

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, FL**

June 12-13, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Snapper Grouper Committee:

Mac Currin, Chairman
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips

Council Members:

Lt. Robert Foos

Dr. Wilson Laney

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Anna Martin
Roger Pugliese

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Andrea Grabman
Dr. Mike Errigo
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Otha Easley
Andy Strelcheck
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Joey Ballenger
Dr. Luiz Barbieri
Kathy Barco
Robert Johnson
Karen Raine

Dr. Jack McGovern
Bob Gill
Phil Steele
Martha Bademan
Dr. Marcel Reichert
Dr. Nick Farmer
Dr. Chris Koenig
Rob Beaton
Carolyn Sramek

Additional Observers Attached

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman Mac Currin.....	4
Approval of Agenda.....	4
Approval of March 2012 Committee Minutes.....	4
Commercial Catches versus Quotas for Species under Quota Management...	4
Recreational Catches versus Quotas for Species under Quota Management...	5
Overview and Status of new SEFSC Quota Monitoring Program.....	6
Status of Delinquent Logbook Review.....	12
Status of Amendments Under Review.....	18
SSC Report.....	18
Advisory Panel Report.....	24
Resubmittal of Action 4 to Amendment 18A.....	28
Amendment 18B/EA.....	35
MPAs and HAPCs for Speckled Hind and Warsaw Grouper.....	49
Presentation on Recommended Percentages of MPA Areas.....	71
Presentation on Impacts of Suggested MPA of Expert Workgroup.....	92
Committee Action as Part of CE-BA 3.....	95
Presentation of MARMAP Fishery-Independent CPUEs.....	106
Discussion of Late Reporting Penalties.....	113
Red Snapper Considerations via Emergency Rule.....	118
Discussion and Committee Action.....	128
Black Sea Bass Management.....	163
Other Business.....	170

Adjournment.....	173
------------------	-----

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, Tuesday morning, June 12, 2012, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Mac Currin.

MR. CURRIN: We will call to order the Snapper Grouper Committee. Before we get into our agenda, Chairman Cupka wanted to have a few words.

MR. CUPKA: I just wanted to take this opportunity to recognize Kathy Barco, who is here with us. Kathy is the Chair of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. She will be with us today and part of tomorrow, but she won't be here Friday when we normally do the introductions, so I just wanted to take this opportunity to recognize her and welcome you and we're glad you're here, Kathy. Thank you.

MR. CURRIN: All right, we will move into our agenda and the first item is the approval of the agenda with the usual caveats that you allow me to shift some things around to make our business run more efficiently, if that is okay with you. If there aren't any objections, we will approve the agenda with that caveat.

We also have minutes from our March 2012 meeting. Are there any corrections or additions? Without objection from the committee, then those minutes will stand approved as well. The update on the Oculina research activities were covered in the Ecosystem Committee. We will not do that. Our fourth agenda item is the status of the commercial catches, Attachment 1A, and Jack McGovern is going to come up and go through those for us.

DR. McGOVERN: This is a table from Attachment 1A, and what it shows is the various species and species groups. It also has in it dolphin and wahoo. This is essentially output from the Science Center's new commercial landings monitoring system, the CLM Program that Dr. Ponwith I think is going to talk about this morning.

It shows the start season, the fishing year, the quota or ACL, the reported landings thus far, the percent landing, and then it shows what the landings were for the previous year to this date and the percent landed to that date. These are landings through May 31st of this year. Some notable species I think would be the deepwater grouper unit, which includes blueline tilefish and that one is at 31 percent. The porgies are at 38 percent. The output we get from the Science Center also shows whether or not it is projected that the ACL will be met this year.

The three groups that are projected to met based on the landings we have so far this year are gray triggerfish, greater amberjack and the jack complex, and they are highlighted there. Gray triggerfish thus far is at 55 percent; greater amberjack is at 13 percent and that has a fishing year that starts on May 1st; and the jack complex is shown here at 75 percent, but we have an update that it is now at 83 percent.

Based on information from the Science Center, it is projected that gray triggerfish could possibly close at the end of September/beginning October. Greater amberjack can possibly close in December and the jack complex possibly in July. That jack complex is almaco jack, banded rudderfish and lesser amberjack.

One thing that is neat about the new CLM is that when we got this from the Science Center the week before last, we talked to Dr. Gloeckner and said, yes, we noticed that the jack complex is at 75 percent and we well need projections and he said no problem and within the hour we had the projections and it came with a memo and then a range of projections suggesting that it needed to be closed between I think the end of June to the beginning of September.

We have the closure package all put together and we're anticipating closing the jack complex in early July. One other thing I wanted to mention is that the aggregate grouper complex, black grouper, red grouper and gag, that is going to go away with Amendment 24, which becomes effective on July 11th, and so we will have separate ACLs for all those. That's it.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Jack. Any questions for Jack? All right, next is the status of the recreational catches, and, Bonnie, we'll turn it over to you. That's Attachment 1B.

DR. PONWITH: First up we've got black sea bass recreational landings. Again, what I'd like to do is highlight the caveats of these slides are noted on the bottom. This is the area of North Carolina to Florida. It is the MRFSS data through Wave 1 for 2012. Those are considered preliminary. The 2011 data are considered final.

The headboats are included through 2011 but not in the 2012 data. The landings, as you can see, are 530,000 pounds. This just shows the patterns of the landings compared to the total recreational effort. We have gag grouper at zero. Greater amberjack, we have 381,000, roughly. There you can see the relationship to the effort and the landings from past years.

For mutton snapper recreational landings, we have 22,500, roughly. For red porgy, we're just under 2,000 pounds whole weight. For red snapper, we're at zero. Snowy grouper, these are in numbers of fish and we're at 151 snowies. For golden tilefish, landings thus far in Wave 1 are just a little over a thousand fish. For vermilion snapper, we're around 516 pounds whole weight. For yellowtail snapper, we're at 13,735 pounds. And that is a wrap.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Bonnie. Questions for Bonnie? Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Bonnie, the utility of these numbers is not just the number where we are but the number relative to the ACL, and I think at every council meeting when you give this report this point is raised. In a couple of places ACL is shown and in some cases it's on the figure with the graphs so you can't see where you are relative to the numbers. What do we need to do get that added so that in each table it's clear what the ACL is so that the information is useful rather than just seeing a bunch of numbers?

DR. PONWITH: I'll talk to the folks and see if we can find an easy way to depict the ACL either on the graph or on the tables that is standardized so it is the same for every meeting.

MR. CURRIN: You might even be able to put it in the title, Bonnie, and certainly on the first graph of the annual landings. That may work for the rest of them as well. Any other questions or comments for Bonnie on the recreational landings? All right, Bonnie, you've got the next two

agenda items, and we'll just let you take those as you are ready. The next is the overview and status of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Quota Monitoring Program.

DR. PONWITH: Okay, we are excited about this landings system in terms of it is our ability to automate, developing scenarios to customize the ACLs, and to be able to generate reports to better understand patterns that we're seeing in the commercial landings. There are going to be a couple of caveats and we'll talk about that I know we have talked about before.

I think that when you see these slides it will drive home the importance of really continuing with some work that we're doing to ensure that we've got good compliance for the commercial reporting. The system works simply by consolidating inputs from several sources. We have permits information. We have information coming in from ACCSP. We have got information coming in from the northeast and then also from the Bluefin System we have set up in the Gulf of Mexico.

Those inputs are consolidated and run through a validation process and then begin the process of analyzing those data, and that essentially allows us to carry out the monitoring of those data once they have been processed. We receive nightly downloads from ACCSP and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center and then receive the Bluefin information coming again from Florida and from Texas.

We get nightly updates of the quota status and then also a projection of days to closure using those data. An important feature of this is the user-defined quotas or the ACLs, which gives us the flexibility to make modifications depending upon what type of management scenarios the council puts in place.

It enables us to review individual dealer reports or consolidated reports through the flexibility provided in the reporting system. Another nice feature is that if an error is found in a dealer report and a dealer makes the correction, those can be automatically synced up so we don't end up having versioning problems and those modifications are actually incorporated going forward, which is a very important feature.

There are different components of the process, and the first is summarizing the landings by stock or by stock group. This includes getting the reported landings, the percentage of quota and then the forecast of the number of days to close. We can look at the quota in very high level of detail, looking at it by dealer or aggregated by any time component or also spatially and use that to help us look at forecasts in a more refined way. It also enables us to review the details of those landing reports, so it's flexible in again helping us to evaluate patterns that we're seeing in those data.

We already talked a little bit about the quota maintenance and being able to take advantage of the user-defined ACL or quota and make adjustments in that. This is an example of what one of the tables look like and you see it is by the stock or the stock group name. It gives the date range for the season opener, the start date and the season end, and then it gives what the quota is; and then beside that the current landings and what percentage of the quota has been achieved by those current landings.

But, of course, things are never really that simple; the plot thickens if you'll go to the next slide, please. We have situations where the – and this has contributed to some of the problems we have had projecting quotas in the old way, and that is that if we had misreporting or dealers that didn't report, we ran the risk of misinterpreting the patterns we were seeing in landings at that point, making those projections based on those misinterpretations and end up either undershooting or grossly overshooting.

What this does is it sets algorithms in the system to be able to help account for that. Again, what we have is an example here where we've got Spanish mackerel is the quota we're looking at. The reporting year we're interested in is the month of March, and we're interested in – that is the landing month. We're interested also in what month were those landings reported.

As you can see of the March landings, only 64,000 were reported in the month of March; 115,000 were reported in the month of April; and 117,000 were reported in the month of May. What that means is that 40 percent of the March Spanish mackerel landings were reported in May rather than a little more close to the day they were actually landed. That is what has been causing us the problems in the past.

What we have is the ability using this system to take the reported landings and adjust them by expanding them for unreported landings. What you will see is a table very much like the one we just saw where it has got the quota name, the quota weight, the reported landings and what percent of the total quota that represents and then an expanded landings, which are the reported ones plus the ones we believe that are unreported and then what percentage.

Well, how do we get that, you might ask? The next slide goes through that process. The expansion process is a way for us to account for non-reporting through the most recent reporting period. The current approach right now is to use the same period in that dealer's reports from the previous year.

The future approach which we're writing the code for right now does exactly that, but then scales those patterns to the fishing year, this year. For example, if a dealer didn't report last year and we see those patterns but last year was a phenomenal year, we assume that the patterns that the dealer reported last year are going to be reflective in this year, but the fishing is horrible this year, we would take that percent of unreported landings for that time period but scale it to the actual landings pattern for this year, so it's a way to further refine those expansions.

The forecasting process then calculates the closure dates to enable us to avoid exceeding those ACLs, so the forecast also can be done under multiple assumptions about the fishing conditions and the fishing pressure; so effort and the conditions out there, is the weather going haywire and is that going to change the patterns we're seeing in the landings. Again, the current approach is to use each dealer's landings from the previous year.

And then as was mentioned in the last slide, the additional approaches would be use that scaled to a comparison of last year versus this year's catches rates; or, to also look at the highest rate for the entire fishery in the previous and current year to help scale those adjustments. The problematic expansions are the ones we'll talk about now.

For most stocks we are actually doing pretty well. Where the expansions appear very reasonable, they indicate that we have got maybe a zero to a 20 percent non-reporting level. Of course, zero percent is the target we're shooting for because that requires the least amount of assumptions to be built into it, so that is a goal to aspire to.

One of the problems that we're having right now is we have some species for which our expansions are indicating that we have non-reporting levels between 50 and 80 percent. Naturally that is going to be problematic because the amount of assumptions we have to make to evaluate what could have been caught in those unreported landings, there is going to be less precision.

We think the circumstances that drive this are partly due to the data system and we're working to make those corrections. The other thing contributing to that is that the current regulations do not require dealer permits on some of these species and that is really seriously contributing to the problem. That's a problem we're working together to try and correct.

The quota definition tools, again we talked a little bit about the ability to make adjustments in the ACLs. They are user-defined quotas and they're built from user-defined species or species groups, gear groups, fishing area groups and landing locations to enable us to look at scenarios and patterns we're seeing in the data.

Quality control and investigative tools is also an important feature of this that really helps us again to look at all those scenarios. We have built-in checking for the landing reports for both the GulffIN and the ACCSP data. It is linked to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center's Dealer Reconciliation System and the SERO's permit data base, which enables us to cross-reference the different ID's we have and come up with sort of a master ID for these reporting systems.

It helps us to be able to review user input, and, of course, the confidentiality issue rolls in on that and people who have the permits to go into the confidential data are able to do that. Again, the system allows us to the flexibility to learn as we go and add modules to this to make it better as we go.

The next thing on our docket to look into is the federal permits are needed for dealers for all federally managed species, and again that gets back to some of those species for which we had such large expansion factors. That reduces the uncertainty by defining who should be reporting and it allows us to monitor compliance of those dealers with these requirements.

We're working with the dealers in the states to improve the timeliness of the reports. The areas we're working on refining the system are tackling those unrealistic expansions for some stocks; developing a user-compliance report. I think that feedback loop will help a lot to improve our compliance, particularly if we're working closely with the states. And then to look at additional data treatments and forecast tools to help us take advantage of our ability now to see patterns in the fishery. Any questions?

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Bonnie. Questions or comments? John Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: Thanks, Bonnie. I had a question about this expansion. Let me say first I thought we had a lot compliance things in the commercial fishery really solved. I get the impression we've still got a lot to jump through. Anyway, in this expansion of the numbers when the reporting isn't timely; did you go back in previous years and plug in those numbers to see how your expansions were working for those previous years. Do you understand what I'm talking about?

DR. PONWITH: That's difficult to do because the – you mean the previous years prior to the immediately preceding year? The immediately preceding year is the year that we're using to generate the expansions. Basically by virtue of using both current year and last year, the expansions are built on both of these years so they're no longer independent. Do you mean going farther back to look at patterns farther back?

MR. JOLLEY: Yes, I was wondering whether or not you might be able to test your methodology by going back and using data from previous years, if you knew what the delays were and those percentages that were not reported in previous years by a month or two and then work up some kind of a module that would test your hypothesis.

DR. PONWITH: We absolutely can do that and that is one of the beauties. I'll make a note of that recommendation, and that's one of beauties of that system is that rather than being a laborious hand-cranked analysis, being able to compare what happened last year to this year and then compare the result of that comparison to patterns in previous years could be done in my understanding pretty quickly.

MR. HARTIG: It is just frustrating that the Science Center has to go through all these hoops to be able to do something that the dealers are federally mandated to do for most species. Now, we can take care of the laws on species that don't have reporting requirements yet. We can do that, but we have talked about this at length before. Law enforcement we heard was going to visit some dealers and make sure that reporting was more timely. Has that happened; is that occurring? Are we getting better compliance on our reporting as of late, Otha?

MR. CURRIN: I don't know, Ben, but Monica told me that Karen is delayed this morning. She had something else going on, but she will be here this afternoon and that may be the person that needs to best address that. If Otha wants to address it, come on up.

MR. EASLEY: Not necessarily.

MR. CURRIN: Well, then you can wait for Karen if you want.

MR. EASLEY: That is what I was going to say is we've had a conference call or two between general counsel and enforcement and Bonnie and Roy. Bonnie will be reporting on the outcome of that, but Karen will be here also to give some more details later on.

MR. CURRIN: Ben, I couldn't agree more with you. I was sitting here thinking with all these expansions, I'm hoping that after the Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee finishes with its work and gets all the necessary permits in place and that we can convince Office of Law Enforcement

and NOAA GC to put some – or the law enforcement counsel to put some teeth into the regulations so that we don't have to worry about these expansions. We shouldn't; there should be no expansion. We shouldn't have to worry about guessing for these things.

We should have the dealers reporting; and if they don't, they shouldn't be dealers. I know that is harsh but they're affecting everyone else, as you know. They're affecting the fishermen, they're affecting the other dealers, and it is a problem that has an easy solution and it just takes some guts to let these people know we're serious. I hope that is where we end up. Any other questions? Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thanks, Bonnie, and thanks to Steve Turner and Dave Gloeckner. This is a huge improvement and it will be very helpful because we get lots of questions from fishermen. I had just three quick questions. One, what is the timing of updates to the website? You say people with confidential clearance can have access; does that include council staff? You're still writing code for the expansion, so when will this be fully implemented?

DR. PONWITH: My understanding is the data are updated on a daily basis into the system, and so I think daily is the answer to the first question. In terms of the access to the finest resolution data, which invokes the confidentiality, allow me to consult with general counsel and get back on who makes the list – you know, who can be actually in the system looking at the fine resolution information; so that's a get-back. And the third question?

MR. WAUGH: You're still writing code so when will it be fully implemented?

DR. PONWITH: Let me get back to you on that. I guess that's a difficult question to answer, and the reason is because the system is build and designed to be flexible enough to be able to add new modules and new ways of evaluating. My expectation is that this is going to be kind of a living tool; so that if we, in working with SERO or working with the council, see a new analysis that actually lends insight to quota monitoring, we can make those adjustments, but it is actually being used right now.

MR. WAUGH: Just one clarification on the update; so the data are updated to the system daily so we can tell our commercial fishermen who are planning trips that they can go to the Southeast Regional Office Website that has this table with the status of quotas and that will be updated daily so that they can plan their fishing trips and decide whether or not to make a trip based on when the quota might be filled.

DR. PONWITH: The data are updated in the system on a daily basis, but in terms of updates to the – let me double-check on that. I'm looking behind the scenes at how the data are assembled and what I need to do is go to the interface and see how those then are adjusted. Let me take that question and I'll get back to you as the day progresses.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I guess the real question is are the expansions done on a daily basis; are they recalculated based on the input from that day? Isn't that what you're asking, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, because that is critical. It doesn't help the fishermen in a positive way if the system is updated daily and nobody has access to it. It really needs that output to be available to the fishermen daily so that they can plan their normal business operations.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, that would be best. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Bonnie, with respect to Gregg's second question, who makes the decision – and, Monica, this may be a question for you – as to who has access to confidential data? We have been going round and round on this issue ever since I've been on the council as well as the dealer reporting issue. It just seems to me that the council can't do its job unless at least the staff have access to confidential data. We can go down the road to a fishery management plan and make decisions and find out later on they might not have been the correct decisions because we didn't know enough.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: To that point, Duane, the Magnuson Act has strict rules on confidential information, right, this data, but the council staff that develops fishery management plans, which is most all of the staff, probably the entire council staff has access to the confidential data. The Magnuson Act clearly allows that exception, so the staff has access.

As you know, Bob has on occasion requested for council members to have access to confidential information, and at this meeting, for example, you will see that with golden crab. There is also a new draft guidance – I guess I'll call it a rule, but it's not really a rule, but it's new guidance on the confidentiality interpretation of the Magnuson Act. Maybe we will get to that later at this meeting, I'm not sure, and I can bring it up, but that is out for comment. That also is another interpretation of who has access to the confidential information, but the staff has it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Bonnie, this might have been something I should have asked Jack, but as far as the closed dates, projecting the closed dates, is the other species that are being closed; is that getting built in there? Like, for instance, vermilion are getting shorter and shorter seasons; so when they can't catch vermilion, then they're going to go target the gags and the amberjack. Then they're going to go target the gags. I know we've got the aggregate grouper, is it 9 percent landed, but I think those grouper are going to be closed before the end of the year, some of those, and is any of that being figured in, change of effort?

DR. PONWITH: Allow me to say that at first cut the projected dates are based on exclusively empirical data. It is based on patterns in sort of the burn rate through the quotas that we saw the previous years. That is not to say that we couldn't add some intuitive assumptions that say, well, but three-quarters of the way through that Species Y is going to be closed and that will impact the burn rate through Species X.

The problem is that it is always harder to anticipate what a human being is going to do than it is to look at data and use those data empirically to calculate a burn rate. There are a lot of assumptions that would have to go in. I think that we could, in the narrative, add caveats like knowing full well that this rate may change or will change when Species Y is closed; but building that in at the onset adds a lot of uncertainty to it. But, I hear what you're saying on that.

MR. CURRIN: Gregg, last question on quota monitoring and then we're going to move on.

MR. WAUGH: And to follow up on Charlie's point, this is exactly why golden tilefish, if you look, we were doing a decent job tracking it, but once the fishermen changed their behavior we have consistently blown the ACL. From what Bonnie is saying is they can't figure out a way to build in that change in behavior, and so the ACLs will continue to be blown.

The solution will be discussed during the data collection committee, and this argues for the need for daily reporting; certainly not monthly; weekly, perhaps. But again for some of these quotas what you're going to find if you're not changing – if you're not building in some ability to account for the change in behavior, it is going to be increasingly difficult not to continue our trend of blowing these ACLs.

MR. CURRIN: All right, thank you. Bonnie, when you're ready you can move on with the status of the delinquent logbook review.

DR. PONWITH: I am ready. We're shifting now from dealer reporting to vessel logbooks. I want to show you some patterns that we're seeing in the turnaround time on those logbooks. We have a meeting internally with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, SERO and our law enforcement folks to talk over the problem and put some ideas out.

The first thing that we're going to do is draft a letter to be sent to each of the permit holders to reinforce the fact that we are going to increase our level of scrutiny on this problem and also increase our monitoring of compliance for the vessel reporting. That is sort of the fair warning letter.

In addition to that, we're going to go through our data and find the most egregious violators and we will let SERO and our law enforcement colleagues know of permit holders who are repeatedly late or extremely late or a combination of both. This is a graph that shows the patterns that we're seeing in the number of reports and the number of days late those reports are.

What you have here are late fishing reports from 2007 through 2011 and also no fishing reports. To know whether a report is late or not, we require a no fishing report to be filed. That way we can remove them from the list so we don't misinterpret no fishing activity as a late report. Those, quote-unquote, no fishing reports are as critical as positive fishing reports to be able to interpret those data.

These are reports received after 14 days from the upload, from the reporting period. What you see here is a huge number of reports that are both types, fishing and no fishing reports that are a day late and then it tapers off from there all the way out to 400 days, more than a year late. You will see that there is no region for no fishing reports so this graphic shows both the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic combined.

We had a follow-on question to this slide and it is like, well, that gives us numbers of reports; can you give us a feel for numbers of vessels who are committing these transgressions. Between

2007 and 2011 we had – first of all, we have got about 1,145 permits so that gives you a feel for the population.

