it is like 85 or 86,000 in 2012, so there wasn't much increase from 2010 to 2011, a little bit in 2012.

Well, in 2010 the observed removals from discards were actually a bit higher than what the ABC was, and in 2011 they were a little bit lower; the net result was that over 2010 and 2011, as compared to 2010 and 2011 they're about 1.03 times, which means if you applied the ratio strictly in 2012 you would have decided that you actually removed more than you could have remove and you probably wouldn't have allowed the fishery.

That would have just been the situation in 2012. But what was actually also going on in 2012 was that we're starting to get to this increasing ABC point on our curve, so we had a 20,000 pound increase in the number of fish. That's why the council looked at the average discards and compared it to the ABC in 2012 and said, oh, you know, there is maybe 15 to 20,000 fish there we could take, which is also a valid conclusion to draw from the data.

If they had done that, just average the 2010 and 2011, we would have probably ended up with an estimate of discards predicted around here for 2012. But when you account for the increased abundance based on what the science center recommended, then you actually brought this line up a little bit and our surplus got to be a little bit less.

So what I think is likely to happen in the future is if you use the two-year average is the discards actually end up below the ABC in 2012, which we only hope they will be, and we know they were so in 2011, then Option 2B or 2C are going to allow for some fishery most likely. How much it is going to be I don't know. It is going to depend on what the actual closed season releases end up being estimated at in 2012.

But I think this does hopefully illustrate that some of the objections of the AP may have been really just based on that outcome, which was driven a lot by 2010. Hopefully in the future this line of discards is going to stay below this ABC and give us a surplus that we can deal with. I hope that by allowing the increasing ABC to account for the increased availability over time that we can address the science center's concerns.

After looking at this and talking with our staff and the regional office folks, it looks like 2B or 2C might be reasonable alternatives for you guys to consider and they bring in the concerns of the AP and the SSC as well. I think that is pretty much all of what I just said. That is the end of the slides. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to take them.

DR. DUVAL: I very much appreciate you going through that, John. I think that was very educational for folks here. It certainly helped to understand it better. Are there questions for John regarding what he just presented? Jim.

MR. ATACK: By looking at this, basically we're losing some compounding if we do the mini-season each year, right? And if you don't do the mini-season, I guess you're leaving fish out there which would affect the ABC the next year. I'm guessing that if you don't do the mini-season you have an ABC with a certain plot. If you do it, that slope drops down based on the surplus that you took out. In other words, if we didn't do a mini-season in 2013, would you be able to have twice as big a season in 2014?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Actually the projections assumed that all of those fish are removed; so if you left fish in the water and didn't harvest them, then in that case the slope of the black line, which is the abundance, would actually be a little bit higher. There would be a few more fish out there in the following year.

MR. ATACK: My last question is then two or three years down the road this will affect our ACLs, I guess, so I wonder by doing this – you know, you have some prediction in, say, 2015 you will have an ACL of 100,000 or 200,000 or some ACL; and by doing this, how much are we affecting a real ACL versus a mini-season?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We really don't have an estimate of any these approaches for what the ACL would be, say, in 2015 because I don't think people have much confidence in extrapolating our discard estimates out that many years, so assume we have enough discomfort extrapolating them out into one year in the future.

What we do know is we have an ABC and we have the estimates from the assessment, and those would not change until we do a new assessment, in which case we start plugging in estimated values with actual observed values. When we actually putting in how many fish were really killed from discards in 2010 and 2011 and discards plus mini-seasons in 2012 and whatever years in the future we continue to allow mini-seasons, then we will get a change in those ABC projections from the table.

MR. ATACK: So we have no idea how this will affect our ACLs, the time we get an ACL or when might we expect to get an ACL if we didn't do this?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Actually to some extent that is true because we have no idea what the discard estimate is going to be for 2012 until we get that number. What we can tell you is that we were a little less than target in 2011; and if that continues to be the same in 2012, we could be. I looked at a little bit of scant data that is available from MRIP on red snapper through the first few waves in the private fishery, and it looks on a similar track as 2010, which means it looks a little higher than 2011, but we know our allowance in 2012 was higher.

We also don't know how the commercial and headboat are going to compare relative to their earlier years. At this point we have so little data to know about what this fishery is doing under this moratorium that, yes, you're right it is really hard to say. That is why I think we have to take great care in picking our method to make sure that our method is robust to this. I think the ratio estimator approaches are going to be pretty robust to whatever is happening.

DR. PONWITH: You're asking exactly the right question, and I like that line of thinking. The situation that we're in is when you do a projection, the year that immediately follows the stock assessment is the year we have the most confidence in. The farther you go into the future the more that confidence weakens.

It is the way it is for fisheries projections and basically it is the way it is for any projection you're making into the future, predicting the future based on what data you have now. The question that you're asking that I really like is weighing the cost and the benefits of taking a little bit now versus what that could bring you if you allowed it to compound, basically adding to the spawning stock and what it might bring you later, that is a science question in terms of what that does for the rate of rebuilding.

It is also a very important socio-economic question of what are the returns on a little bit now versus a little bit more later. I like the line of questioning. It is exactly the kinds of things that need to be discussed from the science standpoint. I think the next stock assessment will help us understand how close to those projections we are and give us a little more firm footing on this.

DR. DUVAL: And remember there is going to be a benchmark assessment in 2014 for red snapper. At least that holds the top slot on the schedule right now for the South Atlantic.

MR. PHILLIPS: And, Bonnie, to that point how useful are the racks and stuff that you've collected this year?

DR. DUVAL: I think he is referring from the carcass collection program from the opening earlier this year, the biological information.

DR. PONWITH: The gold standard right now for the data that we're collecting is, number one, the fishery-independent index. That is the number one most important. Number two probably most important are the age composition, the otoliths we're getting from the fishery independent, and then third most important are the otoliths that we're supplementing that with from the landings. All of those are going to be important data.

MR. AMICK: John, I like your high-tech graphs. I almost understood it, but I had a question. On the average on the discards you have 70,000 fish there, and that is the discard, that is not the mortality? Do you apply the mortality rate to that 70,000 and what mortality rate did you use?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is the mortality; that is about what it was averaging –

MR. AMICK: So that is not the total discards?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is the dead discards.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other questions or comments for John regarding this presentation and recommendations? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: The reality of rebuilding plans is anytime you allow harvest it slows down the rate of recovery, so it is always a balance to figure that out. I guess, John, my question would be of the alternatives that we now, which it sounds like B and C are the two that – what are the relative merits of B versus C and can you give us some guidance on –

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the one that is two years, is that C? I think 2C that has two years is probably slightly better because I think anytime you're dealing with something uncertain like this, if you can bring in a couple of years of data it would be more helpful than just relying on one. You could have a year-to-year swing.

It might be something that maybe after you do this a little bit and after the assessment, if it looks like it is working out pretty well, you may want to extend that and maybe use it a little bit longer. Maybe at some point you start using the average from the time you allowed mini-seasons. Maybe by 2015 you're using 2012, 2013 and 2014. I think using more years will certainly be useful because things can swing from year to year. There would be the risk of using one single year.

MR. BELL: I notice 2B and 2C are ways of computing the ACL, and that is what you end up with is a number. There is sort of not what you do with that. Alternative 3 gets more into the mechanics of dealing with the season. I guess if we chose 2B or 2C as a preferred, something else still needs to come into play to explain how you're going to operationalize that, right? I mean this doesn't just stand alone. You have an ACL at the end of 2C.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I also think these alternatives include the provision that if the total removals exceed the ABC you wouldn't any fishery at all, so there is a fail safe. That is kind of an accountability measure.

DR. DUVAL: Right, and I think recognizing that we aren't really going to know what those total removals are for this year until some time probably in March, I'm guessing, Roy or Bonnie.

DR. CRABTREE: I think last year it was March or April, maybe even a little later than that when we actually put all this together, and then we talked about it at the June council meeting. We would be something along those lines. It may be a little bit better this year since we know it is coming.

I think your first question is, is do you want to continue to have a short season or do you just want to leave it closed until you get the new assessment? If you do want to have a short season,

John is advising 2C. Then you have got to choose, as Mel points out, these operational features as to when it would start and those types of things.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move we make 2C the preferred alternative.**

DR. DUVAL: Subalternative 2C?

MS. BECKWITH: Subalternative 2C; thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Anna; second by Charlie. Discussion. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, we've put the expectation out there that we're going to go down this path. It is kind of hard to put the genie back in the bottle now. Having said that, I had some trepidations about the opening and the tournaments and everything, but it worked out really, really well I think overall, and we collected a number of biological samples to supplement the fishery-independent information. I think it is well worth pursuing this even knowing that when you take fish out early in a rebuilding plan that it affects it the most.

MS. BADEMAN: Yes, I agree with Ben. One of our commissioners that lives in the North Florida kind of region went around to some tackle shops after the opening. It is just incidental information but a lot of those owners and workers there said that they did see a spike in people coming in and people were excited about it. It worked out pretty well, we got a lot of good data. The weather was not so great but –

DR. DUVAL: That is a risk that we take with these kinds of things as we well know. Are there any other comments on this motion for Subalternative 2C? **The motion is to select Subalternative 2C as the preferred to calculate the red snapper ACL.** Jim.

MR. ATACK: Yes, I was just looking at my notes. I guess the AP recommended the 2A as the preferred alternative.

DR. DUVAL: And I think that the AP recommended 2A because as John mentioned they had the benefit of seeing some tables as to I think how that particular alternative would play out had it been – well, as applied to the information that we have right now for 2012 and it didn't look so rosy. I think what John is saying is that by applying the ratio method, that this actually provides a better estimator of the effectiveness of our regulation. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And I believe there is an example in this document that shows under some circumstances you could get more fish from 2C, so it just depends on what is happening. I understand the AP's point but this is an awfully confusing thing, I think given John's presentation, that this is probably the better alternative to go with.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other comments before we take a vote? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none**; that motion stands approved.** Now we move into sort of the nitty-gritty of how this would actually work.

MS. BROUWER: The fishing season alternatives are on PDF Page 9. Alternative 3 deals with the commercial fishing seasons and you have three subalternatives beginning the second Monday or the first Monday in July, August or September. Alternative 4 and its subalternatives deal with establishing the recreational fishing seasons.

The Snapper Grouper AP recommended Subalternative 3C for the commercial red snapper season, and that is a season that would begin on the second Monday in September. They recommended Subalternative 4C for the recreational red snapper season, and that would mean the season would begin on the second Friday in September. The SSC did not have any recommendations.

DR. CRABTREE: Myra, in the emergency rule we specified that fishing would occur in seven-day seasons; does this document say that or is this just open it and then let them fish until they catch it up?

MS. BROUWER: No, it does specify that commercial it would be seven days and two consecutive weekends consisting of Friday, Saturday and Sunday for the recreational sector.

DR. CRABTREE: Only two or as many consecutive weekends as the ABC allows?

MS. BROUWER: I believe initially it is just two; and then based on the landings during those two consecutive weekends the season could reopen.

MR. BELL: Just to comment, I know September – we're not red snapper central, but September starts really pushing it for us on weather. We ran into some weather this year. I know where we are our prime period of a potential hit for a hurricane is September. I would just think maybe earlier in the year would be – I mean just from our perspective I think earlier would be perhaps a little better.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I think there were a variety of public comments that came in. Some were in favor of the second Monday in July; others the second Monday in September. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Excuse me if you already said this, Jim, but why did the AP choose September?

MR. BOWEN: Zack Bowen. I think one reason that chose September was because of the majority of the spawning biomass happened in the June/July/August time. Some of the samples of the snapper that we caught this past September; some of them had already spawned and some of them had not. I think if we moved it earlier you're going to be taking more of a spawning biomass out of the ocean.

MR. ATACK: And then the other things we looked at I think was the black sea bass and stuff was maybe closing by then like it did last year, and that would give another directed fishery for

charters and some advertising. If you moved it earlier, your black sea bass you're also fishing maybe at the same time so it would help, we thought.

DR. DUVAL: Myra wanted to clarify something.

MS. BROUWER: Roy, Alternative 4, the end of the last two sentences talk about the end of the recreational season would be predetermined and announced before the start of the season, and the season will not open if the projected season length is three days or less.

MS. BECKWITH: For the recreational fishery, I would be most interested in a July opening. I am concerned about the discard mortality of black sea bass when we do open the red snapper in September. As we did this last year, we did have quite a bit of people complaining about the discard mortality of the black sea bass.

We're certainly discarding red snapper during the black sea bass season recreationally in June and July, so we're losing those fish regardless. To have those fish available for the recreational and for-hire fishery while black sea bass is open I think would be the most prudent approach, allowing for less discards of black sea bass in September; and taking those fish even though some may be spawn ready, but it is a limited number of fish that we would be taking and some portion of that is being discarded regardless. **Given those points, if I may deal with Alternative 4 first, I would like to move that we make Subalternative 4A the preferred for the recreational season.**

DR. DUVAL: We have a motion by Anna to make Subalternative 4A the preferred alternative for the recreational season; seconded by Steve Amick. Discussion. Steve.

MR. AMICK: I had mixed emotions of when it would be best to start a recreational mini-season. Like the AP says, I agree that the spawning goes on through August and a little bit into September, and they're done, they're spent. But at the same time we don't know what the recreational landings were for 2012 and we won't know until March.

The preliminary feelings or what we have seen is that the recreational landings were nowhere near the ACL that was set. Part of it and mostly probably it is because of effort. Now, September is a transitional month where everybody goes back to school, hunting season and the effort is probably less in September than it would be in July.

I have a concern in the amendment that we have the commercial sector being able to reopen seven days until their ACL is met, but recreationally we have these two weekends, long weekends, which is I think worthwhile at this stage. I didn't believe so in the beginning, but it is worth pursuing.

If we are to try to catch the ACL – and from what I understand it is NOAA Fisheries that would consider the length of the fishing season – I think a July start date would give us more room if there is a possibility of increasing the length of a recreational season to try to catch the recreational ACL.

DR. CRABTREE: As I understand it, though, you're not just limited to two weekends. Depending on how the ABC works out, it could be three weekends. Myra, I don't believe the document indicates that it is seven days, right, so the commercial fishery will just open, they will have some amount of fish, and they will fish until it is caught, and that will largely determine how many days they get by whatever trip limit you set, I would guess.

DR. DUVAL: And just in response to Roy's comment, Steve.

MR. AMICK: Roy, to your point, that is exactly what my first feelings were that September would be a better start date for recreationally; but if there is an opportunity for a three-weekend series of a recreational season it would be better to start it early in the year to avoid the bad weather in the winter, especially on the northern states as you go further north. That is my reason of changing my preferred start date for recreational.

MR. ATACK: Just in response to Anna's comments, black sea bass mortality is pretty low on the catch and release. We looked at that. I'm sure red snapper has got a higher mortality. And with the spawning, moving it to September would seem like a better deal than moving the opening to July.

DR. DUVAL: Certainly, we got a lot of comments in North Carolina. At least I got a lot of comments from folks who were very upset about the fact that black sea bass was closed when this limited red snapper season was open. I think the reality of this is whatever date is chosen as a preferred alternative we're going to have some folks who are disappointed.

We do have a motion on the table to select Subalternative 4A. We have heard the concerns regarding the spawn. We have heard the concerns regarding being able to fish when the weather is a little bit better and potentially start this earlier in the year and possibly, depending on the level of harvest, allow for any additional season openings with regard to the recreational sector. Are there other comments around the table with regard to this motion? Hearing none, are folks ready to vote. Do you need to think about this a little more? Bonnie, you look like you might want to say something.

DR. PONWITH: And it is just to the comments that we heard earlier. Comparing the commercial to the recreational is challenging because the commercial is additionally constrained by the trip limit. We don't really have anything that resembles a trip limit in the recreational. We have a bag limit, but that controls what all the people that go fishing bring home.

The thing that is the wild card is how many people will go fishing. The advantage to having that later in the season, in addition to the things that were already raised, is the notion of the post-spawning season. Certainly, from a science standpoint, that is an attractive alternative is to have that fishery carried out in a way that is as manageable as possible.

The concern that I would have with July is we have been closed for a while; and whenever you're closed and you have a reopening it makes it very difficult to predict human behavior; will

they be excited about this and show up or will they say it is not long enough for me to be excited about and I won't come.

That just creates a lot of uncertainty in terms of being able to select burn rates that actually are good predictors of what is actually going to happen when you open that up. All of that is to say that because all the reasons that make July exciting for going fishing, the weather is better, more people are available to go fishing actually are the very things that make me worried about a July opening because the range of possible outcomes of that fishery is broader in July than it is in September. It is just something to think about from that standpoint.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, in response to that point, Steve, and then I am going to go to Doug.

MR. AMICK: Thank you, Bonnie. I understand the concerns of uncertainty of the recreational sector. It is very hard to track what is going on. I think there was a lot of concern opening this mini-season of what would happen in 2012, and that we were going to blow through the numbers and that we were going to go way over the ACL, and that wasn't the case for whatever reasons.

We could say it is effort, we say it is something going on with the biomass that is out there. At the same time if we're going to have an ACL for the recreational sector, when would be the best time to take advantage of that. The red snapper mini-season does create excitement. Snapper has always been the prize in the bottom fishing communities. When you catch a red, you can feel the excitement on the boat.

It is discouraging to release them at that stage, but it does create – the 2012 season, I don't think the publicity was out there to anticipate the opening. At least a lot of people – we personally in our business we had trips scheduled, we let the people know that you have the bonus of being able to keep red snapper and they were happy, but it was not a big economic effect. I think next year in 2013 there will be more interest and it will have more of an impact. I understand your concerns. I was just trying to maximize the little potential of a recreational ACL.

MR. HAYMANS: That was sort of my point exactly in that we really did put a whole lot of stress and heartburn and headache in, oh, my God, what is going to happen in September and it really was a non-event in my opinion. But, opening in July and trying it for a year will give us an idea about what happens in July when we open it. We might have the same stresses but least we will have data point to see what it is like in July.

MR. HARTIG: Well, we keep arguing about July and September. Why don't we look at this; have one week open in July if you have a two-week season and the other week would open in September. If you have a three-week season, one week would still be open in July and the other two weeks would be in September.

This way at least you get one week in the area of good fishing while the other two weeks you would have in a period where we have an idea of what we might catch. It is another way of looking at it; where you could give people access in areas where weather becomes more of a concern in September. In the northern part of the area they would have more availability to go

fishing during that time while in Florida you could still possibly fish in September more than you could in the northern area. It breaks it up; it gives you another way of looking at another option.

DR. DUVAL: I have Roy and then Mel; but before that, Ben, could you just repeat what you said. You said one week in July and then if there is another opening available you could do another week in September or two weeks.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, if you were only opening for two weeks, you would have one week in July and one week in September. If you were opening for three weeks you would open – and it is still only one week in July and then other two weeks would be in September. You would have the one week in July. It is a new alternative and I don't know what that is going to do. Okay, never mind.

DR. CRABTREE: And when you say weeks you mean weekends.

MR. HARTIG: Weekends.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that seems to me that it is within the range of what is in here now. We have July, August and September. I think we need to check with Monica and get her to think about that, but my initial impression is you would have to direct a new alternative, but it seems to be within the range of what you have. I would be curious as to what Myra thinks.

MR. BELL: Just kind of echoing some of Steve's comments, if you recall back to June when we started down this path, one of our primary justifications was the social and economic benefits from this. I think you would probably maximize that a little bit better by moving towards July or doing the earlier opening. I know this year was kind of a bust for us. I think given why we were doing this and what we said up front, the reason that July makes sense and to at least start something in July,

MS. BROUWER: Just to remind the committee that your intent was to approve this at this meeting for submission; and if you add another alternative, even if it is within the range, it will create more analysis and so the timing will be delayed. It is up you. We can add it but just be aware that the timing will shift.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you for that, Myra. Steve.

MR. AMICK: I understood. I talked to Gregg and he said this is a final amendment to go to the Secretary of Commerce, and I wouldn't want to make an alternative and delay this Amendment 28. However, for NOAA Fisheries to consider the range of possibilities for setting up these seasons, you know, instead of the two consecutive three-day weekends, the last day of three-day weekends or the last weekends of July, August and September was along the lines that I was thinking like Ben mentioned, that it would be a possibility and spread out effort a little bit. Weather-wise you could plan it – the first weekend was bad, you would have two other spread out weekends to try to do a little bit of fishing.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I heard I think what mostly went on and the questions that we're asking. Ben's alternative I think does fall within the range. This is an environment assessment and I think you could add that alternative. It does fall within the range. I'm not sure how much additional analysis would be needed.

I leave that up to Myra, Jack and others at staff to inform you all of that and to tell you whether it would be delayed or not. That is what Myra said so I have no reason to doubt that, but it does fall within this. If you were thinking that it didn't, I guess the idea is that it does. I don't know about the delay time period, though.

MS. BADEMAN: We haven't really talked about this, but it is somewhat related. Is the committee and the council's intent to do another stepped-up data collection effort in these subsequent seasons? Okay, I just wanted to make sure that was clear.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I'm nodding my head in terms of, yes, I think that is an excellent question to bring before everyone. I know it was a lot of work for the states. It was a lot for the Fisheries Service. There was a lot of coordination that had to occur. I can only assume that a similar effort would be desired in order to maximize the possibility of collecting data. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I fully expect that we will be calling upon our state partners and asking them to help us in some targeted sampling again until we get out of the woods on this fishery. If I could, I would suggest this. If you really want to explore one of these new alternatives, I think I would defer the selection of that preferred until full council and give Myra and Jack and company time to really look at what would be involved in that. I don't think we want to delay this until the next meeting, and I am sort of concerned by that.

MR. CUPKA: What would be the consequences, though, of doing something like that in terms of when we hold a public comment?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that is going to be tomorrow, the public comment, and then – well, Thursday, I guess.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I'm not sure if it would be before or after the full council session.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we could erect some alternative like that if that is what you want to do and then the public would know about it and make a comment on it, but I would sure want to have staff to really look hard and advise us before we make a final decision as to whether this is going to delay us or not. I look at this and the analysis I'm seeing on the various start dates as pretty qualitative, so I don't know that a hybrid really entails a whole lot of analysis. It might be that could be done after the fact, but it makes me nervous.