Of those there were 900 vessels who reported 1 to 49 days late. There were 175 vessels who reported 50 to 99 days late, and there were 225 vessels who reported 100 or more days late. There were 383 vessels who never, never reported on time; so between 2007 and 2011 not one time did they report on time. That's a lot of vessels.

There were 997 vessels who had at least one report that was late, and then it kind of goes on from there. We have 335 vessels who had at least one report that was a hundred days late. The good news is we had 762 vessels who had at least one report that was on time. I want to end on a cheery note. This gives kind of an overview of the timeliness of the fishing reports. Again, you understand the fishing reports are I went fishing and here is my log. The no reports are I didn't go fishing.

This gives you a feel for what percentage of the reports were what degrees either on time or late. I think that slide is kind of self-explanatory. This one shows the compliance and the vessel histories. The blue slide up there – and I know these are a little small, but it was informative to show them on the same slide.

The blue slide up above is the number of vessels is on the Y axis and the number of vessels on time and 1 to 49 days late are all reported on the X axis there. Again, the stop light slide below there, the Y axis is the percentage of vessels, and again it shows the median days late versus the number of annual trips by vessel.

This shows compliance by permit type to see if we have a culprit; you know, one fishery versus another. Basically what this shows me is there is not a lot of difference by permit on the timeliness of those reports. Again, this is South Atlantic reporting compliance by permit type. We have snapper grouper on the top slide and king mackerel on the bottom slide. I'm just kind of showing you patterns, and I don't see strong patterns; maybe higher levels of being late in the king mackerel relative to the number of permits. That's the last slide. I guess I'll if there are any questions.

MR. BELL: Not so much a question, just an observation. We have a mandatory reporting system in South Carolina for wholesale dealers, for charterboat fishermen, for a whole variety of fisheries, and it is sort of an observation in human nature. We have issues with late reporting or non-reporting as well as you mentioned the reporting of no fishing, which is important for us to know.

The only way we have been able to improve reporting is through – and we have the ability to do this – is through writing people tickets, taking them in front of the magistrate. I'm not saying I like being hard about it, but that is just human nature. Until there is some ability or some consequences for not reporting, I don't see how that can improve. That has just been our observation. This last year we've had to really focus on some enforcement efforts and our reporting rate is getting much, much better in one year.

DR. PONWITH: Well, I appreciate that and we actually concur based on our meeting that we had with general counsel and law enforcement and the management and the science side. That is what stimulated us to generate a letter going out to each of the permittees saying we really have high expectations and we're going to be monitoring this more closely and some visits are going to be paid. We agree and we hope that we have the same good result that you did by stimulating folks to remember how important that accurate and timely reporting is to successfully monitoring these quotas.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, what was that total number of vessels that never had an on-time report again?

MR. CURRIN: 383, I believe, is what I've got here.

DR. PONWITH: It was 383 and I think those probably meet the definition of egregious.

MR. CURRIN: I suspect there are others that would meet that definition depending on who was defining it. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Bonnie, what timeframe are you using for your compliance, to identify compliance?

DR. PONWITH: My understanding is these reports are due monthly and they are to be turned in some number of days at the close of the month. What the presentation showed is that the math on all of these charts and figures were based on the upload 14 days after the close of the month.

MR. HARTIG: I think legally you have to submit it within one week of the trip. I think that is the legal definition of how we do it. I'm glad you're using the 14 days because in order for a fisherman like me – and I will explain my circumstance – to report on time my week starts on Monday and goes to Sunday.

Now I don't get paid for those fish until the next Friday. We get a ticket of everything we caught. In fact, I fill out most of my own tickets about what I caught on that trip. However, when I get my weekly statement I get the trip ticket numbers that correspond to each of the trips and that is when I get those. In order for me to fill that field on my logbook, it would take two weeks to be able to do that.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you for that information and I guess I would ask, Otha, if maybe the two of us can talk with Ben a little bit more about that and incorporate that into how we plan the timing of all of this. I think it would be useful.

MR. HARTIG: That would be great.

DR. CRABTREE: And just to make sure everybody is clear we were talking about logbooks here. We don't use these to track ACLs, so it is a whole different thing. Now they're used in some stock assessments and they generate some effort estimates for things, but this is a separate issue from tracking ACLs.

MR. JOLLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know how Ben plans to get these kingfish people to give more timely reports, but are there any positive incentives that you have been thinking about to try and encourage better reporting?

DR. PONWITH: The long-term positive influence of better reporting quality defined as accuracy in the reports and timeliness of the reports is that it provides the science center with better information to provide scientific advice management going forward. It basically improves the precision and it improves the quality of the scientific advice going forward.

DR. CRABTREE: But there are things this council could do, I think, to build into the management system feedback. We talk a lot about annual catch targets and annual catch limits and the buffer between them. You could come up with an algorithm or a formula that takes into account dealer compliance, logbook compliance and builds that into the buffer; so if we get more timely dealer reports the buffer gets smaller, fishermen get more fish. If we get more timely logbook reports, buffers get smaller, fishermen get more fish. I don't know how well that would work with fishermen, but I bet you with the dealers things would turn around pretty quickly. You could those types of things into this; we just never have.

MR. WAUGH: The 383 that never report on time, they still get their permit renewed. Okay, Bonnie is saying no; that would be news to us.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if I could, we have people come in with their permits expired and they want to renew. We then check them for logbooks and sometimes they're delinquent. They then have to submit their logbooks to us; and when they submit them, provided they're still within the one year grace period, they get their permit renewed.

Now they could be at that point over a year late in the logbooks because their permit could expire. They then have a year to renew it. If they came in at the very end of that year renewal, some of those logbooks could be fishing that occurred over a year ago. Some of the problem – because this isn't tracking ACLs here, to me the real problem with lack of timeliness is I suspect that the bias in the quality of the data you get goes up because I think the later these are the more likely it is the fisherman is just making up something and sticking it in there so he can get his permit renewed.

I don't believe these fishermen come in and there are delinquent logbooks. I don't believe they just forgot to send them in. Maybe sometimes that is the case, but in many cases they just never bothered to fill one out and they go home and fill one out and I think the quality of the information you get in those cases is probably really poor.

MR. WAUGH: And that was the point is that there is no negative to them. They can submit the reporting requirement at the time of permit renewal. One of the things is we don't use the logbook for tracking ACLs but the ACCSP data standards for quota tracking specify that you should have a way to check, and it should be a two system.

One is the dealer and one is logbooks, so you use it to verify so you're not just relying a hundred percent on dealers. But the idea here is this is a plan to improve vessel reporting, and the bottom line that I got from it, unless I messed it, is that we're going to send a letter to permit holders or have already sent a letter to permit holders reminding them to report on time. Is that the bottom line; that's it?

DR. PONWITH: No, that is not it. It's a letter reminding them to report on time and to let them know that we will be going through the records of report history and that we will be having enforcement visits to people who are having problems with compliance.

MR. WAUGH: One last thing, Mr. Chairman, is it the intent to still allow individuals who do not report for the entire year and then they come in to renew their permit, to get their permit if they provide the data?

DR. CRABTREE: At this point that is how it works. Now if you guys want to make a change to that we ought to have that discussion and then talk about what changes to the regulations we want to make. You would then have to decide, okay, well, how late does he have to be before he can't renew his permit anymore?

We need to think about this because there will be a lot of stake with those types of things. But until some decision is made by the council and changes made to the regulations, that is going to continue to be the way. Now, we can look at going in and ticketing some people who are chronically late on this and do that, but I think all of that is a discussion we need to have.

MR. CURRIN: Well, I don't think it needs to be a discussion. I think it should be routine operating procedures and draw some threshold as to how late you want them to be, but pop them. I mean that's the only thing that is going to make them comply.

DR. CRABTREE: But pop them means what exactly? That is what we have to figure out.

MR. CURRIN: We had some of this discussion and we said, well, the council can suggest penalties and fines and that sort of thing, but that is really not our bailiwick and that the general counsel and the Office of Law Enforcement have to decide that.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, but the discussion really is fines versus do you want us to not renew their permit at that point? The circumstance now where you lose your permit and we will not renew it is if more than one year goes by; and then that is it, your permit is gone. Now if we want to say if more than two months go by and your logbook is not in, you're not going to have your permit renewed, we can have that discussion, but I think that's a pretty harsh thing to do. That is what I'm getting at. I agree with the amounts of fines and all that, NOAA GC is going to do that, but in terms of the ability to renew your permit, I think that's something the council can make some decisions about.

MR. CURRIN: And if we need to have further discussion, I think in the Data Collection or whatever it is called, but anyway that is where it ought to occur and I will certainly weigh in there. I wouldn't suggest that we start yanking permits after two months, but I would suggest

that we have a pretty fine after two months and after six months that we consider yanking some permits. I think it ought to be harsh.

North Carolina has got a system with license plates now. You used to be able to be on your own to get your inspection, but now they won't register your car unless you have got your inspection. You can't drive or at least without some risk. It is pretty harsh but the cost of doing business and the privilege of driving and I see fishing as no different. People need to comply with the laws especially when it benefits them and their fellow fishermen and dealers. Any other questions on the compliance logbook reporting?

MR. BURGESS: Bonnie, when you say you were sending out a letter to permit holders about what is going to be taking place, had you considered a part in the beginning similar to the purpose and need that we have before our amendments to kind of give the public an idea of why we're going in this direction.

Most amendments start out with that and why is the council taking this action, something clear and easy to read, but it gets to the importance of why we're doing this, the timeliness, the importance of it and kind of get the fishermen on board of taking part in improving the timeliness of data and their role in that. As we've heard before around the table fishing buying into something and also the accuracy in the reporting, and I think that could go a long way.

The discussion on the radio out on the water is important also, because one guy might be complaining about it but someone else might have a little more insight in the situation and just come up with something to say, you know, we all need to share in this responsibility. I think that could go a long way.

And something that Ben touched on about the economic logbook – well, we'll say the three logbooks. We have discards, our landings and economics. I was thinking about this and the first information that I have to me in my operation is discards. I get this after every trap and at the end of the day while I'm still out fishing I have all that information wrote down.

The next information is my landings. That is done at the fish house. We get weights and that comes at the end of the day. And then the last information is the economic information because things such as – I get settled up on Friday; so if I sell fish on Monday I don't get that information until then and sometimes a little bit after, similar to Ben, because of market conditions and a return to the fish house.

That is the way I gather my information. Also, as all snapper grouper permit holders, receive a quota survey from your office at the end of the year, an economic survey and gathering information, and that is a good time of year to do that because we're doing our taxes at that time and we have a lot of that information before us. You can just go over your records as you're doing your taxes and a lot of that information is available to you and quite accurate, too, because you're going over all your records, so that was a good time for that.

MR. CURRIN: Monica, you had a comment and then we're going to move on.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, just to be clear and maybe we've covered this already a little bit earlier and I missed it, but the actual regulations say you have to – at least for coastal migratory pelagics and snapper grouper, which is what we're talking about here this morning, is that the fishing report must be submitted to the center postmarked not later than seven days at the end of each fishing trip. And then if you did not fish for the month, then you have seven days after the end of the month to report that you did not fish. It is not 30 days; it is 7.

MR. CURRIN: All right, if there are no other questions, we will move on and, Jack, are you going to do the status of the amendments under review?

DR. McGOVERN: We have a list of amendments here. The final rule for Regulatory Amendment 11 to remove the harvest prohibition of six snapper grouper species in depths greater than 240 feet published on May 10th and became effective on that date. The final rule for the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, which established ACLs for species in FMPs not undergoing overfishing published on March 16th and became effective on April 16th of this year.

The final rule for Amendment 24, which established a rebuilding plan for red grouper, published yesterday and will be effective on July 11th. The final rule for Amendment 18A, which established an endorsement program for black sea bass along with black sea bass management measures, published on June 1st and will be effective on July 1st.

We sent out three letters last week including those who qualified for endorsements and those who do not qualify for endorsements instructing them how to appeal and another letter to those who qualified but won't get an endorsement until they renew their snapper grouper permit. Amendment 20A was approved by the secretary on April 10th and the final rule package is under review in the region; and the proposed rule package for Regulatory Amendment 12, which increases the commercial and recreational ACLs for golden tilefish, is also under review in the region.

MR. CURRIN: Questions or comments for Jack? All right, thank you very much, Jack, I appreciate it. Luiz and Carolyn, are you ready to do your SSC report? We have the pleasure of both of them being here. I presume Luiz is here; I haven't seen him yet. No, he hasn't made it?

DR. BELCHER: Luiz might actually be on his way. I just sent him a text to see where he was because he indicated he was going to be here. You all have received the SSC report in your documents and I figured since we have done kind of in the past is let you kind of ask the questions.

I know that there has been a lot of discussion relative to the speckled hind and Warsaw grouper discussion that we had. I think the easiest thing is to let you ask the questions and then I will do what I can to direct you to what the discussions were and where ended up at the end of the meeting.

MR. CURRIN: All right, we'll open it up for questions.

DR. BELCHER: Well, I guess the broad synopsis is the two large points were the ABC Control Rule and we did talk about the ORCHS approach. There is a meeting that we had suggested for August to actually go through and apply the ORCHS approach to get the scores so that we can look at these species from that technique.

The other thing was that in looking to other things that were going on, ancillary at the time you also had the Calibration Workshop for the MRIP numbers, which obviously has an effect on how we look at our ABCs because of that whole timeline shift between the old MRFSS survey and the new MRIP survey and how we bring those numbers into the same scaler.

That obviously has an impact especially for the ABC Control Rule at the lower tiers where we're dependent on landings. We were waiting on that report to come out, which it is now out, and again to have this ORCHS meeting which is tentatively set for August so that we can go through and set the scores in and then come back to the SSC at our October meeting so that we can formulate those ABC recommendations. That was the big forum for the ABCs.

Then in looking to speckled hind and Warsaw, like I said, I kind of figured you would have a lot of more pointed questions about what our discussions were. For those of you that actually listened to it, it was probably one of the ones that I had the hardest time getting everybody to kind of roll us along because it really did have a difficult time with getting the track to flow.

There were specific questions that were asked that were kind of a yes/no, go to the next step type approach is how I felt, but I think what happened was when we got to look at the big picture of what folks were looking for in the end and the output, it caused people to push back from the table because we don't really know the tie for area closed to a biological reference point.

It is not as simple as a one-to-one transfer where if you close 20 percent of the area it will get you percent of a reduction or an increase in the biological reference points. With that, I think that was where you saw a lot of the group had these discussions. Then also you dealt with the overfishing status.

These species, both have been determined that overfishing was occurring yet we don't have the data to say that they're not undergoing presently this overfishing issue. So, you kind of wrestled back and forth with is it necessary to do something; we don't have that information to say that overfishing is still a problem, but we can't ignore the fact that in the past it had been considered overfishing.

Is the MPA the best approach? That is a lot of the question that was asked as well. Are there other possible measures management-wise that could be applied that would get you the same effect? Is it better to back away and take a bigger picture approach and look at it from an ecosystem standpoint? Do we look at it more in that snapper grouper complex as a means of defining the MPAs instead of getting to the level of detail for speckled and Warsaw specifically?

I'm trying to think of some of the other comments that we had. The two methodologies that were discussed, Roger's approach as well as Nick Farmer's approach, Nick's approach looks at a

lot of the trends in the data that is there for the landings and such and the big thing is needing to look more in that temporal shifting component.

All of the data points are there but it is not necessarily looked at from the standpoint of the continuity of those places over time. I mean, you may have a high aggregation at one point, but if that was in 1981 and if you ended up at that same point ten years later and they were zero, that is really not teased apart in those images right now.

That needs to be addressed in there to kind of get a feel if there is any kind of temporal shift as well as spatial shifts because obviously you could block off an MPA and if the fish are no longer there you're not gaining anything by using that. We did feel the two methodologies definitely complemented one another.

The problem comes into reconciling issues when you don't have an overlap. If the fishermen can overlap the biological assessment or the landings assessment and it does well, then it's easy to kind of block out these areas; but when there is a disconnect in them and you have areas that aren't on top of one another, you end up with a bigger more blurry picture because fishermen are telling you where fish are that you haven't necessarily documented, and that can also be a function of our surveys and how much the survey, which is a broad-scale all-species survey overlays with something that may be more species-specific. These are just some of the things that we did talk about. Like I said, I'll take whatever questions or concerns you have about any of the discussion.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that report, Carolyn, and a lot of the things you said are concerns that I certainly had. I think in particular the comments about the traditional biological reference points not applying, I was unable to listen to the meeting unfortunately, but I was wondering if the SSC had any recommendations for alternative approaches. I seem to recall somewhere in the report that there was some discussion of what types of assessments should come through the SEDAR process versus things that might come directly to the SSC.

It seems to me that given the relative lack of information that we have on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper that there needs to be some kind of SEDAR like process. The Beaufort Assessment Model is kind of a Cadillac, and we're just not going to have the type of information for all the species that need to be assessed to plug into that model, so I was just curious if the SSC had any advice in that regard for some approaches we could take instead of the traditional biological reference points.

DR. BELCHER: I do know that was part of a later agenda item that we looked at. One of the things that the SSC has been asking on and off again for a number of years – this has been pretty much since we started working the control rule back when we were on Jekyll Island – to have this ability to look at some of these species that we do have a lot of fishery-independent data that is currently not being looked at.

We have a lot of species that sit in that Tier 4 where that ORCHS approach is going to be applied. That could be bumped up to a Tier 3. The problem is that we don't have the build-in

for them to get to that stage of the SEDAR process where we can get something like surplus production models and that.

But the group does want to take the time as we go through this ORCHS approach to actually identify those species that we think should be put up to a Tier 3 and then at least get the recommendations in line at the SEDAR process and find a way to accommodate for how these are going to be built in.

DR. PONWITH: To that point, we have discussed internally both in the Gulf of Mexico and in the South Atlantic the merits of holding a benchmark stock assessment slot open for some of those unassessed stocks that go through a preliminary evaluation based on data availability and what tools might be applicable to those combinations of data and actually generate one of the lower tier types of assessments on them.

That gets us into a situation where we have got a better feel for the true status of that stock and it gets us out of that endless do-loop of we'd love to assess this lesser known stock but one of our greater known stocks that were undergoing some changes is going to bubble up higher chronically in the priority for. We would encourage entertaining that as a option in the near future of using one of those benchmark stock assessments and plugging as many of those sort of on the cusp of data poor but enough data to be valuable evaluations.

MR. HARTIG: Carolyn, I have been to so many meetings this month that they're all running together and I'm not sure what all was discussed at each one, but one of the papers I read, and it was interesting it was done on the west coast where they actually used percentage of occurrences inside and outside of MPAs to kind of do an assessment type – something outside the box.

Now, did the SSC look at that paper and discuss that potential? No, you guys didn't, okay. Well, maybe we can get that to you at your next meeting and then you can review that paper and discuss the merits of that kind of assessment technique. I think Luiz knows what the paper is.

MR. CURRIN: Go ahead, Luiz, and welcome. We're glad you're here. Sorry we got started before you made it.

DR. BARBIERI: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and apologies again for getting here late. I was expecting to give this report at one o'clock this afternoon, and it took me a little bit by surprise.

MR. CURRIN: Well, you're early then.

DR. BARBIERI: Anyway, good morning, everybody. Yes, Ben, we looked at some papers discussing some methods but not as comprehensively as perhaps we would if we had had more time. One of the issues that I think we faced at our April meeting is that the process of evaluating this issue had just been started.

The MPA Working Group that was supposed to meet and provide some advice to the SSC and the council had not even had an opportunity to meet at that point. From my perspective the SSC

looked at this issue from a preliminary type of perspective and we discussed the pros and cons. We explored a number of possibilities. We discussed the issue but really expected to discuss this in more detail perhaps later in the year, after some of this other information was made available to us and we had more of a chance to look at other methods and other papers.

One of the things, however, that we discussed, and I don't know what the possibilities would be to put those forth, would be explore the possibility of what is called a management strategy evaluation. Jim Berkson, who is with the Center and is also with our SSC, has participated in some of those exercises, which is very informative.

Even if you don't have all the information to conduct a formal assessment, some of these MSEs or management strategy evaluations will provide you some exploratory what-if scenarios. You can actually measure some of the things that could be going up and down through this modeling exercise; something that we thought could be instructive has been used in other areas of the country by other centers and applicable to other councils, and we thought it could be instructive here as well.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you for that because that was the one question I had on the report is exactly what those management strategy evaluations were and you have at least given me a little bit of insight into that and I can delve into it further myself. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Just one point; the SSC had a lot of discussion about the overfishing definition, but the other part that I don't know that was mentioned specifically was how overfished – did the SSC concur that those two species are significantly overfished? I don't know that you guys made that statement in there or did you?

DR. BELCHER: It was not determined for those two species. That was in the report that the overfished status was not there but the overfishing was occurring at the last status determination.

MR. HARTIG: Right. Well, that was the status determination but the conversations you had – and I found them fascinating – about whether overfishing was still occurring; did the SSC – I don't think you came out with a statement that you said based on what you looked at, that these two stocks were significantly overfished. I don't know that you made that jump.

DR. BELCHER: Well, that is what I mean is based on the –

MR. HARTIG: You don't know.

DR. BELCHER: – the fact in the past that determination had not been made and it is kind of hard to make that same leap when we can't make even the distinction on the overfishing anymore.

MR. CURRIN: I think there were some individual comments by folks on the SSC that they questioned whether in fact overfishing was still occurring. There was no consensus statement regarding that – and correct me if I'm wrong, but there was certainly some discussion and some

opinions expressed by some of the members at least questioned whether in fact we had enough information that they were still undergoing overfishing. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee – and, Carolyn and Luiz, I don't know whether you're the right ones to ask the question or not, but I'll ask it, anyway; and that is whether you all were – or Nick and Roger were putting together the distribution maps for these two species; do you know if you checked for museum records?

I know sometimes those are not necessarily part of the normal fishery-independent data sources we would check and a lot of these museum records – and we have some good natural science museums in the southeast are online now. I just ran the North Carolina ones and they do have some records for at least speckled hind, so that might be an additional source of information especially for the past. Most of their records are from the late sixties and early seventies. If those weren't consulted, that is something that you might want to do.

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, Wilson, that is a very good suggestion. It is something that some scientists have explored with other species that follow that same pattern that are presumed to have been abundant in the past to some extent and are no longer there, especially in developing maximum age information, some of those critical parameters that are based on the history of the fishery and the long-term pattern of the species life history.

Yes, this would be very helpful that we didn't explore. You see, the complexity of this issue that we face with Warsaw and speckled hind is really fairly large because these formal definitions of overfished and overfishing are really based on present conditions. Historical information is informative in helping us understand the life history pattern and the population dynamics pattern, but it is really not informative in giving us an idea of the rates of fishing right now and the status of the biomass of the stock as it is right now.

All we had to work with at that point were indicators. A few years back when the SSC set those ABC values at zero, we felt that all the indicators were showing that the status of the stock was really overfished and that the stock had been depleted to a level that was concerning. The rates of fishing, that is a different issue that is even more complex for us. I don't think at the April meeting we really had all the pieces in front of us to be able to make a fair judgment in that sense. That I think is why the report is equivocal and the committee couldn't really reach any consensus on that topic.

MR. CURRIN: Wilson, before you follow up on that, make sure you check your collection in your garage, too. You may have a couple down there.

DR. LANEY: I'm reasonably certain, Mr. Chairman, I do not have any Warsaw grouper or speckled hind in my basement. Well, the point on that, Luiz, was just to say I think the museum records are not going to be very revealing relative to any past fishing rates or population structure because usually there are so few of those animals in those collections. But, where they may be very important is showing where they were in terms of habitat distribution and that is the advantage I think of looking into those museum records.

MR. CURRIN: Other questions for Carolyn and Luiz? This is your last chance; they may be gone. Luiz says he is going to stick around. While I've got an opportunity, congratulations to you on being elected chairman of the SSC and thank you for your service there. Ben, you had a question? Well, they'll be around if something comes up in our discussion of the speckled hind and Warsaw issues. Thank you very much. Why don't we take a ten-minute break or so?

MR. CURRIN: Let's get everybody back to the table, please, and we'll resume the Snapper Grouper Committee. Next on our agenda is a report from Robert Johnson, the new chairman of our advisory panel. We are pleased to have you here and thank for your willingness to serve as chairman.

Before I turn it over to Robert, it was brought to my attention that Carolyn Belcher has served as the chair of our SSC for – I got two reports – four and six years. It has been a long, long time and that is a heavy-lifting job. Carolyn, we greatly appreciate it and I know you know that, but I just wanted to get that on the record.

I'm sure Chairman Cupka was planning to say something at our full council meeting, but I wasn't sure whether you were going to be around, so I just wanted to get that out right now, and thank you very much. I look forward to your continued service on the SSC but in a less stressful role, we hope. All right, Robert, thanks again for being here and we will turn it over to you to give us the highlights of the AP report. That is Attachment 3 in your briefing book.

MR. JOHNSON: The AP met on April 18th through 19th. A large part of our meeting was directed at the discussion of MPAs and speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. The first things I'm going to cover pertain to that. We had a lot of discussion about the importance of clear transit provisions for any future MPAs.

The group also wanted to recommend that the council look at allowing transit in the Oculina Bank to be consistent. Basically what we're looking for is just one clear rule on transit through all MPAs. Another motion was the council should approach the state of Florida and request that the harvest of Warsaw grouper and speckled hind be prohibited in state waters.

We're sitting here talking about how depleted these stocks of fish are, but for some reason the state of Florida, my home state, still allows them to be taken in state waters, so we wanted to get that cleaned up. Another motion was to further identify and expand the EFH and HAPCs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper as the basis for potential MPA design and development.

We also wish the council would do research to determine the effect of existing MPAs on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper; what do we gain with the MPAs that we have in place. And then a big concern also, after listening to Dr. Koenig's presentation, is enforcement of existing MPAs be stepped up and verified. If we're going to have them, we have to have some way to enforce them and make sure that they're working.

We also request that the council include an action in CE-BA 3 that requires an evaluation and enforcement plan for all MPAs implemented or modified and acknowledgment of the fact if there is not enough data to put together well-planned MPAs, that the MPAs should basically

have a sunset clause, something that requires the scientists and policymakers to revisit the need for the MPA, review the results of the evaluation and verify the effectiveness of the MPA in order to keep it closed in the future.

We want to know if they're working; and if they're not working, why do we have them? The AP also requested an analysis to determine the impacts of the existing regulations; you know, what do we gain from what we've done already. Have there been any studies? The group as a whole was concerned that they felt that there hasn't been much done on that.

Okay, I'm going to move on to Amendment 18B. We talked about golden tilefish. I think it is after the fact, but anyway we supported the council's preferred alternative under Action 1 to establish a longline endorsement. We also talked about the allocation. It was the group's desire that 75 percent goes to the longline sector and that a 25 percent allocation goes to the hook-and-line sector.

The group supports the council's transferability of endorsement. We support the current fishing year. We also want to remove the 300-pound gutted weight trip limit when 75 percent of the ACL is taken. That's in the longline fishery. The concern of the group was that in the longline fishery they catch an entire quota before any hook-and-line fishermen ever get to participate. I think that is the case.

We also, as a group, talked about the 500-pound gross weight trip limit for golden tiles for snapper grouper fishermen who did not get a longline endorsement. We also made a motion that vessels with a longline endorsement are not eligible to fish for the trip limit. In other words, you can't double-tip. You can only do one or the other.

Okay, under other business, this is something that we've recommended a couple of times. We really are hopeful that the council will act on it, and that is pertaining to gray triggerfish. We really want to raise the size limit to 14 inches, from 12 to 14 inches, and that was for gray triggerfish and hogfish.

There was a motion made that the council look at increasing the commercial limit of red porgy from 120 head per trip to 240 head and that the recreational bag limit be bumped up from three to four. Also, under other business we recommended that the council require a federal recreational snapper grouper permit; make it an annual permit that has to be renewed every year.

We're just trying to narrow down the sampling universe so it is easier for the managers to figure out who is fishing for reef fish. We also recommend that the council consider taking action to clean up the snapper grouper fishery of latent permits similar to what was done in 1998, using the control date of September 17, 2010. That's all I have. Anybody have any questions?

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Robert, very much. Questions? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Thanks, Robert, I appreciate it. On the MPA enforcement, it really seems to me that the only way to substantially enhance enforcement would be to require VMS on vessels. Did you all talk about that? I really think there is not a viable alternative to that other than we

get a huge amount of money coming in to go to enforcement, and I just don't see that being in the cards.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Roy, we did talk about it and there was some talk about requiring – I think a motion was made to require VMS on all vessels. Personally, I don't know how that would ever be able to happen in the recreational sector. We talked about education and at least letting the fishermen know these things exist and where they are. The ones that are nearshore are a lot easier obviously to enforce.

Dr. Koenig talked at length about enforcement issues they had in Madison-Swanson in the Gulf of Mexico. It is a big problem if we're going to have them. We also talked about reconfiguring existing MPAs. I think as a group no one was in favor of going out and establishing a bunch of new MPAs without knowing what have we gained from the ones we already have and maybe looking at some of the ones that we have that are stretched offshore to protect golden habitat and maybe shifting them on their axis.

DR. CRABTREE: On the recreational snapper grouper permit, I hear those types of ideas come up, but it seems to me if we had one I'm not sure what we would do with it. I'm interested in what the thought was that we would actually do with such a permit if we had it.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, it was just really to identify who the users are. We talked about actually two different permits. One would be a deepwater complex permit for recreational anglers that wish to participate in the golden tilefish and snowy grouper fisheries. The other one was just reef fish in general.

I know like the state of Florida has a snook stamp and they have a lobster stamp. We're just trying to figure out – if we're surveying some guy that fishes for trout and flounder, that is a waste of money and time and effort if we're trying to get at reef fish, so we're just trying to help the managers determine who is fishing for what.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I mentioned that last night to Roy on the way to dinner, Robert, and he brought one point that I hadn't thought about, and that was how it might confound some of the MRIP estimates because that is based on the entire universe. It would seem to me, in thinking about it, Roy, that there might be some capability of refining the estimate of effort by constraining that universe.

In the expansion for MRIP, which is done on the entire universe of the anglers based on intercepts, it would seem that perhaps the PSEs would be reduced if you had a smaller universe to which you were expanding based on a known universe of –

DR. CRABTREE: I think that part of it is true. I just think that is not way the survey is structured now. Florida has a snook stamp, but it is not used to estimate snook catches. The snook catches are estimated through the MRFSS/MRIP survey, and that's the problem. I would hate to require a permit and people would have to pay for the permit. It would cost the federal government money to issue – it costs the Fisheries Service money to issue a permit because we

wouldn't get the funds that were raised. They go to the general treasury. I think to restructure the survey in order to use that sampling universe would cost money as well.

And then you can see if we ended up with a whole bunch of permits like that, because they have talked about doing it in the Gulf as well, you end up with substantial costs because now you have got boutique effort surveys going on and that would have to come at the expense of something else.

It's one of those things that sounds pretty good, but I think it would require substantial restructuring of the survey that I'm not sure we have the resources to do. And then you would have think even if we did have the resources, is that really where we would want to put them there or would we want to put them to more dockside intercepts or where. It is a complicated problem.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Robert, for the report. I was just wondering if you could refresh my memory a little bit because it was towards the end of meeting so I didn't quite remember the discussion, but there was a motion that was made that the council consider increasing the gag, black grouper bag from one to two and then the aggregate grouper limit from three to four. Help me remember what the rationale was for that.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Michelle, that motion was brought forward by Jim Attack. He said that we had not reached the recreational ACL on gag grouper. We have a four-month closure already and he thought that it was his desire that we give the fishermen more fish; and as a group that was supported.

Personally, I'm not sure if I – but that is not about me, but I don't want to get into a situation and I don't think the group does either where we have a fishery shut down. But if something could be looked at – I don't know the numbers. I think he said that we didn't reach 50 percent of the quota last year – I don't know if somebody can tell me – so it seems like there was some fish there that we aren't using that it would be a good faith measure to give back to fishermen maybe a little bit more fish.

MR. JOLLEY: I'm sorry I got in a little late, Robert, but I have an abiding concern that in some of these fisheries we're relying too much on catch statistics and we need a lot more biology, age, growth and reproduction. I just wondered if you mentioned anything in your review about some of the efforts that you're expending with the FWC in collecting biological information in Florida.

MR. JOHNSON: John, that wasn't a topic of the AP meeting, but I can answer the question. We are doing work with the state of Florida to try to get a lot of information, batch fecundity, age structure of the stock, and not just red snapper, a lot of different species. Personally, I feel like moving forward that is the only answer to really figuring out what is going on out in the ocean. But we didn't talk about that at the AP; that is just something we're doing.

MR. CURRIN: Anything else for Robert? All right, Robert, thanks very much for being here and thanks for agreeing to serve as chair of the AP. All right, Brian, our next agenda item is regarding the resubmittal of Action 4 in Amendment 18A dealing with the transferability of

black sea bass endorsements. Information for that can be found in Attachments 4A and 4B under the snapper grouper tab.

DR. CHEUVRONT: What I'm going to be referring to and what I have up on the screen right now is Attachment 4A, which is the actual resubmittal document that is for your consideration. I'm on PDF Page 7, which is a summary of the single action. I am going to explain to you a little to remind you of the history of how we got to this point and what we're asking for you to do today.

When 18A was submitted, there was an error in Action 4 which was the transferability action in that amendment. It had the wrong preferred alternative in there. There was some confusion. As we went back later and looked at the council record, it wasn't clear as to what exactly – there is some question as to what the council's actual intent was with this action.

When 18A was approved, it was partially approved except for this action, knowing that we were working on revising this to bring it back to the council and to have you look at it once again. Hopefully, you all have Attachment 4A up and you're on PDF Page 7. If you're actually looking at the real document it is the document Page 6.

The one thing that we wanted to talk about was in the black sea bass pot endorsements, how can they be transferred and what does the transfer actually entail. There is one other point that I want to make sure that we get clear because it is not actually in the text here. When I get through this whole thing, I bring that up just to make sure that we're clarified on exactly what we mean.

According to the black sea bass pot endorsements, they can be transferred under the following conditions. First is that they will be transferable upon the effective date of the final rule implementing this action. A valid or expired but renewable and renewable endorsement can only be transferred to any individual or entity holding or obtaining at the same time a South Atlantic unlimited snapper grouper permit.

In other words, you can't hold an endorsement without also having an unlimited snapper grouper permit. But the endorsement is transferable independently of the snapper grouper permit, so you can transfer – in other words, if you have a snapper grouper permit now and you're a black sea bass pot fisherman and you have the endorsement but you no longer want to participate in that fishery, you can transfer that endorsement to somebody else as long as they have a permit.

You do not have to transfer your snapper grouper permit at the same time, but you can only transfer it to somebody who has a snapper grouper permit or is buying one at the same time. They don't have to buy that permit from you. They could be buying it somebody else. It's just that they cannot hold that endorsement without the permit.

The landings of black sea bass that are caught under the endorsement, the way this is stated now, will be associated with the snapper grouper permit. In other words, you cannot transfer landings when you transfer the endorsement. The landings stay with the snapper grouper permit. The one question that we have that we wanted you all to clarify for us – and we think it is the council's intent – is that the landings that are recorded on the snapper grouper permit of black sea bass

using pots prior to the endorsement going into place would also remain with the snapper grouper permit.

We think that is the council's intent, but I don't have any record of the council actually saying that. We think your intent is that landings stay always with the snapper grouper permit and the endorsement transfers freely without – and I think what you can do is you can just – when we get to a discussion if somebody will just say that is the intent and we can get that on the record, I think that will be plenty good for what we need.

That's the way the codified text is being worked out and everything as well, but we just want that clarity from you. Then the last thing is that the endorsements would not be automatically renewed. The endorsement holder at the time of renewing the snapper grouper permit would be required to check a box on the form that they have to fill out when they renew their snapper grouper permit.

This is just a way of forcing the endorsement holder to say that they have the intention of renewing that endorsement and that it is not being done automatically. You have to show intent that you want that endorsement renewed. That is the whole thing. Now, you'll notice that this one action doesn't have alternatives and all that stuff because we didn't have to do NEPA stuff with this. It's just a clarification so this is a pretty short document.

We don't have to go through actions, alternatives, any of that, so what you're being asked to do at this point is give us any direction or clarifications that you may have at this point; and then once we have worked through all that, if you want to make a recommendation to the full council to send this on to the secretary for approval, that is where we need to go.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Brian. Monica and then Roy.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And just clarify a little bit further what Brian said regarding NEPA, you have already done NEPA on this in terms of analyzing the various alternatives. You did that with Amendment 18A, so you have completed it. That's why this version of the amendment is nice and tidy and small, and I bet Gregg likes it a lot because he would like all our amendments to be like this.

MR. CURRIN: Gregg is not the only one that likes it. Roy, did you have something else?

DR. CRABTREE: I was going to clarify our intent.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and that is what I was going to ask for next.

DR. CRABTREE: My view is that our intent was that all of the landings stay with the snapper grouper permit, both landings from before the endorsement is issued and landings after the endorsement is issued. All landings stay with the snapper grouper permit.

MR. CURRIN: And that was my understanding as well, and we had a lot of discussion before we arrived at the decision that the landings would be tied to the permit and that was certainly my

understanding and intent. Anybody feel differently? I see Tom nodding in the affirmative. Anyone have any problems with proceeding that way? I see no objection from anyone. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just a question for Brian and to clarify the record; Brian, under 3.1, the discussion of the endorsement transferability criteria, there is an example given that is as follows, and it is really a discussion about an example given for the fact that you can transfer endorsements separately from the permit, so it lays out the true criteria that the receiving individual or entity already possesses the South Atlantic snapper grouper permit or the receiving individual or entity obtains a South Atlantic unlimited snapper grouper permit at the same time as the black sea bass pot endorsement.

And then the example states a black sea bass pot endorsement could be transferred to one individual and the South Atlantic unlimited snapper grouper permit it was associated with could be transferred to another individual. However, the endorsement can only be used to harvest black sea bass with pots if it is associated with a valid or renewable South Atlantic snapper grouper permit. However, the endorsement can be used – that is not meant to infer that someone could get an endorsement with having a snapper grouper permit.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That is correct; we want to make sure that people understand that if you're going to hold that endorsement that has to be an unlimited snapper grouper permit that it is tied to at all time.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So you won't have the situation where an individual comes in – for example, if you had a snapper grouper permit and an endorsement and I didn't have either one of those and I could perhaps – well, I couldn't buy your endorsement and get it transferred to me unless I had a snapper grouper permit.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That is correct. I think in this example what we're trying to show is that the two are not tied together as long as the receiving entity has a snapper grouper permit – unlimited snapper grouper permit as well – either they're buying one from somebody else at the same time that they're buying your endorsement or they already possess one, then they can have the endorsement. The endorsement can move from permit to permit but it must always be tied to an unlimited snapper grouper permit. It cannot be held by an entity who does not hold a snapper grouper permit.

MR. CUPKA: Two things; sometimes we say unlimited and sometimes we just say snapper grouper permit, but the record needs to be clear that it has to an unlimited permit because there are two types of snapper grouper permits and we only want it associated with the unlimited. The other thing is on the requirements here, that last thing about endorsement holders checking a box, I would hope that is clearly spelled out somehow.

I remember the problems we had in rock shrimp where there was a misunderstanding that people had to renew both things, and we had some real problems with that. Whenever they get the form, they need to renew their permit and it needs to be clearly spelled out that they need to check that box if they intend to renew their endorsements.

MR. CURRIN: That brings up something that occurred to me as well, David, along those same lines. Let's just say there is a scenario where someone renews their unlimited permit. They have an endorsement or had one the previous year and forget for some reason to check the box; well, I presume that when they receive their permit they would also receive tags for their pots that year; is that going to be the case? Carolyn, can you answer that?

MS. SRAMEK: Yes, and speaking to the larger issue, I understand the concern about what happened with the rock shrimp and we certainly don't want to have similar situations. I think we have several steps in place to mitigate that. What we didn't have then that we do have now are customized letters that will at the time we issue the snapper grouper unlimited permit but did not issue the endorsement, we will have a reminder in there that is specifically saying you did not renew your endorsement, you need to do so and you're eligible to do so.

For all permits that have a renewal window of like, say, a year, when we get to two months from the end of their year renewal, we send out another letter. We call it a termination letter. We send another letter that says, hey, your permit such and such or your endorsement such and such must be renewed by whatever the date it is or else it will be non-renewable. Those are two additional steps we did not have in the rock shrimp days.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, and I think that clarifies my question.

MS. SRAMEK: Okay, with regard to your tags, the actual purchasing of tags is somewhat independent of the endorsement itself, so they would need to do that explicitly up to their 35 tags.

MR. CURRIN: I just wanted to make sure there was adequate time and some leeway for somebody who forgot to check or didn't see the box or whatever; and if they got their permit back and did not receive their endorsement, and you have indicated that you're going to notify them, hey, you didn't do that, and they've got some time to do it. Let's make sure that people aren't closed out because they forgot to check a box and didn't have reasonable time to take care of that. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: And just again for clarification, since the black sea bass are going to stay with the permit, I think the council's intent is once you sell that endorsement, if you sell it and then you turn around and you see your single permit to somebody that is going to make a corporate permit, those landings would become part of that corporate permit, which would then give him the window of possibly applying for another endorsement. I don't think that is our intent. Maybe it can't be done but I was seeing that as a loophole.

MR. CURRIN: That is certainly not the intent; and if there is some way that can be done, we need to make sure that we prohibit it. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Charlie, there won't be – so there is a limited number of endorsements, and I forget what the number is. It's 31? So if there are 31 endorsements, so in the situation you're talking about, there is not going to be then 32 endorsements. There are 31 endorsements. It's in the regulations that when you transfer your permit, you transfer the

vessel's entire catch history to the new owner. Yes, in the situation you have given, the scenario, that black sea bass catch history would go along with all the other snapper grouper catch history.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, any other questions or concerns about this? Is everyone okay with the language in this action? Tom.

MR. BURGESS: Not on this action but in Amendment 18A just a brief comment. When this is finished, I would like to have a chance.

MR. CURRIN: All right, let's go ahead and deal with this. If everybody is okay with this, I'd entertain a motion to approve for formal review and then a separate motion after that to deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. David.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we recommend to full council approval of this amendment for submission.

MR. CURRIN: Motion by David and second by John Jolley. Is there discussion on that motion? The motion is to recommend to full council to approve the transferability action for formal review. No discussion; is there any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved. I would entertain a motion as well to deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. That is Attachment 4B that is before you or in your briefing book.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend to the full council that we recommend deeming of the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Duane; second by Tom Burgess. Discussion on that motion? No discussion; is there any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved. All right, Brian, thank you very much. Tom, you said you had a comment. Does that care of it; did we do everything you needed?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, I think that's it.

MR. CURRIN: And, Tom, you had a comment more generic of 18A. Monica, does this have to do with this action.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It does and I would hope that – we could discuss this at council, but you allow staff editorial license to maybe even add an example or two to kind of tie up some of the questions that were asked today at the council meeting and just to make sure the examples are accurate and if there is any – just minor editorial license, really. I thought the document was in pretty good shape, so I appreciate, Brian, your work.

MR. CURRIN: Let's go ahead and take care of that now with another motion, if we would, just so that we capture it for the full council and I don't have to remember it and no one else does either.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And the other thing is that Chairman Cupka made the comment about making sure that it is clear that every place that we mention the snapper grouper permit in the document, it explicitly states the unlimited snapper grouper permit and not the limited one. Monica, I appreciate the comments about this, but Kate Michie did a lot of heavy lifting in getting this – and the SERO staff in getting this thing done. As a matter of fact, she did most of pulling all the actual stuff together, and I just want to make sure she got recognized for that.

MR. CURRIN: All right, so is there a motion to allow the staff some latitude to make editorial changes as per the discussion of the committee and the counsel on this? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. CURRIN: So a motion by Charlie to give the staff editorial license to make changes and clarifications in the transferability action. Second by Michelle. Discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved. Do we also need to give our chairman authority to deem this in some way or are we okay, Monica? I think he has that authority, does he not?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think it is in your SOPPs now.

MR. CURRIN: I think it is.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'll double-check that.

MR. CURRIN: David, are you comfortable?