MR. HAYMANS: The alternative doesn't say anything about consecutive weekends anywhere, right? It just has a start. If we did the start by the second Friday in July, between now and July the analysis could be done and presented to the regional administrator to determine when the second season may be. It doesn't necessarily have to be consecutive, right?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think that is implicit in what is in here that it is consecutive weekends. The problem is you just can't leave it up to me to decide these because then I'll have to go through proposed rules and take public comment and all of that. When we open a fishery, I don't think we explicitly say it is open for consecutive days, but that is the understanding that it is. I think that is the way this has been set up.

DR. DUVAL: And the way it is written right now the alternative states that the season will consist of weekends only and that the end will be predetermined and announced before the start of the season. I guess my question was just that it doesn't necessarily – if this motion passes and we have a recreational season that begins on the second Friday in July and goes for two consecutive weekends, that doesn't necessarily preclude another reopening; does it or does it?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, in theory if we figured out that the ACL was not caught, we could reopen it, but in reality I don't think we're going to have any way to really figure that out. What we will do when we know what the ACL is, we will project how many weekends we think it is going to take to catch it, and then they will be consecutive weekends starting – if you pass this motion, that second Friday in July and it would be however many weekends we figure, and that would be it.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I'm not on your committee but to inform the council a little bit more relative to the spawning periodicity and percentage of red snapper, I asked Jack if he had any information on that and it turns out he has a paper on his hard drive, and he may want to just share what the relative amount of spawning is that is going on in July, August and September just so the council knows.

DR. DUVAL: Jack, would you mind coming up to the microphone and just sharing that information for us.

DR. McGOVERN: I looked at a paper by White and Palmer in 2004, and they show the percentage of individuals that are ripe, developing, have post ovulatory follicles, and for the females the greatest percentage occurs in July, August and September. It is pretty high for all those months. That is for the whole South Atlantic. I don't know if they have a plot in here that shows it by state. That is for all the samples they collected.

DR. PONWITH: And just another thing to keep in the back of your minds from the science standpoint is that setting your season so that if there are multiple weekends, they both land in the same wave. It gives you a precision benefit in the estimate. If you have them spread in multiple waves, it is a little teeny spike three times versus a somewhat bigger spike in the wave. It is just another thing to add into your formula, things you consider.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you for that reminder. I recall dimly now that we had some of this discussion previously when we were considering this earlier this year. Is there anymore discussion or comments on this particular motion? The motion is to select Subalternative 4A as

the preferred for the recreational red snapper season. That would have the season beginning on the second Friday in July. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Does that mean if we went to a second, it would be the next weekend in July if we're doing them in consecutive weekends.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that is certainly my understanding of how this works, but Myra has pointed out to me it doesn't actually say that, but I think that is what we mean. Assuming that is what our understanding is, I think we need to add the word "consecutive" into the document.

DR. DUVAL: We might be able to do that in a separate motion once we dispense with this motion that it would be our intent that those weekends be consecutive. Is everybody ready to vote? I think there has been a lot of good, productive discussion. This is what I was hoping for because this is a high-profile issue and I want to make sure that everybody's concerns and all the alternatives have been thoroughly discussed.

Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.** Thank you for all the discussion. Now to address the point that John and Roy brought up that right now the language of the alternative does not indicate that weekends would be consecutive.

Myra, would you like a motion from the committee to please add the word "consecutive" to the language within the alternative to indicate that recreational weekends would be consecutive? I would entertain a motion to indicate in the language of Alternative 4 that recreational fishing weekends will be consecutive. Is anyone willing to make a motion in that regard? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: **Michelle, I'll make the motion to indicate in the language of Alternative 4 that the recreational fishing weekends would be consecutive.**

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Anna. Discussion. Monica has a slightly perplexed look on her face.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It is not about this particular action.

MR. AMICK: I'm not sure of the benefit that we get by having consecutive weekends. Say if it's two or three – I'm not sure of the benefit of why two consecutive weekends would be better than, say, the last weekend of several months.

DR. DUVAL: It doesn't indicate that it would be just two consecutive weekends. It is just that all the weekends would be consecutive. I think as Roy has indicated when we get the information indicating if we could do this near year, if we could have a season, that they would rely on the science center to develop some projections of what the allowable harvest would be and that would indicate how many weekends could be opened, correct?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, you could have it be every other weekend, I guess, or something like that. If we start getting to where the weekends are skipping all around, it is going to get complicated. We haven't really analyzed that kind of thing.

DR. DUVAL: And I think Bonnie brought up the point that you want make sure that your weekends are not skipping around between two waves. I don't think that this necessarily would do that. The way this is structured right now would allow for everything to be within a wave.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, we have got July/August is a wave so you should be fine and everything should be within Wave 4.

MS. BECKWITH: To that point, the only benefit of a consecutive weekend I can see is being able to plan ahead, but I wouldn't be opposed to not having them consecutive as long as they're identified in advance. If we were going to do one weekend on and one weekend off, then that still allows the industry to be able to plan for it. I don't have any preference over being consecutive or having a weekend in between.

DR. DUVAL: Is there any other discussion on this motion? Is there opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.** We kind of dealt with things out of order. We went to Alternative 4 dealing with the recreational fishing season and we haven't made any decisions with regard to the commercial fishing seasons. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I would make the motion that we have Subalternative 3A for Alternative 3.

DR. DUVAL**: Motion by Charlie to select Subalternative 3A for specifying the commercial fishing season.** Is there a second; seconded by Tom Burgess. Discussion. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, according to Jack we have got spawning going on in July, August and September, so it doesn't matter from that aspect. Everything else will be open. It is one of the few times that everything is open commercially, so there will be more interaction with red snapper then. It just makes more sense to go ahead and do it while everything is open. The weather is better. We're less likely to deal with hurricanes. Again, we don't have any benefit of moving it any other time for spawning.

DR. DUVAL: And the AP preferred on this, just as a reminder, was the second Monday in September, was it not?

MR. ATACK: Yes, the AP recommended that, but they also recommended under recreational the second Friday in September so they were aligning the two seasons. If you're going to move the recreational to July, then I think you need to move the commercial to the same time.

DR. DUVAL: I would agree that seems to make sense. Other thoughts? Are folks ready to vote on this motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.**

The next alternative is Alternative 5 and that deals with eliminating the commercial and recreational 20-inch total length minimum size limit, which we did for the limited reopening that we had for this year. There are obviously no subalternatives within this. It would just be a motion from the committee to select Alternative 5 as a preferred alternative, so I would entertain a motion like that at this time.

DR. CRABTREE: So moved.

DR. DUVAL: Was that Roy?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, ma'am.

DR. DUVAL: **Motion by Roy select Alternative 5 as the preferred; seconded by Ben. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.** Then finally we come to the red snapper commercial trip limit and there has been a lot of comment on this from both I think the commercial industry as well as the recreational industry.

There are a number of subalternatives under Alternative 6 ranging in 25-pound increments, from 25 pounds gutted weight to a hundred pounds gutted weight. As a reminder, we went with the 50-pound gutted weight trip limit for the limited reopenings that we had this year. Is there anyone on the committee willing to make a motion in that regard? Actually just let me quickly let Jim go through the AP's preferred.

MR. ATACK: We went with Subalternative 6D, which was establish the trip limit of a hundred pounds. I guess part of the reason behind that is the commercial season – that was looking at the reopening – we had the 50 pounds for the mini-season and we didn't meet the limit, so they were wanting to go with the hundred pound trip limit.

MR. PHILLIPS: **And to that point I would make the motion that we select Subalternative 6D, the hundred pound trip limit.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie; seconded by Tom Burgess. Discussion. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I don't know; we have gone around both ways with this thing. I'm a little bit concerned that during the opening and the primetime when everything is open and everybody is out there, that we may get more fish than we're bargaining for. I would certainly entertain 75 pounds instead of the 50 to just give us a little bit of a hedge on the chance that during that time when everybody is out there fishing in the best weather of the year that we don't overshoot it or we try not to, anyway.

DR. DUVAL: And I know we had this same discussion back in June I think was whether or not – I think we initially started out with a hundred pound trip limit as a preferred and then moved it down to 50 for similar concerns. Are there any other comments on the commercial trip limit? John Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: I think I would feel more comfortable with Ben and moving a little more slowly; 75 would be something I would rather see.

MR. HARTIG: Well, in that case I will move as a substitute motion Subalternative 6C; establish a red snapper commercial trip limit of 75 pounds gutted weight per trip.

DR. DUVAL: There is a substitute motion by Ben to select Subalternative 6C as the preferred; seconded by John Jolley. Discussion on this. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't have a problem with it. I don't really want to have a one-week season and get almost there, but we're not going to know, so I really don't have a problem.

MR. AMICK: Basically even 50 pounds or a hundred pounds is not a big difference with 75 pounds. At 50 pounds you're only looking at two 20- or 25-pound fish; 75 maybe three; or even if it averages out to eight or ten pounds, it is not a lot of fish either way. You can't really make a trip commercially on those numbers, but it will eliminate discards.

MR. ATACK: Yes, but I think Alternative 3 that we voted on earlier is not a one-week season. It is opened and it stays open until the ACL is met, right, with the trip limit in place. It could go on two, three or four weeks depending on when it is met, right?

DR. DUVAL: A good point.

DR. CRABTREE: Is that right, Myra, or is it seven days; I can't remember now?

MS. BROUWER: It does not specify that it is seven days.

DR. CRABTREE: So it is just going to open and they fish until they catch it.

DR. DUVAL: It does say in the alternative that the commercial fishing season will not open if the projected season length is three days or less. It just doesn't specify a maximum under that.

DR. CRABTREE: If you wanted it to open in seven-day windows, you could add that in there. We did that the last time to give us a chance to get the dealer reports and make sure. It is up to you, I guess.

MS. BADEMAN: Well, if we didn't have the seven-day thing on there, would you guys project when you would think it was going to be closed just from the science it would be open eight days or whatever and then if they're not caught during that eight days we could do a reopening?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that would depend on the magnitude of the ACL, I guess; and if we thought it was small enough that they actually could catch it in seven days, then we would open it with a defined period and then if we found out they didn't catch it all we would reopen it.

If the ACL was pretty high, though, and we thought we had time to do dealer reports we wouldn't. My guess is the ACL is not going to be that high and we will probably have to open it for period of time and then close it down and regroup.

MR. HARTIG: So regardless of what we do, Roy, you're going to make the decision on how long it is going to be open if it is a small number of fish?

DR. CRABTREE: We will have to make a decision about that if the projections suggest it could be caught before we would get the dealer reports.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And that is to a point, Ben, I was going to bring up after you were done selecting I guess through Alternative 7 is to sort of walk through what is likely to happen this coming spring so everybody is on the same page and everybody knows what is going on. If we can discuss that at some point on the record, I think that would be very good for all of us and the audience and the future readers of this amendment.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I think it would be good to walk everyone through that kind of scenario, the mechanics of how this would play out. We have a substitute motion on the table to select Subalternative 6C as a preferred, which is the 75-pound commercial trip limit. Is there anymore discussion on that particular item? Are folks ready to vote on this?

Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved** and the substitute motion now becomes the main motion, which means we get to vote on it one more time. The main motion is now to select Subalternative 6C as our preferred. Is there any objection to this; that is the main motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

There is one more alternative, which is Alternative 7, and that deals with the recreational bag limit, and this is one fish per day. This is what we did previously for our open season, and I guess I would entertain a motion from the committee with regards to that. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I move we select Alternative 7 as our preferred.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Anna; second by John Jolley. Discussion on this motion? Is there opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: When we did the emergency rule, we put language in there that gave the RA authority to modify the opening and closing dates in the event of severe weather. It is not that big a thing with the commercial fishery because they would keep on fishing, but with the recreational fishery it would be more of a deal.

If you want to do that, you ought to indicate that and have some language put in there. I would ask that if you do want to do that, you give me some criteria on that kind of thing. I'll kind of tell you how I thought about it the last time to me severe weather meant there is a hurricane or a tropical storm.

It doesn't mean it is bumpy out there. We ought to talk about that because it is right in the heart of hurricane season and it could be that we have the recreational fishery opening and a storm is bearing down.

DR. DUVAL: Discussion from the committee on this; would you like to include something along these lines? Steve.

MR. AMICK: Well, for us a small craft advisory of 20 or 25 knots basically shuts us down, and that is basically we're looking at five to eight foot seas. I don't know if you predict that kind of front coming through and the northeast wind blowing at that level. That is just a comment.

DR. DUVAL: I see hands going up all over the place here. The weather is always going to be bad for somebody somewhere I think is really the reality what we're faced with. Quite honestly, for this season's recreational opening of red snapper I think the Morehead City area was the one place where people were actually able to get out. Everywhere else it was pretty rough. I think that is just the reality of what we're dealing with. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and that is the problem. You might small craft advisories in one area but not in the others, so it is a bit of a can of worms. If you decide, no, we don't want to do that, then when this issue comes up I can say, well, the council talked about it and decided not to put that in there. That might be the best thing to do here is just let the chips fall where they may.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I was simply going to add but if you were to have something that said if a tropical storm or a hurricane were projected to impact the South Atlantic coast, then you would delay. They will understand that. Do we need a motion, recommendation or what?

DR. DUVAL: We would need a motion to do something like that. Before we get a motion, I think Bonnie wanted to make a comment.

DR. PONWITH: Just as Roy has suggested, that we would be relying very heavily on our state partners for helping us to collect whatever data necessary to capture as much about this fishery as we could. I guess it was just the reminder that if we set up to do additional biological sampling, to do effort monitoring, to really do a good job of characterizing the scope of this fishery, we would have to also be prepared to stand down from that and then reassemble it at another time. I only raise this because this is an impact that all of us are going to have to be prepared to deal with if we build that contingency into the planning.

DR. DUVAL: What is the pleasure of the committee; would you like to include a provision for severe weather; specifying that this would be potentially in the event of a tropical storm or a hurricane that would affect the South Atlantic Region, as Doug has suggested? It is up to you all. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I like Doug's idea that if it is a tropical storm or a hurricane, we delay; but other than that, it goes forward. We typically get five-day projections; and so if there is something in a five-day projection that is getting into the South Atlantic, it would get shut down.

If you want to do that, I think that would be the way to go, either that or just don't even deal with it.

DR. DUVAL: Well, the one thing I would want to clarify or I would want clarified in a motion is that this would be for both commercial and recreational. Right now the way we have selected our preferred alternatives, we have aligned the openings of these two fisheries. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Before the motion is made, if we don't include something, if it is going to happen no matter what, if we wind up with one, we're stuck. I think it behooves us to have some sort of contingency in there with that. So with that, I would make a motion that we – I don't know what the right term is here, Roy, to allow you to –

DR. CRABTREE: To give the RA authority.

MR. HAYMANS: To give the RA the authority to delay the opening in the event of a projected tropical storm or a hurricane making landing fall in the South Atlantic United States.

MS. BECKWITH: Not landfall.

MR. HAYMANS: There seems to be unanimous consent here that the word "landfall" wasn't correct; so a tropical storm or a hurricane affecting the South Atlantic.

DR. DUVAL: **Okay, so a motion by Doug to include language in Alternatives 3 and 4 to give the RA authority to delay opening of the fishing seasons in the event of a tropical storm or hurricane affecting the South Atlantic. Is there a second; seconded by Anna. Is there discussion? I think we kind of had the discussion before we had the motion. Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.** Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you could just add that as a discussion in the document. I don't know that you necessarily have to put it with the alternative; but if Myra thinks that is the way to go, then that is fine.

DR. DUVAL: It might make it clearer to the public when they're reading the final alternatives in the final version of the document that was in there and not having I think to dig around for that would probably be beneficial, but that is just my thoughts.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think that is a good idea.

DR. DUVAL: So that leads us a motion to approve this amendment for submission to the Secretary of Commerce. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to approve Regulatory Amendment 28 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce.**

DR. DUVAL: If you can make it just Amendment 28.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Anna; seconded by Charlie. Discussion. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: At this point I think it would be good if someone could kind of walk us through exactly how this is going to happen, when the regional administrator is likely to get an estimate from the science center which would put this ball in motion and how you all think it would happen.

DR. DUVAL: I agree and I am just wondering who is prepared to lead that discussion, if that would be Roy or Bonnie or some combination of the two of you. The one thing I will note is that it is five o'clock right now. I'm not trying to curtail any discussion, but I do have to make an exit here fairly shortly. If we could wrap this up in the next 15 minutes, that would be great.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we would send a memo down to the science center requesting discard estimates. I think we did that last year in the April timeframe. We will consult with them and see how quickly we can get that. Once we have the numbers, we will then apply the formula that you have selected and calculate an ACL.

We will then do projections of how long we think it would take them to catch those. I think the amendment says that if it is three days or less there is no season. We would make those determinations. If we decided there is not going to be any season, Monica, would we put a notice in the Federal Register with that determination?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I will think about that, but somehow we would alert the public.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we would either do that or at minimum we would send out a Fishery Bulletin explaining that. Then if we decide there is going to be a season and these are going to be the start dates of things, we will then send out a Fishery Bulletin letting the commercial guys know that you're going to open on such and such a date and here are the rules that you're going to be fishing under.

We would put one out to the recreational fishery that will say you're going to open on weekends beginning on – what did we choose – the second Friday in July and you're going to get this many weekends and then the fishery closes. I don't know if we put that in the Federal Register or not, but we will figure that out.

If we project that the commercial fishery could catch their quota in anything less than seven days, then I would guess they will get a very short season; and then if there is any left over we would reopen. If we somehow come up with a good way to count the fish that allowed us to really evaluate the recreational situation, we might could reopen that, but I don't think that is likely to happen.

Then if we get within five days or so of the opening of either fishery and there is a tropical storm or a hurricane coming in on us in the forecast, I am likely going to get on the telephone to the state directors and the council chair and we will have a discussion about it. But if it appears that there is a reasonable probability of that thing entering into the South Atlantic, we would put something out and delay the season opening and regroup after that. I think that is about how this would work.

DR. DUVAL: Monica, does that help you a bit?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, it does; and it is likely by the June meeting that the council would know what is going to happen each year?

DR. DUVAL: I would certainly hope so given that our preferred alternatives have I think the second Friday in July as the opening and that would certainly be ideal.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I would expect we would have it figured out by the June meeting and would advise you of it at that time. We will try to give people as much advanced notice of when this is going to happen as we possibly can so people can book trips and things.

DR. DUVAL: Okay; so are folks around the table satisfied with that? Okay, are we ready to vote on this motion? The motion was made by Anna and seconded by Charlie to approve the amendment. Is there any objection to approving Amendment 28 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce? Seeing none**; that motion stands approved**. The next motion we need is to deem the codified text for Amendment 28 as necessary and appropriate. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to deem the codified text for Amendment 28 as necessary and appropriate.**

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second; seconded by Charlie. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.** And then the final motion that we would need is to give staff and the council chair the editorial license to make changes to the amendment document as appropriate prior to submission. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Michelle, I make the motion to give staff and the council chair editorial license to make changes to the amendment document as appropriate prior to submission.

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second; seconded by John Jolley. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. At this point it is five minutes after five and I am going to suggest that we recess for the day and we will reconvene tomorrow morning at 8:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting was recessed at 5:05 o'clock p.m., December 4, 2012.)

- - -

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

December 5, 2012

- - -

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Cape Fear Ballroom of the Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel, Wilmington, North Carolina, Wednesday morning, December 5, 2012, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: We will reconvene the Snapper Grouper Committee. We have two items left on our agenda under our regularly scheduled business and then we have a couple other items scheduled under other business that we will need to attend to. The first thing we're going to look at is Amendment 27 which deals with yellowtail, mutton, Nassau and blue runner.

MS. BROUWER: Okay, this is Attachment 7A in your briefing book. If you recall, Amendment 27 is the one that contains several actions. Many of them deal with yellowtail and mutton snapper; in particular options to transfer management of these species to the South Atlantic Council and several actions that would have to be taken if that comes to be the case. Then we have an action in there to formerly take over management for Nassau grouper and an action to look at revising the Snapper Grouper Framework. The last time you did this was in Amendment 17B. Lastly, we have an action that deals with blue runner.

The first order of business would be to approve the purpose and need. However, because the Gulf Council would prefer that the discussions having to do with transfer of management take place when this special committee meets at some point, and I guess we're going to talk about that during Executive Finance.

Many of the actions in this amendment will likely be taken out. I would probably want to go through and look at the actions first and then come back to purpose and need, and maybe you guys can just give us guidance to edit it accordingly. Action 1 is on PDF Page 5. Actions 1 through 5 are the ones that deal with the Gulf of Mexico Council relinquishing management of yellowtail and mutton.

We have a note in there from the IPT explaining what I just mentioned, that the council chair suggested that a joint steering committee be developed and tasked with developing recommendations for joint management of these two species. The Gulf Council did not vote on whether or not to hand over management of yellowtail and mutton. Our recommendation at this point would be to move Actions 1 through 5 to the considered but rejected appendix.

DR. DUVAL: I think we heard yesterday that we are going to be discussing when to set up a meeting of this sort of South Florida Workgroup with the Gulf to handle issues like that, that are cross-jurisdictional, so at this point I think I would entertain a motion from the committee to move Actions 1 through 5 to the considered but rejected appendix. David.

MR. CUPKA: Madam Chairman, **I would move that we move Actions 1 through 5 of this amendment to the considered but rejected appendix.** I would like to make a couple of comments at the appropriate time on this, too.

DR. DUVAL: Can we get a second to the motion; seconded by Martha. David, go ahead.

MR. CUPKA: These actions here regarding yellowtail, mutton and Nassau was something that we talked about a couple of years ago when we received a letter from the Gulf Council – Bob Shipp was chairman at that time – wanting to know if we would be willing to consider taking over management of those three species.

I sent them a letter back indicating that we would be interested in entertaining that suggestion. We talked about it a little bit, but then both of our councils I guess got bogged down and working on the ACL amendments and whatnot and we really didn't get back to it. When we did, there was some concern raised I think by the Gulf Council regarding some permit issues and some bag limit issues that would need to be worked out.

I guess these actions in this amendment addressed some of those concerns in ways that it might be worked out. Then subsequent to that the Gulf said that in regard to mutton snapper and yellowtail, that they wanted to reconsider I guess in giving up management authority for that or at least try and work through this dual council committee to see what might be the best way to do that. They didn't take any action on this particular amendment at their last meeting. That is kind of where we are.

I think it is appropriate to deal with it through this joint committee as we look at a number of South Florida management issues. That will involve our Executive Committee and a special committee the Gulf has set up as well as representatives from the state of Florida and the regional office and the science center on how the best way to move ahead and manage at least these two species.

Now, the Nassau thing did move ahead and there was a notice published in the Federal Register I guess indicating that management authority for Nassau was going to under the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic Council, so we do need to move ahead and incorporate that species into our fisheries management unit, which is something that hasn't been done yet.

That is the species where you recall there is no harvest allowed at this time so we don't have the same issues to deal with that we have with yellowtail and mutton. I think it is appropriate for the time being to move these first five actions out of this amendment. I think the work that staff has done will be very helpful when we decide how we're going to move forward with this in this joint committee. It is not like it is wasted effort or time. It is going to be very helpful but just not at this point. With that, Madam Chairman, I will turn it back to you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for those comments, David. I think that probably is reflective of what a lot of other folks are hearing. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think David sums it up pretty well. To me the key thing I think we want to do with particularly yellowtail but the mutton as well is come to a situation we're fishing on a single ACL. Right now we have a pretty artificial break between the Gulf and the South Atlantic.

I think the basis of that jurisdictional allocation is suspect because I don't know that we really have the resolution to know for sure which fish are caught on which side of the highway down in the Keys. Now, I think turning it over to the South Atlantic is one way to do that but probably not the other way.

I think if both councils agreed to a common control rule and a common allocation formula in the plans we could potentially designate one council as the lead for specifying the ACL and that kind of thing. I think at the end of the day if the Gulf Council is not comfortable with relinquishing management of this, that doesn't prevent us from getting to where we want to be because I think there are other ways we can get there.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other comments from folks around the table about this issue? Is everybody ready to vote? Any objection? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.**

MS. BROUWER: Okay, that will bring us down to Action 6, which is on PDF Page 20. This is the action that would extend the South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction for management of Nassau to include the Gulf of Mexico. There are only two actions; no action and the alternative. Here you would need to select a preferred. Of course, the Snapper Grouper AP did talk about this at their meeting in November. There concern is mostly from the potential for listing Nassau under the ESA. They discussed it and Jim probably wants to elaborate on this, but their recommendation was for the council to request that NMFS do a very thorough research on the historical distribution of Nassau and known spawning aggregations in the South Atlantic.

DR. DUVAL: Jim, did you want to add anything to that?

MR. ATACK: Yes, we talked about it and I guess nobody is really aware of many landings or any spawning areas. If NMFS can research was there really any landings a long time ago, because we're worried that this ESA could put some restraints and for no real gain. If there is no spawning or really no Nassau in the area, why are we looking at them?

MR. HARTIG: To Jim's point, and it is a good one, before the Bahamas prohibited us from going over there and commercial fishing, we caught a lot of Nassau groupers and landed them in the United States. Now, that is pre when we started separating groupers, and I don't know how Nassau was ever separated out of that, a lot of the harvest – and there were a number of us who did it.

There were about a dozen of us that went on a regular basis and we caught significant numbers of these animals and they were landed in the U.S. We didn't list the Bahamas as to where they were caught. In the listing stuff that is going to be something that NMFS has to take into consideration in that petition to list Nassau as endangered.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other comments on this? I think at this point I would entertain a motion from the committee probably to select Alternative 2 as our preferred under Action 6.

MR. PHILLIPS: Michelle, I make the motion we select Alternative 2 as our preferred for Action 6.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie; seconded by John Jolley. Any other discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

MS. BROUWER: Action 7 is on PDF Page 22. This is the action that would modify Section 1 of the framework procedure. The no action would be to leave that section alone, and what is included in the no action alternative is only Section 1 of the framework procedure, which is quite lengthy.

If you move to PDF Page 25 you will Alternative 2, which would modify this section with the language that you see up on the screen, basically to make it easier and faster for the council to make adjustments to ACLs. I think here we're going to probably need some guidance from NOAA GC regarding whether this sort of action can still be taken.

DR. DUVAL: And I will just note that Snapper Grouper AP supported Alternative 2 as the preferred, but I am going to ask Monica if she has got some comments.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, what we're doing here today is you're thinking about approving this document to go out for public hearings, right? I have no problem leaving this in here to go out to public hearings and get the public's comment. I don't know that it will stay exactly like this. To be frank, it has really been a workload issue that I haven't been able to focus on this particular idea very much. However, I have been contact with a lot of my colleagues and I am looking at various shortened frameworks that other councils use.

Let's keep this in here now and let's get the public's comment on this. And then I'm assuming it will be brought back to you in March although the timing – Okay, Myra is shaking her head, yes, that is true. Then if we need to add anything in here to further elaborate on exactly how this would work and all that, then we can do that then.

DR. DUVAL: Does anyone else have any questions on this particular action? The intent is to make it easier for us to update our ABCs and ACLs. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Not a question but just to comment; I talked to Monica about this yesterday, is just to review other council jurisdictions and see if there are ways that they do things in a faster manner that we could possibly implement.

DR. DUVAL: I agree; no need to reinvent the wheel if we don't need to. If nobody has any other questions, I think at this time I would entertain a motion to select Alternative 2 under Action 7 as our preferred. Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: Yes, I would like to make a motion to select Alternative 2 under Action 7 as the preferred.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Martha; second by Anna. Any other discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.

MS. BROUWER: Okay, and the last action in Amendment 27 is on PDF Page 27, and it deals with the blue runner issue. Here the no action talks about blue runner being included in the Snapper Grouper Management Unit since the inception of the plan, which was in 1983. We do have an ACL for blue runner that was put in place through the Comprehensive ACL Amendment earlier this year. We have accountability measures.

Here are several alternatives that will have to change, and let me talk about that a little bit. Alternative 2 reads remove blue runner from the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Unit and place it in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Unit. Well, the only action you could take under this FMP is to remove it from Snapper Grouper FMU.

You can't take an action to put it in a different FMU, so that alternative would have to change to remove the wording pertaining to placing it in the CMP FMU. Alternative 3 would retain blue runner in the FMU but allow commercial harvest with a gillnet for vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit.

The issue there is that they are caught by Spanish mackerel fishermen and these folks depend on this little bit of income, which is a seasonal thing. It mostly happens just in the springtime. This alternative would consider requiring an endorsement for blue runner on the Spanish mackerel permit. Alternative 4 would retain it in the FMU but then exempt it from the permit requirement for purchase, harvest and sale.

Alternative 5 I think would have to go away altogether because it reads remove blue runner from the Snapper Grouper FMU and allow Florida to assume management responsibilities. Well, here again we can't really take action to direct Florida to do anything. You can only remove it from the FMU, so we would suggest that we get rid of Alternative 5.

The Snapper Grouper AP supported removing it from the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Unit. The SSC stated that the ACL is rather high compared to the landings in gillnets, and they would like to see this again in April with more analyses and in a more finalized format.

MR. HARTIG: Myra, we don't have to get rid of Alternative 5. We just need to edit it and that would be to remove blue runner from the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Unit, period.

MS. BROUWER: That would be the same as Alternative 2.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Myra, I think you could keep Alternative 2 if you wanted to make this Amendment 27 also be amendment to whatever of the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP and

include it – in one document you would be removing it from the Snapper Grouper FMP and placing it in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP, because you would be amending that plan as well. Saying that, remember that FMP is joint with the Gulf and so the Gulf would have to at least review and approve that action as well.

MR. CUPKA: Madam Chairman, I was going to make a motion that we remove Alternative 5 under Action 8 to the considered but rejected appendix.

DR. DUVAL: We have a motion from David; seconded by Charlie to remove Alternative 5 under Action 8 to the considered but rejected appendix. Is there any discussion on that motion?

MR. HARTIG: And I was right the first time; Alternative 2 and Alternative 5 are not the same. They're different. Alternative 2, you put it in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Unit. Under Alternative 5 you remove it from the Snapper Grouper Management Unit and that is what I want to do. I want to remove blue runner from the Snapper Grouper Management Unit, period.

DR. DUVAL: And I think that was clear and what Myra had suggested was simply altering Alternative 2 to remove the phrase "and place in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Plan". It was not to not have any alternative there that simply removed it from the unit, but that was the first suggestion. Subsequent to Monica's comments, yes, you could do that to either Alternative 2 or Alternative 5 and end up with an alternative at least you just removing it from the fishery management unit. David.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, that was going to be my next motion, if I could, was to modify the wording on Alternative 2 to remove the last part of it and then we can decide where we want to go from there, if that is agreeable.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, do want to preclude the idea, though, of moving it into the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Plan? If that is something you're not interested in doing, then I think you can get rid of Alternative 2 and modify the wording of Alternative 5. If you are considering moving it into coastal migratory, then we need to make this a joint amendment of both plans and figure out what we're going to do. I still think they're going to be a number of obstacles in removing it from the FMP, and we're going to have to have a really good case as to why that makes sense.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, this is just my opinion, but to me procedurally keeping Alternative 2 as it is just seems incredibly messy. This is a joint plan with the Gulf and it would certainly add more time to the approval process for this particular amendment. I would think it would need to be discussed in the Mackerel Committee. We would have to go to the Gulf Council and get their concurrence with this and go through all of that in order to make that happen. It just seems very messy to me. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, working with the Gulf Council doesn't have to be messy, and in my view we need to do more of that. We're too reluctant to engage in that, but I will say I don't see

any advantage in moving it into the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Plan. It doesn't really make any sense to me.

It seems to me what you want to do is exempt the blue runner from a number of the constraints you have on selling fish to allow some of these guys I guess in the Spanish Mackerel Fishery a bycatch to be able to sell it. It really seems to me that what you ultimately want to do here is not move it to coastal migratory pelagics and it is not to remove it from the FMP.

It seems to me what you want to do is make an allowance so that these guys can continue to do what they apparently have been historically doing. I don't have a problem removing Alternative 2 because I have never really understood what that would accomplish moving it over there, anyway.

MR. CUPKA: We may be jumping ahead of ourselves a little bit here. Alternative 5 is something we clearly can't do so I'm just trying to get rid of it to start addressing some of these issues and clean up the document a little bit. We haven't gotten to Alternative 2, but 5 is something I think we clearly want to get rid of.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I agree that you can't make the state of Florida do something; but if you remove it from the FMP does the state of Florida have any desire to go in and manage blue runner, then, because once you remove it from the FMP, the state, at least for state vessels, can manage out into the EEZ particular fish.

DR. DUVAL: I'm going to ask Martha if she will be happy to reiterate what I think she said on the record at the last meeting.

MS. BADEMAN: Yes, our preference would be just to remove it from the FMP. We don't have any blue runner regulations, per se, but we would be happy to remove it from the FMP; and if management is warranted that is more specific, then we can go down that road.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with David; if we could at least dispense with Alternative 5, then we can move on to discussion of the other alternatives. Are there any other specific comments on removing Alternative 5 under Action 8? Is there is any objection to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.** So now I think if folks want to consider altering the language of any of the other alternatives, now is the time to think about that. If what you want to do is remove from the fishery management unit, the simplest thing would be to have a motion to modify the language of Alternative 2 to remove the phrase "and place in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Unit. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I will be happy to move that we modify the language of Alternative 2 and remove the phrase "and place in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Unit.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Anna; seconded by John Jolley. Discussion? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just so I'm clear, when we're talking about fishery management unit in this action, we're really talking about fishery management plan, correct?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I believe so. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Roy said he didn't understand why that was in there. Well, frankly, the whole problem arose when gillnet fishermen off Florida could not land their bycatch of blue runners in the Spanish mackerel fishery. They all have coastal migratory pelagics permits. I mean they have mackerel permits.

To get a mackerel permit, it is still open access so it doesn't preclude anyone who is currently catching blue runner to get a permit and fish for blue runner. To me if we're not going to remove it from the management unit, this was a logical progression of where it would be. You can take it out of there for now, but still we're going to have to find a place for it.

I think what Roy is proposing is messy in that you're providing an exemption for a species of all the sale attributes. We're going to have to go round and round through this and figure out the best way to do it, but we may come back and put it in the coastal migratory pelagic fishery, but it doesn't have to be in here now as long as somewhere in the document it states that it could be in the discussion, that is fine with me.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think if you decide you want to take it out of this plan and put in coastal migratory pelagics, you're going to have to do it simultaneously. You can't just take it out and say one day we will put it in. Now, if you wanted to recognize to sell blue runner you have to have a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit, either one, I think that is what Alternative 3 essentially does.

You can do that without taking it out; and that is what I'm getting at, there are different ways to skin the cat on this. I recognize it might be opening a can of worms, but this is a fishery that I believe the overall ACL is over a million pounds. In the scale of our fisheries this isn't a small fishery.

We have already determined that management is needed and we have put in place ACLs, and it is difficult for me to see how we now just turn around on that and say, well, we have now decided management is not needed. I think that is a problem so I think where you're likely going to wind up on this is creating some alternative way and maybe that is recognizing that you can sell blue runner if you have a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit, but I think we're going to end up doing something like that to make some accommodation for these guys. I would also point out, too, this isn't a case where the commercial ACL is not being caught. I'm told that we're going to close blue runner next week because the ACL has been caught.

MR. HARTIG: Well, Roy, yes, blue runner needs to be managed de facto because of ACLs. It is the only reason it needs management. The productivity of the stock is so much higher than the

landings would indicate on the commercial side. It's incredible. It's a bycatch fishery in the commercial fishery. I saw you part of it in the Keys in the gillnet fishery.

In Spanish mackerel it is a bycatch. It is a bycatch in the king mackerel fishery. There is some occasional targeting going on. The stock is so much bigger than commercial landings would indicate. It is an underutilized stock in my opinion. Based on the SSC's ability to use the third highest landings, none of the productivity is taken into account on the stock.

We're going to try and wrestle with some of this at the next SSC meeting with some of these species like almaco jacks and banded rudderfish, which fall into these types of categories whose productivity is much higher than landings would indicate. The other thing I would say about reviewing the recreational landings on blue runner, they're all over the map.

The spikes from year to year are significant. The targeting and the CVs I guess of that method of management is suspect on the recreational side. Given the fact that most of the fishery occurs in state waters, both commercially and recreationally, the only real federal fishery occurs in that bycatch of Spanish mackerel gillnets, I would say move it out of the unit. If situations arise and we can go to Florida and get some kind of a management plan with Florida, which we're ready to do, we can do that.

DR. CRABTREE: To that point, it is a bycatch in the sense that they're not targeting but by the Magnuson definition it is not bycatch because they are retaining it and they are selling it. When I went out in a yellowtail commercial boat, we weren't releasing or putting the blue runners back. They went in the fishbox and they sold them.

You may be right about the productivity of the stock, I don't know, but I know what the record has in it right now is the estimates of MSY and things that we got from the SSC, and that is really what we have to deal with in terms of the productivity of the stock. We are going to have to be careful.

I suspect we have a number of other species that probably have the majority of landings in state waters and to take this one out but not the other ones is kind of inconsistent, and we have got to maintain some consistency here. I don't rule out taking it out of the management plan and maybe we can build a solid record for doing that, but I think it is much easier to take one of these other routes that simply provides an exception.

MR. AMICK: I had a question for Ben. I wasn't sure as far as bycatch in the Spanish mackerel gillnet, but, for example, in the yellowtail what the bycatch is there and if it is sold as a bycatch, what would happen if you moved the blue runners into the coastal pelagics? Would the yellowtail fishermen have to have a pelagic permit? I don't know how much bycatch there is in the yellowtail fishery.

MR. HARTIG: I think even Roy could speak to that better than I because he was actually on a yellowtail vessel I guess a couple of weeks ago down in the Keys. No, I mean we can encapsulate it in all of our permits if we want to. We can do that. I mean if you made it as

specific as you had mentioned, you would have to have that coastal migratory – you would have to have a permit.

Yes, whether it would be an endorsement or whatever you do with it, to me the easiest way would be to tie it to the Spanish mackerel permit and then anyone who wants to catch blue runners would be able to apply for the federal permit and be able to catch them, because it is an open access permit. There isn't any reason to constrain harvest on blue runner, in my opinion.

MR. JOLLEY: I agree with Ben. I think blue runner is very underutilized and there is a lot of room for increasing the use of blue runner, but I'm also concerned about the live bait fishery. We have got a number of species in Florida that are being used for pelagic fishing, for sailfish, for king fish and for other species.

There are a lot of blue runner that are caught for live bait down in Florida, all along the coast; and when we run out of things like tinker mackerel and goggle eyes, they're one of the prime fish for us. As long as there is some open access that these fishermen have through the mackerel process, I guess that would be acceptable, but I'm worried that we're overlooking that live bait fishery that goes on extensively from Fort Pierce to Key West.

DR. DUVAL: The motion on the table is to modify the language of Alternative 2 to remove the phrase "and place it in the CMP Management Unit. Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.**

We have four alternatives under this action; no action, remove blue runner from the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Unit, retain it in the unit but allow harvest with vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit or require some kind of endorsement, retain it in the unit but exempt it from the permit requirement for purchase, harvest and sale.

Do folks feel like these alternatives cover the range of what you would like to see? We're scheduled to approve this amendment for public comment, so this would go out during our January/February public hearings and then we would review that public comment again in March. Yes, Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Madam Chair, do you want a preferred or do you want to take this out to public hearing as is?

DR. DUVAL: Well, it is up to the committee. I think it is always helpful for the public if we can choose a preferred so that we can give them some indication of what we're thinking.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, well, let's see if we can choose preferred. I move Alternative 2, remove blue runner from the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Unit as a preferred.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Ben; seconded by Martha. Discussion? David.

MR. CUPKA: I share some the same concerns I think that Roy does. If we just remove it, I mean compared to other fisheries that we have retained management for, it is a significant fishery looking at the magnitude of the catches, which now you're talking about what is room for expansion so it could get to be even more.

It seems to me that Alternative 3 would be a much cleaner route to go. It would still be under management. It would allow both the snapper grouper fishermen and the Spanish mackerel fishermen to harvest it.

I don't know how big a problem this endorsement thing would be, but I just think if you take it out completely, it is too significant I think in terms of the magnitude of landings and things that are going on and the potential for landings to even increase further. I have real concerns about just removing it from management.

MR. PHILLIPS: To John's point about using them for live bait and selling them and if they had to go get a Spanish mackerel permit, what kind of issues is that going to cause if you've got a whole bunch of recreational people looking for Spanish mackerel permits so they can keep doing what they're doing. I mean which is the lesser of the evils?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, there is an income requirement for Spanish; and how effective that is in precluding that – and what incentive would – I guess possibly some recreational people would do that, but I don't know that there is much of it. **I'd offer a substitute motion I guess to establish Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative.**

DR. DUVAL: A substitute motion by Roy to select Alternative 3 as the preferred; seconded by David. Discussion? Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: How would the endorsement for the Spanish mackerel permit work?

DR. DUVAL: That is a very good question. Does anybody have any thoughts on that? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess I would ask Monica to comment on it because it is kind of odd. The Spanish permit is under the coastal migratory pelagics, and then we'd have a blue runner endorsement that would be under the snapper grouper plan. I know if that is a problem necessarily. I don't think we've every done something like that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: With the first sentence of Alternative 3, "retain blue runner in the Snapper Grouper FMP but allow commercial harvest of it with a gillnet for vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit," all right, you're still pretty much staying within the Snapper Grouper FMP. You're just recognizing they could have another permit.

The second sentence, "require a blue runner endorsement for a Spanish mackerel permit for the commercial harvest and sale of blue runner," to me if you're endorsing the Spanish mackerel permit, then you're getting into the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP.

If you're requiring the blue runner endorsement under the Snapper Grouper FMP, you could just require a blue runner endorsement but then you would stay within the Snapper Grouper FMP. However, you'd probably be getting into some of the issues Ben talked about that he didn't care for, which was exempting them from maybe certain sale requirements. I don't know; it gets messy but I think if you keep the second sentence as it is, you're getting into the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP and that would require an amendment of that FMP.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I guess I was wondering myself why the second sentence is even in there. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I'm wondering if we need to work on this motion some. Why couldn't we modify Alternative 3 to say "sale of blue runner is allowed by people who have a snapper grouper permit or a Spanish mackerel permit?" Would that get us where we need to be? I guess, Ben, is there anybody selling blue runner right now who are catching it on hook and line and don't have snapper grouper permits or is it just these – John is nodding yes.

MR. JOLLEY: We're not getting any numbers I don't think on this live bait fishery, but I can tell you it is big and it is big money. It is a big issue. If we're going to get involved in managing this blue runner, we'd better be thinking about this live bait fishery. There are other species involved, but it is big. I will tell you there are a lot of people that would really be upset if they can't get their live bait. I think Ben will back me up on that. It is a big issue and there are a lot more fish being caught than people think.

DR. CRABTREE: John, are the people who are selling blue runners as live bait; are they doing this for a living; are these commercial fishermen that are doing this or are these just guys doing it parttime on the side? What I'm getting at is the income requirement is all commercial fishing – you have to make so much money from commercial fishing. Would they be able to meet the income requirement, do you think, to get a Spanish mackerel permit? I think it is 25 percent?

MR. JOLLEY: Well, a few will probably have that permit, but my guess would be most of them don't.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, they can get the permit. The question is are they legitimate commercial fishermen who are making a living off of this?

MR. JOLLEY: The answer to that is yes.

MR. HARTIG: The problem is compounded by the fact that Florida doesn't list blue runner as a reef fish species; so in state waters you can harvest blue runners without any of the permits. That is one of the things that happens with that.

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to mention to Roy's question why couldn't we just leave it in the Snapper Grouper FMU but then require either a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit, I think the problem with that is that gillnets are a prohibited gear in the snapper grouper fishery and so there might be some enforcement issues, perhaps.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, then we could make an exception that gillnets are an allowable gear for blue runner, I guess, so we'd have to do that.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, we have a substitute motion on the floor to select Alternative 3 as the preferred. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm thinking I should withdraw my motion right now because it seems to me there is some work needs to be done here to figure this out.

DR. DUVAL: And that is what I was going to go towards is do we want to dispense with this motion and then work on the alternative or do you want to – we have had enough debate on this and it requires the committee's concurrence to withdraw the motion. I don't anyone is going to object to that.

DR. CRABTREE: **I will withdraw my motion if Ben will withdraw his. (Laughter) I'm going to withdraw my motion.**

DR. DUVAL: Is there consensus around the table to allow the motion to be withdrawn? Okay, yes, the motion is withdrawn.