MR. CUPKA: Yes, I was going to raise that issue. I know we in the past have always put that verbiage in there, but it is pretty much understood and it may even be in the SOPPs now that that is the way we proceed.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think maybe to err on the side of too much, I think it is probably a good idea to have that in here because technically the SOPPs are still under review and there are some additions that might be made at this meeting. I would do it.

MR. CURRIN: So I would entertain a motion from the committee to give the council chairman authority to make editorial changes in the codified text.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. CURRIN: Second by Tom Burgess. Is that an adequate motion, David? I may not have captured everything that we need so if the wording needs to be changed or moved –

MR. CUPKA: That is not the wording we usually use. I think I also – well, I know I have been reviewing all the amendments before they're submitted also in addition to the codified text. I don't remember the exact verbiage but it was more than just the codified text.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, it seems to me there was some deeming associated with it; some deeming authority. Monica, have you got some suggested verbiage here.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I would give the council chairman the authority to approve and not make the editorial changes – to approve any editorial changes made in the amendment and to deem the codified text as appropriate. I think that's fine.

MR. CURRIN: All right, Charlie, is that okay with you and with the seconder, Tom Burgess. All right, I will read it for Joe. **The motion as it stands now is to give the council chairman authority to approve editorial changes in the amendment and deem the codified text as appropriate.** Are you okay with that, David? I think that provides more clarity. **Any discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** All right, I think that takes care of everything unless, Monica, you have got anything else on this resubmittal of transferability from 18A.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do not; thank you.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, Tom Burgess, you had something you wanted to bring up from 18A?

MR. BURGESS: Yes, just briefly, Mr. Chairman, at our last meeting Roy was describing what constitutes a trip and that it is at the point of unloading your catch. With our new rules going into effect in 18A of returning to port with your traps, there has been discussion about safety issues, about retrieving your traps and putting yourself in jeopardy.

When Roy described what a trip is, that they have the ability to come inside the inlet, get out of the weather and then go back and retrieve their traps and then unload their fish. I'm not sure all fishermen are aware of that, and I kind of would hate for them not to at least have that information in the back of their head before it's a life and death situation of getting a ticket or something. I was wondering is there any way possible for them to access that information or kind of maybe get it to them in a reasonable way where they could access that. It seems like it might important to someone.

MR. CURRIN: Have you got a response, Roy?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we have a very limited universe of endorsement holders so I think we could put together a letter that describes what a trip is and how all that works and send it out to them.

MR. CURRIN: That would seem to be reasonable way to handle it. Tom, do you think that would be acceptable to the –

MR. BURGESS: Yes, certainly, if everybody feels that it might be important to do that. I don't know, it just seems like – I hate for somebody to get jammed up out there because I think everybody is going to try to do the right thing.

DR. CRABTREE: Let me suggest, Tom, that get with Jack McGovern and talk about what we need to put together, if you could do that.

MR. BURGESS: Yes, certainly, and Otha also – at one of our meetings I had asked him about if something happens, if somebody breaks down and has to come in and has to leave their traps or something, I think he said there was a number to call, that you could explain your situation and get on the record; and if you had problems like that, you're not going to necessarily go to jail or something to that extent. I think that might shed a little light on the situation.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Tom, and it is my understanding and impression that law enforcement works pretty well in conditions of safety and endangerment with the fishermen and usually is not very harsh on them under those conditions, especially if they're notified in advance. You might include that phone number in your letter so that they can notify law enforcement in case there is a problem or safety-at-sea issue. All right, let's move into Amendment 18B. Myra, are you going to do this?

MS. BROUWER: I'll walk you through the decision document for Amendment 18B, which is golden tilefish. This is Attachment 5A in your briefing book. You have seen this amendment many times by now. There were a couple of changes that were suggested at the March meeting so I'll go through those. The first action is to limit participation in the golden tilefish component of the snapper grouper fishery, and that is on PDF Page 114.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, are we looking at the decision document or the amendment itself?

MR. CURRIN: I think it is the amendment, is it not?

MS. BROUWER: Correct. I'm sorry; I'm talking about the amendment document.

MR. HARRIS: Is that where we want to be or should we be in the decision document?

MS. BROUWER: Well, it is up to you.

MR. CURRIN: I want it to be wherever Myra thinks we ought to be and whatever is easy for her.

MS. BROUWER: I would suggest you look at the amendment document since there may be additional tables and figures that would help the discussion along.

MR. CURRIN: All right, an executive decision has been made to use Attachment 5B, which is the 18B decision document. I should clarify that because if that's the way you guys want to do it from here on, that will be fine with me.

MS. BROUWER: This first action is to establish to limit participation in the golden tilefish component of the snapper grouper fishery and your current preferred is to do so by establishing a longline endorsement program. If you recall at the March meeting the option to discuss a hook-

and-line endorsement program was still on the table, and the council put that in the appendix, and so there are only two alternatives under this action with Alternative 2 being the preferred.

MR. CURRIN: Is everybody okay with that? No desire to change the preferred? All right, the next action.

MS. BROUWER: The next action is on PDF Page 119 for those of you following along with the amendment document and not the decision document. This action is to establish the eligibility requirements for the longline endorsement. This is where some changes were made at the March meeting. We have many subalternatives.

I'll remind you that the Snapper Grouper AP, when they last met in April, recommended Subalternative 2A. This is the subalternative that was put together when the Golden Tilefish Workgroup was meeting. Your current preferred is Subalternative 2F, which makes eligible participants that have an average of 10,000 pounds of golden tile caught with longline gear for the best three years within the period 2006 through 2010.

At the March meeting you requested that we add and analyzed three new alternatives, Subalternative 2G, 2H and 2I on your screen. This basically diminishes the average poundage from 10,000 to 5,000 pounds from your preferred. That is 2G and then 2H and 2I extend the eligibility period through 2011 and also with 5,000 and 10,000 pounds as qualifiers.

If you go to the table under this action you will see the number of endorsements that would qualify under each of these alternatives. Currently if you stay with your preferred, there would 14 longline endorsements issued. Ten of those endorsements are in Florida and four would go to individuals in South Carolina. You can see the breakdown by county of where these endorsements would end up.

MR. CURRIN: Hold one second, Myra, I think Ben has got a question or comment.

MR. HARTIG: I just had a motion if you would like.

MR. CURRIN: All right, let's make sure we go through all the clarification and let Myra finish and then we will entertain a motion.

MS. BROUWER: You can see that the three new alternatives that were added increase the number of longline endorsements with Subalternative 2H being the one that results in the most number of longline endorsements issued. Again, the majority of the endorsements would go to Florida.

For this action, what we would need first is a motion to give us the go-ahead to add these three subalternatives to the amendment if you so choose. And then a couple of clarifications; we would like you to clarify on the record that it is the intent of the council that only individuals with the longline endorsement can use longline gear to catch golden tilefish. I'm sure that this is the council's intent, but we would need that clarification on the record just to make it twice as clear.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, to be twice as clear, that certainly I think is our intent of the endorsement; so if you're fishing for snowies or Warsaw or whatever, you can keep those but you can't retain golden tile unless you have this endorsement. Is that good enough?

MR. CURRIN: And I think that is certainly where I thought we were. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Does that mean you can't have longline gear on the boat because I can see boats that might have a directed shark permit that had a longline. Do you not need the longline on the boat; is that going to be part of it or just –

DR. CRABTREE: I know that we have other fisheries – Gulf grouper springs to my mind – where we have longline endorsements and there is language relative to that, but I don't know if we have clarified that in this document or in the codified text at this point. I guess I would ask that we take a look at the language relative to the longline endorsement in the Gulf and what the requirement there is. There may be language that the gear has to be stowed, et cetera, et cetera, but I can't recall.

MR. CURRIN: I guess the only time it would be a problem is if you had a shark longliner and I'm not aware of any other longlining activity that occurs here that had golden tilefish, and I don't know how common that is. Aren't most shark bottom longlines primarily; I guess they are.

DR. CRABTREE: There are bottom shark longlines; how many of them also fish snapper grouper, I don't know. In the Gulf they do that kind of thing. I guess the question here is if you have a vessel that does bottom longline for shark and they want to go fish under the 500-pound trip limit for golden tile, if we went by that, no longline gear on board, they would have to take the spool and everything off, and it seems like you're pretty much saying that vessel can't go fish longline. There may be language we could put in there that doesn't go that far, but that ensure – for example, you can't have any gangions or any of the terminal gear you would need to fish with longline gear, but I don't think that has come up and we need to take a little closer look at that.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, good point; thanks, Charlie, for bringing that up. All right, we also need to decide about the inclusion of Subalternatives 2G through 2I. We currently have a preferred that is other than those. If there is some desire to change the preferred to one of those three new subalternatives, then we will need a motion to include those in the amendment. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, do you want me to make my motion to choose a new preferred first and then a motion to include the three new subalternatives?

MR. CURRIN: Well, if your intent is to pick one of the new subalternatives as a preferred, you can go ahead and include all three and change the preferred to whatever your desire is, if it is among those three.

MR. HARTIG: Well, yes, it is one of those three. **The first motion I make would be to include Subalternatives 2G, 2H and 2I in this document.**

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Ben; second by John Jolley to include Subalternatives 2G though 2I in the document. **Discussion on the motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** Ben.

MR. HARTIG: The next motion I would make would be to change our preferred from 2F to the new Subalternative 2G; an average of 5,000 pounds gutted weight golden tilefish caught with longline gear for the best three years between 2006 and 2010.

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Ben; second by John Jolley to change our preferred to the new Subalternative 2G.

MR. HARTIG: And the rationale, if I may, Mr. Chairman, the original motion from the Tilefish Workgroup that they came out with included 17 vessels in that motion. This one includes 18, one more. We have had an increase in quota. What this also does is it encapsulates a couple of smaller vessels with smaller landings that have been in the fishery for a significant part of the timeframe. It captures one or two more vessels at a smaller landings level. That was my rationale for using this a new preferred.

MR. CURRIN: **Any further discussion? Is there any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.** I'm sure as you noted from Robert's report and Myra's scroll through it on the screen that the Snapper Grouper AP looked at this issue again and they reiterated their support for 2A.

We've had a lot of discussion I think over the development of this amendment about those restrictive and fairly relatively long ago qualification dates, of some changes in this fishery that gives I think most of the council members some pause with qualifying people based on landings that are five, six, seven years old; just as some rationale to the AP on the record here for the council not choosing 2A. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Chairman, following up on that discussion, I think it might be helpful down the road when we're putting this together to elaborate on that rationale, because under 2A you do get the vessel in North Carolina and South Carolina. Under your old preferred and the new preferred, there is no vessel in North Carolina. That is one we're going to have to build a good rationale in the document so any assistance from you would be very helpful.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, at least for me I'm just not comfortable with cutting it off at 2008. There have been other vessels come in that are substantial producers and have put a lot of investment into the fishery that would be eliminated if we used 2008 as the cutoff. The Magnuson Act requires us to look at both historical and current participation.

I just feel like 2006 puts too much emphasis on historical participation and doesn't recognize the current participation as going on. I think that 2F gives a better balance of these overall although I understand it results in a situation with some states. Whatever vessels are not being included in those other states haven't participated in the fishery now for several years. At least that is my thought process on it and I think that is consistent with most of our discussion.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think it is. There may be some reason that boat or one of those three boats in North Carolina has not participated because the quota has closed pretty quickly and the season has not been open. It may have been during the time of year where it was difficult to impossible for that crowd up there in Dare County to fish. I don't know that and Michelle may have more insight.

DR. CRABTREE: And to that point I think Ben's motion – I mean, our current preferred is still recognizing those early years because we're going back to 2006. Ben's motion lowered that qualifying poundage level down to 5,000 pounds, and so I think we have moved in that direction. But 2,000 pounds, that's an awfully low qualifier and I'm afraid if we include this more recent timeframe, which for me I think we have to do, if we lowered it further down to 2,000 pounds, then I think you're starting to let more boats in that people are comfortable with. Choices have to be made somewhere and I think this is the best balance overall in my estimation.

MR. CURRIN: And to some degree we have accommodated some of those fishermen up there with the allowing of the 500-pound hook-and-line trip limit that allows some participation by folks up that way but just not in the longline fishery. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I was just going to echo those remarks, Mac, that I think if we stay with our preferred on splitting the ACL between the longline and the hook-and-line, that could potentially alleviate some of those concerns.

MR. CURRIN: My understanding it is a very difficult fishery off of our coast just because of the current and where these things are. We approved that motion, did we not? That just provided some more discussion. Gregg, I hope that helps. Is that reasonably adequate, anyway? All right, Myra, let's move on.

MS. BROUWER: Moving on to Action 3, this is to establish an appeals process, PDF Page 129. Your preferred is Alternative 2, and I will remind you this was supported by the Snapper Grouper AP. I don't believe the IPT or staff have any recommendations for this action.

MR. CURRIN: Is everybody comfortable? In the decision document, that is Page 13. We have got a Preferred Alternative 2; everybody okay with that. All right, I am seeing no desire to change it.

MS. BROUWER: Action 4 would allocate commercial golden tilefish ACL between the two gear groups. Your current preferred is to allocate the commercial ACL 75 percent to the longline sector and 25 percent to the hook-and-line sector. In parentheses we have specified what would be under the adjusted ACL once Regulatory Amendment 12 is approved.

MR. CURRIN: Are we still comfortable with this allocation? There have been, of course, some comments from the longline fleet that varies quite a bit from what they see as historical allocation among the sectors. With the increase in the quota, I just want to make sure that we're not leaving fish that might be caught by the longliners if the hook-and-line fleet is unable to catch them. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, just to point out that Roy's concerns from the last meeting about the rationale, I'm working on that now with Myra and we will have that. It shows the historical allowance for the council to look at the hook-and-line fishery in two different amendments and then we will put in that information from the long-term landing series that shows what the hook-and-line percentages were in the past. We will have the rationale.

MR. CURRIN: All right, so if everybody is comfortable with this current preferred, keep in mind if it turns out that the hook-and-line fishery has difficulty attaining their allocation of the quota, then certainly the council can come back in I presume through a framework and adjust that – or not through framework but through an amendment and adjust that allocation in the future if that is the desire. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: I know Ben is going to work up that rationale some more with Myra, but again is this is another place that I'm sure we're going to receive some scrutiny. What you're doing is you're allocating 75 percent of the commercial ACL to 18 longliners and then the balance, the 25 percent to the rest of the hook-and-line fleet, so I think that portion will be taken fairly quickly. I just want to make sure any additional rationale you can provide and get it to us would be helpful, because I think this is going to be a point that receives some scrutiny.

MR. HARTIG: What is the point, Gregg, that you're trying to answer why we're giving 75 percent of the quota to 18 boats; is that the point you're trying to clarify?

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: But I think when you go through the document, those 18 boats have been catching – I mean, they have been responsible for the past many years for almost all of the landings. We're trying to carve out some for the hook-and-line fishery to try and bring things back to where it was some years ago before the derby fishery developed and the longliners started catching it all up. I think the 18 longline vessels that we're letting in are the ones that have historical and concurrent participation and they're the ones that have been catching most of the fishery all along.

I guess there is an issue, Myra, as I understand it with how the closures work on this and the way the document is written right now, if the commercial ACL for the longline fleet was met, both the longline and the hook-and-line sector would close down. That seems clearly not our intent and it seems to me it would undermine the whole reason for doing this.

I think clearly our intent is that when the longline ACL is met, the longline fishery closes down; and when the hook-and-line ACL is met, the hook-and-line fishery closes down. It seems to me that can be addressed in the discussion just by making our intent clear. I think to interpret it any other way just wouldn't be consistent with the whole purpose of the action. I hope Monica is okay with doing it that way.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Monica is okay with doing it that way, and I think we should definitely put it in the discussion. It makes no sense to have an allocation for the longline and

then you did a separate for hook and line without those corresponding closures. I don't think you need new accountability measures, but you need to put that right in the discussion of the document that is what you mean. That's the only logical progression if you ask me.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and make sure that we have separate accountability measures for the two sectors. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And then I have a question, and I think this came back to something that came from the AP report. If the longline fishery closes, can a vessel then with a longline endorsement fish under the 500-pound trip limit with vertical line gear or in the document is it clear that those endorsed vessels are done and can't fish on the other quota?

MS. BROUWER: From what I understand, Roy, that is the intent and if it needs to be – and in fact we were going to ask for some clarification on the record so that we can include a little bit more discussion to make that perfectly clear that if you have a longline endorsement you are not allowed to participate with hook and line for that with – you are not eligible to participate for the 500-pound trip limit that is being allocated to everybody else that does not have a longline endorsement.

DR. CRABTREE: And I guess if that is the way we go, it is possible if the longline fishery closed early, that the longline vessel could transfer his endorsement somewhere else and then go fish under the 500-pound trip limit and then transfer the endorsement back later in the year. I think there could be some shuffling coming out of that to try and get around it. I think we ought to have some discussion about that because it wasn't clear to me if that was our intent or not.

MR. HARTIG: Well, certainly that was the intent was not to have the longliners fish. If you had landings under the longline endorsement in any year, you would be precluded from participating in the hook-and-line 500-pound quota. If you had landings under an endorsement, you would be precluded from fishing. That would take care of switching endorsements around.

DR. CRABTREE: And I guess that is clear in the language later on with the trip limits in Action 8.

MR. HARTIG: But to address your problem, I think if you word it so that if you had landings with an endorsement in a fishing year, you would not be able to fish under the 500-pound hook-and-line quota.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that gets tricky, though, because law enforcement goes out and boards a vessel, they're not going to know if that vessel had landings or not. They're just going to know this vessel has an endorsement so he can't be doing this. I think there are some enforcement problems coming from that reading of it.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I would agree with you short term but longer term you can do the investigation and find out and you could do that on paper without ever being on a vessel. If the vessel had landings of golden tilefish with an endorsement under a longline and he had landings under the 500-pound trip limit, you know.

DR. CRABTREE: I hear what you're saying; all I'm saying is I don't think that will happen and I don't think it will work out that way. I think the way this is going to go is if the vessel has got the endorsement on it, then he can't fish; but if he doesn't have the endorsement, the law enforcement officer is not going to see any reason to go any further with it. Otherwise, he is going to have to investigate the landings history of every vessel out there without a longline endorsement, and I doubt they're going to put that kind of time into doing it.

MR. HARTIG: Well, no, you don't have to investigate the landings with the longline endorsement. You wouldn't have to do everybody else because those would be the ones specific – the ones that were specifically disqualified from participating in the hook-and-line quota.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if they have the endorsement you don't need to investigate their landings. They can't fish under the – participate in the fishery. It is if they transferred the endorsement off the vessel, then when you board it they wouldn't have the endorsement; and unless you knew the vessel previously had the endorsement, you wouldn't see anything that would cause you to investigate is what I'm saying.

MR. CURRIN: Well, there are 18 people and it's a pretty short list of people. I suspect that law enforcement officers that worked in a particular area would pretty quickly understand who was participating, who had endorsements and who didn't. I don't know; I understand it's a problem.

DR. CRABTREE: That may be with FWC and maybe with the NOAA folks there, but I'm not sure that would be case with the Coast Guard.

MR. CURRIN: That is very true. I think the intent is clear. I'm not sure we solved that problem or the potential for a problem. Has anybody got any suggestions about how to deal with it and make sure that we can prevent?

DR. CRABTREE: I suspect it won't be that much of a problem and that the way we have set it out will probably work reasonably well, and it is the most straightforward way to do it. I would suggest we go with the way it is and then if there is a problem down the road we will figure out a fix to it.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I can tell you that if there is a longline fisherman fishing in the hook-and-line trip limit, you'll hear about it.

MR. CURRIN: Some self-policing may take care of it. There seems to be a lot of camaraderie that has developed among all of these fishermen over the last little while so maybe they can sort it out, and that certainly would be preferable. All right, are we ready to move on?

MS. BROUWER: Okay, the next action is allowing for transferability of the longline endorsements. Here there has been a little bit of changes in the language. Up on the screen you have the alternatives as they were presented to you in March, and then we consulted with the permits office and changed the language of the alternatives to mirror what has been done for the

black sea bass pot endorsement transferability action that we've just talked about. The suggested changes are on the screen now and we would need a motion or guidance to adopt these changes.

MR. CURRIN: If you're okay with the suggested changes to the wording since March, then I would entertain a motion to accept those recommended changes from the IPT. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: So move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Ben; second by Charlie to accept the recommended wording changes from the IPT on this action.

MR. HARTIG: And just to make sure, those are the same ones we have for black sea bass that we just approved in the last amendment.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and I believe they are. Any further discussion on the motion? **The motion is to approve wording changes for the transferability action. Any further discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.** The preferred now is still Subalternative 2A, which allows transferability upon the program implementation. No desire to change that preferred alternative? I see no hands being raised. All right, let's move on.

MS. BROUWER: Action 6 would adjust the golden tilefish fishing year; and your current preferred is no action, to retain the existing calendar year as the golden tilefish fishing year from January 1st through December 31st.

MR. CURRIN: Is everyone still okay with that preferred?

MS. BROUWER: Here again just to clarify it on the record that this would apply only to the commercial sector.

MR. CURRIN: That's certainly the intent. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I just wanted to make a couple of comments about this. I was at the AP meeting and heard the discussion about maintaining the existing fishing year due to the fact that the shallow water grouper is in place. There are market opportunities for golden tilefish. My comments are not in any way, shape or form a reflection on the North Carolina AP representatives that are there.

They do a fantastic job but there is no one from the northern part of the state who is on the AP right now, and I would be remiss if I did not mention some of their concerns about their ability to take advantage of those market opportunities during the January through April shallow water grouper closure.

It is just due to a combination of geography and weather. I am not saying no one else besides North Carolina gets bad weather in the winter. That is certainly not the case, but I was hoping that – and I know that this amendment has been going on for a while and we need to get this thing through, but just a future request to the Snapper Grouper AP that perhaps we can examine

the idea of a split season for this fishery that might allow for folks in different regions to take advantage of those different opportunities.

It is even mentioned in the preamble to this decision document about the fishing season and just that the opportunities are somewhat disparate across the region. I would just request that the Snapper Grouper AP address the idea of a split season.

MR. HARTIG: I certainly concur with that. Additionally what it would do is it would allow us to stop the season in midstream and get the total count and then we'd have a much better idea of what we had left going into the other half of the season, so we'd have a better accountability measure on the commercial side, too, so that would work also.

MR. CURRIN: Any other comments? All right, anything else here, Myra?