DR. CRABTREE: I would ask that staff – I think, Myra, you get a sense of what we're trying to do here. If you all could come up with, I guess by full council, maybe some way on how we might reword that. If we're going to go out to public hearings, we need to make some modifications to it, but I'm not quite sure we're going to get that done sitting here right this minute.

MS. BROUWER: If we simply remove that last sentence of Alternative 3, blue runner would continue to be in the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan, gillnets would be allowed as a gear to harvest them, and folks with a Spanish mackerel permit would also be allowed to harvest it. That seems to capture everything you all want to do if we simply remove that last part.

DR. DUVAL: It doesn't legalize gillnets as a specific gear in the snapper grouper fishery. It just allows those folks who have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit that are using a gillnet and have blue runner to retain it. David.

MR. CUPKA: And if you did that, you would probably need to add after the word "harvest" in the first sentence "and sale", I would think.

DR. DUVAL: Do folks feel like we could actually make the necessary modifications then to this alternative right now? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think we probably could, but we have a motion on the floor right now so I think you need to tell us how procedurally you would like to handle this.

DR. DUVAL: The motion on the floor is to select Alternative 2, as amended, as the preferred alternative. Are folks prepared to vote on this? Objection to this motion, 2 opposed; those in favor of Alternative 2 as the preferred, 2 in favor; abstentions. The motion fails. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, I'm going to move that we modify Alternative 3 to read, "Retain blue runner in the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan but allow commercial harvest and sale of blue runner for vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit." If I get a second, then I would ask Myra to advise us if that would work.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by David.

DR. CRABTREE: **"Commercial harvest and sale of blue runner for vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit".** I took out the gillnet because based on John's comments we have got people who are using other gear.

DR. DUVAL: **So the motion now reads, "Retain blue runner in the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan but allow commercial harvest and sale of blue runner for vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit".**

DR. CRABTREE: And then I think I need to add another sentence to the motion that would read, "Allow gillnets as an allowable gear for blue runner".

MR. JOLLEY: We might need to include those fishermen with a king mackerel permit as well because that fishery has gone from a handline fishery and net fishery; a lot of people are using rod and reel and there is a lot of live bait being used by the commercial king mackerel fishery, and there is buying and selling going on there, too.

DR. CRABTREE: I think to do that, all they would have to do is have a Spanish mackerel permit and then they would be okay.

MR. JOLLEY: Does that go with the king mackerel permit?

DR. CRABTREE: It is an open access permit so anybody can get one. I suspect most people who have a king mackerel permit have a Spanish permit.

MR. JOLLEY; So then would you legally – if you are a live bait fisherman in South Florida or the Gulf of Mexico and you don't have that permit, then you're going to have to go seek that permit to catch those live bait and sell them; is that right?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. JOLLEY: I know we would like to get a count of this going on. There is no count of this live bait stuff going on, I don't think.

DR. CRABTREE: They'd have to go get a Spanish mackerel permit.

MR. JOLLEY: What if they have no income from Spanish mackerel?

DR. CRABTREE: The income just has to be from commercial fishing. If they have got an income from selling blue runner as live bait, that would qualify them.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, the regulation or at least part of it says to obtain or renew a commercial vessel permit for Spanish mackerel, at least 25 percent of the applicant's earned income or at $10,000 must have been derived from commercial fishing; i.e., harvest and for sale of fish or from charter fishing during one of the three calendar years preceding the application.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, David seconded. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm guessing this still leaves hook and line for blue runner inside of state waters open so that they could catch live bait and sell it. We're basically still going to have two sets of regulations for these fish?

DR. CRABTREE: My understanding is Florida doesn't have any regulations for blue runner, so the situation would be the same as it is now. If you're fishing in state waters you can pretty much do whatever you want with blue runners.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So does any of this harvest occur in the Gulf? Is this down in the Keys where this primarily takes place? I'm just wondering does the Gulf manage this at all? Is here anything for the group that is going to meet jointly to look at maybe for blue runner?

DR. DUVAL: Can Doug or Phil enlighten us on that? Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: They do not manage blue runner in the Gulf.

DR. DUVAL: While there is some conferring going on in the background, I am just going to reread the motion since there has been a little work on it. The motion reads modify Alternative 3 as follows: retain blue runner in the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan but allow commercial harvest and sale of blue runner for vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit. Allow gillnets as an allowable gear for blue runner. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Do we need to specify the gillnet is an allowable gear for blue runner in the snapper grouper, because it –

DR. DUVAL: I think that would be a good clarification. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: So another complication, John, these live bait guys, if we do it this way, they will be required to sell their live bait to a licensed dealer. Well, here is the problem we've got then. If this is a substantial harvest of fish it is going unreported right now, and that is a problem for us to have a substantial quantify of fish landed that aren't reported in any way.

I don't know how to fix that. I suspect they're just selling them right to the charterboat or whoever is buying it, but there is no record of that anywhere. They're commercial fishing so I don't know that it is picked up in MRIP anywhere, so that is an amount of fish being caught. We'll have to deal with that, but I'm not quite sure how.

DR. DUVAL: We have just modified this sentence a little bit to say, "Specify that gillnets are an allowable gear for blue runner only in the snapper grouper fishery." Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: And to the point of trying to track the fish and from what I hear from John they're not selling to dealers, it is not practical for them to sell to dealers, it's making Ben's motion look a lot better. If Florida is going to agree to take over it, then let them track all the fish.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, the problem is we don't know what Florida would do. Right now they're not tracking the fish either; and if we just take it out of the FMP, then the fishery is just not managed. Now, if we had some plan from Florida in state waters as to they're track it and they're going to do these things, then maybe we could justify it, but we don't have anything like that so I think we need to work with Florida a little bit to do that.

DR. DUVAL: I don't think we did this when the Comprehensive ACL Amendment when we took species out of the fishery management unit.

DR. CRABTREE: That is correct but we determined that those species weren't in need of management. They had very low landings, they didn't occur in our jurisdiction and things like that, and we had not established ACLs for those species either at that time. Now, we could go back and look at the ACL Amendment and the criteria we laid out and see if blue runner meets it, but I suspect it does not.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to say if a fishery was 80 percent in state waters, that was the criteria, if I remember right. We really don't know because Florida doesn't track in-state landings. We really don't know; maybe the live bait fishery is much larger than what is a bycatch in other fisheries. In asking the question a minute ago – and this isn't the time, I know, but as we move forward why can't we start a Jacks FMP and let's get them out of the Snapper Grouper FMP. I know right now we're trying to keep the fishery open, but as a next step can we consider that?

DR. DUVAL: I think that is certainly an option. I think that is something we can sort of put on the list of items we may want to address down the road. I would like to get through a few of the amendments that we birthed from our last meeting before embarking on something like that.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, this just illustrates another one of the problems that has come up from the way we've done this for 30 years. They were lumped into snapper grouper out of convenience years ago and now we're seeing one of the issues that has come up. It's time to start fixing some of those issues.

DR. DUVAL: I'm not disagreeing with your rationale or justification. I'm just thinking of other things that we have on our plate right now, that's all, but suggestion duly noted. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Doug brought up the jack complex. My plan in other business is to bring the jack complex up and revisit how we formed those complexes; the same way with the deepwater complex. There are significant problems arising with the discards of yellowedge grouper in the snowy fishery that need to be addressed.

The productivity levels of both almacos and rudderfish from a commercial perspective are much higher than the landings allotted by the SSC. We went over 86 percent in the jack complex this year, and it was closed significantly early. As we evolve through this process we have to address that arise in these ACLs on a more timely basis. We will talk about it more.

DR. DUVAL: We can do that. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Not to belabor this, but we have got other species than the species, too, so Doug has got an interesting suggestion. These other species are going to eventually come up as well. I can tell you there is another species whose catch is higher than it is for blue runner, and it is very significant.

DR. DUVAL: I think everybody has made some excellent points about future activities and things that we need to consider as Ben pointed out as we evolve this fishery management plan. I guess my point is just we can't do everything all at once, and we did an awful lot in September. I would like to actually get back to this motion. I think we have had a lot of discussion about it.

I am going to reread the motion as it stands right now and then I would like to take a vote. **The motion is to modify Alternative 3 as follows: retain blue runner in the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan but allow commercial harvest and sale of blue runner for vessels that have been issued a Spanish mackerel permit or a snapper grouper permit. Specify that gillnets are an allowable gear for blue runner only in the snapper grouper fishery.** Does anybody have other tweaking that they would like to do to this? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: When you take this out to public hearing, you may get some very good comments from the public, right, on ways that this could be tweaked and changed in order to let them continue to do business in the way they want to and all that, so this doesn't preclude you from changing an – maybe even putting in a different alternative or revising one of these at the next council meeting. It would be really good if you could target that community down there or wherever they are that harvest this to see what they think about this.

DR. DUVAL: In order to make this perfectly clear, there has been a little discussion about the placement of "only" in that last sentence; to place "only" before the phrase "blue runner" so that it would read "Specify that gillnets are an allowable gear for only blue runner in the snapper

grouper fishery". I think it would just be cleanest if we could have a motion to move the placement of the work "only" in Alternative 3. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I would move that we move "only" in front of "blue runner" for this motion.

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second to that motion; seconded by Charlie. **The motion reads move the placement of the word "only" in Alternative 3 and place in front of "blue runner". Does that sound better so then that reads "Specify that gillnets are an allowable gear for only blue runner in the snapper grouper fishery" so that. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.**

We still need to select a preferred alternative if we want; we don't have to. Is anybody willing to make a motion for a preferred alternative? Does anybody want to express any preference for not having a preferred alternative at this time?

MR. HARTIG: Madam Chairman, I don't think it is critical. We can go to the hearings with a suite and see what the public says and then develop a preferred afterwards. We have done it numerous times before.

DR. DUVAL: All right, then we will not select a preferred. The next motion I would be looking for is one to approve Amendment 27 for public hearings in January of 2013. Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: I would like to make a motion to approve Amendment 27 for public hearings in January 2013.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Martha; seconded by Charlie. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. The next item on our agenda is a presentation by Dr. Nick Farmer on reorientation of our existing Deepwater MPAs for Speckled Hind and Warsaw Grouper. I am going to suggest that we take a ten-minute break and let Nick get up here and get his presentation ready.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. DUVAL: All right, folks, the next item on our agenda is a presentation by Dr. Nick Farmer on an analysis of reorienting the existing Deepwater MPAs to provide additional protection for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. This is something that we requested at our September meeting. The SSC has reviewed this presentation, so I'm going to turn things over to Dr. Farmer.

DR. FARMER: To give you an outline of the presentation for today, I am going to talk a little bit about the management history versus stock status for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. We will talk about landing and discard trends for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. I have developed some methods for modeling the distribution so we can talk about observations and also some statistical models of where these things might be located both historically and currently.

We will talk about the theory and describe some spatial closures that are currently in existence as well as some reorientations and then evaluate the impacts of those closures on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and some associated snapper grouper stocks. Speckled hind and Warsaw grouper have a pretty complicated management history and they also have been indirectly benefited by a variety of other management measures.

As we look through this timeline, basically in 1988 you have got a speckled hind SPR estimated at 25 percent, Warsaw grouper at a dismal 0.2 percent. In 1990 the speckled hind SPR drops by half to 12 percent; Warsaw grouper's SPR goes to 6 percent. In 1992 these two stocks were placed in the five-grouper aggregate and then in 1994 there was a no sale restriction put in place and a limit of one per vessel. Also, the Oculina MPA was established.

Then in 1996 the new assessment says speckled hind SPR is at 8 percent. Warsaw grouper unfortunately was not able to be assessed. In 1999 speckled hind dropped again to 5 percent; Warsaw grouper again unable to be assessed. In 2000 red porgy, which is somewhat affiliated with Warsaw grouper and speckled hind out on the shelf edge, had a no sale restriction put in from January through April.

In 2004 speckled hind and Warsaw grouper were both officially determined by SEDAR to be undergoing overfishing and that is basically where they have stayed in terms of federal status determination since then. In 2007 Ziskin – and the reason I'm putting 2007 for Ziskin's work is that is the last year of data in his report – determined that speckled hind was still overexploited, and that is a peer-reviewed document.

Then red porgy in 2008 had a permanent January through April closure. In 2009 we had the eight Deepwater MPAs implemented. Shallow water grouper had a January through April closure; red snapper was closed all year. In 2011 we had a no harvest ACL of zero put in for speckled hind and Warsaw as well as the 240-foot closure. That was removed in 2012. In 2012 a variety of associated species were closed due to quota closures from the ACLs, which would include the deepwater complex in September, shallow water grouper in October, vermilion snapper March through July and then again October through December, and gray triggerfish in September.

As we move in looking at landings and discard trends for speckled hind, on the top here we have a graphic of the number of fish landed or discarded, and this is coming from the recreational fishery. The landed catch is in the gray there. The B2's from the recreational fleet, which is the discards, is in the light blue. The commercial estimated discards are in the purple.

The commercial discards could only be estimated from 2001 on because those are estimated from the commercial supplemental discard logbook using a ratio of discards per unit effort and then expanded out to a whole logbook. Then if you look at the bottom, those are commercial landings, which obviously are confounded by the no sale prohibition starting in 1994.

I have overlaid a variety of management actions that I think may have had some impact on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper encounter rates on this graphic, and you can see a general trend. For recreational there is a lot of noise. There may be some decrease there at the end. There are a couple of points there at the end that are lower than most of the other points in the time series, but definitely a noisy trend and hard to really tell what exactly is going on.

For Warsaw grouper the total numbers encountered and landings are lower and in general much lower through the time period beginning back around 1992 and moving through time, so it is a little bit harder even to see any trends associated with management measures there. We looked at a variety of data sources.

I think we're in the teens and maybe in the twenties at this point in terms of data sources that we have considered to look at where speckled hind and Warsaw grouper have been observed in the South Atlantic through time. In general the trends would say that these stocks occur for the most part along the shelf edge, so from about 25 fathoms out to about a hundred fathoms is where the bulk of the observations come from with the exception of the headboat observations, but I would take those with a grain of sale because those location reports are not nearly as specific as these other data sources.

You can also see that there is a broad spread in terms of where different data sources detect the stocks. That causes some issues with the analysis just because we don't have one perfect data source that covers the entire geographic domain for these stocks, so we had to do a lot of reaching and assimilating of different sources.

In thinking about closed areas to protect speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, here are some general points to keep in mind. The depth that you want to probably look at is from about 25 to a hundred fathoms. Statistically there is a higher probability of encountering a speckled hind and Warsaw grouper at those depths.

There is likely a greater than 50 percent release mortality and that is based on gag, which is the best study proxy species in terms of its body morphology and life history. There is also a greater percentage of mature fish. You basically don't really see too many mature speckled hind or Warsaw grouper prior to about 25 fathoms because they move as they grow into deeper water. You also have the bulk of the fishery effort that would interact with these stocks occurring in about the 25 to 50 fathom depth range.

In terms of alignment and size you would want to have some large shelf-edge closures. Those would cover likely foraging and spawning habitats. We don't have a ton of information on spawning for these stocks, but those spawning observations that we do have are in deeper water from the shelf edge on out. I will show you some images of those.

You can also see them on the previous slide, although not very well because it is pretty small, but those are the stars. You will see some kind of in between the Snowy Grouper Wreck and the northern South Carolina MPA. There is some in the northern South Carolina MPA; and then

running down along the shelf edge, there is a couple more down into the Edisto MPA. Those are speckled hind spawning observations.

We also have some anecdotal information about Warsaw grouper spawning taking place in between the Edisto and northern South Carolina MPAs and then some additional down in the St. Lucie MPA area and then some more Warsaw grouper anecdotal information down west of Key West. In terms of alignment and size, large shelf-edge reserves – a large reserve is more efficient from a unit area standpoint both in terms of enforceability and also in terms of its protection afforded for stocks.

What we do tend to find with the implementation of MPAs is that fishermen tend to redistribute fishing pressure along the edges of the MPA to take advantage of spillover of the increase of abundance and density of stocks inside the reserve, and so you want to have a reserve that is large enough to provide a buffer for the stocks that are actually designated to be protected within there so that they aren't just moving out of the MPA and being caught up, because then you don't get much benefit out of that MPA.

In terms of location selection, you're going to want to look at source habitats. A source habitat would basically be a place where the stock is heavily abundant and would potentially seed the rest of the geographic area. One of the things that we have in terms of information on that is we have documented occurrences. Those would be the point observations that I showed you in the previous image.

We also have documented hard bottom habitat and possible hard bottom habitats, so I have attempted to account for those factors, recognizing that there is a limitation in the survey information that we have, and there are probably a lot more places out there that we haven't looked that may contain these stocks.

In terms of locations there are opportunities to extend or modify existing MPAs or to expand the network of MPAs to encompass these source habitats. What I wanted to look at before talking about reorienting reserves was the rationale for why the current reserves were implemented where they were implemented.

This was a very long and I gather politically intense collaborative process between the council, scientists and fishermen. A lot of these reserves in terms of their placement were a compromise of those various groups. One of the risks that you run with a compromise type of approach like that is if you implement a reserve in a place that is not a source habitat you may be inadvertently redistributing fishing pressure onto places where the stocks that you're actually attempting to protect are in higher abundance.

In looking at the rationale for these reserves, we have the Snowy Wreck MPA, and that is a wreck plus some deep hard bottom habitat. That was intended to protect the stocks that are listed on the table here, which primarily was snowy grouper but also speckled hind and some other shelf-edge stocks. In terms of comments, that used to hold a spawning aggregation of snowy grouper and may continue to hold one.

The northern South Carolina MPA is a shelf-edge hard bottom reserve and was intended to protect snowy, yellowedge, speckled hind and a variety of other shelf-edge stocks. The Edisto MPA was vermilion snapper and a few other shelf-edge stocks, juvenile snowy grouper, speckled hind.

There is also a comment in there that it may be a larval source or sink due to the Charleston Gyre, so there may be some opportunity for that reserve to redistribute larvae if there is in fact some spawning going on in there. The Charleston Deep MPA contains no hard bottom habitat. It was intended for an artificial reef that to my knowledge was never implemented, so I don't know if that one is providing too much of a benefit at this point for anything.

The Georgia MPA is set over mud bottom. That is a tilefish fishing ground. It is east of a popular fishing ground. As we look it, you will see that there is not much habitat for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper in that MPA as it currently exists. The North Florida MPA contains both shelf-edge hard bottom and mud. It is probably the best studied of the MPAs you have out there besides Oculina in terms of the habitats that are in there due to some really great work that Andy David and his group have doing.

The reserve was basically intended to protect snowy grouper, speckled hind, tilefish, vermilion and a few other shelf-edge species. There are popular fishing grounds to the north and to the south of that reserve, so that may be a situation where again the reserve is protecting some stocks, but there may be some effort being redistributed into some areas north and south.

From what I can tell, though, it looks like the North Florida MPA relative to those areas north and south probably has a higher abundance of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper than the areas north and south, so that may be a pretty well located MPA. The Oculina Experimental Closed Area was intended to protect deepwater coral but also had some subsidiary benefits in terms of protection for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and some other members of the deepwater complex.

The St. Lucie Hump MPA was intended for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and I will have some additional comments on that one in a bit. The East Hump MPA, there is a mention on the South Atlantic Website that it was intended to protect Warsaw grouper. I know Andy David's group has been down there on some dives now and saw some snowy grouper but as of yet I don't think they have seen any Warsaw grouper or speckled hind in that MPA.

The MPAs that are being highlighted right now, the northern South Carolina, Edisto, Georgia and St. Lucie Hump MPAs, are MPAs that I felt might benefit from some examination for reorientation, I will move through and talk about each of those. This image right here, which is a bit crowded – and we will zoom in on some of these in a moment – shows the northern South Carolina MPA, the Edisto MPA and the Georgia MPA and the proposed reconfigurations of those.

Zooming in on the northern South Carolina MPA, you can see that the proposed reorientation would basically just tilt it on its axis and align it more north/south in terms of the rectangle than east/west. The reason for that is you can see in the MPA we have got – this red here is speckled hind definite habitat in that it contains habitat where speckled hind were actually observed by one of the various surveys we looked at.

You can see also there are some spawning speckled hind that were captured within the existing MPA, but also outside of it, here and then down here. These is also a bunch of hard bottom habitat that they have been observed in here and here, on the outside, so to the west and then also to the southwest. There is hard bottom edge right here in the yellow that extends south of the MPA.

If you reorient it, basically what you would be accomplishing you would be encompassing these spawning observations and a bit more of the point observations and hard bottom habitat. Now, one of the risks that you run with any of these reorientations is there is not much study of what is happening out in this deeper water.

The reason for that is most of the technology that we have doesn't allow people to get down there and look around without great expense, so most of our surveys have been focused kind of in the, I would say, 50 fathoms and shallower depth range. It is not really clear what is going on out here, but one of the nice things about the northern South Carolina reorientation is you sacrifice some deep water out there, but by reorienting, because of the way that the shelf runs, you do actually encompass some of that deepwater habitat again to the south.

Now, here is a three-dimensional image of the northern South Carolina MPA. You can see basically the existing MPA is this slightly green-shaded MPA right here and this shadow box right here shows its benthic signature. The reorientation is this box right here going down. What you will notice is there is some hard bottom habitat right over here with speckled hind observations – those are the red diamonds – and then a Warsaw grouper and speckled hind observation here and another Warsaw grouper and speckled hind observations down here.

This reorientation accomplishes some things in that it encompasses those points, a bit more of this known hard bottom habitat. These are from SEAMAP so the darker squares here that follow the shelf are SEAMAP-known hard bottom, possible hard bottoms here in the gray and then these empty squares right here are not hard bottom.

One of the things that you can also note from this is that there is this nice kind of dynamic convex sweep of the shelf edge right here. Will Heyman, a member of your expert working group, has done a variety of papers looking at spawning aggregations in different places, including the Keys and Belize.

One of the things that he has discovered is that bio-geomorphology is a useful predictor of where spawning would occur, and so basically the features that you would look for as a signature of a fish spawning aggregation site would be a pronounced slope and then a convex edge on a shelf edge, so ledges and edges. We know fish like those and they apparently like them to spawn.