MS. BROUWER: Okay, moving on to Action 7, this would modify the golden tilefish trip limit, and this is on PDF Page 149. Your current preferred is to remove the step-down, the 300-pound gutted weight trip limit when 75 percent of the ACL is taken. The IPT has suggested rewording for the no action alternative, and that would be to retain the current step-down regulations that implement a trip limit of 300 pounds gutted weight once 75 percent of the quota is taken.

Some members of the IPT have made that suggestion. Staff recommends retaining the current wording because it mentions the 4,000 pound trip limit currently in place. I believe those are just the recommendations, so it is up to you whether we retain it or change it. I guess I would like to hear what Monica has to say about that since I understand the wording for the no action can sometimes be of concern for GC.

MR. CURRIN: And you will also have the opportunity, Monica, to think about this some and bring up any issues at full council if you'd like, if that is a more palatable situation for you.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, I think that is more palatable. I would like to discuss that further with Myra.

MR. CURRIN: The whole action is a little bit confusing I think because the intent of the 300-pound trip limit, the step-down, was to allow the hook-and-line fishermen to participate. It never worked out that way. We've got a situation now with the separate allocation for the hook and line where we're going to ensure their participation, so we really don't need the step-down anymore. We've played with this wording a lot. It is still confusing I think a little bit just because of the prior circumstances and where we're trying to get to. If you understand all the history, then all the wording makes perfect sense. We're just getting rid of a measure that was in place that we no longer need, but it is still a little bit confusing to the public I think. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Is it your intent to keep the 4,000 pound trip limit in place?

MR. CURRIN: I don't recall any discussion by the committee to change that trip limit for the longline fishery, so, yes, my understanding is that is the intent of the committee. Anybody feel differently about that? We have had some discussions about lowering that a little bit to extend

the season, but the longline fishermen seemed to be comfortable with it. They have got their allocation and they can fish on it anyway they see fit. All right, are we okay with the wording changes? Unless Myra and Monica come up with some suggestions for us, I'm okay with it. All right, let's move on.

MS. BROUWER: Action 8 would establish trip limits for fishermen who do not receive a longline endorsement. Your current preferred is to establish a trip limit of 500 pounds gutted weight for the golden tilefish component of the snapper grouper fishery for commercial fishermen who do not receive a longline endorsement.

We specify that vessels with longline endorsements would not be eligible to fish for this trip limit. We were wondering if this last portion of the alternative needs any clarification. There was some concern that this might be misinterpreted; so if you'd like to discuss that and give us guidance as to whether we should change that or not, that would be helpful.

MR. CURRIN: So I guess one clarification is that vessels – okay, I'm sorry, no need to say that, that is covered. Any other comments? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, yes, vessels with longline endorsements are not eligible to fish for this trip limit, I guess it is a little weird because you don't really fish for a trip limit to being with. I think the key point is vessels with the longline endorsements are fishing under the 4,000 pound trip limit and they fish on a separate quota and everything. I think our intent is consistent with this, but it could probably be worded a little bit better.

MR. CURRIN: And it probably ought to specify golden tilefish longline endorsements since there are other longline – well, are there other longline endorsements? Is the shark fishery endorsed in any way? I'm just trying to prevent a situation where if there is a shark longliner who has got a snapper grouper permit that would be eligible to hook and line for golden fish, but the way this is worded it says if you've got a longline endorsement, then you wouldn't be able to fish for –

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it should be clarified that is a golden tile longline endorsement that we're talking about. It is not some other.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Maybe we could have some discussion on the record for this particular action that if a person did not receive a longline endorsement; could they use their longline to then catch this 500-pound trip limit?

DR. CRABTREE: No.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't believe that is your intent but just make it clear on the record.

MR. CURRIN: That's certainly not the intent.

DR. CRABTREE: No, the intent – and I think we talked about earlier – was that you can't retain golden tilefish on a vessel with longline gear unless you have a golden tile longline endorsement.

MR. CURRIN: And the season is in. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: And to that point, what is the definition of what constitutes a longline because we've just put in for this red snapper research, and they've got short longlines with like ten or twenty hooks or something. How many hooks or is it a length of line that constitutes a longline? That would be helpful to clarify exactly what that is.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My computer is pulling up that definition.

MR. CURRIN: I don't recall that but realizing how innovative fishermen can be, it is certainly something we need to take a look at. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: According to the regulations, it said bottom longline means a longline that is deployed or in combination with gear aboard the vessel, weights or anchors that is capable of being deployed to maintain contact with the ocean bottom.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: There is another definition for just longline. It means a line that is deployed horizontally to which gangions and hooks are attached. A longline may be a bottom longline; i.e., designed for use on the bottom or a pelagic longline; i.e., designed for use off the bottom. The longline hauler may be manually, electrically or hydraulically operated.

MR. CURRIN: That would seem to cover it, Charlie. I mean, fished horizontally; there are ways to get around attached hooks with gangions if you wanted to run a short piece of it; but if it is fished horizontally, that would prevent somebody from I guess laying it out up and down; I don't know. Are you comfortable with those definitions?

DR. CRABTREE: The gear you're talking about is fished vertically, right?

MR. PHILLIPS: I think it is going to be fished vertically.

DR. CRABTREE: Widespread in the Gulf they use bandit gear that has 15 or so – these Christmas tree rigs they call them and they have lots of hooks on them, but it is vertical so it is not a longline.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: We have a definition for buoy gear if you would like me to read that to you.

MR. CURRIN: We have been through that before with the king mackerel fishery with some guy in North Carolina that wanted to use buoy gear or modify it somehow. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Well, I don't want to complicate this; it is already complicated enough, but when you fish the vertical gear a lot of times you want the whole gear to lay on the bottom, too. You keep letting it out until that vertical piece of gear lays flat on the bottom in some fisheries. You could stretch the point and say now that is horizontal, but it doesn't look that way from the gear

when you first deploy it. If the fish are on the bottom and not coming off the bottom, the fisherman will put that gear right on the bottom and lay the whole thing right out on the bottom.

MR. CURRIN: All right, I'm not hearing any desire to further clarify the existing definitions of longline. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I would ask staff to talk amongst themselves before full council and see if there is anything we need to do here or if we think we're okay. I do recall when we did longline endorsements for the reef fish fishery in the Gulf there were a lot of changes made distinguishing between buoy gear and longline gear, but it has been a while and I don't remember exactly what we did. I don't think we're going to straighten it out right here and now.

MR. CURRIN: No, we're not going to straighten it out right now, I don't think. You guys can talk about that a little bit, Myra, and look into it; and if you've got some suggestions at full council, then we'll go with it there.

MS. BROUWER: Up on the screen I have a suggestion for how to clean up the language under the alternatives. First of all, we have established trip limits, plural, which is incorrect, so we would suggest "establish a trip limit of 500 pounds". Subsequently, specify that these are golden tilefish longline endorsements and insert the word "under this trip limit". Perhaps this would get at the concerns that we were discussing earlier. If that is the case, then I would suggest you give us guidance or make a motion to adopt this suggested language.

MR. CURRIN: Is everybody comfortable with that language? I think it clarifies it quite a bit. Are we okay with guidance to staff to make those changes? David.

MR. CUPKA: Well, Gregg has indicated I think he would like to have a motion, so I would so move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CURRIN: Motion by David to accept the suggested language under Action 8; second by Charlie. Discussion? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Just so I don't miss it, can one of these who is not getting in the fishery who has the gear; would there be any reason why they would want to fish that gear for the 500-pound limit? I mean they're not getting the longline endorsement.

MR. CURRIN: Correct.

MR. HAYMANS: They've still got the gear because they had fished it previously; are they going to fish it for a 500-pound trip limit?

MR. CURRIN: There will not be any opportunity for them to use the longline to fish for that 500-pound trip limit. That is the intent of the committee so far, and I hope the language is clear on that. They can use hook-and-line gear, vertical gear to seek that trip limit. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: To Doug's concern, the vessels that fish cable gear, most of them buy galvanized cable that is good one season and that is it. If you're going to fish the next year, you buy new cable.

MR. CURRIN: Further discussion on the motion? Do you need some clarification, Jack?

DR. McGOVERN: Well, the way I read that, if somebody has a longline endorsement they can't catch less than 500 pounds and I know that is not the intent.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I see what you're talking about. It took me a while to read it that way, I guess. Yes, we probably ought to clarify that somehow.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: There are a couple of ideas here and one would be for staff to work this up with slightly revised wording to come back for the full council or we could continue to work on it here. One thought I had is why are we not just saying the trip limits go to the hook-and-line fishermen, and then we could discuss in the body of this that if you have a longline endorsement you're not allowed to fish under this, but there may be reasons that I haven't discussed yet with Myra why that is not a good idea. We could clean some of this up unless you want to continue to work on it, and that's fine.

MR. CURRIN: It's the last action and let's see if we can clean up right now. Jack's suggestion I think is good; and rather than under this trip limit maybe we ought to say under hook-and-line trip limit and include some of that verbiage directly referring to the hook-and-line fishery. Maybe that helps. Jack, have you got better language?

DR. McGOVERN: No.

MR. CURRIN: Does that take care of at least one of your concerns; have you got others?

DR. McGOVERN: I think along those lines what I was thinking is that vessels with longline endorsements are not eligible to fish for this trip limit with other gear; i.e., hook and line.

MR. CURRIN: Any other concerns about the verbiage here? I think that clears it up some. Is everybody okay with that? **I'm not seeing anybody objecting, so further discussion on the motion, which is to clarify the language of alternatives under Action 8. Further discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

If you guys come up, Myra, with some additional concerns, just bring them back to us at full council. That adds a fair amount of clarity. I'm not sure it's a hundred percent clear but it is better. If anything else comes up, bring it to us. All right, that's the last action?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, this is the last action in the amendment. I'm looking at the recommendations that we had under this action. Again, perhaps and Monica and I can talk about the no action. It might need some tweaking. It is the same issue that we had with the one prior, so we will take care of that and bring it back at full council if any changes that need to be made.

At this point this amendment is scheduled to be approved for formal review, so we would need a motion to go ahead with that process.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. CURRIN: **Motion by Doug to approve Amendment 18B for formal review; second by Ben. Discussion on that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none, that motion is approved.** We will also need a motion to deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

MR. HAYMANS: I so move.

MR. CURRIN: **Motion by Doug to deem the codified text for Amendment 18B as necessary and appropriate; second by Charlie. Discussion on that motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** Likewise, as we did with the previous action under 18A or the transferability action, we would need a motion to give the staff editorial license. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. CURRIN: **Motion by Michelle to give the staff editorial license to make changes to the amendment document as appropriate and give the chairman the authority to approve changes to the document and redeem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Second by John Jolley. Discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.** Nothing else on 18B?

MS. BROUWER: No, Mr. Chairman, that concludes 18B.

MR. CURRIN: Let's go ahead and break and let's come back at 1:15 and we will jump into speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, Tuesday afternoon, June 12, 2012, and was called to order at 1:15 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Mac Currin.

MR. CURRIN: Let's go ahead. Our next agenda item is dealing with an issue that we've heard from the SSC about as well as advisory panels, and that is the consideration of the possible use of MPAs and HAPCs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. There is a series of attachments, 6A through 6H, and Myra is going to start with a little overview and we will move through from there.

MS. BROUWER: Very quickly just to remind everybody why we're considering MPAs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, this is because Regulatory Amendment 11 took away the 240-foot closure. Therefore, it was considered prudent to discuss other potential measures to address bycatch mortality of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. You will recall in March the council gave us guidance to schedule several workshops; five of them in total; three of which supposed to happen before this meeting, and they did.

We will update you on what took place during the public workshops. There were two, one in Charleston and one in Pooler. We also convened a group of experts. We call it the MPA Expert Workgroup. They met in Pooler for a day and there is a written report that came out of that meeting with their recommendations.

Roger and myself are going to tag team and walk you through all that. There was also a comment period that was open where people provided comments on MPAs as well, so I will give you a summary of the comments we received. Just to touch on the advisory panel report, Robert has already covered the salient points of that report.

In respect to MPAs, the AP felt that it was important that the council consider an evaluation of existing MPAs and any future MPAs and that they also consider potential sunset provisions to make sure that there is an evaluation of how effective these measures are. With that, I think what I will do is ask Carolyn if she would like to reiterate the SSCs recommendations. I don't know if anybody needs her to do that. I think the SSC was pretty clear in their recommendations. Do we need to call Carolyn to the table?

MR. CURRIN: Unless there is a specific request from the committee to do so, Carolyn is here and if questions come up maybe we can ask her to come up at that time rather than ask you to come up and say what you said earlier unless you've got something that has occurred to you that you and/or Luiz intended to say but did not or forgot to. If not, we will just call you up as needed.

MS. BROUWER: Okay, the other thing that we had on the agenda is just to go over the information that is contained in the ruling for ESA petition, the petition to list speckled hind and Warsaw grouper under the ESA as either threatened or endangered. I just wanted to touch on a couple of things that were included, and I believe Gregg actually already mentioned some of these items yesterday when we were discussing Regulatory Amendment 11.

The petition for Warsaw grouper, the ruling on that petition was published in September of 2010. The agency did not find that the petition was warranted and they go through an explanation of the reasons why that is. One of the statements that the agency published is that Warsaw grouper has always been too uncommonly captured in fisheries for data on landings or weight of fish landed to be a reliable indicator of population status and trends.

I wanted to point out that there is actually a directed fishery for Warsaw grouper in the Gulf of Mexico, so I'm assuming there are plenty of landings information in the Gulf and that this statement actually pertains to the South Atlantic portion of the Warsaw grouper population. Okay, then the petition basically goes on to explain the scarcity of data for Warsaw grouper, talking about historical trends.

There is a statement that says the protogynous hermaphroditism in Warsaw grouper has not been confirmed. Like I said, the fishery in the Gulf of Mexico is for the deepwater complex. There is an allowable take of 1.2 million pounds annually. The deepwater complex includes misty grouper, yellowedge grouper, speckled hind, Warsaw grouper and snowy grouper. Similarly, the

petition for speckled hind covers some of the same information. This one came out more recently. It was published May 1st of 2012, and again the agency found that the petition to list speckled hind under the Endangered Species Act was not warranted.

That petition includes information that states that the speckled hind population in the southeastern United States is thought to be one continuous population extending from the Gulf of Mexico around the Straits of Florida and into the South Atlantic. It goes on to say that the South Atlantic receives a considerable influx of recruits that originate in the Gulf of Mexico and are transported to the South Atlantic Region via the Straits of Florida and the Gulf Stream.

The reason I'm pointing this out is basically to inform the discussions we're going to have this afternoon about these two species so that you can keep some of this information in mind. The petition also talks about the data suggesting that the speckled hind population in the Gulf of Mexico is more stable than in the South Atlantic. I think that is mainly what I wanted to point out. If you have any specific questions, I hope that you had the chance to read some of the statements that were published in these two notices that pertain to speckled hind and Warsaw. Any questions on that?

MR. CURRIN: Questions for Myra on the response to the ESA petitions on Warsaw and speckled hind? I don't see any.

MS. BROUWER: Okay, what I'll do now is just give you a little overview of the workshops, and what I'll do is touch on mainly how the workshops were conducted and the kind of information, the amount of information we got and then Roger is going to get into a little bit more detail on the depiction of the spatial information that we received.

As I said, the first public workshop was held on the evening of April 18th in conjunction with the Snapper Grouper AP meeting. The workshop began at six o'clock. It was advantageous that the Snapper Grouper AP members were there, so most of them participated during the public workshop. In addition about ten members of the public attended the workshop.

Council staff basically just provided a brief orientation of why we were there and the kind of information we were expecting to receive. We provided some orientation and explained that we were not there to discuss whether MPAs were good or bad; specifically that we wanted to get information on MPAs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

We had several charts that were provided on the surface where folks could indicate with a marker areas that they knew were important for speckled hind and for Warsaw grouper, and then those were translated into a GIS that Roger is going to show you momentarily. The Pooler Workshop was conducted in a similar manner. This was held in May; the evening when the workgroup convened.

This workshop was not as well attended as the one in Charleston. I guess there were probably about nine members of the public that participated. It was conducted in a similar manner. In the attachment that you have in your briefing book there are several figures that summarize all the information that we received. I'm going to pass it on to Roger to walk you through that. In

addition the workshop report includes a couple of tables that show the percent occurrence of each of these two species within the existing MPAs and within the ones that have been suggested by the public.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay, going into the workshops, one of the things we wanted to do is make sure we had information available from which we could have fishermen and the public react and be able to provide information similar to what we did when we originally worked on the marine protected areas in the past.

What is presented in the two first documents is the distribution information we had. We identified the positive information on these species. The most important information available was the actual true occurrences of both Warsaw grouper and speckled hind. The images that were presented provided the detailed information from the MARMAP/SEAMAP Program between 1978 and 2011, the Reef Fish Observer Program, 2006 to 2010; NOAA's MPA survey work that they did on the marine protected areas and providing information on these species between 2004 and 2010; and the fishermen.

You see the MPAs relative to those distribution points. We also wanted to put some of the information on habitat distribution so the SEAMAP information on hard bottom distribution within what was looked at as a core distribution of the adult habitat between 60 and 100 meters was included on this.

This was the base document charts that were provided for individuals to react to. We had been building an online system that you had opportunity to see in the beginning of the council meeting, but at this meeting really it focused on the hard copy work and most of the work was done actually hand-drawing the information in this area.

What you see is the first one was the depiction of the information; and the second area, you actually see some of the locations. What we've got is a combination of a number of things; reorientation of the existing MPAs; identifications of locations of occurrence; and then just totally new areas to consider relative to the creation of MPAs specifically to address the speckled hind and Warsaw.

This was the area to the north that covers areas that presently have the snowy grouper in northern South Carolina and Georgia MPAs and the Charleston Artificial Reef, and those are the distribution of the different areas, both occurrence and recommended potential new areas. Now, again, these were translated from photographs of those areas and then created right directly on the material.

In the southern area the same; we had information on the species distribution, some new areas identified and again just occurrences. We did not get any specific additional point occurrences to add to the overall data set, so this one individually we were focusing on these locations and where to go.

If you look at this, this is the one to the south. That was the occurrence information, and this shows you reorientation, examples of reorientations of the North Florida MPA, concentrations of

speckled hind and Warsaw; really speckled hind mostly in the southern areas, and those actually are ones that were identified directly in the existing Oculina Bank area and then further to the south.

In the most southern area the Warsaw Hole was also identified as a potential area for consideration as one targeting specifically an aggregation of Warsaw grouper. Now, in order to look at this in context, what we did is we looked at the existing MPAs, looked at the occurrence information and compiled that to understand the distribution of occurrence that we know in the existing MPA areas.

If you looked across all the MPAs as they exist now, what you come up with is about 14.6 percent of the occurrences from all those different data sets that I identified existing in the existing MPAs. Now, I will qualify that with the fact that this did not include some of the information we do know exists for the Oculina Bank. This is strictly the MPAs themselves.

Starting with that, where we did receive the information was at the Charleston Workshop. The Charleston Workshop, what we had were a number of different alternatives. The ones where you actually had some areas were Big Rock, a reoriented northern South Carolina MPA, a reoriented and expanded Edisto MPA, just reoriented Edisto; and the Georgia MPA.

Okay, what I did here was looked at the specific areas, looked at how many more occurrences or the numbers of occurrences with either new areas or reorientations and then added those in and identified what the expansion – remember, I had identified the original percentage was 14.6 of all occurrences in the area, and this is showing what actually – when you added in, say, for example, the Big Rock alternative was a new area; it increased it up to 16.2 percent.

Now this is just adding in that individual alternative itself, so this is not like additive. It is only if you looked at the existing MPAs and then what that contribution of either the reoriented or new area would do. A reoriented South Carolina northern just brought it up to about 14.8 percent; 17.2 with a reoriented and expanded MPA for Edisto.

The reoriented areas for Edisto brought it all the way up to 22.9 percent. That's where you really can see – if you look at that one Edisto alternative, there is fairly significant numbers of occurrences on both the eastern – I guess the eastern and western portions of those areas. A new southern Georgia MPA would bring it up to 16.9; reorientation and expansion of the existing Georgia MPA would have brought it up to 15.5 percent; and an expanded Georgia MPA would bring it up to 15 point – so those are the areas that were identified and translated, as I said, from the hand-drawn photograph and then translated to spatial presentations of what exactly were presented at the workshop itself. That's it for the workshop.

MR. CURRIN: Let's see if there are any questions about these workshops first, Roger, before we move into the Expert Workshop Group. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roger, did you have a chart with all these –

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, Charlie, actually it is in the workgroup report. I'll just zoom in tight and then walk down through.

MR. CURRIN: Show an example here because they're all on those charts.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, you all have these here.

MR. CURRIN: Attachment 6B, that one is Page 3, I believe.

MR. PUGLIESE: And so what you see here is an example where somebody had identified the Big Rock area and had created an orientation relative to Big Rock. You move further south and there was just an occurrence of speckled hind identified in one area to the south. The reorientation of the northern South Carolina MPA; this was taking that and shifting it. Now, again, this was specifically to speckled hind and Warsaw so people were not considering the orientation for tilefish, et cetera, and deepwater species. It was just trying to address the issue at hand.

The Devil's Hole or Georgetown Hole was identified. Now, that is actually – this area in here was originally just kind of identified in that general location. The Edisto MPA reorientation and then a reorientation of shifting to the north as two different alternatives were looked at. And then an area that is south of the existing Georgia MPA and realigned right with the bathymetries to capture speckled hind in that location.

MR. CURRIN: That's good; that just gives you an example.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, the rest of them are all there. You can look in those and do the same type of thing, zoom in and see, and this is specifically to the workgroup and we have some additional beyond that.

MR. CURRIN: All right, any other questions for Roger? Yes, John.

MR. JOLLEY: Have you talked to some of the fishermen about this reorientation; is that where you got it?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, that was at the workshop and not the workgroup. This was the workshop with the public and fishermen, and they were saying, well, look at this type of area, and there were some considerations about what that means. There was a lot of that discussion.

MR. CURRIN: And keep in mind there are a couple more of these workshops planned or least two more further up the coast, I guess, to gather input from fishermen in North Carolina and where; Florida, I guess one in Florida. Other questions for Roger about the workshop before we move into the Expert Workgroup? All right.