It is probably more important in terms of the shape of the slope than the actually habitats that are there, which makes sense given that the slope is probably a more permanent feature than a gorgonian or some form of coral. The fish are potentially attracted to those types or sites. Because of that, I listed this as a potential aggregation site; because if you reorient the MPA you are encompassing more of that convex slope.

Now, looking at the Edisto MPA, there were a variety of proposed reorientations by the expert working group, so this is a bit of a noisy figure. The proposed reconfiguration number one basically would just take the Edisto MPA as it exists now and tilt it about 45 degrees, so this is that black box right here.

The reorientation number two proposed by the expert working group is this kind of interesting diamond-shaped thing here. We also suggested maybe it would be more beneficial to have the boundaries running straight east/west so at least two of the four boundaries are aligned with cardinal directions and then 45 degree angles coming up.

Basically what that would accomplish in reconfiguration number three is it captures more of these habitats up here to the north which have, as you can see, a ton of observations of both speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. There is a huge hard bottom habitat up here where we have seen a lot of them in our various surveys.

All those Xs are observations of speckled hind and all the pluses, like right here, are observations of Warsaw grouper, and this contains the hard bottom habitats that are currently within the existing Edisto MPA, and it sweeps from around 25 fathoms, which is this bathymetry contour right here, out just shy of a hundred fathoms.

The reason I'm recommending out to a hundred fathoms is because the only known observations of spawning Warsaw grouper in the South Atlantic were in 95 fathoms of water, so it may be an important area for them. Now, those depths may be sort of a de facto MPA for Warsaw grouper already in that there is probably not a lot of fishing pressure going on out there that would interact with them, but it argues the fact if you're going to go ahead and close in an area shallower, why not, if there is not a big impact of extending it out deeper on the fishermen themselves, just go ahead and make sure that there is no impact on those spawners.

Here are the labels. There is Reconfig. 1 in the black, Reconfig. 2 in the blue and Reconfig. 3 in the orange. Here is a three-dimensional view of that. This is a bit harder to see than the other one just because there are so many different proposed reorientations, but the biggest impact I think comes from reconfiguration number three.

You can see that comes up and it covers these hard bottom habitats up here and all these point observations of speckled hind whereas the others fail to encompass those. Another thing to note is that there is a nice hard bottom habitat, a very broad one, up here with a lot of observations of speckled hind that is currently unprotected and not considered for any sort of protection, so there may be some redistribution of pressure if we reorient the reserve onto here.

Now, one of the things to think about when thinking about that redistribution of pressure is that the reserve is already X-square kilometers in size and these reorientations don't really change how much bigger it is, so there may not be as big of a redistribution of pressure as there would be through the implementation of a new reserve.

Here is the Georgia MPA, and you can see that basically there is a lot of unknown habitat in white, definite nor habitat for speckled hind in blue, and then there is some possible habitat for speckled hind in yellow; whereas, to the southwest there is some habitat that is known to contain speckled hind and also some point observations of Warsaw grouper. If you moved the Georgia MPA from the tilefish mud inshore and south, then you would encompass some hard bottom habitats and some point observations of some speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

Now the last MPA that I was considering in terms of a reorientation, extension or whatever you want to call it, repositioning, would be the St. Lucie Hump MPA. As you look at this reserve, you can see that there are some observations here of documented occurrences. These are points that were received after the fact and these are from the expert working group of observations of Warsaw grouper just to the northeast of the existing St. Lucie Hump Reserve, which is here in the blue.

One of the things that I wanted to suggest is I have this St. Lucie Hump extension or whatever drawn here with the line right here; I would suggest actually moving that line north by about 500 meters to encompass the remainder of this edge. I actually just plotted this out with the bathymetry this morning and realized that there is this interesting bathometric feature right here which I believe is Push Button Hill, which is discussed in detail in the expert working group report.

I think you would be setting yourself up a little bit if you implemented the reserve here but cut across this feature here because we know that fish don't respond to lines on a map. They respond to habitat features so you would want to contain that habitat feature within there. To further illustrate that point in three dimensions, I think this is a really interesting graphic right here. This is the existing St. Lucie MPA.

This Warsaw grouper observation actually is just to the east of it, so there are no observed points for speckled hind or Warsaw grouper in here. There is this one known hard bottom habitat contained within here. But, if you look to the north, you see that there is this interesting hard bottom and possible hard bottom and then some more deepwater hard bottom out here that is currently unprotected.

Then there is this very dynamic habitat feature right here, and this is actually Push Button Hill, which was identified in about a full page of detail in the expert working group report as a very important fishery spawning aggregation site for a variety of snapper grouper stocks in the South Atlantic.

There is also the wreck of a freighter that was sunk by a submarine in 1942 down here to the southeast of it. This is a case where this MPA may actually be inadvertently redistributing fishing pressure right on to this interesting aggregation site. One of the arguments by Dr. Heyman and his group is that if you protect a site that is known to contain spawning aggregations of certain stocks, it may very well contain spawning aggregations of other stocks that are less well studied. He has proven that in a couple of papers in that they go out looking for a spawning aggregation of a certain fish and then they end up finding that there are spawning aggregations of variety of types of fish in that area.

This may be an opportunity here especially given the relatively high numbers of Warsaw grouper that have been observed to put in some form of protection for a Warsaw grouper spawning aggregation. In terms of the impacts of these closed areas, there were a variety of ways we looked at this.

I tried to take kind of a multifaceted approach to looking at both distributions and impacts because the data sources were so diverse and each suffered from their own variety of biases. I figured why not look at it a couple of different ways and see if we see a similar story being told by a variety of methods, and that certainly seemed to be the case.

The methods that we used included a qualitative habitat suitability model, and those are the graphics that I have shown you in the past few slides where the habitat is classified as yes, maybe or no. You have got known habitats that definitely contain observations. You have got probable habitats and those are the maybe, and those are habitats where there is hard bottom there and you haven't looked. And then the no habitats would be places where you've looked multiple times, at least five times there has been a sample in that area and they've never seen one.

That was one way we did it and we did a ratio of those known and probable areas within the MPAs to the total known and probable area from 25 to a hundred fathoms in the South Atlantic. That was a way of grading out what percentage of the stock in known and probable area is inside the MPA versus out.

Then we did a quantitative habitat suitability model and that basically was done with a logistic regression model. I worked with people at the science center and we developed a statistical model basically of the distribution of these stocks based on the encounter rates with various gears at different depths, latitudes and habitat types and come up with a statistical model of the probability of a stock being contained within a particular area.

Again, we looked at these in terms of the MPAs as a ratio, so the percentage of the stock within the MPA relative to the total percentage of the area-weighted stock outside of the MPA; so taking into account both the probability of encountering the stock within an area and the size of that area.

And then the percent observations per gear samples is the simplest way of looking at this, and this is basically within the MPA how many times did we look with fishery-independent gear for

speckled hind or Warsaw grouper and many times did we see one; and then with fishery-independent how many sets did we make, for example, with MARMAP and of those sets how many times did we actually see it.

One of the things that I wanted to bring to your attention – and I have said this before – is that we have got a lot of point observations but we can't be exclusively dependent on the point observations to determine what we're doing for these stocks. The reason for that is that the point observations are heavily biased towards the areas immediately in and immediately surrounding the existing MPAs, because that is where we spent the money to go looking, but there are a lot of other places where we have never looked with a scientific survey where we have some information anecdotally that things may have occurred.

In looking at that I wanted to show you – for example, Jeffery Buckel on your SSC sent me a paper that he and Dr. Ruderhausen and some other individuals had put together and this contained observation points for speckled hind in the Snowy Grouper Wreck Area. What is interesting is my modeling approach of probable habitat shows this big swath of yellow right here, which would be probable habitat for speckled hind, and all these Xs you see here in I guess the northwest corner of the MPA, are place where they went out and looked and saw speckled hind, so those maybe habitats are in fact yes habitats.

That is again driving home the point that you can't just look at the point observations; you need to consider the habitat underlying those points as well. With that said, I wanted to look at the percentage of known and probable habitats contained within the MPAs versus within the reconfigurations of the MPAs, and also I threw in the 240-foot closure to let you know basically how what you're considering now compares to what you implemented between 2011 and 2012.

These are your existing MPAs in sentence case and this is the percentage right here in blue of known and probable habitat of speckled hind contained within those existing MPAs, and then here is your 240-foot closure. That is the percentage of known and probable habitat that was contained within that, and then here are the reconfigurations.

It is not super-clear but I can tell you that the reconfigurations do contain slightly higher percentages of known and probable habitat relative to the existing MPAs so they are more efficient from that metric than the existing MPAs. If you added up all the existing MPAs in terms of their known and probable habitats for speckled hind, it adds up to 8 percent of known and probable habitat. For Warsaw grouper it also adds up to 8 percent.

The 240-foot closure for speckled hind covered 40.2 percent of known and probable habitat and for Warsaw grouper it covered 40.5 percent. The best reconfiguration for the existing MPAs would basically get rid of the northern South Carolina, Georgia and Edisto MPAs and replace those with the northern South Carolina reoriented, Georgia MPA reconfigured and Edisto reconfiguration number three, and that would give you 10 percent as opposed to your 8 percent for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, so a gain of 2 percent.

In terms of the estimated percentage of the stock protected – this is from the statistical model of distribution of the stocks – the existing MPAs for speckled hind would give you a total of 6 percent whereas those best reconfigurations would bump you up to 8 percent, so a gain of 2 percent.

For Warsaw grouper it gives you a 7 percent existing; with the best reconfiguration it bumps you up to 8 percent. The 240-foot closure would put you at 41.5 percent for speckled hind and 50.5 percent for Warsaw grouper. Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: So there was a lot of bottom in the 240 closure but we didn't close the fisheries that are producing all the discards, so that just reflects area but it doesn't really reflect protection at all.

DR. FARMER: That is correct and I was going to get to that in a minute. In terms of positive observations per gear sample, fishery dependent is in the blue and fishery independent is in the red. Basically the point that I would like you to take home from this is that the Edisto Reconfiguration Number 3 in the case of speckled hind and then the Georgia MPA reconfiguration for Warsaw grouper give you the highest POGS or positive observations per gear sample.

In general the reconfigurations that I'm proposing give you slightly higher percent observations per gear sample versus the others. Also it is interesting to note that the 240-foot closure has lower positive observations per gear sample than the rest, and that may reflect the fact that the bulk of the stock seems to be coming from at least in the samples that 25 to about a hundred fathoms versus this 40 fathom on out area.

Looking at closure impacts for speckled hind, some take-home points here would just be here is your reorientations in all caps and here are your various metrics of interest; so your area contained within the reserve, the state that the reserve is located off of, the number of positive observations of speckled hind contained in the reserve; and then that positive observations per gear sample for fishery independent and fishery dependent; and then the habitats' suitability analysis; the percent of known habitats, so that's places where you have definitely seen them; known and probable, which means you have either seen them there or there is hard bottom where you have never looked with a sample; and then the percent stock from the statistical model.

The main take-home points here is that your maximum reconfigurations basically would bump you from – for example, in known habitat they would bump from a total of 17 percent in the existing reserves to 35 percent so they do reflect the sampling regime better. In terms of known and probable habitats, they bump you from 8 percent to 10 percent, and then in terms of the statistical model they bump you from 6 to 8 percent.

In terms of points they bump you from 73 contained in the reserves to 400 contained in the reserves. Another thing to note is that your maximum reconfiguration basically is about the same area, maybe a hundred square kilometers more than the existing reserves; whereas, the 240-foot closure covered ten times as much area.

MR. HAYMANS: What struck me about that was looking at the size of the – you know, I'm concentrating on what the Georgia areas looks like – the lower Georgia's, the original; the above is the reconfiguration – visually it looks like to me when I go back, the Georgia looks smaller.

DR. FARMER: Yes, I think it is longer and that is where you're running into that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Actually that Georgia MPA actually has some snowy grouper on it, and that is one of the reasons we put it there. It had a couple of – at least two numbers with significant snowies on it. I don't see the 30 fathom line on these maps, but I've got a sneaking suspicion this new reconfiguration is right in the middle of the B-liner fishery.

DR. FARMER: Do you want to take a look at that figure real quick for the Georgia one? The 25 fathom line is this line over here; and then the 30 fathom line I don't have it on here, but it is probably right around there because I can see a bend right there. Yes, it probably is starting – the 30 fathom line is probably somewhere within there.

MR. PHILLIPS: To that point, I would really like my fishermen to be able to see this. If we can keep it offshore and it will still do some good, I don't have a problem but this is – I'm not sure.

DR. FARMER: So looking at the three-dimensional image of it, I would say this probably is your 25 fathom line right here, so that would be way to the west, and then this line right here would probably be your 30 fathom line moving through it. So then looking at Warsaw grouper, your reorientations again are more efficient.

The maximums get bumped up, so from the existing 14 points to 41 total point observations within your known habitat inside the reserves increases from 11 to 30 percent; known and probable habitat from 8 to 10 percent; and then percent of stock from 7 to 8 percent. And then you can compare to the 240-foot closure there, they are definitely less than that.

Another thing to point out is that the percent of known and probable habitat in both of the cases for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are definitely significantly below the initial request of the council which was to look at 20, 30 or 40 percent of the stock. Now, looking at spawning aggregations, this is information compiled from the expert working group and then in consultation with Will Heyman with regards to the geomorphology of the shelf edge within the reserves.

If you look at the Edisto Configurations Number 1, 2 and 3, you have observed speckled hind spawning in those as well as in the existing Edisto MPA, and you also have observed snapper grouper spawning within there as well as in the Edisto MPA. The geomorphology would suggest that there is possible spawning within that Edisto MPA and the reconfigurations.

The Georgia MPA we don't have any information about spawning in there but geomorphology would say it is possible because it is a shelf edge. The northern South Carolina reorientation

contains observed spawning of speckled hind as well as other snapper grouper, and geomorphology would suggest that it is very likely or likely a fishery spawning aggregation site.

The St. Lucie Extension MPA, we have a lot of anecdotal information about snapper grouper spawning within there; none so far about speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. Bio-geomorphology would suggest that it is very likely that is a fishery spawning aggregation site due to its benthic shape.

When we're talking about speckled hind and Warsaw grouper in particular, we're talking about trying to create MPAs that control for bycatch effort. That seems to be the thing that we're most concerned about for these stocks is that rate of encounters even with the ACL equal to zero may be high enough that it is of a concern for those stocks in terms of the release mortality.

One of the things to think about with that is that fishing effort, which I've shown you, for example, the percent of commercial trips in the South Atlantic color-coded so that the warmer colors mean more trips, cooler colors mean less trips, and the fish stocks – and so here is the statistical model right here of the probability of speckled hind and warmer colors indicate places of high concentration and cooler colors places of lower concentration.

Effort and fish stocks are heterogeneously distributed and so the largest bycatch for reductions will take place in areas that you close that have high concentrations of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and high fishing effort, because what you're doing then is you're pushing fishing effort off of the place of high concentration of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper onto a place where there is less of a concentration of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

In looking at that I wanted to look at, well, what happened with the 240-foot closure there. In 2009 about 15 percent of the commercial trips were in greater than 240 feet and there were all these species here with landings of greater than 10,000 pounds outside of 240 feet. In 2010, the year before that was implemented, we had 17 percent of the trips in greater than 240, and we had a bunch of species with landings greater than 10,000 pounds.

A lot of those stocks dropped off the list in 2011 and your percent of commercial trips dropped by 40 percent, from 17 percent down to 10 percent. The stocks that are still being fished outside of 240 are of concern in terms of the high level of association with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper; so this goes to Roy's point that the 240 closure didn't pull all the effort off of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

That is because they're also associated with fishing effort for greater amberjack, almaco jack, vermilion snapper and gray triggerfish, all of which had landings greater than 10,000 pounds outside of 40 fathoms. Then down at the bottom you can just see the percent of total snapper grouper trips by fishing depth in five fathom bins; so you can see where the bulk of the fishing pressure in the South Atlantic is inside of 20 fathoms and then it really drops off once it gets out of 35 fathoms.

In terms of excluding bycatch effort, I used 2010 commercial logbook trips as the baseline and then assumed that logbook effort was uniformly distributed within the depth grid and that longline and vertical line trips between 25 and a hundred fathoms would potentially interact with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

What I'm looking at here is what percentage of commercial trips would be excluded from the area within the MPA, and this is going to be an area-weighted percentage because the commercial logbook resolution is much, much wider than the resolution of what we have for where the speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are, and it is much broader than the size of these reserves.

The commercial logbook effort, the finest I could get it and still have it be reasonably robust was the five-fathom bin and then a north/south block of 1 degree latitude. Basically what I did at that point is I overlaid the reserve over that 1 degree latitude/longitude bin with the five fathom east/west boundary and looked at the percentage of habitat contained within the MPA from that bin versus the amount outside of it.

As a visual representation of it, you could think of it like the commercial logbook resolution would be the size of this piece of paper, 8-1/2 by 11, and maybe the MPA is the size of an index card, so let's say this piece of paper contained a hundred trips and the index card is covering 10 percent of that area, so then 10 percent of those hundred trips or ten of trips would be eliminated.

That is the best I could do in terms of assuming that the effort is distributed uniformly within that commercial logbook reporting area. Based on those ratios, you can see that the 240-foot closure excludes about 6 percent or 7 percent of the trips for speckled hind, and then the St. Lucie Extension, northern South Carolina reorientation and so on exclude about that same amount if you add them all together.

In terms of the efficiency at relocating bycatch effort per unit area protected, the 240-foot closure was far less efficient. I mean it is ten times as big and it results in about the same overall impact on bycatch effort, so you get a much more efficient relocation of bycatch effort by looking at these shelf-edge reserves from 25 to a hundred fathoms, and the Edisto Reconfiguration 3 is the efficient of those with regards to relocating bycatch effort.

DR. CRABTREE: Nick, on the trips, though, with the 240 closure, given that most of the six species that were part of that closure weren't targeted, it is not clear to me how that closure really redistributed any trips because most of the people out there were fishing for other animals.

DR. FARMER: Yes, so with the 240 closure – I apologize, I was supposed to mention that – that is that asterisk at the bottom. What I did for that one, recognizing that we actually had data for that in terms of the percentage of trips, I looked at the ratio of 2010 trips outside of 240 to 2011 trips outside of 240 to look at the actual percentage trips that dropped off with the 240 closure.

Yes, basically it dropped by about 6 or 7 percent and that drop was probably associated with pulling people off of, for example, snowy grouper and blueline tilefish. Yes, there were still

some trips going out there and landing those other stocks that I have in here like golden tile, blueline for the North Carolina EFP permit, almaco jack and vermilion snapper, gray triggerfish and greater amberjack were still landed at those depths.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if it was a lot of blueline tile trips, about 95 percent of those are north of Hatteras and up in an area where based on the work we did in the EFP, they didn't encounter speckled hind and Warsaw.

DR. FARMER: Right. Your main concerns really are those shelf-edge areas where the people are going outside of 240 and still landing vermilion, gray triggerfish and stocks like that. In terms of impacts on associated stocks, we determined the species associated with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper using percent co-occurrence, hierarchical cluster analysis and dimension reduction analysis.

I have actually spoken with you guys before about these associated stocks, so I am going to skip kind of right to the fundamental point of it, which is that the most associated stocks with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are not the deepwater species from the 240 closure in terms of overall snapper grouper effort, and in fact there are red porgies, scamp, vermilion snapper, gray triggerfish, greater amberjack, red snapper, gag and a few other stocks.

You do get some snowy grouper in there, but it is relatively far down the list in terms of most associated. Then I looked at the possible closure impacts, so if we reorient these MPAs what are the possible impacts on harvest for those associated stocks that I had identified? I used the same approach that I discussed a moment ago with the example of the piece of paper with the index card, so basically I took the commercial trips and I parsed them out to the finest area that I could, overlaid the reserves on top of those and looked at the ratio of areas within versus outside of those areas.

Here is a graphic, for example, of gag average landings parsed out by depth grid cell for the commercial fishery. This is it for the whole South Atlantic and this is kind of the core of where the gag landings are coming from and the hotter colors again denote a higher percentage of the overall gag landings.

This is headboat distribution of gag harvest. I recognize it is probably pretty hard to see up on that little screen, so hopefully you guys are following along in the briefing book version of the presentation. The impacts on harvest that would be predicted by these reorientations, there is no reserve where based on the way that I have looked at this, there is no reserve where the impact would be greater than 1 percent in a given reserve.

If you added up the impacts across a variety of species, so I looked at red porgy, vermilion snapper, scamp, greater amberjack, blueline tilefish, gag and red grouper, the cumulative impacts might add up to about 5 to 8 percent for a given reserve, and for most of them they were less than 2 or 3 percent.

And that is assuming that effort is complete -- or those landings are completely eliminated by the implementation of the reserve; whereas, in fact it is probably pretty likely, especially given the landings are constrained by an ACL, that the fishermen would be able to, for most cases, redistribute their fishing pressure and still land up to the amount that they had landed in the previous year.

As an example for that, the 240-foot closure, if I use the approach that I just described to you with the overlaying of areas, it predicts some losses for all these stocks, especially for greater amberjack and blueline tilefish. Looking at the actual impacts on harvest for the 240-foot closure, you can see the actual impacts were much greater but you would probably have to deduct this one right here, which is red grouper, because we also put in the four-month closure for shallow water grouper, so that is confounded in there.

Then we also put in for scamp that four-month closure on shallow water grouper. If you eliminate those impacts and you just look at the existing ones for the other stocks, you have basically the predicted and actual for greater amberjack are almost spot on. For blueline tilefish the impact was greater than predicted; but then for vermilion snapper, red porgy and gag, they actually caught more in the subsequent year than they did in the previous year, so the 240 closure didn't have an appreciable impact on that and the fishermen were able to compensate for that with those stocks.

And then on the bottom is the percent reduction in landings predicted through that method for the headboat. A couple of take-home messages from this is that the relative impacts of reconfiguring reserves or putting in these relatively small shelf-edge reserves economically versus the 240-foot closure, there is no comparison. The 240-foot closure was far more severe in terms of its impacts.

But, it does provide also some evidence that even these simulated impacts might not be real if fishermen can redistribute their fishing pressure, which it appears that they were able to with the much larger 240-foot closure; so therefore with these smaller closures, I would say there is a pretty good chance that they could as well.

In terms of MPA selection I have given you a variety of metrics to look at in order to pick the most efficient MPAs, so you would be looking for reserves that have high percent observations per gear sample from the fishery-independent and fishery-dependent data, and so those are in those tables I showed you, those really complicated tables. We can go back to those if you like.