MS. BROUWER: The report from the Expert Workgroup is Attachment 6C. The workgroup was convened to obtain input from folks who are knowledgeable about MPAs, both scientists

and fishermen who have had experience, some of the people that were involved in helping the council establish the first either Deepwater MPAs.

We received suggestions for people who would be a good addition to this workgroup from the Snapper Grouper AP and other people. We convened in Pooler. We provided a lot of background information, general sort of stuff on MPAs, a few scientific articles, other pertinent information to the workgroup.

The folks that were involved are up on the screen; Joey Ballenger, who is here and works for MARMAP; Churchill Grimes, who is an SSC member out of the Southwest Fisheries Science Center; Stacey Harter. She is a scientist with the Panama City Lab with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Will Heyman is someone who is very knowledgeable about MPAs and especially has done a lot of work in the Caribbean and in Belize. He is out Texas A&M. Chris Koenig, who is here, out of Florida State University; Ken Lindeman, Florida Institute of Technology – he has been involved with MPAs in the region and spawning aggregations in particular – George Sedberry, of course, who was going to be here to present this to you but in the end was not able to come.

That is why I'm running through this instead of him. George was elected the chairman of the workgroup and so he is responsible, along with Don DeMaria, for putting this report together. This was entirely put together by the workgroup. Then finally Gabe Ziskin is someone who did very recent work in our area on speckled hind.

Fishermen included Jack Cox from North Carolina; Ralph Delph out of Northern Florida; Don DeMaria from the Keys; Bobby Freeman from North Carolina as well; Rusty Hudson, who is present today here; and Mark Marhefka out of Charleston. Mark Brown was also invited but he was not able to attend the workgroup.

We conducted this very informally. We oriented the workgroup as to why we were there and what we were expecting from them. We went through the recommendations that the SSC had provided; the recommendations from the Snapper Grouper AP and from the Law Enforcement AP. There was a lot of concern and enforcement was one of the things that was well discussed during the workgroup. We provided some of the background information that we've received from our APs.

Then we broke down into breakout groups. The participants organized themselves basically into workout groups to basically just hash out recommendations, and that is how the workgroup was conducted for the remainder of the time. The report is very comprehensive. It has a lot of information. I encourage you to take a little bit of time to look through it.

There are a lot of figures that depict the recommendations from the breakout groups. There are many different recommendations and Roger will address some of them, but there are figures in the report that show the areas as they were provided to us by the workgroup participants. The report also contains tables with the coordinates for these areas and the attributes of these areas that make them good candidate sites for protection of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. I'm going to pass it to Roger now to walk you through it a little bit more.

MR. PUGLIESE: What I want to do is talk two things, process quickly, and then jump directly into what was provided. What I wanted to do was at least identify what you're seeing in the report as identified in the workshop that we were building the online system for access to the information. Day Two of the workgroup, actually the members got online and created a lot of these directly on the managed area site.

They were able to look at the distributional information, look at the areas, create the images, pass them back and forth between each other, so this was the first real hands-on opportunity to use the online system to generate some of this information. They were able to work with this and come up with areas, come up with reorientations of these. You saw the flexibility. That provided the foundation.

In addition to that structure there was specific information on point location areas or general locations of Warsaw areas in addition to what are you seeing in these areas. What I wanted to do is go directly into just kind of a compilation of what came through in terms of alternatives. Moving from north to south, what were presented as opportunities or ways to address the different areas for MPA alternatives for speckled hind and Warsaw; again identifying the species distribution.

Mainly the focus and you're seeing is a lot onto the speckled hind; two areas to the north of the Snowy Wreck MPA; an expansion to the west to capture known habitat while not – something that is made clear in the workgroup report, while not having a lot of the point locations from the fishermen's experience the significant amount of distribution justified that addition as one of the alternatives.

As you moved further south there was a finger added in, an extension of the northern South Carolina MPA as a recommendation to capture that edge habitat and specifically speckled hind distribution in the area. To the south of that, the area focus that came out originally of the workshop but also has been re-acknowledged here was looking at Devil's Hole or the Georgetown Hole, which more people know the name of that. Fishermen to some degree know it as Devil's.

Two different orientations from the fishermen's standpoint, the smaller location really focusing on the core area of Georgetown Hole and then a large one that really captured a very extensive point distribution of speckled hind. As you move further down the edge, the alternative was identified as the Edisto MPA. Then the workgroup reported – actually there were two recommendations and they're basically the same thing. It is just that they were looked at and both separate groups came up with the reorientation, so that comes out as an alternative.

When you move south beyond the Georgia MPA, an area was capturing like a new Georgia to the south, capturing speckled hind distribution in that area; and then south of the North Florida MPA was a St. Augustine MPA, again capturing not only speckled hind in this case but also some of the distribution of Warsaw grouper.

Two areas that were identified specifically for Warsaw were Push Button Hill and the Warsaw Hole. Additional areas were identified as distribution but these ones were pretty much focused on as real opportunities for looking at those as MPAs in the area. The coordinates for those areas are included in the workgroup report.

What that brings us to then is the same type of a summary relative to what I did in the workshop; looking again at these new areas that were proposed, looking at the information we had on distribution and how that may have affected it, so you have all the different MPA areas which show – I don't need to I guess go through each and every one of those.

The change was originally I identified 14.6 percent; moving it up to 15 percent all the way up to, when you looked at that large Georgetown Hole MPA up to 26 percent of the occurrences adding just that one MPA into this area, so you had a range of occurrence change based on these new or reoriented or expanded MPA areas. That's pretty much what came out of the report. I think again one of the most effective thing was the opportunity to work with the fishermen and work with the public and actually use some of the hands-on tools that the council has been developing over time.

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to add and acknowledge that Rusty Hudson, Chris Koenig and Joey Ballenger who were involved with the workgroup are here. If they can answer anymore specific questions, they can come up and answer those for you.

MR. CURRIN: Questions for Roger or Myra? David.

MR. CUPKA: Not a question; I just wanted to say that Ben and I had an opportunity to attend that meeting and I thought it went extremely well. I was very heartened by what I saw happening there, the interaction between the fishermen and the scientists. I thought it was an extremely well-done meeting and I think the staff is to be commended, too, for the way it was organized. It was a very good meeting.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Roger, if I could ask on that table, most of the columns are dedicated to occurrences and the last column is total percentage in modified or new MPAs; total percentage of what?

MR. PUGLIESE: That's total percentage of occurrences in the data set, so that's occurrences – the same type of thing, total percent of occurrences that exist in the core MPAs plus that addition and then increasing the total occurrences for the entire new distribution as 16.2 percent in the first case, so it is occurrences of speckled hind in the existing and then potentially the new expanded area.

MR. CURRIN: And by the data set, you're referring to the entire data set for the –

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, it is the entire one that I identified earlier that includes SEAMAP/MARMAP, reef fish observer, fishermen, et cetera, that we have.

MR. CURRIN: 581 occurrences of speckled hind exist there?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't want to jump ahead, but is there another table or a separate one developed for Warsaw or, no, because they were only identified in the Push Button Hill and the other location you said?

MR. PUGLIESE: No, it didn't do the same because there is such a limited distribution, the occurrence wasn't necessarily a co-occurrence. I think it was a focus that really was looking at where specific spawning or concentrations could occur, and those are the ones that were identified for Push Button Hill and Warsaw Hole.

There happened to be some co-occurrence with some of these other designations, but it was more really focusing, on those ones, really on speckled hind to a great degree. Ben did provide some very specific information to support that and then some other areas just in terms of other distribution of Warsaw that may be considered, but not really orientations or specific recommendations for those areas.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roger, adding the possible MPAs and turning the other ones on their axis, basically what you're doing is covering more of the ledge. Have you figured out exactly how much of the ledge now will be covered if we do all of these, say, from Cape Canaveral to the North Carolina line of something. It looks like by the time you turn them and drop another one in and turn them and drop another one in you have covered a good bit of the ledge where they're working vermilions and stuff.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and I did a quick aggregation of all those things in terms of occurrences, like half of the occurrences if you added all of them up, but that doesn't necessarily translate to the habitat distribution. Really, if you look at those habitat distributions right now even, they're an underestimate of what – I had originally done the same type of thing with just looking at the SEAMAP distribution inside those areas and it was about 6 percent of the overall area.

But I will tell you that this is way underestimated because I'd say half of these points of occurrence aren't even included in the SEAMAP data sets, which would automatically add those in as additional – well, with the way we did the scenario for designating those habitats, those were additional habitats.

So if you look at some of the MPAs, they may have some of the documented habitats but then half of the area may have speckled hind in it that aren't necessarily – which are habitat, too. In terms of the quick answer to your question, overall it added a lot if you add those, so it definitely grabs a very significant portion of the shelf, and then the habitat is even more significant than even with the SEAMAP identified just because the occurrence information hasn't been worked up to the level that it could be.

MR. HARTIG: Roger, given our ignorance about the amount of habitat we actually have; would it be better served just to use the occurrence data instead of trying to base it on habitat?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and I think that's why – I mean the occurrences, when you really get down to it, these are validated, verified species in those locations. When we went into looking, that was additional information in terms of additional information on habitat in the area, but the occurrences is the most significant information we have on these species right now.

DR. DUVAL: Roger, one of the things that came out in the SSC report – and I guess either Carolyn or Luiz could speak to this if I'm misstating it – they mentioned a potential need for a temporal analysis of the presence/absence data and I was just wondering how easily that could be done.

All the presence/absence data right now is lumped over the entire 1970-something to whenever; and so if we could look at it by decade or something like that, clearly the earliest points are going to be from the MARMAP/SEAMAP surveys and only later points from the fishery observer program and some of the other data sources. I was wondering if you could speak to that. I guess I would love to have some pictures of this occurrence data that show the progression of occurrence through time.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and I think one of the things I can tell you, if you'd look at the way the information is, if you looked at the ROV as all new information basically the last X number of years where they're doing the sampling; the reef fish observer, a lot of it is probably the more recent occurrence; the fishermen occurrences may be more historic but it is a small portion of this; and some of the more recent MARMAP information actually – the 2011 added a number of additional points directly into occurrences within the MPA. We can try to look at it and maybe break it down further. I'll work with Marcel in terms of the MARMAP/SEAMAP information, but at least looking at some of those other – those were more recent already so that we have to look closer to actually get some more clarification.

DR. DUVAL: Just a followup to that, when I'm looking at the dots on the page, there is no distinguishing amongst all those different programs. Everything is the same color so that is why I feel like it might be helpful. I think another thing that I saw in the SSC report was where the fish were versus where they might still be was an important point.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, one other thing I think that we're going to have information further on is while we want to know that difference, I think one of the other pieces that is going to be really important that we will get ultimately from – I think Grant Gilmore is going to be trying to compile some of his historic information relative to the Oculina Bank because they had about 80 dives on the Oculina Bank.

I was trying to get some of that in advance of this, that virtually on all those dives they had some occurrence of speckled hind. So even if you take a small portion and add into here, that area in there was significant and my assumption is it still has to be fairly significant especially given the limited amount of research we've really done on that area in terms of documenting the distribution. It's probably less than 1 percent of the area has been covered in terms of really documenting the species occurrence and the habitat associations.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I was going to make a suggestion along the lines of what Michelle just did, which is that maybe you could color code by decade and then you could change the shape for each different program. That might be one way to depict the information. Also, I did find that the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History records are online, at least some of them are, and I pulled up another eight records for speckled hind just from that data base; so with the seven from the North Carolina Museum that gives you fifteen.

I was talking to Marcel about the possibility of looking at the College of Charleston Museum records. I think there are some additional data that can be mined that will add some records to these. Again, most of those are going to be on the older side of things, too. They will more be historic records as opposed to any kind of current things.

Mac made a good point, too, is that the museum records are in a lot of cases going to be limited to juveniles because of the size of the containers that most museums store their specimens in, although not necessarily because they do have big coffins and things like that that they put larger specimens in. I think it's worthwhile to at least go through the collections at the National Museum and the southeast to try and pull those records in as well.

MR. CURRIN: And thinking about that, Roger, with respect to the temporal aspects of when these occurrences happen, I think that is very important. I like Michelle's suggestion of ten-year blocks and be able to look at the most recent or the oldest and then start adding in the more recent. I think if rather than see them as Wilson suggested as different shapes and that sort of stuff, I'd rather see an additive kind of block process so we can visualize that rather than have things hidden.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and I think that would be good. The one thing I didn't mention is one of the reasons I kind of aggregated everything was to at least keep some confidentiality. We do have some fishermen points in and we do have some of the location. We did that online by reducing the resolution that you could actually get the coordinates for. But doing it the way you're talking about, that would still retain that and you'd look at a large block, aggregate those for ten years, and we could look at what would be interpreted as a recent occurrence versus a combined historic occurrence.

MR. CURRIN: I think that would add some strength to it. If we had some areas where we had old records and we still had fish there, then that may be a better site to consider than an area where we had them a long time ago but we don't have them now. Mel.

MR. BELL: I just had a question about the occurrence data. It's a combination of fishery-independent data from MARMAP; it's also whoever the fishermen were that attended; so it is not necessarily exhaustive in terms of the whole ledge system or maybe you had good representation and knowledge of the entire system. It's whatever folks were willing to share in terms of their data?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, that's true and truthfully the fishermen side is fairly limited in terms of what is presented. To a great degree it is the research components from MARMAP and reef fish observer is a component and the most recent ROV work. That is as representative as the

research side of the world is and the observer component with some additions. We did not get a very extensive dump of individuals' points and locations and where to go. They were more willing to look at where we may look or a recommendation versus this is a point on the map.

MR. BELL: And that is what I was remembering back to the original – when we were sitting down years ago and drawing the original boxes, there was willingness to share some things but not others.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a question specifically about the MPA off of Georgia; is that a new in addition to MPA or is that a replacement, a new MPA as a replacement?

MR. PUGLIESE: That was recommended as a new one. At least in that context it was a new to add into the –

MR. HAYMANS: And that's because the existing didn't have any occurrence of speckled hind?

MR. CURRIN: It's just for our consideration. Ben, before I get you, Chris Koenig wanted to make some comments to the committee I invited him up. Chris, thank you for being here and thank you for participating in the Expert Workshop.

DR. KOENIG: I just wanted to make some comments about the temporal data that was just brought up a few minutes ago. If your interest in the temporal data is related to the fact that they were in one place but they're not there now, meaning that those places aren't important to them, I think you're mistaken.

I'm not sure I'm interpreting right what you're saying, but what I've done in Madison-Swanson, when it was first closed in 2000, was actually – there were no speckled hind or Warsaw grouper in there, and we knew that they were there back in the sixties. We had photographs of catches from that area.

Over time they became very popular, very common, I should say, in that area, in Madison-Swanson but not outside. The issue is that if you think that because they're not there they won't be there if it's closed, I think you're making a mistake. The data as to where they were is probably the best data you'll have.

The best data that I've seen are publications that were done on the Research Vessel Onslow Bay as published in a paper by – I think it was 1981 by Churchill Grimes and his colleagues showing where a number of catches out on – and I can't remember the name of the rocks, but it is the two areas that are closed off Onslow Bay there, where speckled hind was actually the dominant grouper in that area.

Another study that was done recently and published in 2008 by Ruderhausen and his colleagues showed that there were none there, fishing the exact spot, but it is wrong to interpret that because they're not there now that the habitat is unsuitable for them. The fishing intensity is a factor that I don't think you're considering.

If some of the newer data shows that they're abundant in an area that they weren't in the historical data set, then that could be a function of fishing intensity in the newer area. I would be very cautious about interpreting any temporal data and interpreting it in the sense that the older records are not as valuable as the newer ones.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you; and I think we all appreciate that. The one comment I think I made that makes a lot of sense to me is if we can see that temporal data and if we can identify a spot where not only were there old records but there are current records as well, then to me that places a little higher priority on that. When we're in the business of trying to prioritize the selection of areas, it makes the most sense to me as well to try to select those areas that are most important. Thank you for those comments. David.

MR. CUPKA: I had a question for Roger, and this goes back concerning historical data and all. I guess this is the problem of being an old-timer but I remember back in DNR in the early seventies we got funding from the Coastal Plains Regional Commission and did a two-year project fishing off South Carolina for reef fish.

I don't know whatever happened to that data. I know that Bearden and McKinsey put out a report on that, but it was in the early seventies. Like I say, it was a two-year project and I don't know if you've run across any of that data or made an attempt to find it. That was really back before the fishery got going good. It was exploratory fishing off South Carolina where we were looking at what was out there and where it was. I remember catching large speckled hind during that two-year survey. It might be worthwhile seeing if we can't locate those records and include them.

DR. DUVAL: Just to the point about the temporal data, I was not making any allegations as to the importance of those historical sites. That was a concern or that was a comment that the SSC made and it was one that I certainly agreed with. I think it would be informative to see that just temporal distribution, and I think it can also help inform future analyses particularly with regard to habitat and where speckled hind and Warsaw grouper habitats were or might be, and that could inform future ROV efforts in terms of trying to groundtruth whether there is still existing habitat that is ideal for those fish.

DR. LANEY: Yes, I think, Chris, you're right on target there, and that was the reason that I felt it was important to pursue the museum records especially because those to be older records that show where there was habitat used by those species at one point in time. My interest in seeing things broken out temporally is because I think if you look at it from a temporal perspective you're going to see the range shrinking from what it used to be because the older records will probably show a broader distribution and some of that in all likelihood is due to fishing intensity, maybe, so that was my interest in seeing them depicted temporally.

MR. CURRIN: And Nick Farmer just informed me that depending on how this all goes, he has got the capability of displaying that information temporally so we will be able to look at it if we choose to go further down this path. Any other questions or comments for Roger or Chris or Myra on the Expert Workgroup? All right, public comments that we have received on MPA

consideration, Attachment 6D, and Myra is going to run through those. Then we're going to have to make a decision about how we want to proceed here.

MS. BROUWER: The period to submit comments on the council's possible consideration of MPA to protect speckled hind and Warsaw grouper began on April 16th and concluded on May 21st. During that time 18 written comments were received. I'm going to go through some of them. I'm not going to read all of it into the record. This is an attachment in your briefing book.

I have summarized the main points that the commenters brought up, and the comments themselves have all been included in the briefing book. There was one letter that was submitted late last week that was e-mailed to all of you. One commenter submitted a paper on a scientific study conducted to evaluate MPAs in the Florida for spotted seatrout, black drum, red drum and common snook. That study reiterated the benefits of MPAs to recreational fishing and their usefulness for reef fish species with high site fidelity.

The American Sportfishing Association maintained that the use of MPAs should be considered only after conventional resource management measures have failed. Five individuals supported the use of MPAs only if they are limited to small key areas, they are marked with data collection towers and are offset with equal areas of artificial reefs.

One commenter was in support of whatever actions the council deemed necessary to best manage the resource. The East Coast Fisheries Section of the Southeastern Fisheries Association submitted comments, too. They stated their lack of support for MPAs for several reasons. There is no critical review of evidence that justifies new or expanded MPAs in the region.

There is not enough evidence that overfishing of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper is still occurring. Recent amendments to the FMP have decreased bycatch pressure on the rarer members of the snapper grouper complex. They stated that moving forward with the creation of new and/or extension of present MPAs without new stock assessments for these two species would be a management decision without scientific merit and would not be justified with the current supporting scientific information base.

The Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's Association also opposes the establishment of any new Deepwater MPAs for the sole purpose of protecting speckled hind and Warsaw and recommends instead that NMFS conduct a full-scale evaluation of those already in place to determine if additional protections would be necessary.

A Snapper Grouper AP member provided some recommendations. He would like encouraging education on practices which will decrease discard mortality; design MPAs that protect both the shelf edge and specific spawning areas for all snapper grouper species; and share enforcement and monitoring of these areas between NOAA and recreational and commercial groups.

One individual again stated that the council should start showing positive results from prior laws they've put in place and product more proactive research. One person commented that speckled hind and Warsaw grouper have never been abundant in the region and are likely not overfished. According to this individual, speckled hind are found only in 48 to 54 fathoms of past the break,

and Warsaws are found in 500 to 600 feet on deepwater wrecks. He did not support the use of MPAs to protect these two species.

The Natural Resources Defense Council pointed out some shortcomings from the analyses that were conducted by the regional office. They cautioned against relying on those data to determine the precise occurrences of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper without first incorporating the complete spatial scope of each data source. They provided numerous recommendations that you can see in your briefing book.

The Pew Environment Group also provided comments with recommendations on scientific and socio-economic considerations for designing effective MPAs. They pointed out that properly designed place-based protections can have benefits for a wide range of species and habitats in addition to Warsaw grouper and speckled hind.

One individual offered his personal knowledge on how and where to find speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and maintains that it is possible to avoid these species. This individual suggested the Charleston Bump and the Marathon Hump as potential MPAs. Finally, there were two letters from fishermen addressed to Dr. Koenig that were submitted in support of MPAs.

These folks have been through the process of establishment of the MPAs in the Gulf of Mexico and they support MPAs as management tools for reef fish. They believe fishermen should be involved in their design and establishment. That pretty much wraps up the kinds of comments we received. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

MR. CURRIN: Questions for Myra on the public comments received on this issue? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: What is "complete spatial scope of each data source"; do you have any idea; from NRDC comments, Myra?

MS. BROUWER: I don't have any idea. I would have to call in NRDC to come explain that, and I don't think they're here today.

MR. CURRIN: Any other comments or questions for Myra? All right, it's time to decide how we're going to proceed here, folks. We have got some other presentations from Nick and a couple more items to address if we decide to go forward with consideration of MPAs as a way to address issues regarding speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. Everybody knows where we are.

Regulatory Amendment 11 has passed removing the deepwater closure. Clearly, the fact that the council in the past proceeded to develop and pass Amendment 17B that implemented that deepwater closure, to me at least indicates that the council thought there were additional measures needed to address bycatch issues and protection for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. I guess the question before us now is if the MPAs are a way to address some of those concerns or is there some other way that the council would rather see to address the bycatch issues and reducing harvest and interaction with these species. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: That amendment was passed with the belief that they were undergoing overfishing, right, and we've got evidence now that perhaps they're not?

MR. CURRIN: Well, there certainly are some questions about that now. I guess the SSC has had some discussion on that. They certainly didn't come to any agreement that they believe that they're not undergoing overfishing right now. I guess it kind of depends on which way you want to lean or which side of the fence you want to come down on as to where, but certainly the individual council members can have opinions about that. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: To Doug's point, yes, based on some of the discussion the SSC had, the overfishing criteria was in question. However, given the SSC had given us a zero landings for Warsaw and speckled hind, they still thought that both of those two species were significantly overfished.

Now I don't know that I'm putting words in their mouth but that is what I got out of their discussion about those two species. Even the overfishing definition may be in question, I don't think there was any question in the SSC's mind that both of these animals are still in significant problem and probably overfished.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, are we going to get a presentation on how much area and how many occurrences are going to be covered just by doing the Oculina extensions so we could kind of get our head around how much that might help and whether that might be enough. I'm concerned about the linear closure of the shelf especially off of Georgia where we don't have much bottom inshore.

It could restrict commercial and recreational fishermen to a significant degree. It is going to be hard to figure out something. We have got these points but a lot of our decision I think is going to be subjective on what we feel like we need to do just from looking at everything. I'd kind of like to know what might happen just from the Oculina because we know we need to do that or something.

And that is a two-fer; we'll get coral and we'll get speckled hind and maybe some Warsaw or whatever is in there. If that is enough, then maybe we can look further up and see do we want to tweak or do we want to add, but I'm concerned about the linear amount of break that would be closed if we were to do all of the above.

MR. CURRIN: Keep in mind, Charlie, that extension we're considering on the Oculina is just the HAPC. That is not a closure to fishing and all of that, so that is going to be quite different than just the MPA. The existing experimental closed area in Oculina has – I'm sure we could count those points.

Roger and them may be able to recount those, but those have been in place for a while so that is not an additional benefit. I realize your concern and I think everybody shares a concern about having significant areas of the shelf locked up so that people can't fish. It is going to be a balancing act and it is going to be up to the opinions and the thoughts and actions of the council as to how much of it ends up being considered.

Understandably, the SSC didn't feel comfortable giving us some estimate of some quantitative benefits that we can get from some given area of closure. It's just a hard question and I don't think anybody has got those answers. I'd love to see it. I said, when we first started going down this road, I sure would love to be able to say after it was over with that we've got some quantified benefit.

Maybe one day in the future we'll get to that point but we're not there now. To me it's a matter of whether the council decides that they need to take some additional measures to protect these two species, which as Ben stated are pretty obviously in fairly dire straits. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think you're right, Mac. There is going to be a great deal of uncertainty here and we're going to have to make some judgment calls. It does look to me like there may be some ways we can close some new areas or tweak or adjust some of the ones we already have and pick up some gains and do more for conservation of these species.

I think the trick is going to be seeing if the gains are justified based on the costs of it to our other fisheries and things, and it's probably too soon to say that yet. I think we have indicated all along, since we've worked on Regulator Amendment 11, that we were going to take a look at seeing what more we could do.

I don't think any of us felt like Regulatory Amendment 11 was effective, and our goal here is find something that is more effective. I think, as you point out, it is going to be balancing act and we're going to have to look at the benefits versus the costs. I think to get to that we've got to keep moving the process along, and we're just going to have to make a decision based on our best judgment. I think we ought to keep moving forward with it.

MR. CURRIN: That is the first decision we have to make is whether we think that moving forward with consideration of adding or restructuring or whatever some MPAs to try to better conserve these two species is the way we want to go or if somebody has got some other brilliant idea of an alternative way to proceed.

I haven't been able to come up with a better way to proceed than to consider some closed areas. The SSC can't tell us that it is going to give us this benefit, but it is clear from their discussions that they feel there is some benefit, even though they can't quantify it, to some closed areas. There is some literature that backs that up; that these closed areas provide conservation benefits.

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to point out – and perhaps this will address what Charlie had brought up – that if you take all the existing MPAs into account, 14.6 percent of the occurrences of speckled hind occur within the existing MPAs.

DR. DUVAL: I have lots of comments and questions and things swirling around in my brain about how best to approach this topic, and I think back to the chairman's letter that we all received regarding our process that was outlined for moving forward. One of the things stated in that letter was to first consider expansion of existing MPAs and then look towards potential new areas and spawning season closures.

I think in my mind looking at some of those expansions might be a good first-step, a good-faith approach, but I have a lot of – maybe I'll just jump off here and mention some of the questions that I have and I think some of the information that I would like to see that could help inform whether or not future areas are needed and placement of future areas.

One of the things was looking at the temporal analysis that I brought up. I think that could be informative in terms of habitat modeling. It was something that the SSC mentioned, both a temporal analysis as well as some kind of habitat model to help inform future decisions. In regards to our existing MPAs, I would be interested in hearing from Bonnie and Roy I think the existing surveys that have gone on with regard to the information that we have about those MPAs.

It was my understanding that it is a comprehensive design, looking at – I mean, we have pre-MPA information and post-MPA information, but it's more of a snapshot kind of set of information that we're getting once a year from those MPAs. Maybe I'm wrong about that, but I'd love some commentary on that.

Certainly, it might seem that we might need more comprehensive monitoring inside of our existing MPAs. With regard to the status of these animals – I think Roy spoke to this earlier, but we have very limited really fishery-dependent and fishery-independent information. The no sale provision has been in place since I think 1994 for both of these species; the no harvest provision in place since January of last year.

One of the things that I think about is enforcement and creating disincentives for fishermen to capture these fish. When I was looking at the NOAA summary penalties, fees, we've got a \$1,500 fine per fish for Nassau grouper and Goliath grouper. Why don't we implement something like that or consider permit suspensions.

If we're that serious about protecting these animals, we need to avail ourselves of all potential tools. One thing that was mentioned to me by a fisherman was the potential – and this could get tricky, but a potential tag program for these species; give each fisherman two tags every year for Warsaw grouper and ten tags every year for speckled hind; set up some kind of protocol where they call enforcement as they're coming to the dock; biologists can come and get some dependent and biological information on these fish.

I think we are in an information dearth which is why I asked Carolyn the question earlier about some of these alternative methods that could potentially be used for fish that are maybe not Tier 4. We've got a little bit of extra information but we need a different approach. And then also looking at – I was just perusing some of the Gulf landings of Warsaw grouper and speckled hind during that same time timeframe where we have had the no sale provision in place.

Based on the comments from the listing decisions, if these are really a unit stock throughout the Gulf and South Atlantic, it seems like we ought to be able to pool that information to do some kind of – I don't want to say stock assessment, but some kind of update as to the biological status of these two species. I'm just curious why there is not more pressure in the Gulf to take action.

Why is all the pressure coming here? I've got more to say, but I'll just leave it at that because I've been rambling on for a while.

MR. CURRIN: You can continue to ramble if you'd like; you make some good points, Michelle.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Michelle's points, I think those two fish that they used to catch, they're dead discards, they're going to float. If we could get those brought in and the local DNR people could come and – or they're frozen or whatever and we could start getting some biological information off that along with exact locations on where they're caught, that starts telling us a lot more. I don't think discard logs are going to be nearly as accurate as what people could bring us a couple of fish. We're not going to hurt the stocks because they're not going to live, anyway.

The small Georgia MPA that they talked about as a possible addition, I thought I heard them say that was 82 square miles. I don't want to know what a big one is because that sounds like ten or twelve miles along the break and maybe seven miles wide or something. That is a huge chunk of area to me. It is not that I want to say no to MPAs.

I think some things might could be tweaked, but I sure would like to get some extra information and some hard data, bring in some fish somehow, like some kind of methodology like Michelle talked about so we can really know – if we're going to shoot something, we want to know what we're shooting at and not use a shotgun approach.

DR. DUVAL: To Charlie's point and following up, I kind of put out there that, yes, here are all these concerns and sort of questions that I would like to see answered. I realize we always operate in an information deficit, but I think if we were to take a phased approach and look at going out with expansions to our existing areas and try to get some of these things and the ball rolling on answering some of these other things. Then the next phase could be looking at some newer areas. That is kind of what I was suggesting.

MR. HARTIG: Well, from my perspective having fishing for some of these animals, not so much speckled hind but Warsaw, there isn't any question in my mind that it is significantly overfished. That discussion from the SSC has put a question in my mind. I also snowy fish also, so I know about the effort reductions we have seen in those fisheries that overfishing possibly may not be occurring any longer, but we need to know that. We need to characterize that.

We need to look at those kinds of data at how the regulatory impacts have impacted the deepwater fishery over time. I think we can do that; we can look at those types of things. But the question in my mind – and I support Roy – is I don't think there is any question that we don't need to move forward on MPAs. Now, having said that, there is a whole lot of uncertainty in these discussions, and this council has been held to the fire on the basis of science over these last four or five years in particular.

Science isn't going to solve the question in this particular case, which is going to be tough. As Roy said, there are going to be judgment calls to go along with this MPA. But having said that, get the most amount of science and what comes up with that. And what points to Charlie's point about Oculina is maybe the HAPC isn't going to give us anymore occurrences, but I think the

Gilmore work, someone who worked in that area for years and years and who did the initial work there with the subs, will give you a lot more occurrences in that area and will bump the percentage of occurrences up in Oculina that were already closed.

I think as we go down this road and we continue to do this, if we have some kind of decision tree or some kind of way that we want to move forward, I think we can get there and I think that we will find out a lot of information as we go that we may be in better shape than we thought at the beginning of this process.

MR. CURRIN: And I agree with you, Ben, I think if we do start down this road and we make a concerted effort to contact people like Grant Gilmore and the museums and anywhere else we can get information about the occurrence of these species and get some more dots on those maps, we can make a better decision.

It wouldn't surprise me as well that it will not end up being nearly as painful as a lot of people envision at this point. Well, we've got to decide whether this is how we're going to or not. If it is the desire of the committee, perhaps a motion to move forward with consideration of development of MPAs to address conservation concerns of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper would be in order or something to that effect. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: So moved; can you word that, Myra?

MR. CURRIN: I think that will work. The motion by Ben is that the committee recommends moving forward with consideration of MPAs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper; second by David. Discussion? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: So are we to select MPAs that would be taken out for August public hearings today, then?

MR. CURRIN: I don't know; I mean if you want to, you can if that is the way the committee and the council want to proceed. I'm not sure of the timeline on this. I know there was some urgency and we were hoping to be done by the December meeting, so I don't know where that kind of throws us or put us. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that is the question because I don't think we're going to have a document ready to go to public hearing, but I don't want to wait around a long time. I think when we get the document ready to go to public hearings we ought to hold public hearings. I'm afraid we're getting too rigid in terms of when we hold public hearings rather than deciding we will have public hearings when the documents are ready. I can't see how we're at a point right now to go to public hearings.

MR. CURRIN: I think we can make a lot of headway, Doug. I think with the input that we've received so far we can develop a slate of alternatives. We are, keep in mind, going to have two more workshops where we're going to receive additional input from both Florida and further up the coast in North Carolina, so that may alter some things or reinforce some things. Certainly,

we shouldn't make any final decisions before we get that input from the participants and the fishermen. Myra, you wanted to say something about timing.

MS. BROUWER: I think you've covered what I was going to say. It would be useful for staff, however, if you gave us some guidance of maybe a handful of alternatives that we could develop at this meeting so we can get started with the analysis.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think we can make some headway at this meeting. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, just to say the intent of this motion was not to set up the same timeline that we were under before; because for me having attended that workgroup and seeing the progress we made and seeing the things that we did not get done, I think there is merit in bringing that workgroup back together at a later time in this process.

There was a lot of discussion that didn't occur because of the time constraints we had that we needed to have; some of it on life history, some of it on species-specific places. Certainly, we could benefit from that workshop coming together. I don't think anybody disagreed that I talked to in that workshop that wouldn't be a good idea.

The other thing we heard today from the SSC was that was their first shot at this when they say it, and they're looking forward to seeing it again in October. Maybe that is too early, but we'll just have to go down the timeline. I think we ought to look at a timeline on what we expect if we make this decision to go down that path.

MR. CURRIN: Did we get a second to your motion? David seconded; that's right. David.

MR. CUPKA: I was just going to suggest that maybe we ought to do kind of an incremental approach where we would have a range of alternatives; one being maybe just realigning some and then maybe looking at some new ones and then maybe a combination of those. I would like to see this done incrementally and not just jump in with both feet, because I think there are too many unknowns and too many other things that we need to look at. I would like to see an approach like that so you could see staff put together something along those lines.

MR. CURRIN: That makes a lot of sense to me as well, and Michelle brought that point forward as well. Further discussion on this motion? Tom Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: I was concerned about supporting the motion but the discussion around the table has made me feel more comfortable about it with everything that is going on here and what the South Atlantic has done to protect these species and in relation to what is going on in the Gulf. It seems like if we're not going to public hearings at this round and gather more data and make the best informed decision that we could make, I would support it.

MR. HARTIG: Just one more thing that I think is of utmost importance and something for the public to key in on, both of these species have gone before to be listed; they have been petitioned to be listed. Now, some of the comment we have gotten back is, well, they didn't even list them,

in a fishery you don't even want to get to the listing stage. That is the key thing, never get to the listing stage.

We're already there, so we have to take some additional steps to make sure that these fish do not get listed; that we don't have choke species that completely destroy our reef fish fishery in the future. We will have an insurance policy where we will have enough of these animals in the ocean.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think you intended to say you don't want to ever get to the petition stage and we're already there, yes.

MR. HARTIG: Right.

MR. CURRIN: We certainly don't want to get to the listing stage. **Further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** All right, let's take a ten-minute break.

MR. CURRIN: Let's get the committee back to the table and come to order. Now that we have some direction as to how we're going to proceed and where we're going to some degree at least, Dr. Nick Farmer is here with a presentation on trying to help us get to the point where we can decide on what percentage of an area we think is adequate to provide the necessary protection, either looking at habitat or occurrence. Nick, we're happy to have you here. There are a couple of attachments here, 6E and 6F, and you can let us know where we need to be.

DR. FARMER: I guess in your briefing book there should be a presentation attachment which would be South Atlantic CE-BA 3 –

MR. CURRIN: That's Attachment 6F and it is under the presentations under the snapper grouper tab.

DR. FARMER: This presentation basically is a continuation of things that I've presented to you on Regulatory Amendment 11 and follow-ups to that. I have attempted to basically address comments from the council, SERO, the science center, NRDC's extensive comments, and also comments recently given to us after presenting this to the SSC.

There was a letter from the council to NMFS. There were a couple of things requested. Among them were provide guidance on what percentage of occurrence or habitat is appropriate to be closed and develop a way to model the distribution of catches within the statistical grids, such that once you guys choose an area we could determine the percent of catch by sector that would be impacted.

The first question basically was posed to the SSC and I think that our response from SERO would be very similar to the SSC's response, which is it is difficult to say what percentage of habitat is appropriate or necessary given how old the assessment is for these two stocks and how limited the data is.

I will provide some examples from literature from various marine reserve peer-reviewed studies that provide some recommendations for percentages of stock and/or habitat that should be protected in order to provide some buffer against uncertainty and to provide buffers against overexploitation. Clearly, these are species that do suffer from bycatch mortality due to the depth of their occurrence.

They are caught with species that are still open for harvest in the snapper grouper fishery and they do suffer from bycatch mortality, so MPAs are one method that certainly would benefit them, but determining what percentage of habitat needs to be closed is something that we couldn't specifically quantify. Then I will show you some approaches towards how we might model the distribution of catches within statistical grids once you develop some MPA alternatives.

I think you guys understand that stocks in the South Atlantic don't occur uniformly across the managed area within the South Atlantic; so in order to determine the impacts of a closed area we're going to need some closed areas for consideration. One of the requests was what would be the impacts of closing 10, 20, 30 or 40 percent of the habitat.

Well, the question that I would have would be, well, where is that 10, 20, 30 or 40 percent going to be located, how big are each of those areas going to be, because there is a variety of different things that will go into what the impacts of that will be. Those impacts will be different depending on what stocks we're talking about. Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Just one clarification; the question that was posed to you was not reductions based on 10, 20, 30 or 40 percent of the area. It was if landings were reduced by 10, 20, 30 and percent.

DR. FARMER: Right, so landings of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, but there wouldn't be any landings of speckled hind or Warsaw grouper because the ACL is zero; but if you're talking about removals of them, that also is going to be spatially dependent. We have a distribution of points along the South Atlantic Shelf that would suggest that these things occur from the Keys all the way up to the North Carolina/Virginia Border.

If you closed 40 percent of that and that whole 40 percent were off North Carolina, that would be very different than closing 40 percent off the Florida Keys in terms of its impacts on various stocks.

MR. WAUGH: Right, but the question we asked was what would the financial impacts be if landings of snapper grouper species were reduced by 10, 20, 30 and 40 percent so that the council would have an idea of the impacts of that range of reductions, so that they had that here. I was just clarifying what the question was.

DR. FARMER: And I guess I'm still a little confused by the question; and maybe the council, as we talk about this and go through this presentation, can help me understand a little bit better what you're looking for. If you're seeking to reduce speckled hind and Warsaw grouper by certain percentage checkpoints, that may or may not reduce other snapper grouper stocks by comparable

percentages; likely by significantly less of a percentage if you're efficiently siting these speckled hind and Warsaw grouper closures.

Obviously, like I said, if you center those closures off of certain areas, they may have a bigger percent impact on, say, red porgy than they would on blueline tilefish or other stocks. Anyway, we'll move through here and I'll show you some maps of not only where speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are being caught but also some of your associated species, and I think you will kind of get the gist of where I'm going with that.

In looking at these questions, some of the things we were asking were, well, what data are available, what species are caught with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper because those would be the ones that would be impacted by closures, where are speckled hind and Warsaw grouper caught in terms of depth and area.

If we're going to close them, how much area, how long, should they be rotating closures, should we go for one large closure or a couple of large closures or a network of smaller one, how should closure areas be identified and how would we quantify their impacts? This presentation will attempt to address some of those questions.

I think the primary question here is, well, how much do we need to close, right? Well, I think that is tied to what the stock status is or at least what it is perceived to be, so I wanted to give you a bit of a background with regards to the stock status of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper in the South Atlantic.

You heard Chris Koenig give some very flattering comments to Grimes, et al, 1982's report. Speckled hind were captured in 58 percent of the sets there in the 1970's and they were the fourth most common shelf-edge stock and the most common grouper on the shelf edge off of North Carolina and South Carolina on those rocky outcrops. I'd say that is a far cry from where we are today in terms of speckled hind.

In 8.5 percent of sets Warsaw grouper were observed. They were the 19th most common within that North Carolina to South Carolina area, and that is based on data again from the 1970's. Manooch and Mason in 1987 looked at the entire South Atlantic based on data from the seventies to eighties and concluded only that there were inadequate data for a YPR model for Warsaw grouper.

Even back then there just wasn't enough data to do a relatively simple version of an assessment model on that stock. Huntsman, et al, in 1992 looked at data from North Carolina to North Florida in 1988 through 1990 and they found that SPR for speckled hind declined from 25 percent to 12 percent; whereas, Warsaw grouper increased SPR from 0.2 percent to 6 percent. Obviously those are both still pretty low.

Potts, et al, in 1998 from North Carolina to North Florida used data from 1996 to conclude that speckled hind had decreased from the 12 percent down to 8 percent; and then Potts and Brennan updated that and found that SPR had declined again to 5 percent. Ruderhausen, et al, in 2008 did a study in Onslow Bay, North Carolina, where they compared 1970's data to 2005/2006 fishing

data and found that in sites where speckled hind and Warsaw grouper had been caught in the past, they were no longer found.

Ziskin, et al, in 2011 from North Carolina to Central Florida, 1977 through 2007 data, found that there were enough trends to conclude that speckled hind were likely still overexploited. The trends they observed were increased fishing mortality. They saw no mature fish, and they also observed reduced size at age over that time period. Those all those are pretty big red flags.

One of the quotes from Ziskin, et al, was as long as speckled hind continue to be caught in the deepwater reef fishery they will continue to experience high post-release mortality and dramatic improvements in the status of the population should not be expected. One of the things that the SSC had asked us to look at was, well, are the impacts of the other management measures in the South Atlantic that have into place since the Ziskin data, which is the most recent of the studies, was conducted.

Since then we've have had a couple of MPAs implemented. We have got a red porgy closure. We have got shallow water grouper closures. We've got a vermilion snapper closure. Then we have the ACL being set equal to zero. What we have here on the top in this graphic is speckled hind as a stacked area graph, so the overall magnitude is the top of these peaks and then the breakout of the different levels of discards by fishery are denoted by the different colors.

This is the number of fish discarded in the commercial, which is purple – and I want to note that I only had the ability to use the commercial discard program from 2002 onward so there may be commercial discards prior to here. There likely would be but I have no way of computing those because we didn't have a supplemental discard logbook for the commercial sector prior to that.

We've got commercial discards in purple; we've got recreational discards in this blue color, and then we have recreational landings in numbers in this gray color. You can see kind of bouncy, highly variable trend, which I guess you would expect given that it is, one, survey MRFSS data for the most part, and there was also a great deal of variability, and then on top of that you've got a variety of management measures overlaid on that.

You do see what appears to be a bit of a falling off from the 2007 through 2010 time period, but you also get this uptick in recreational discards from 2010 through 2011. And then on the bottom here you have commercial landings that have been reported, and you can see a big decline there, which makes sense given the management measures and the harvest prohibition that went into effect back in 1994.

Here is the same graphics for Warsaw grouper. You can see not only the magnitude is different but also the trend is much more pronounced in terms of historical relatively high and then a big dramatic falling off basically from the early nineties onward. There are a variety of analytical challenges when looking at speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

I've spoken to you guys about this before, but there are a few new members so I want to go over it again. There is limited fishery-independent data in the South Atlantic. There is limited observer data and there is limited species ID prior to 1992. All of these are bad things when you

consider there was a prohibition of sale in 1994, so the incentive to bring them in or report them and all that basically vanishes right around the same time period as we would have been collecting species-specific information on them.

There was also limited discard information. We don't have a lot of depth-specific or spatially resolved data. There is disproportional effort where we don't have a lot of effort out beyond the shelf edge where these things may have been the most abundant in the past. We also have an ontogenetic shift in the life history for these stocks where you've got the juveniles in where the bulk of the snapper fishery is taking place, but then the adults move offshore and we don't get a lot of information on them.