You would want it to have a high model percent stock. You would want it to have a high percentage of known and probable habitat. You would be looking to minimize the predicted impacts on harvest of associated stocks, if possible. You would like it to have high efficiency per unit area, so you want to get a big bang for your buck if you're going to close a spot, close it in an efficient way, and then try to contain known spawning aggregations.

In summary here are the best MPAs from the ones that looked at. The Edisto Reconfiguration 3 of the various Edisto reconfigurations was the most efficient. The Georgia MPA reconfiguration

was more efficient than the Georgia MPA. The northern South Carolina reorientation was more efficient than the northern South Carolina MPA. The St. Lucie Extension was more efficient than the St. Lucie MPA.

Your maximums again are somewhere between about 8 to 10 percent of the stocks being protected within there. The reconfigured MPAs are more efficient per unit area than the 240-foot closure and excluding effort from areas with high concentrations of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. However, the total percentage of the stock protected is probably lower.

The predicted maximum would be about a 6 percent impact on commercial harvest and 2 percent on headboat harvest, and that is assuming fishermen just eliminate the trips versus relocate them. There are other areas that have been proposed by your expert working group and also by a document I prepared for the SSC that contain source habitats or probable source habitats and also additional spawning sites.

For example, Warsaw grouper, we don't have any identified spawning sites for Warsaw grouper really within this consideration besides maybe the St. Lucie Extension. There is a place west of Key West known as the Warsaw Hole that is believed to have some Warsaw grouper spawning taking place in there, and then there is an area between northern South Carolina MPA and Edisto MPA known as the Georgetown Hole or the Devil's Hole which has some anecdotal information of Warsaw grouper spawning.

The effectiveness of these proposed MPAs and the existing MPAs is reduced if fishing pressure is redistributed onto source habitats, so it is important to consider the distribution of the stock as a whole when implementing these things or reconfiguring these things, because what you don't want to do is you don't want to locally relocate pressure from an area where speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are abundant onto an area where they're more abundant. With that, I will take any questions.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that presentation, Nick. It was very thorough and obviously has taken a lot of time and effort and hunting around for different data sets, so we very much appreciate your willingness to come back before the committee and make this presentation. I am sure folks have comments and questions. I have a few myself so I thought I would ask those first. I guess one thing I wanted to clarify is in terms of assessments of these two species, these have never been assessed under the SEDAR process, correct, Bonnie? I mean what has been done is really simply catch curve analyses in the past.

DR. PONWITH: Well, you have to break apart the question. The SEDAR process is the process that we have established with the data workshops, the assessment workshops and the review workshops, and then the actual stock assessment approach is something that would be within there. A stock assessment has not been done at the caliber of something like red snapper in the region.

In discussing with our analysts the technical feasibility for conducting a stock assessment on this, the take that we have got from that analysis is that we've probably got enough data to do a

conventional stock assessment on speckled hind, but it is questionable whether we could do a conventional stock assessment on the other stock. The difference is that we think we've got enough intercepts, we have got enough landings data for speckled hind to be able to generate an index of abundance for that stock.

DR. DUVAL: And that is just in the South Atlantic; that does not include Gulf landing observations?

DR. PONWITH: At this point that definitely is true for the South Atlantic and I'm double-checking on the status for the Gulf.

DR. DUVAL: But I guess would you say that the techniques that were used previously would be unlikely to pass peer review were they used today with the information at that time?

DR. PONWITH: Well, that is kind of a loaded question. When we're doing an assessment, the standard that we're looking for is best available scientific information. We take the information we have and use the methodology that is most suited to the quality and the quantity of the information that you have and generate advice and include in that advice the level of scientific uncertainty. We certainly wouldn't have done a stock assessment back in the eighties and given a point estimate and said this is perfect knowledge, so again it is kind of a qualified answer.

DR. DUVAL: And I guess in terms of the level of information that we have available; what are the differences in the surveys between the Gulf and the South Atlantic? It is my understanding that there is more information available in the Gulf for these two species than there is in the South Atlantic most likely as a result of the level of surveys that the Gulf has as compared to the South Atlantic.

DR. PONWITH: If you're just looking in probabilistic terms, the amount of fishery-independent data collections that we have done in the Gulf of Mexico relative to the South Atlantic is considerable; and so just by sheer virtue of the duration of those fishery-independent data collections and the spatial coverage of them the amount of data we have in general is higher. The South Atlantic we have got MARMAP, which is a long-term data collection, but it remains to be seen how susceptible those species are to encounters in that, but more recently the addition of the SEFIS, so certainly the Gulf has more fishery-independent data.

DR. DUVAL: And I guess the other question I had is probably for Nick. I know, Nick, in your presentation you delineated certain management actions that had taken place and along a timeline, and I know that it was a motion made at our last committee meeting and it was also a motion made by the AP to conduct an analysis of those regulations to see if we could quantify the level of I guess maybe a reduction in bycatch that might be encountered; and so beyond this have you been able to do anything with the data that you have and the regulations? I know it is a difficult thing to try to parse out and I very much appreciate that.

DR. FARMER: Yes, I think at this point the best we can do with the data we have available is, for example, these graphics that I have shown you of the time series of landings and encounters

relative to management actions, so you can see the trend visually and infer for yourself whether any drop that you might see in the last few years is due to actual management action or if it is due to just variability in the time series.

That is the hard thing to tease out because these things aren't landed, and so we're basing any conclusion that we would make on their bycatch, on self-reported B2s and then expanded commercial discards, which are also self-reported and then expanded out from a 20 percent sub-sample, and then recreational sub-sample obviously is much smaller than that and then expanded out. You have those issues associated with it.

We did do the same approaches on the existing MPAs as we used to evaluate the reconfigurations, so I think we have a relatively good handle in a relative sense on the Deepwater MPAs, and all those methods are the same in terms of how we looked at the existing versus the proposed reconfigurations.

So even if there are errors within there, in a relative sense those would be cancelled out, so I think it is useful from a relativistic point of view. And again these two graphics on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are probably the best you could do in terms of teasing out what the impacts on bycatch would be.

DR. DUVAL: And I guess I asked that question and asked the questions about the data that we have available because in some sense the lack of available data both from a fishery-dependent and fishery-independent perspective as compared to the Gulf, where there is a directed fishery, really puts the South Atlantic I think at a disadvantage in terms of apparent health of the stock. That is just the only point I was trying to make.

DR. FARMER: As a comment on that, I think we do have some peer-reviewed literature, including the Ziskin paper, that shows a variety of trends for speckled hind, which is historically the more abundant of the two stocks and also appears to have had a substantial decline. He is not seeing any mature individuals and the length at age and a variety of other trends appear to suggest that the stock was at least as of the last data point in 2007 overexploited. There are probably three or four metrics within there that would indicate that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Bonnie, you have harvest of both of these stocks in the Gulf, and I think one if not both are considered one stock for the region, the Gulf and the Atlantic. How is that going to play into an assessment and/or rebuilding?

DR. PONWITH: Well, there is precedent for conducting a stock assessment as one stock. I guess I'm not understanding. Are you talking about technically how you would do a stock assessment?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, we're looking at closures, expanded MPAs; and if it is one stock, it is almost like we have got a localized depletion problem instead of – if it is one stock, how are we going to handle if it is overfished and we're fishing in one place and we're not another?

DR. PONWITH: If the question is suggesting that you use the Gulf of Mexico as the source stock and continue to fish, that probably – I guess I'm not totally clear what your question is, but localized depletion is certainly something of concern for a stock that has a wide geographic distribution.

That said, having a wide geographic distribution can be a buffer against ecological or biological or a fishery's problems in subsections, so all of that would have to be taken into consideration in the stock assessment and incorporating data from both the fishery-independent data and the data on the landings and exploitation rates across the geographic range would be important.

MR. BELL: This is an observation and then a question. I'm not surprised by the slight gain in some of the reorientations. Looking at the Georgia reorientation, the Edisto and going back a little bit in the north – and I was there on the original MPA. I guess we were an AP back then, and I drew the original boxes off of South Carolina, so the reorientations actually represent what we were originally trying to do, which was what Nick was getting at, which was to follow the ledges and edges.

We were working a lot back then just from bathymetry, which is basically what we had. I'm not surprised at all that you get a little bump in some of this. There was also some moving around of the boxes to try to – because there was sensitivity to some sweet spots and things there that folks weren't quite ready to give up, so to speak, so that is not surprising,

As we maybe consider reorientations I don't know if some of that resistance would still be there and maybe not now since the concept seems to be a little bit better understood. And then also I just was curious; the wreck that is down in the St. Lucie site, has anybody ever looked at that; is there any evaluation of what is going on with that wreck in terms of any spawning aggregations or the fish that are there.

DR. FARMER: I imagine I could probably send an e-mail and I might be able to get an answer pretty quickly and maybe by full council because I know somebody who does a lot of wreck diving, and I would be he has been on that one.

MR. BELL: Yes, I know who you are talking. And, related to that, the Charleston Deep Site, originally our intent was to have had out there a long time ago an actual reef and we're still working on that. I am hoping within the next year or so we actually will have something out there. It won't be an aircraft carrier, but it will be something bigger than a tugboat.

I know John and I have talked about the concept of actually creating some of these deepwater wrecks as reefs. If nothing else, they can be kind of demonstrations of what you can get with the right type of habitat in the right depth of water. I hope we're able to follow up on that. Just one more point; if anybody would like to see what – because the original concept that we came up with years ago was actually tiered towards deep water, a little closer in and a little closer in. We actually had a three – you know, worked all the way in and understanding that these fish move back and forth over time depending on the species and their life history.

But you don't see any of those shallower water ones; we stuck with the deepwater reefs as kind of the first step in using MPAs as a tool. But if anybody would like to see some video, I have got some clips here that I'd be glad to show you on a lunch break or something of some of the stuff we have done. Actually the council supported us way back in actually developing one of these sites.

DR. CRABTREE: I want to come back to Charlie's question. I don't see this situation as any different than almost all of the snapper grouper or reef fish species we manage. Virtually all of them occur both in the Gulf and in the South Atlantic. There is probably some degree of interchange that occurs between all of them; but with a couple of exceptions being yellowtail snapper and black grouper, which the center of abundance is off the Keys in South Florida.

We assess them separately and we manage them separately and their statuses are dealt with separately. That may not be the best way, but that is how we've dealt with it and how we appear to be planning to continue to deal with it based on our future assessment schedules. I don't think this is any different than virtually everything else we do.

DR. FARMER: Yes, to that point, we do have also observations of spawning condition speckled hind and spawning condition Warsaw grouper in the South Atlantic. The Gulf may be a source for some of them, but there is also a localized source.

MR. AMICK: To Mel's point about this Charleston Deep, that is news to me, and I was curious the depth of that MPA, the size, and questioning the viability of a deepwater artificial reef program to – the percentage of benefit that we'd get from the reef structuring of these MPAs. I wonder if you an MPA in place and you put structure out there, what benefit could be derived from that instead of just completely ignoring the Charleston Deep.

I look into a lot of the fishing in the Gulf and I follow for-hire businesses and a lot of the Warsaw grouper that they're catching are on man-made reef structure in deep water, and a lot of them are huge, and I wonder maybe there is an opportunity there for a pilot program to sink something out there in this protected area and see the benefits from it.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think that was certainly the intent, if I recall. My memory is a little bit dim of that time, but that was certainly the intent. It was fishermen had suggested – as they have as we have continued this debate here – the use of artificial reefs is something that they would like us to consider in that regard. Mel, to that point.

MR. BELL: Yes, it was actually twofold. One was that you would get some augmentation – in other words, you're adding some additional hard bottom and you have seen the effects of what goes on in wrecks and stuff.

The other thing was to sort of have a demonstration because at the time we were trying to get people to just understand the concept of what we were trying to do in terms of if you set an area aside and you leave it alone, what happens, what sort of quantities of fish do you get there, do they spawn there? It is kind of twofold. One would just be to demonstrate and it in an area

where you can demonstrate it; and, two, you're adding some habitat. Of course, the more structure, the better. The trouble, of course, is funding. It is not cheap.

MR. HAYMANS: My question was the source of reoriented areas, because it doesn't match up to what comes from the expert workgroup, but Nick was just explaining to me that some of those areas are independent of the expert workgroup. What we talked about a couple of meetings ago is what the expert workgroup came up with, which is shifting the Georgia MPA south off of St. Simons, and it actually made it quite smaller. I guess I would like to see the results of that analysis in comparison to what he did in the report.

DR. DUVAL: And I think Nick has an answer for us.

DR. FARMER: Yes, and to that point there is a document in the SSC's briefing book that I presented to them in their October meeting which has a variety of other MPAs. They were proposed by SERO and also by the expert working group to locate the MPAs in areas with higher concentrations of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, so basically looking at getting the maximum bang for your buck, area closed versus percent of stock covered.

If you look at that SSC briefing book report, there is a table similar to the tables that I showed you in here. I believe it is Tables 9A and 9B in that report. They look kind of like these tables but with some additional MPAs, and there are a lot of figures and stuff of where those things would be located.

DR. DUVAL: So you're saying you have done that analysis for those reorientations as suggested by the expert workgroup?

DR. FARMER: Yes, all the expert working group proposed reorientations plus several others have been analyzed.

MR. HAYMANS: And also I had issues with the sizes of that compared to what we've got published and Nick explained to me that – or reminded me that you actually removed those areas outside of the 25 to a hundred fathoms that occurred in the existing MPA and that is where the areas where those sizes come from, because they're actually different than what we find, say, on the dashboard when you look at a size of an MPA.

DR. FARMER: Yes, and I thought that was important because remember most of these metrics are area-weighted metrics and the only places we did the computations of the percent of stock in there was between 25 and a hundred fathoms, so we had to look at only the area in 25 to a hundred fathoms in order to have the appropriate area weight.

MR. PHILLIPS: Concerning the Georgia MPA, I know there is snowy grouper there, so if you reconfigure it and move it very far inshore, even though we're working on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, snowies are still under a rebuilding plan. Are we willing to make those tradeoffs? I think, if I remember right, one of my guys said there was another wreck inshore that

they used to catch amberjack on years ago, which probably would have some Warsaw and stuff on it.

DR. DUVAL: Actually I had a question about that. Nick, you said it was set up for tilefish; have tilefish caught in there? Have there been any tilefish in those observations in this particular MPA?

DR. FARMER: That is not something that I looked at specifically, but I do have data that I could use to look at that if you wanted to look at it, and I'm sure Charlie has an answer.

MR. PHILLIPS: To that point, that's how I found the snowies because I was tilefishing, and they were stacked up on an airplane wreck 90 feet high. It was unbelievable to see what could stack up on a wreck that I could not turn my shrimp boat around and stay on it; it was that small. It was in roughly 650 feet.

MR. JOLLEY: Nick, I enjoyed that. Some of the tables and graphs are a little bit hard for some of us to fully understand, but I got a lot out of that. My question to you follows along what Mel and Steve have been getting at, and that is, is the scientific community looking at the possibility of using artificial reefs as a mitigating influence on management, in other words, as a tool to try to help us with this particular kind of problem.

I would be interested in the discussions that have gone on if there have been ay, but in South Florida some of us are beginning to think that we may be able to begin to develop some MPAs that would not be fished in deep water, that would not take away – for example, if you established a new habitat and declare it a non-fishing area, you haven't taken anything away from the fishermen, and we see that as a very saleable idea.

DR. FARMER: I think there have been mixed results in the scientific community on the positive versus negative impacts of artificial reefs. At best it creates new habitat which then creates a place where more fish; i.e., fish that would have died otherwise for lack of having a habitat where they could survive would move to and then grow and hopefully reproduce.

At worse it makes fish move or redistributes fishing pressure on to a site that is an important habitat and then you end up negatively impacting the population. In general if you implement an artificial reef, I would say there is probably a timeline that would be required for positive benefits to be realized because the fish have to discover that site and start using that site.

The site has to get the growth necessary to support obiverous fish on it as well as predatory fish, that sort of thing. I'm not sure what the timetable is for those things to become effective. They do obviously deteriorate through time, maybe to a greater extent than a real hard bottom habitat would. In terms of these particular stocks, I think one of the things we would like to do is protect an area that might be a potential spawning habitat.

Those tend to be kind of a longer memory type of a feature. In the case of spawning aggregating groupers you typically have older individuals that are guiding the younger individuals to the

spawning aggregation, so you would have to have basically a new spawning aggregation develop on that wreck site, and that has happened in certain instances.

I know there is a Goliath grouper spawning aggregation I think off Jupiter that is on a wreck. It happens; I think that the timetable for it is certainly longer term than protecting an existing habitat where they're already located, but it is certainly something that could be thought about as one way of trying to address the issue.

MR. JOLLEY: In response, I apologize, maybe I wasn't very clear, but we're thinking about deep water and Warsaw grouper primarily. In our case we're thinking deep, 500 feet, a lot of current, and so some of the earlier experiences might not apply. For example, it is very hard to fish wrecks in 500 feet of water, and then when you have got mean currents it makes it even harder to do.

Our thought process is that if we can get it deep enough it would manage itself to a great degree because fishing pressure would be very, very difficult to establish. It was in that light that I wondered if the scientific community was thinking that here is an example of where there might be some real potential to add to the carrying capacity especially for animals that we're discussing that we haven't tested.

MR. HARTIG: I was a little bit disappointed that you didn't have the occurrences in the St. Lucie area because I did put some of those forward. There are Warsaw and speckled hind, quite a few speckled hind actually in that area. It is a unique area. It has black sea bass in an area that doesn't have many black sea bass and it has a large biomass of black sea bass.

But the other thing we haven't done and I think it is very important to look at as we get through this process is the available habitat left to fishing around these extensions. I say that in the context of the St. Lucie Expansion. Let me add one thing about St. Lucie before I go forward. It didn't show the big drop in that – I mean, you showed almost the whole bathymetry of Push Button Hill, but you didn't show what I know occurs in that St. Lucie area, which is a big hundred foot drop.

It occurs in a horseshoe and that is where most of the Warsaw congregate. Now, there are a bunch of pinnacles throughout that thing where the speckled hind seem to – they seem to dot these things, they seem to dot the tops of these pinnacles.

But if we don't look at the context of how much habitat is available and what we're going to be taking away by these extensions – if you look at South Florida in particular with the compression of the Continental Shelf, you have an area that starts in Jupiter that comes out of the mud, and you have that type of habitat that really starts in Jupiter and then runs all the way up the coast in broken increments.

Some of it is more continuous as you get to the north, but in that area where we are you've got that one area off Jupiter and then you've got the St. Lucie – after that goes into the sand you have got the St. Lucie, which is closed, and then you have got Push Button Hill, which people fish on,

and then that drives back into the sand and you have got a couple of isolated other spots, and then you have got the Oculina Closure.

Sandwiched between two closures already is the area that is considered to be St. Lucie Humps to be closed,, and it is directly off an inlet and it is heavily fished by the recreational and commercial people. Politically, I mean you have to weigh these things; we do. We have to weigh the politics of where you're going to put them and if people are going to have an area to fish any longer in that deepwater complex.

As we go through this – and I had asked Roger, and I don't know if he is here, but at least I provided all the known habitats in my jurisdiction. I fished it all and I know it, so I provided all the habitats. I mean, you can map them out and then make a reasoned judgment about what you're going to have left if you closed this. That's all I would like to say.

DR. FARMER: I think at the September member you and I had talked about some of your observations and we had talked about getting those. I guess for whatever reason we haven't gotten them from you, and that certainly is something we could use. For example, if you have point locations for hard bottom habitats and there is no SEAMAP sample in there saying that is hard bottom, I can convert that location to a hard bottom if you give me that information.

Obviously, I can plot your point locations, too. This is a process and I would envision any of this process to be a dynamic process where as new information comes in – because I would certainly hope that we have some baseline monitoring if we do any of this and some follow-up monitoring, so as we get new information we can make some improvements.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other questions for Nick on his presentation? All right, after Ben asks his questions and we get some answers, what we need to do here is provide some guidance to staff on what alternatives we would like included in Regulatory Amendment 17 and when we would like to see that document again for review, so just keep that in the back of your mind because we still have several items under other business that we need to discuss as well that I know are important to people. Ben, go ahead.

MR. HARTIG: The Foundation Study, where you actually had the Foundation that went out with snapper grouper fishermen over a period of years; did you use that, Nick, to inform your – and it goes back to Michelle's question about how discards have declined over time. Did you use that study to inform any of this information?

DR. FARMER: Can you repeat the question on which study that was?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, the observer study from the Gulf and South Atlantic Fishing Foundation.

DR. FARMER: I don't think I received any information on that one unless it is included in the Reef Fish Observer Program; but if that is a study – I have my data sources listed at the end of the presentation. These are all of them; so if it is not on that list, then I haven't received it. I

thought I had solicited everything that was out there; but if there is more information, it certainly would be helpful.

MR. HARTIG: It is pretty extensive and it is the only observer information we have from the snapper grouper fishery. Well, there is an earlier paper by – and I can't remember who did it, but there is a shorter timeframe, but this goes over I think four or five years of information, and their information just came out. It is not like it has been out for probably three months.

DR. FARMER: So that is not part of the Reef Fish Observer Program?

MR. HARTIG: I don't think so.

DR. FARMER: Bonnie, do you know?

MR. HARTIG: Bonnie knows; I mean, it was a CRP type project. No, I don't think it is.

DR. PONWITH: Well, if it was done under CRP, it isn't part of the standard observer program. It would be an augmentation using similar protocol.

MR. HARTIG: But that is the only information we and certainly that can pulled in. The one other point, and I will leave it at that, is when you're looking at that hundred fathom mark and trying to get to that in these, this is all based on habitat. If there is no habitat in a hundred fathoms, there aren't going to any Warsaws in a hundred fathoms.

Our information that we have seen, they're all really habitat tied. Warsaw in particular, you could close 1 percent of the bottom and protect 99 percent of the animals. They are really, really specific about where they want to be on these habitats. Yes, they will roam to a certain degree, but they pretty much stay on these higher pinnacles in these areas. That is an important point.

In the Keys now where you have your habitat – I mean there is a gradient there all the way from the reefs inside and then you start getting to those pinnacles offshore and then all that bleeds into almost that lophelia stuff, so you have all this interaction of habitat in the southern area, which you don't have. You have got a big break between lophelia and oculina as we go up the coast. Looking at that probably in a region-specific way would help us inform our judgments if we want to go to 600 feet or not.

DR. FARMER: Again, adaptive kind of an approach, so if, for example, some of these reserves going out to a hundred fathoms might make sense because there is documented hard bottom out there; and with the other ones, if there is no hard bottom, I agree with you there is not much point in protecting out there; although that begs the question if there is nothing out there, what do you lose by protecting it. Are people fishing out there at all, anyway?

DR. DUVAL: All right, we're at the point in the discussion where I would like to consider some committee action. As of our last meeting the motion to move forward with considering marine protected areas for these species was to be contained in Regulatory Amendment 17. We received

the requested presentation, so we need to provide staff some guidance with regard to what alternatives you would like to see included in this amendment and when you would like to see the document back. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it appears to me there are gains we could have in protection provided by the existing MPAs by reconfiguring them a little. I think we ought to minimally include that along the lines of what Nick laid out as something we're doing. I guess the question is whether we want to look at some additional MPAs along with that. I think Nick indicated he has already analyzed a lot of what came out of the workgroup and done a lot of that, so it seems to me we could pull a lot of that stuff together and look at it in terms of alternatives at the next council meeting.

MR. CUPKA: I think the workgroup expressed an interest in getting back together. They felt like they could do more work on this, too. The first step was to look at reconfiguring what we already had and obviously that gives us some gains but probably not enough where we should be, so maybe the next step is to look at these suggestions from the workgroup, give them an opportunity to come up with more and see if we can't concentrate on areas that are really going to give us a big bang for the buck in terms of these two species.

DR. DUVAL: So, David, when you say the areas that were considered by the workgroup and looking at those and some additional areas, are you referring to all the areas that were considered by the workgroup. Doug brought up the point that the analysis that Nick has presented here is like maximizing the reconfiguration of our existing MPAs; so analyzing the reconfigurations that were suggested by the workgroup he has done and that is contained in a different paper. Were you suggesting including those reconfigurations from the workgroup in this document? If you could just clarify sort of –

MR. CUPKA: Well, I think we need to look at those, but I also think the workgroup thought they could provide additional areas that maybe Nick hasn't looked at. If we can get a chance to look at those, maybe we could see how much more of a gain that we could get from those. Clearly, the first step was just reconfiguring the existing MPAs and then seeing if there are some additional areas that we want to consider. I don't think we're at the point yet of knowing exactly what those are. I see this as a continuing work. I don't think we're going to get where we need to be maybe even in this amendment without some additional work.

DR. DUVAL: There are a couple of different ways we can move forward. We could give staff some guidance on alternatives to include in this regulatory amendment for us to review at our March meeting, and we could also request that the expert workgroup be reconvened. Staff would have to weigh in on that with regard to budget if that is feasible. Those are a couple pieces of direction that we could give. Well, I'm the chair so I can't make motions. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: It seems to me that maybe moving forward with the amendment with only considering these reconfigurations would be kind of a step-wise approach and then taking the next step in a different amendment; so as the MPA Steering Committee has the opportunity to meet again and look at some different options we would be able to consider that maybe a few

meetings from now in a separate amendment rather than stopping forward movement on these additional protections until we have Tier 2 and Tier 3 considered.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I just think that if we're considering changing and adding different closed areas, we need to do it at one time and not stepwise. The public needs to know that we have thought through the whole process at once rather than making a small change here.

MR. SWATZEL: Well, I guess I just had question. Do we have a definable goal in terms of percentage of stock that would be protected or a definable bycatch reduction? I mean exactly what are we shooting at?

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think it would be very important to – and that is certainly not something that would probably be -- it would require further committee discussion but metrics for success. I think that is very important when you're considering things like this. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and that is one of our problems. What we have gotten from the scientists and the SSC is they don't know what the status of these stocks are now, and they don't know what needs to be done, so this comes down to some extent to a judgment call as to how precautionary or how risk averse you want to be as a council.

Now, what I would like to see at the next meeting – and I think Nick has it done – is alternatives that look at these reconfigurations, and then I would like to have Nick identify like three to four additional spots that score the highest in his way of evaluating these things in terms of providing some benefits. That would give us I think a pretty good range of things to look at in terms of providing some additional protection for these things.

I don't see that anybody is going to give us a number saying here is what you get to. We're going to have to figure that out on our own. It seems to me if we tried to look at reconfiguring and maybe a few other additional spots that seem to have high levels of benefits that would be enough for us to look at and work on for right now.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Roy's point, we don't know where we are on these fish. I would be more inclined to bring Nick's stuff back in front of the workgroup and look at where we are. Like the Georgia MPA, I know it has got snowies in it; do we want to give up the protection of the snowies.

We can talk to the fishermen because they can tell us what is in there – they have got information that Nick doesn't have – and bring it back to the workgroup and say let's see if we can hash something out a little bit firmer; look at the stuff off of St. Simons, the box we made. I would like to see it be done as inclusive as we can do it.

I am not really interested in seeing a box right in the middle of the vermilion ground where you just move everybody on each end; and if there are any speckled hind and Warsaws on the end, they get the same pressure that they would be getting if it was spread out, so I don't know that you get much bang for your buck by putting it in the middle. We need to talk to fishermen about

that. I would be inclined, if we had the money and time, to reconvene the workgroup, put his reconfigurations out there and let's talk it over and see what we're going to get and what we're going to lose.

MR. HARTIG : Ditto from Charlie.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I'm okay with that and I'm sure Bob has plenty of money so I wouldn't worry about that, but, David, when do you think we could pull the workgroup together and have them look at some of these things?

MR. CUPKA: Well, if we were going to do it, I would like to do it before our next meeting in March.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that would be great, get them together, have them look at this and some of the other things Nick has and then bring us some areas to look at and the workgroup's findings at the next meeting.

DR. DUVAL: How do other folks around the table feel about that, reconvening the expert workgroup between now and the March meeting, have them look at all of the analyses that Nick has done and not just the reconfigurations, but the additional areas and provide input on that? I am seeing heads nod around the table, but I would really appreciate a motion from the committee to do something along those lines, along with timing. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I'll move that we reconvene the Expert MPA Working Group between now and the March meeting; that we ask Nick Farmer to make presentation on his analysis on reconfiguration of MPAs and additional MPAs; and based on the outcome of this working group, that we have a presentation looking at alternatives for reconfiguration and some additional sites to review at the March meeting.

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion on the floor; is there a second; seconded by Charlie. Is there anymore discussion on this? Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: In terms of clarifying the product that would come to the March meeting, it would be the product out of the expert workgroup that would come to the March meeting and then you all would discuss that?

DR. DUVAL: Is that everybody's understanding that what we would be looking at would be coming out of the expert working group? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, but our expectation is what comes out of that working group is some alternatives, as this says reconfigurations and some additional potential sites that have high value.

DR. DUVAL: So would you prefer that we include in this a request that the working group provide their recommendations for reconfiguration and a few additional high-value sites? Do you need that in there or no?

MR. WAUGH: No, I think this is clear. I was just making sure that we were clear that what would be presented in March would be the alternatives that come out of working group and not a draft regulatory amendment document with alternatives and biological, social and economic analysis. Phil is breathing a sigh of relief over there as am I. You would look at the alternatives in March and then give us guidance on timing at March.

DR. CRABTREE: Right, and that is my intent and then we will look at some alternatives and we will make some decisions about what we want to do with them and then hopefully the following meeting we would come forward then with something to start to put a regulatory amendment together.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, is everybody clear on that? Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. We are now at the end of our scheduled committee business and I am aware of at least three items under other business that we need to take care of.

The first one is something that we discussed briefly at our last meeting, and I am going to ask Tom Burgess to go over this, but it really involves on duly permitted vessels the ability to carry four commercial divers instead of three. There are a couple of attachments in the briefing book. One specifically is an excerpt from the Gulf Amendment 34 to the Reef Fish Plan, I believe, that deals with this. Tom, if you don't mind kind of walking us through this a little bit.

MR. BURGESS: I was approached by a diver concerning an amendment that came before the Gulf. That was Amendment 34, and Action 2 in that amendment states "modify crew size regulations for dual-permitted permitted vessels while fishing commercially". This came about to eliminate the crew size requirements for dual-permitted vessels and to increase the maximum crew size from three to four. This was a safety issue that he brought to my attention and it had been adopted in the Gulf, and he would like to see if possible for it to be adopted in the South Atlantic. I was interested to see if we could pursue that.

DR. DUVAL: It seems to make logical sense. It would be consistent with regulations for dually permitted vessels in the Gulf. It seems like the shell of vehicle has already been done. I think analyses would certainly need to be updated to reflect the South Atlantic, but I guess I would look to Roy to see if he has any thoughts on that.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think we can do that. I think we can take the Gulf Amendment and we will have to obviously make changes to the analysis to reflect the South Atlantic situation. I think a lot of the legwork has been done. It arose in the Gulf as a safety concern. We have consulted with the Coast Guard and enforcement so all of that kind of stuff has been done. I support taking a look at that. I think the real issue is going to be where in the order of priorities do we put it, but I certainly think it is something we can do.

DR. DUVAL: I guess the question is do we do this through a separate amendment or do we have the ability to do this in an amendment that we already have ongoing, and I'm just going to ask Myra to speak to that.

MS. BROUWER: Well, an option is to add it to Amendment 27. This is an action that couldn't be done through the framework, so it would necessitate a plan amendment. That is one that is going to public hearings in January so this could be added with the understanding that we're not going to have a whole lot of time to have analysis ready, but we could include it in that amendment if the committee wanted to do that.

DR. DUVAL: Do folks have any concerns about doing something like that, including this as an action in Amendment 27? I'm not seeing anybody having any concerns, so I think I would entertain a motion to add an action to Amendment 27 to allow dually permitted vessels to have four commercial divers on board similar to Gulf Reef Fish Amendment 34. Tom.

MR. BURGESS: I move to add an action to Amendment 27 to allow dually permitted vessels to have four commercial divers on board similar to the action in the Gulf Reef Fish Amendment 34.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Anna. Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: I think in the Gulf, in the document – I'm just trying to remember off the top of my head – it wasn't just divers. It was crew so that it is not limited to divers.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so we should change that. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Didn't we establish the other day that we don't have definition for crew?

DR. DUVAL: Monica, definition of crew.

DR. CRABTREE: In the Gulf it was anyone on board the vessel, so you're talking about the vessel can't have but four people on the boat, and this is on a commercial trip. Everybody on the boat is part of the crew.

MR. ATACK: I would just like to say I would support this. I'm a commercial diver and we like to have two people on the boat and two people down; so if you're dually permitted and you can't do the four crew, you can only have three crew, so this would be a move for safety reasons and allow boats having dual permits.

MR. CUPKA: Roy, the action the Gulf took, wasn't that tied into a certificate of inspection that would somehow allow a certain number of people depending on what was on their certificate of inspection?

DR. CRABTREE: That was a different issue that had to do with multiuse for-hire vessels and the moratorium permits and passenger limits on it. That is not an issue in the South Atlantic

because we don't have a moratorium on charter vessels. I think that is what you're referring to, and we haven't resolved that one in the Gulf yet.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, any other discussion on this? **The motion reads add an action to Amendment 27 to allow dually permitted vessels to have four crew members on board similar to the action in Gulf Reef Fish Amendment 34. Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.** Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just for clarification for the record when we're talking about dually permitted, you're talking about those vessels that have both a commercial and a for-hire permit, correct?

DR. DUVAL: That is correct.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, and also I just checked the regulations that deal with – well, 50 CFR 622, they don't have a definition of crew, but they define a headboat or a for-hire vessel in a certain way that discusses how many crew members they can have on board, so that is how we approach that kind of thing.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you for that clarification. The next item of other business that I wanted to get through is I think most folks were sitting around the table during the Dolphin and Wahoo Committee the other day and had an opportunity to review the spreadsheets of accountability measures and ACLs that Kari McLauchlin on the South Atlantic Council staff put together for all of our managed species.

Rather than go through that spreadsheet right here and try to have some discussion with regard to how we might want to consider making some of our accountability measures within the snapper grouper fishery more consistent.

Because some of them vary a bit between our species depending on what we have done in certain amendments, I would hope that I could get a motion from the committee to direct staff to work with staff at the regional office to perhaps finalize and clean up the spreadsheet and present the committee with some options or suggestions for ways in which we might want to pursue consistency among those accountability measures. Is anyone willing to make a motion? Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I move to direct council staff to work with SERO staff to finalize the regulations' spreadsheet and bring options to the committee in June of 2013 that consider changes to the AMs.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Tom Burgess. Discussion. I think it is just going to be more productive for us to consider changes that would allow for consistency amongst the species if we have some options in front of us rather than trying to hammer things out here. Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.** Now, I know Ben had a couple of items that he wanted to address and one of them had to do with I think recreational harvest of blue runners.

MR. HARTIG: The one thing I neglected to do when we were talking about that issue was that we move to direct staff to investigate the recreational data used for determining the landings for recreational catches of blue runner.

DR. HARTIG: There is a motion on the floor by Ben; seconded by Tom Burgess. Discussion?

DR. CRABTREE: Ben, can you shed a little light on what you're driving at so that whoever investigates it knows what it is they're investigating?

MR. HARTIG: The intent is in looking at the blue runner landings, as I mentioned before, is that they're very peaky. The other part of that is I want to get into the nuts and bolts of where those samples are collected and what is pushing that high recreational number of blue runner, which no one in my area seems to be able to corroborate.

We need to really get into the nuts and bolts of where the information – the spot locations. We're going all the way back to how this data is collected to find out specifically for this species now and maybe other species in the future, but to look at blue runner in that context now, to get into the nuts and bolts of MRIP and MRFSS and how that data was collected.

DR. DUVAL: Is there any other discussion or questions for Ben? Is there any opposition to this motion? I guess, Ben, it might be helpful if we had a sense of when you would like to see something like this. Maybe give staff a couple of meetings, maybe come back in June or something; would that be acceptable?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, this is not time-central. I'll talk to staff.

DR. DUVAL: Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved**. Ben, I thought you had a couple of other things you wanted as well.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and the other thing is to review the jack and deepwater complexes with the intent of developing an options paper to bring before the council. I didn't put a timeline on it. I'm willing to do this myself. I'm willing to write it and pass it on to staff and then have them make it and come before the council in March if you all so desire. I'm not looking to take up anymore of staff's time in some of these things. The additional one I'm going to ask for next will be as well, but if the council doesn't have a problem me developing an options paper that actually goes through staff that you can review in March.

DR. DUVAL: I think staff would be more than happy to only have to review something instead of develop something, but we're looking for a second to this motion. Seconded by Charlie. **The motion reads review the jack complex and the deepwater grouper complex with the intent to bring an options paper to modify those complexes to the committee in March of 2013.** I'm assuming that this refers to some of the conversation we had a little bit earlier, the point that Doug brought up about maybe it is time to think about a separate management plan for some of

these species or at least in the case of the deepwater complex perhaps disaggregating some of those species. Gregg, did you have a comment?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, you handled some of it. Just to get a little idea of what we're looking for here, because the complex is just made up of the individual ACLs of the species, so regardless of how you shuffle those shells around you're still going to end up with the total of those individual ACLs. Taking and sticking them in another plan isn't going to change any of the big MSA requirements; so just a little more guidance as to exactly what you're interested in.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I'll give you the guidance. I will show you exactly where the problems are. There are some real problems that are occurring that we need to remedy really as fast as we can. I understand as fast as we can given the workload we have now. I'll talk to Doug about his – his doesn't really fall into what I was going to do, but it may be an additional thing that we might look at. You will see it; you'll get it.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, is there any other discussion on this? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion stands approved.** Ben, you had one more thing, you said?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and this one won't be controversial. The other one is that I would move that we develop an options paper to review unharvested ACLs and to be able to move ACLs between allocations.

DR. DUVAL: You were joking when you said that.

MR. HARTIG: You picked up on that.

DR. DUVAL: The motion is to develop an options paper to review unharvested ACLs and allow for moving ACLs between sector allocations. There are two seconds to that; so Charlie. Discussion?

MR. HARTIG: Well, Madam Chairman, basically one of our biggest charges is to maintain MSY while achieving optimum yield, and for a number of our species – and I'm sorry I don't have the figures before you to show that; but if you just recall looking at Bonnie's slides in the beginning when she presented the recreation catches, for some of our major species we're well below the allocations, especially on the recreational side.

I'm going to look at this in the vein of both sectors because there is some room in jacks especially if the ACL on the recreational side was met, that we could move some allocation in that direction as well. It is not going to be as equitable to the recreational as it would be to the commercial.

Just the number of stocks that aren't being harvested by the recreational side is much greater that is not being harvested on the commercial, so it is going to be kind of unbalanced in that regard, but just to bring that paper before you for you to look at it in the context of optimum yield. I would like to thank Jim – and this was unorchestrated – when he talked about optimum yield

throughout his conversations with the council at this meeting. At three different times at least he mentioned reaching optimum yield, and like I said that is one of our charges and what we should try and do and to have some way to get closer to optimum yield is my intent.

DR. DUVAL: There was conversation about this at the AP meeting. I will say that the Mid-Atlantic Council does have a procedure. It is in regulation that allows for a certain percentage of the recreational bluefish allocation to be transferred to the commercial allocation, but that transfer can't exceed a total number of pounds on the commercial side, and it is only if the recreational sector is not projected to meet its allocation otherwise. I'll just put that out there for folks. Ben, just to clarify, it is your intent that you would actually write up this options paper and would it be your intent to also have staff review it and then bring it before the committee in March?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, that is my intent.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, and I think Gregg had a question and then I saw Steve with his hand up.

MR. WAUGH: This will come up on Executive Finance, also, when we relook at our priorities, but we've got Snapper Grouper Amendment 29 that is looking at allocations and revisions to ABCs and ACLs from the ORCHS technique. We have got that scheduled to begin discussion in June. It seems to me that would feed into that amendment.

MR. AMICK: To Ben's point, I'm just sensitive to your motion there because ACLs are fairly new management tools and what we're going through the last few years, recreational effort is at its all-time low. Hopefully in the future the effort, as the stocks rebuild, will slowly increase. I am thinking of the vermilion snapper ACLs and what happened this year in 2012 where recreationally 18 percent of our ACL – I think without the headboat index in there – so it seems like while there is a lot of vermilion snappers sitting there, but I'm just making the comment more than anything else. I'm sensitive to say, well, there is plenty of vermilions, we're okay on vermilion snapper because the recreationals only caught 18 percent of their ACL, well, hopefully in the future recreational effort will increase.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that comment, Steve. To that point, Ben, and then I'm going to move on.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, it is a great point. I struggled a little bit with it, but you have to look at the – you know, we don't manage in a vacuum. The country has just gone through a great recession. It doesn't look like the economics is going to change much in the near term. The economy is going to drive how many recreational people go fishing as well as the rebuilding, so somewhere we have to find a way to get to optimum yield.

I'm not talking about all the allocation – and you will see some portion, as Michelle had mentioned. What is going to be the new norm is the question that we have to agree with. And the economic thing as we watch slow growth, what happens when all this printed money and

inflation starts and then we have to deal with – our main economist over there is shaking his head, but we don't manage in a vacuum and that is the main point.

MR. ATACK: I guess why we came up with this idea or were looking at it and thinking about it and discussing it was we were looking at, for example, the gag fishery. This year the commercial hit the quota, the gag fishery shut down. There were a lot of other grouper out there that couldn't get harvested on the commercial side. We're looking the ACL total and the gag ACL total is not going to be anywhere near met.

The recreational is – it is a 50/50 fishery I think and the recreational is a small percentage of it. There are a couple of issues there because in Amendment 16 we changed the bag limit on the recreational side. We cut the season. And then with all the other accountability measures for other fisheries and the economy and da, da, da, you know, the catch is down on the recreational side. So one of the proposals we had also was to take the bag limit back to the five on the aggregate grouper and the gag from one back to two; and with the spawning season closure, that way the recreational could maybe harvest closer to their ACL.

The other side of the coin is make that change but if the recreational is really not projected to meet their ACL and there is a certain amount left on the table, then what harm would it do for the commercial to be able to harvest some of those fish and make that money and still get closer to the ACL and the optimum yield. That is kind of how we kicked it around and came up with it.

With that situation, it is really a win-win for both sides. We're really not trying to take from the recreational. I think you have got to manage your recreational with the bag limits and the season; and if it looks like that should be adjusted up some, I think it should be; but again look at each species, you know, where the landings are versus the ACL; and then if the commercial can – it looks like they're going to exceed theirs and the recreational is not and stay under the total ACL, I mean isn't that win-win for everybody?

MR. BOYD: I just wanted to ask Ben if he would come to the Gulf Council and make this same motion for us. (Laughter)

DR. DUVAL: And plan to walk out of there; is that what you're saying? Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: Well, just a comment; I was trying to wrap my head around and – I mean, if it has been done in the Mid-Atlantic, but given the data collection issues that we have with the recreational sector and the lag, I'm just trying to wrap my head around how we have this one accounting system for commercial and this slower or no accounting system for recreational kind of how to reconcile some of those differences in doing something like this. I'm sure that would all be discussed in the future or hammered out in the future; so just my initial thought.

DR. DUVAL: And I think that is a great comment and a great point to make, and it sounds like that is something Ben is thinking about. I see him nodding his head and hopefully the paper that he puts together that would be one of the items that he would address. Is there anymore discussion on this item? Could I see a show of hands of folks who are in favor of this motion, 8;

those opposed, 2. Okay, **the motion passes with two in opposition**. Is there any other business to come before the committee? The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 o'clock noon, December 5, 2012.)

Transcribed by:
Graham Transcription, Inc

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

INDEX OF MOTIONS

COMMITTEE MOTIONS MADE DURING SSC REPORT

REGULATORY AMENDMENT 13 MOTIONS

MOTIONS MADE FOR REGULATORY AMENDMENT 18

INDEX OF MOTIONS (CONTINUED)

BLACK SEA BASS MOTION

REGULATORY AMENDMENT 15 MOTIONS

AMENDMENT 28 MOTIONS

INDEX OF MOTIONS (CONTINUED)

AMENDMENT 27 MOTIONS

INDEX OF MOTIONS (CONTINUED)

REGULATORY AMENDMENT 17 (MPAs for Speckled Hind and Warsaw Grouper)

OTHER BUSINESS MOTIONS

- - -

SEDAR Committee
David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP
Charlie Phillips, Chair
David Cupka, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Anna Martin

SNAPPER GROUPER
✓Michelle Duval, Chair
✓~~Jessica McCawley~~; Vice Chair MARTHA BADEMAN
✓Steve Amick
✓Anna Beckwith
✓Mel Bell
✓Tom Burgess
✓Roy Crabtree
✓David Cupka
✓Ben Hartig
✓Doug Haymans
✓John Jolley
✓Charlie Phillips
✓Tom Swatzel
✓Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate/Dewey Hemilright
Staff contact:
Myra Brouwer / Brian Cheuvront

SOPPs
Tom Swatzel, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

SPINY LOBSTER
Jessica McCawley, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Roy Crabtree
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

JASON WALKER
JACK MCGOVERN
LUIZ BARBIERI
BONNIE PONWITH
SCOTT SANDORF
PHIL STEELE
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
KAREN RAINE
TONY AUSTIN
MAC CURRIN
DICK BRAME
OTHA EASLEY
DOUG BOYD
CHIP COLLIER
JIM ATACK
ZACK BOWEN
NICK FARMER
JIM KELLEY
MIKE MERRIFIELD

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2012 - 2013 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

Steve Amick
6902 Sandnettles Drive
Savannah, GA 31410
912/429-3537 (ph)
912/898-0361 (f)
SteveAmicks@aol.com

Mel Bell
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Anna Beckwith
1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com

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

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

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. Mario Gil
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)
Mario.g.gil@uscg.mil

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)
doughaymans@gmail.com

John W. Jolley
4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/732-4530 (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 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

Robert E. Beal
Acting 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)
rbeal@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
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

Fishery Outreach Specialist
Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@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 Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager
John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators
Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Julia Byrd – julia.byrd@safmc.net

SEDAR Admin/Outreach
Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@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

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.

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:

Snapper Grouper Committee

December 4, 2012

Wilmington, NC

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Gretchen Martin		gmartin@edf.org	28411
Ted Venker		[illegible]	
Jessica Landman		jlandman@edf.org	20912
Bob Lorenz		RJLORENZ@EC.RR.COM	WILMINGTON
Lt. Michael S. ERVIN (NCMP)		michael.ervin@ncdenr.gov	
Brian Gorski		bgorski@cccaFlorida.org	
Clip Collier		clip.collier@ncdenr.gov	
Justin Shepard		justin.shepard@ncdenr.gov	
A Rust		276 Ocean Creek Rd	Wilmington, NC

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.

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:
Snapper Grouper Committee
December 4, 2012
Wilmington, NC

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Kenny Fex AP	910-620-5847	Kennyfex@gmail	122 NE 38th
Ken Stump consultant	202-390-9520	magpieadk@gmail.com	20008
Rusty Hudson DSF	386-239-0948	dsf2009@aol.com	POBX9351 32120
Karen Raine	727-824-5360	karen.raine@noaa.gov	GCEP
J. Merrifield	321. 388. 8881	jeanan@wildoceanmarket.com	31796
Angie Baker	on file		
Leda Dunmire PEG	305-393 0934		
Helen Takade-Heumacher EDF		htakade@edf.org	
MAC CURRIN	919-881-0049	maccurrin@gmail.com	301 Westwood Raleigh, NC 27607

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:

Snapper Grouper Committee
December 4, 2012
Wilmington, NC

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Dave Nemeth NRDC	20 7727700	dnemeth@nrdc.org	
Melissa Locke EDF	919 881 2909	mlocke@edf.org	4000 Westchase Blvd Raleigh NC 27607
Ken Stump, consultant	202-390-9520	magpiewdc@gmail.com	20008

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:
Snapper Grouper Committee
December 5, 2012
Wilmington, NC

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Rusty Hudson DSF	386-239-0948	dsf2009@aol.com	32120-9351
Karen Raine	727-824-5360	karen.raine@noaa.gov	
Kenny Fex AP	910-620-5847	kensunfe@gmail.com	~~910-620~~58
Helen Takade-Heumacher EDF		htakade@edf.org	
Leda Dunmire PEG	305-393-0934		
Melissa Locke EDF	919-881-2909	mlocke@edf.org	4000 Westchase Blvd Raleigh NC 27607
ANDREA DELL'APA ECU		MAKO1979@HOTMAIL.COM	
Bob Lorenz	910-232-4735	RJLORENZ@EC.RR.COM	P.O. Box 10512 WILMINGTON, NC 28404
JEANNA MERRIFIELD	321-383-8885	jeannamo@wildoceanmarket.com	32796

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:

Snapper Grouper Committee

December 5, 2012

Wilmington, NC

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Scott Baker	910-962-2492	NC Sea Grant	
Brian Gorski (CCA)	407-854-7002	bgorski@ccaflorida.org	
ANDREA DELL'APA (ECU)		MAKO1979@HOTMAIL.COM	
Gretchen Martin		gmartin@edf.org	28411
Susan Shipman	912-222-9206	Susanshipman@att.net	
Holly Binns	850-322-7845	hbinns@pewtrusts.org	
Hilary Cole - USFWS NCSU		hlcole@ncsu.edu	27606
Mike Merrifield CCSC	321 383 8885	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com	
Ken Stump consultant	202-390-9520	maggiewdc@gmail.com	20008

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:

Snapper Grouper Committee

December 5, 2012

Wilmington, NC

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Jeanna M[illegible]	321-383-88[illegible]	jeannam@wild[illegible].org	32796
Jessica Landman, EDF	301-312-4193	jlandman@edf.org	20912

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

Attendee Report

GoToWebinar

Generated

Dec 11, 2012 06:46 AM PST

General Information

Webinar Name
SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 2 of 5 (Tuesday)

Webinar ID
743159874

Actual Start Date/Time
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST

Actual Duration (minutes)
135

Clicked Registration Link
103

Opened Invitation
39

Total Attended
29

Session Details

brennan,kenneth	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:44 AM EST

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:33 PM EST	100.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Package,Christina	christina.package@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:35 AM EST

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:48 PM EST	115.58

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.

Park,Steve	atlanticprodive@aol.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:19 PM EST

City Atlantic beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:19 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:57 PM EST	98.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Reichert,Marcel	reichertm@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 27, 2012 04:33 PM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:57 PM EST	125.05

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.

g,a	andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:54 AM EST

City Chas

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:53 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:01 PM EST	68.88

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Lamberte,Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:18 PM EST

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:19 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 03:56 PM EST	37.43

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 64

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.

Bresnen,Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Nov 14, 2012 04:04 PM EST
City	Tallahassee
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:23 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:59 PM EST	95.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

DeVictor,Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 08:48 AM EST
City	St Pete
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:02 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:08 PM EST	126.08

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 51

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.

pugliese,roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:35 AM EST

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:25 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:05 PM EST	99.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Mehta,Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 03:37 PM EST

City St.Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:54 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:30 PM EST	96.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 69

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.

c,m	mec181@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 07:47 AM EST
City	mtp
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:58 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:08 PM EST	124.55

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Byrd,Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Nov 30, 2012 11:18 AM EST
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:03 PM EST	130.85

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.

Crosson,Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 11:00 AM EST
City	Miami
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 03:33 PM EST	40.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

holiman,stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 08:38 AM EST
City	st pete
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 03:56 PM EST	63.62

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 42

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.

Clemens,Anik	anik.clemens@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 03:48 PM EST

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:02 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:30 PM EST	88.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Smart,Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:40 AM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:37 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:04 PM EST	87

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.

Helies,Frank	fchelies@verizon.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:04 AM EST

City Tampa

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:59 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:08 PM EST	128.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

meyers,steve	steve.meyers@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 02:26 PM EST

City silver spring

State MD

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:10 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:40 PM EST	90.02

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.

Larkin,Michael	michael.larkin@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 01:00 PM EST
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:52 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:40 PM EST	107.53

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

MacLauchlin,Bill	billmac@charter.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 09:25 AM EST
City	Stockbridge
State	GA
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:51 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:08 PM EST	77.65

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.

mershon,wayne	kenyonseafood@sc.rr.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 03:22 PM EST
City	murrells inlet
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:22 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:06 PM EST	103.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 72

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Neer,JUlie	julie.neer@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 08:42 AM EST
City	Chas
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:03 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:05 PM EST	61.4

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.

Eich,Anne	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:38 AM EST

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:54 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:08 PM EST	134.65

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 75

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

travis,michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 15, 2012 02:54 PM EST

City clearwater

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:57 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:06 PM EST	129.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 57

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.

sebastian,Cameron	cameron@coastalscuba.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 01:22 PM EST
City	myrtle beach
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:21 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:06 PM EST	104.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 77

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Michie,kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 08:08 AM EST
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:59 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 03:40 PM EST	41.45

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.

Ballenger,Joseph	ballenger@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:57 PM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:58 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:01 PM EST	63.95

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Fetherston,Elizabeth	efetherston@oceanconservancy.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:47 PM EST

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:47 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 04:19 PM EST	31.65

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.

mccoy,sherri	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 09:19 AM EST
City	cape canaveral
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 03:34 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 05:08 PM EST	94.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

FARMER,NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date	Nov 14, 2012 03:38 PM EST
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.

plowden,david	dplowden@ec.rr.com

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:40 AM EST

City wilmington

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

Franco,Dawn	dawn.franco@gadnr.org

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:00 AM EST

City Brunswick

State GA

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.

Friess,Claudia	cfriess@oceanconservancy.org

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:56 AM EST

City Austin

State TX

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

Holland,jack	jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:23 AM EST

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Pate,Michelle	pates@dnr.sc.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:50 AM EST

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

Heil,Dave	dheil331@gmail.com

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 01, 2012 09:50 AM EST

City Winter Park

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.

lew,capt	capt@captlew.com

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:06 AM EST

City vero beach

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

Gore,Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:33 AM EST

City Sarasota

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.

Ballenger,Joseph	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:27 AM EST

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

von harten,herman	capt_bo@hotmail.com

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 02, 2012 04:30 PM EST

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.

Lloyd,Vic	vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 02, 2012 09:23 AM EST

City Atlantic Beach

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

Dukes,Amy	dukesa@dnr.sc.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 04:54 PM EST

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.

Fredrickson,Ivy	ifredrickson@oceanconservancy.org

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:50 AM EST

City Portland

State OR

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

sedberry,george	george.sedberry@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:51 AM EST

City savannah

State GA

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.

Malinowski,Richard	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:35 AM EST

City st pete

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

Laks,Ira	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 10:48 AM EST

City Jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Attendee Report

GoToWebinar

Generated

Dec 11, 2012 06:46 AM PST

General Information

Webinar Name
SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 3 of 5 (Wednesday)

Webinar ID
267310874

Actual Start Date/Time
Dec 05, 2012 08:08 AM EST

Actual Duration (minutes)
668

Clicked Registration Link
75

Opened Invitation
38

Total Attended
46

Session Details

Helies,Frank	fchelies@verizon.net
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 03:48 PM EST
City	Tampa
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 03:48 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 06:44 PM EST	176.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

pugliese,roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 05:20 PM EST
City	charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:20 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 05:29 PM EST	8.57

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

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.

Malinowski,Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 02:46 PM EST
City	st
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 02:47 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:00 PM EST	73.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 44

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Johnson,Robert	jlfishing@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 09:04 AM EST
City	St Augustine
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:50 PM EST	464.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 43

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.

plowden,david	dplowden@ec.rr.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 12:10 PM EST

City wil

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 12:11 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:16 PM EST	311.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 39

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Mehta,Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 03:38 PM EST

City St.Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:56 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:30 PM EST	453.65

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 64

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 Dec 05, 2012 08:19 AM EST

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:20 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 03:23 PM EST	422.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Crosson,Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 10:05 AM EST

City Miami

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 10:06 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 10:13 AM EST	7.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 56

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.

mccoy,sherri	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 06:02 PM EST

City cape canaveral

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 06:02 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 06:58 PM EST	56.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Dukes,Amy	dukesa@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 04:54 PM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 03:33 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:56 PM EST	82.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Smart,Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 09:03 AM EST
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 09:03 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 09:27 AM EST	23.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Sedberry,George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 09:17 AM EST
City	Savannah
State	GA
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 09:17 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:59 PM EST	326.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

holland,jack	jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 09:01 AM EST

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 09:02 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 02:57 PM EST	269.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Byrd,Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 11:18 AM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:33 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 05:55 PM EST	562.4

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.

hawkins,jess	jhawkins9@ec.rr.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 05:54 PM EST

City morehead city

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:55 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:16 PM EST	81.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 71

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

MacLauchlin,Bill	billmac@adtrends.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 02:18 PM EST

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 02:20 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 03:05 PM EST	44.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 62

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

phillips,todd	tphillips@oceanconservancy.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 01:41 PM EST

City austin

State TX

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 01:42 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 05:28 PM EST	225.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Laks,Ira	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 05:14 PM EST

City Jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:14 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:15 PM EST	120.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

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.

Tucker,David	blueocean@centurylink.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 07:03 PM EST

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 07:05 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:15 PM EST	9.78

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Reichert,Marcel	reichertm@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 27, 2012 04:34 PM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:33 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 12:03 PM EST	209.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

austin,anthony	redress@ec.rr.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 05:32 PM EST

City hubert

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:32 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 06:40 PM EST	68.07

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 42

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Franco,Dawn	dawny730@msn.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 08:33 AM EST

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:34 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 03:17 PM EST	403.25

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Gerhart,Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 08:55 AM EST
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:55 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 05:18 PM EST	340.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 47

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Gronka,M Steven	stevegronka@seaquestkids.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 08:17 AM EST
City	Newark
State	DE
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:19 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 08:22 AM EST	3.28

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.

c,m	mec181@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 08:10 AM EST
City	mtp
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:10 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:16 PM EST	665.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Package,Christina	christina.package@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 08:24 AM EST
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:25 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 10:02 AM EST	97.35

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.

eich,anne	annemarielbeich@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 05:03 PM EST

City st pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:03 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 05:51 PM EST	47.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

holiman,s	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 08:13 AM EST

City st pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:16 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:23 PM EST	486.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 52

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.

Mitchell,W — warren.mitchell@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 10:25 AM EST
City	Beaufort
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 10:25 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 11:31 AM EST	65.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Lloyd,Vic — vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 02, 2012 09:25 AM EST
City	Atlantic Beach
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 11:11 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 06:54 PM EST	321.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Michie,Kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 08:36 AM EST
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:36 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 03:55 PM EST	439.18

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Reinhardt,james	james.reinhardt@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 08:18 AM EST
City	silver spring
State	MD
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:20 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 03:32 PM EST	432.52

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.

Eich,Anne Marie	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 08:19 AM EST

City St. Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:19 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 05:14 PM EST	534.95

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Neer,Jullie	julie.neer@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 09:01 AM EST

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 09:01 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 02:45 PM EST	343.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

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.

Clemens,Anik	anik.clemens@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 03:48 PM EST

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 01:43 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 05:35 PM EST	232.7

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

lew,capt	cat@captlew.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 10:08 AM EST

City vero beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 10:09 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 10:11 AM EST	2.15

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

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.

crabtree,laura	lcrabtree96@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 05:53 PM EST
City	st. petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:53 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:17 PM EST	83.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

cox,jack	dayboat1965@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 05:00 PM EST
City	morehead city
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:01 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:11 PM EST	129.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 59

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	Dec 05, 2012 09:56 AM EST
City	Stockbridge
State	GA
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 09:57 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:16 PM EST	559.33

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 42

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

g,a	andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 09:45 AM EST
City	chas
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 09:45 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 12:06 PM EST	140.85

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.

merritt,michael	miridon@ec.rr.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 05:48 PM EST
City	wrightsville beach
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 05:48 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 07:16 PM EST	87.42

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Fetherston,Elizabeth	efetherston@oceanconservancy.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 01:45 PM EST
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 01:45 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:11 PM EST	145.72

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.

Heil,Dave	dheil331@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 01, 2012 09:50 AM EST

City Winter Park

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 10:13 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 03:33 PM EST	319.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

DeVictor,Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 08:48 AM EST

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 08:49 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:32 PM EST	462.82

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.

Furnish,Abby	aaf6@duke.edu

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 11:18 AM EST
City	Atlantic Beach
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 11:20 AM EST	Dec 05, 2012 12:01 PM EST	41.65

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

park,steve	atlanticprodive@aol.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 05, 2012 03:47 PM EST
City	atlantic beach
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 05, 2012 03:48 PM EST	Dec 05, 2012 04:35 PM EST	47.43

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 53

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 Nov 14, 2012 03:38 PM EST

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

travis,michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Nov 15, 2012 02:55 PM EST

City clearwater

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.

Bresnen,Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com

Attended No

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 04:04 PM EST

City Tallahassee

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

Blum,Frank	scarolinaseafood@knology.net

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 05, 2012 10:10 AM EST

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.

Attendee Report

GoToWebinar

Generated

Dec 11, 2012 06:45 AM PST

General Information

Webinar Name
SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 2 of 5 (Tuesday)

Webinar ID
743159874

Actual Start Date/Time
Dec 04, 2012 07:42 AM EST

Actual Duration (minutes)
426

Clicked Registration Link
103

Opened Invitation
39

Total Attended
39

Session Details

Eich,Anne	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 08:38 AM EST
City	St Pete
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:39 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	367.65

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 45

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

von harten,herman	capt_bo@hotmail.com
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Dec 02, 2012 04:30 PM EST
City	charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:02 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	345.08

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.

Holland,jack	jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:23 AM EST

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:23 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:42 PM EST	197.95

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 16

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

g,a	andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:54 AM EST

City Chas

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:54 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:46 PM EST	189.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 5

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.

plowden,david	dplowden@ec.rr.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:40 AM EST

City wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:41 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	332.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 19

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

mccoy,sherri	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:19 AM EST

City cape canaveral

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:19 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	328

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 7

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.

pugliese,roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 08:35 AM EST
City	charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:35 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	280.78

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 17

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Laks,Ira	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 10:48 AM EST
City	Jupiter
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 10:56 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 01:24 PM EST	109.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 0

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Q: -
A: --unanswered--

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Byrd,Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Nov 30, 2012 11:18 AM EST
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:42 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	365.33

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 8

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

c,m	mec181@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 07:47 AM EST
City	mtp
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 07:48 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	419.07

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 12

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.

Fredrickson,Ivy	ifredrickson@oceanconservancy.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:50 AM EST

City Portland

State OR

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 11:51 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 11:58 AM EST	7.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 10

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

DeVictor,Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:48 AM EST

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:49 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	319.8

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 13

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.

sebastian,Cameron	cameron@coastalscuba.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 01:22 PM EST
City	myrtle beach
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 01:24 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	83.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Crosson,Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 11:00 AM EST
City	Miami
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 11:01 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	118.7

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 11

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.

Pate,Michelle	pates@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:50 AM EST

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 11:51 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	176.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 16

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Smart,Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:40 AM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 11:41 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	186.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 5

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 Dec 04, 2012 08:33 AM EST

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:37 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:41 PM EST	304.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 8

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

sedberry,george	george.sedberry@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:51 AM EST

City savannah

State GA

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:52 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	230.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 11

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.

Malinowski,Richard	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:35 AM EST

City st pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:35 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 09:39 AM EST	4.18

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 16

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

holiman,stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:38 AM EST

City st pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:41 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	253.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Michie,kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:08 AM EST

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:09 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	248.08

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 15

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Ballenger,Joseph	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:27 AM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:27 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	379.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 9

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.

Clemens,Anik	anik.clemens@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 03:48 PM EST

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 01:25 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	81.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 11

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Lloyd,Vic	vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 02, 2012 09:23 AM EST

City Atlantic Beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 01:09 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:04 PM EST	37.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Neer,JUlie	julie.neer@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:42 AM EST

City Chas

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:42 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	364.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 14

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

MacLauchlin,Bill	billmac@charter.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:25 AM EST

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:26 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	227.55

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.

brennan,kenneth	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:44 AM EST

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 01:03 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	104.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 11

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Franco,Dawn	dawn.franco@gadnr.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:00 AM EST

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:00 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	346.67

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 14

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.

Helies,Frank	fchelies@verizon.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 09:04 AM EST

City Tampa

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	341.78

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 10

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Larkin,Michael	michael.larkin@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 01:00 PM EST

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 01:01 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	106.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 6

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.

Reichert,Marcel	reichertm@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 27, 2012 04:33 PM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:24 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	383

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 18

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Bresnen,Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 04:04 PM EST

City Tallahassee

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:33 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	374.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 16

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.

lew,capt	capt@captlew.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 11:06 AM EST

City vero beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 11:06 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 11:46 AM EST	39.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Mehta,Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 03:37 PM EST

City St.Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:15 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	259.17

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.

meyers,steve	steve.meyers@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 02:26 PM EST

City silver spring

State MD

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 02:26 PM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:48 PM EST	21.33

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 17

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Package,Christina	christina.package@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 08:35 AM EST

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 08:35 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	231.43

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 18

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Q: I'm at SERO and we're unable to get the audio through the web. Not sure if it's on our end or your end there, but wanted to let you know
A: --unanswered--
Q: What is the telephone call in number for the webinar? The audio is not working over the web
A: --unanswered--

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Friess,Claudia	cfriess@oceanconservancy.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Dec 04, 2012 09:56 AM EST
City	Austin
State	TX
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:57 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 11:01 AM EST	57.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 2

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

travis,michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Nov 15, 2012 02:54 PM EST
City	clearwater
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:44 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	302.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 10

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.

Dukes,Amy	dukesa@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Nov 30, 2012 04:54 PM EST
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 04, 2012 09:02 AM EST	Dec 04, 2012 02:47 PM EST	345.15

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 11

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

FARMER,NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date	Nov 14, 2012 03:38 PM EST
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.

mershon,wayne	kenyonseafood@sc.rr.com

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:22 PM EST

City murrells inlet

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

Ballenger,Joseph	ballenger@dnr.sc.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:57 PM EST

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.

Lamberte,Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:18 PM EST

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

Heil,Dave	dheil331@gmail.com

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 01, 2012 09:50 AM EST

City Winter Park

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.

Fetherston,Elizabeth	efetherston@oceanconservancy.org

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:47 PM EST

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Park,Steve	atlanticprodive@aol.com

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 04, 2012 03:19 PM EST

City Atlantic beach

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.