We also have patterns of historical overexploitation, which means that the current distribution of the stock may not represent the historical distribution. Now with that being said, we did have a lot of data sources that we could pull from, and they all tell a very similar story, so it is not all bad news.

The commercial logbook, we've got information on discards from 2001 through 2011, so we looked at those. We have depth information from 2005 to present, so we had some information there. We've got the headboat logbooks; we've got reef fish observer; we have MARMAP; we have ALS, Florida trip ticket, Georgia and South Carolina and North Carolina trip ticket; ROV surveys; reports from fishermen; SEFIS; Reef Observer Program Data; the Reef Fish Visual Census.

We have got an ROV program in Oculina Banks; we've got stuff done by Manooch back in the seventies; and we have some submarine observations from George Sedberry. Those are all going to be rolled into all the various maps I'm going to show you later. We've got a lot of information and we do tend to get more every day. Basically, every time I think I'm done making this presentation, I get a new e-mail with some more data.

Speckled hind and Warsaw grouper were closely associated in all these data sources that we looked at. They had relatively low associations with blueline tilefish and snowy grouper. We saw some association with Warsaw grouper, misty grouper and shallow water groupers. We saw some association with speckled hind with vermilion snapper, red grouper, scamp, porgies and grunts.

These are the top co-occurring species with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper by sector, so we've got commercial and headboat information here. MRFSS doesn't really catch much in the way of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper presumably because they're deeper and a lot of those private recreational guys especially aren't going that far offshore.

We have got red porgy, scamp, vermilion snapper, greater amberjack, gag, red snapper; those are kind of the big key species in terms of frequency of occurrence. I'll be showing you some images of where those species occur later so you can kind of gauge impacts of MPAs in various places on those stocks.

In terms of depth of capture, we saw them from zero to 640 feet for speckled hind and 80 to 480 feet for Warsaw grouper. We found that encounters were more likely deeper than 160 feet, and there were a variety of things confounding that analysis, which I have already kind of spoken about.

The reason the depth of capture is important is because we think that barotrauma is the main source of release mortality for these stocks, and that is why we're considering MPAs in the first place. The reason I show this graph is because gag grouper is pretty well studied with regards to the impacts of barotrauma on it. It has got a relatively similar body structure and a relatively similar life history compared to Warsaw grouper and speckled hind.

It is kind of the most comparable species I could find that had a good barometric curve. What you can see for gag is once you get out to about 25 or 30 fathoms that is when you're getting into the 40 to 50 percent release mortality rate. My recommendation would be is if you're going to consider MPAs to reduce bycatch mortality for a species you probably want to put them in water depths where bycatch mortality is a concern; so 25 to about a hundred fathoms would be a good area to start looking at.

Here are a few more arguments for why that is the case. If you look at size of the fish versus depth here – and these red lines here are the L-50 line, so that is the length at 50 percent maturity. And then here on the Warsaw grouper image we have the minimum length at maturity and we also have some observed spawning fish. So this is length in inches on the Y axis and then depth in fathoms on the X axis.

This is a merged MARMAP and Reef Fish Observer Program data set. What you can see here is that your mature fish for speckled hind really just starts showing up after 25 fathoms. All the fish over this line basically are beyond about 20 to 25 fathoms. If you're looking to protect mature fish, which are going to be the ones that spawning and supporting the recovery of the population, they're out in those deeper waters where they're the most vulnerable to bycatch mortality.

The same deal with Warsaw grouper; if you look at this line here, which is a logistical line fit to the size at depth, and this minimum length at maturity line, all of those observations for the most part above the line are occurring outside of about 25 fathoms. Your spawning fish, the only ones ever observed in spawning condition at least by a scientific survey are out beyond 90 fathoms, so that is why I said a hundred fathoms might be kind of your outer edge for a closed area.

Now, if you look at the distribution of fishing effort in the South Atlantic, the snapper grouper fishery for the most part operates in this area described by this white bar area, so this domed area with a peak in the 80 to 120 foot range that extends out. You can see that the observations of speckled hind in red are shifted slightly to the right and the observations of Warsaw grouper are shifted even deeper.

There are a couple of things you can conclude from that. One is that speckled hind and Warsaw grouper occur for the most part a little bit deeper than the core of the snapper grouper fishery. Another would be that using snapper grouper fishery data to get information about speckled hind

and Warsaw grouper is going to be a little bit challenging because they're not perfectly sampled by the snapper grouper fishery.

But, with that said, we do have a lot of data sources; and when you plot them out they show a pretty consistent pattern. Now, if you've got this up on your laptop, it's probably a lot easier to see, but this is a graph of speckled hind occurrences on the left would be all the data that we have so far for speckled hind in terms of where they occur.

The red X's are headboat and those have been aggregated into low, medium, high and highest by standard deviations in terms of the total number of observations. That would be our least precise data source that I plotted on this graph. That basically is reported to 1/36th of a lat/long stat area, and I would say that reports in terms of the location of the catch are not super reliable.

They get you kind of in the ballpark, but they may not be exactly precise especially for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. The other point observations are actual lat/long observations and you can see a very consistent trend emerging there. They're all basically stacking up in that 25 to a hundred fathom range with a couple of occurrences inside and outside, but basically they're occurring on the shelf edge in the South Atlantic. I think that makes a lot of sense if you think about the life history of the species and listen to the fishermen tell you where they used to encounter them. Yes.

MR. JOLLEY: What does HBS on the chart here mean?

DR. FARMER: The data sources in here, HBS is headboat survey, so that is our least precise data source and that is why it is kind of buried at the bottom. That kind of shows you the geographic range of the stock, but I wouldn't necessarily use that to gauge exactly where fish are occurring.

And then within there you also have spawning fish observed by Ziskin and reported in his 2008 masters thesis; so that you see these here, these are those purple stars; and then you've got the SEFIS Program with some trap observations and video observations. You've got MARMAP with the blue squares here; Oculina ROV study down here inside Oculina. It is underneath reserve so it is hard to see but it is in there.

And then Sedberry with some submarine observations; deepwater MPA surveys; and Manooch's study back in the 1970's; Reef Fish Observer Program are those yellow triangles; and then Rusty Hudson, who is in the back here, reported some stuff. I want to comment that I spoke with Rusty actually before coming on, and I should have included his points over here on the right as well because apparently they're still being observed there.

One of the things I wanted to stress with the comparison of these two graphics is there has been a lot of talk of a temporal analysis and a lot of concern about a geographic compression of the stock distribution. I'm not really seeing that when I look at these graphs. Now part of that is being driven by the fact that we have reef fish observer program data that is only from 2006 to 2010, and that is a lot of the observations.

But even within the MARMAP data I would say we're seeing less information, which makes sense because we're truncating the time period by two-thirds, but the overall geographic distribution and spatial spread of the stock does not appear to be much different between these two graphics.

Moving on to Warsaw grouper, you actually see a very similar trend, just a whole lot less occurrences; but in terms of occurrence you see it on the shelf edge for the most part, out in that 25 to a hundred fathom range. We have an observation reported spawning area by Don DeMaria down here off of Key West that he refers to as Warsaw Hole. He said that they're still observing Warsaw grouper out there.

What I'm going to do now is I'll move into a bit more description of how we might compute the impacts of MPAs and show you some better resolution maps. In terms of spatially protecting these stocks, if bycatch is still a concern, 25 to a hundred fathoms is a good place to look for MPAs.

A couple of reasons why; there is a higher probability of encounters statistically of encountering these stocks in that range. There is also like a greater than a 50 percent release mortality rate and there is probably a greater percentage of mature fish. Protecting those things is all good. Alignment in size, well, we would look at covering the shelf edge and we'd want to design the reserves to be efficient and enforceable.

Some things that are cues for efficiency, if you have an MPA it's performance is going to be degraded if you make it too small and fish are going to be able to move out of it. If their natural movement patterns and home range requirements are substantially larger than the reserve or approximately the same size as the reserve, there is going to be a lot of spillover.

Fishermen do tend to fish the edges of MPAs because the MPAs get a buildup in biomass, so you get that spillover of adults. As they compete against each other, they go seeking new habitats, so what you're going to want to do is you're going to want to design your reserves to have a buffer. In terms of selecting a location, you want to probably look both at places where there are documented occurrences and also you want to look at and consider documented hard bottom habitat.

You'd probably want to extend or modify existing MPAs as well as looking at creating an MPA network. In terms of how much area to close, this is about as good as I can get you without a stock assessment. First you want to kind of define what you mean by area, right; what stages of the population are you trying to protect?

We've kind of talked about that and I'd say you're looking at stages that are vulnerable to bycatch mortality. In terms of defining a target closure percentage, we've got recommendations from the literature ranging from 8 to 75 percent. The higher recommendations are from situations where there is a lot of fishing pressure outside of the reserve.

That isn't the case in the South Atlantic. We've got an ACL of zero on these stocks outside of the reserves, so you probably don't need to go all the way up to that 75 percent because it is not a

free-for-all outside of there. It is actually a zero harvest scenario. In terms of being strategic in design, they need to be enforceable and community support is critical.

When you consider the size of the South Atlantic and how limited enforcement is, if you don't have the buy-in from fishermen, you have a reserve on paper but in terms of what is going on out on the water is anybody's guess. You don't want to place your reserve in a sink. You don't want to put it into a habitat where the fish are going to go in there; and when they spawn, that spawning is not going to help boost the population.

You don't want to put it in a place where they're not going to spawn at all. Providing an adequate buffer relative to movement is important. I actually did my dissertation on movement of fish in reserves and found that with realistic movement patterns MPAs can have a pretty good impact; but if you take those realistic movements and you double them and triple them, the benefits of MPAs are eroded pretty quickly.

Here are the examples from the literature. This is mostly from Marine Protected Areas; Tools for Sustaining Ocean Ecosystems" from 2001. What I have done here is I've plotted a bunch of peer-reviewed studies on the X axis and then the closure recommendation on the Y axis. The trend that emerges is basically 20 to 50 percent is kind of the core range that people were recommending.

There were scenarios like I mentioned where there is no protection on the outside of the reserve where they were recommending higher. There were some scenarios where they were recommending lower. Basically, the current thinking on MPAs in terms of the target size was best summarized I think by the FAO's recent statement on them, which is that the amount of area depends on the objectives of the MPAs, the nature of the protection outside of the MPAs and the biology of the species.

There is no one size fits all answer for the appropriate size, scale or number of MPAs. In terms of designing within that context of uncertainty, siting is important. I would say be strategic. You want it in a good site because if you put it in a bad site you're going to redistribute effort on the source.

You have some MPAs, for example, in the South Atlantic right now that don't really have any habitat or observations that would be good for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, so those in effect would be pushing effort on to speckled hind and Warsaw grouper by redistributing it. If you were to implement some new MPAs that didn't really cover places where speckled hind and Warsaw grouper were and weren't in a habitat suitable for them, again that's going to push effort on to speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

In terms of where to put them, also you want to look at encompassing past observations and critical habitats. Obviously, the better the habitat the more fish it could probably hold so you're looking at carrying capacity there. You want to cover adult habitats and spawning grounds if you can identify them. And if you think about it, networking is always good for business.

In terms of size, the guidance has always been go big or go home for marine reserves, and that is because a small reserve basically provides very little protection, if any, against fishing pressure because the fish will move, fishermen can line up along the boundaries, they can bait them and chum them up.

If you're catching stuff along the edges there, you're going to catch a lot of the population that is inside there as well. A big reserve will also help restore natural ecosystem dynamics and it will cost less per unit area to establish and to enforce. In terms of shape, you want to keep it simple. One of the things that is kind of a new thing with tracking technologies is natural barriers to movement have shown up in some recent studies.

For example, in my work I found that black grouper, red grouper and a couple of snapper species down in the Dry Tortugas did not like moving across really large sand channels. They like to stay over contiguous reef. If you know where the habitat is you can be a bit more specific about where you put the reserve; and if you align its boundaries with those natural barriers to movement, fish obviously don't care about state jurisdictions, they don't care about lines on a map, but they do respond to habitat queues.

I think as I start showing you some high-resolution habitat images you will see that the occurrence of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper really stacks up on high habitats, nice habitat features. We came up with an approach for identifying important habitats for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper that I think is pretty good considering the limitations of the data that we had available.

One of the issues that we were running into when first looking at all this information is we've got a ton of data sources, they're all limited and they all very biased. We've got geographic bias, we've got gear bias, and so how can we control for all of that. If you look at just points, one of the points that you're going to run into is that a lot of the point samples from recent years especially are from studies that have been funded to evaluate the impacts of the new MPAs that have been implemented in the South Atlantic, so the sampling has been occurring in and around the current MPAs.

If you're looking at just the total number of points contained within any given MPA, you're going to get a high number within current MPAs and around them because that is where we've been looking, so our lat/long specific information is going to be tied to those areas. In order to kind of reduce the impacts of that and put all these data sources on a level playing field, we did what basically is a preliminary kind of version of a habitat suitability analysis.

I broke the South Atlantic into polygons that were ten minutes high, which is about 1/36th of a lat/long area here, and five fathoms wide using the coastal relief model, which is kind of the best bathymetric model that we have. Then I assigned the habitats a grade of yes, maybe, no or unknown for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper in terms of whether it was a viable or suitable habitat.

Habitat would be categorized as yes if it contained a point observation of a speckled hind or a Warsaw grouper. It would be assigned a maybe if it had no point observations and had fewer

than five samples, but it contained hard bottom, potential hard bottom that's from the SEAMAP survey or a slope from a more recent bathymetric sample that was the mean slope for a SEAMAP-graded hard bottom or higher than that slope; or, if it contained a headboat observation so it creates this maybe field as well, which gives you a bit more of a buffer against, well, we may not have every looked there but it could be a speckled hind or Warsaw grouper habitat and it might actually contain some.

And then I graded some as no and that would be if there were greater than five point observations in there with no actual speckled hind or Warsaw grouper observed or if there were no hard bottom or potential hard bottom. And then if there were never a sample taken there or there was no habitat ID, it was graded as unknown.

Although we can't provide you with a target percentage habitat that you should be looking at closing, I could say that we definitely can at least provide a pretty good guess of what percentage has already been closed, and that is what this table is intended to provide. Basically we're looking at the habitat area that we have defined, which is 25 to a hundred fathoms.

We've got area containing speckled hind and kilometer squared here for the South Atlantic. A whole lot of it is unknown; some of it is no, maybe and yes for a total of 23,592 square kilometers. Of that, yes and maybe comprise as 5,950 square kilometers of that 25 to a hundred fathom range.

In terms of being MPAs, we've got 436 of that 5,850 already in MPAs in the South Atlantic; so for speckled hind we're at 7 percent of the yes and maybe habitat already contained. Now, like I said, if you look at just points, 10 percent is already in there if you look at just those yeses, places where we've definitely seen speckled hind, so you're either at 10 percent or you're at 7 percent, maybe somewhere in between. In terms of area containing Warsaw grouper, you've got 8 percent of the yes, 7 percent of the yes and maybe already in MPAs. Yes.

MR. HAYMANS: Question; is this an updated presentation that you're giving us beyond what was in the briefing book?

MR. JOLLEY: Our table is a little different.

DR. FARMER: In the table in the briefing book, what I did is I only had at that point the SEAMAP habitat categorizations; so then I got this huge – right after I sent it out, within 20 minutes after I sent it out, I got an e-mail from George Sedberry NOAA has now made available all of our multibeam bathymetric data from the entire South Atlantic.

I went through and pulled that out and went through and recategorized all the habitat so where SEAMAP had defined some habitats as unknown, I went in and looked at the slope of the bathymetry within those habitats and reassigned them if they were at a high enough slope, if they were at the slope that the SEAMAP samples had come out as a hard bottom habitat, then they were recategorized as maybe in terms of their habitat type, so they might be hard bottom.

There is a slight change in the dynamic between unknown, no and maybe in this table. This right here is an image of point observations off of North Carolina relative to depth. You can see the depth in fathoms receding out to that hundred fathom line. I've actually drawn a little bit darker line here for the 25 fathom break, so you can see the 25 fathom break and the point observations, which are the black X's and crosses, so the crosses are Warsaw grouper and the X's are speckled hind, seemed to be stacking up in that 25 to a hundred fathom range.

You can see that the headboat stuff is kind of all over the map. Those are the red things. And then underneath all that you can see these kind of light gray circles. Those are places where there were samples but there were no observations. If you look at the habitat underneath that, one other thing that is interesting is that the blueline tilefish fishery is up here and you can see there is not a whole lot of hard bottom up here according to SEAMAP; whereas there is nice hard bottom in 25 to a hundred fathoms out here along this shelf break here.

Once I graded it out, this is how it came out for speckled hind. You can see the 25 fathom line, which is the dark line here, the yes habitat is in red, the maybe is in yellow and the no's in blue and then unknown is kind of the transparent color. And then for Warsaw grouper, there it is. So basically I guess my recommendation would be is you're going to be looking at reserves when you're looking at these maps, you should be thinking, okay, well, we're going to get a lot of bang for our buck probably out of covering these red habitats, which are the yeses; and we might also get some benefit out covering areas that are yellow, which are the maybes.

Off of South Carolina, we have got a lot more information mostly because the Reef Fish Observer Program and MARMAP have sampled pretty extensively out there, and we also have a lot of deepwater MPA surveys and stuff that have gone out there. You can see a huge smattering of point observations off of South Carolina.

You can see that basically there are some areas where they lump. We also have some reported speckled hind spawning locations from Ziskin, which are these purple stars; and we have some Warsaw grouper potential spawning observations, which are these yellow stars. I'm going to zoom in on a couple of these areas in a minute. Here is the SEAMAP and also some NOAA bathymetric stuff from the South Carolina shelf edge.

Zooming in on it, so if you look at this graphic, this is the northern South Carolina MPA here and this is the Edisto MPA here, and there is this big habitat feature right here, so I'm zooming in on that. You can see the SEAMAP information here in the grays and stripy grays. Gray is hard bottom and then the stripy gray is potential hard bottom, and then you can see these red peaks here. These are what appear to be hard bottom habitat features.

What is really interesting about it is if you really zoom in on it, within Edisto you can see there is actually a hard bottom feature than runs right here and the points just stack right up on top of it; and then up north of the reserve there is this other kind of hard bottom ridge with a bunch of little peaks on it, and there is a ton of observations stacking up on there.

Down here there is another ridge with some observations and then down here there is another ridge. What is interesting about this I think is not only if you look at the SEAMAP stuff it seems

to confirm that the SEAMAP categorizations are pretty good because you do see SEAMAP graded out as hard bottom underneath these features, but you can also see how there is definitely some opportunities for reconfiguration or expansion of this reserve to capture some more hard bottom features.

The take-home message is if you reconfigure Edisto or some of these other MPAs, don't forget about these deeper water habitats. I don't think they're fished all that hard so removing them from protection might not be – you might not get a huge socio-economic boost from that, but you do have some observations of spawning fish out in those deeper waters.

Here is the northern South Carolina MPA and you can see again some spawning fish reported, and then you also have this really dramatic habitat feature here with this big ridge, and you can see all these observations stacking up on there and then also this inshore feature here. You also have again a lot of spawning observations in the deeper waters out there.

Off of South Carolina you see a lot of habitat graded out as yes for speckled hind and then the maybe is in the yellow; no's in blue; and then the transparent stuff again is unknown. For Warsaw grouper you also have a lot of yeses and then the maybe is in yellow and then the no's and the unknowns are transparent.

Then off Georgia and northeast Florida you've got the Georgia MPA here, and one thing that is interesting to note right away is there are no observations in there. Then you've got the Deepwater MPA up here off South Carolina and no observations in there. Just inside of the Georgia MPA you've got a lot of observations and then south of it you've got a big clustering of observations and then they just follow the shelf edge down into the North Florida MPA and then below that.

Now this area right in here is among the best studied and so I'll get into that in a minute, but you can see SEAMAP we've got a lot of hard bottom. That's the black here. And then Andy David's group has pulled some data from the U.S. Navy and NOAA and kind of aggregated that and really did some nice habitat mapping around here.

You can see this kind of pinkish feature here. That is rock and rubble habitat, so you can see the observations of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper here, and you've got Warsaw grouper in here, which is neat to see. You can see those stacking up right there on that categorized rock habitat and then up here as well. Again off of Georgia here is speckled hind grading out as yes, maybe and no and then Warsaw grouper as yes, maybe and no.

Southeast Florida, we've got the Oculina Experimental Closed Area. Now, I didn't include all of Oculina Bank and I didn't evaluate the Oculina extension because as currently worded the regulations for those would not protect speckled hind and Warsaw grouper from bycatch. If those were changed and expanded to kind of more of a no take, no bottom fishing type area, then those would certainly provide additional protection for those species.

But we do have some observations within the Oculina Bank so that is getting a lot of credit there as a closed area. Obviously, we've got a lot of hard bottom in that area, and so speckled hind

you can see here right along the shelf edge and then Warsaw grouper here, and you can see that the Warsaw grouper observations actually are also a little bit north of it.

And then the Florida Keys we've got really just some observations here and then the Warsaw Hole, which is believed to be a spawning ground. You can see you've got a lot of hard bottom in the Keys. I think anybody who has dove there that comes as no surprise. And then I think one of the things that I wanted to mention here is you can see all this gray right here.

Those are all samples taken by Reef and the NOAA, University of Miami, Florida Fish and Wildlife Reef Visual Census Program. So we've got two observations from Reef in over 20 years of sampling and we have zero observations within diveable depths in the Keys from the Reef Visual Census in over 35 years of sampling.

That again really leads me to the conclusion that really 25 to a hundred fathoms is more where we want to be looking. Here is the Warsaw grouper habitat for the Keys. In terms of MPA selection, I have kind of an approach that I think might work in terms of ranking out how these MPAs are potentially performing once you develop some alternatives.

This is kind of a hypothetical example of how you would do kind of an ad hoc CPUE approach to ranking MPAs. You'd draw some MPAs and you count the ratios of the points to samples for all the point data in the MPAs, and then you standardize those and average across them. Now, Jim Berkson of the SSC had recommended let's look at some various weighting factors for those different data sets and how we standardize them.

I think the SSC recommended at minimum let's try to develop kind of an aggregated fishery-independent and fishery-dependent ranking of CPUE. Here is some kind of pretend MPAs with an area assigned to them and then how much of that area is yes, how much is maybe, and then what percentage of the South Atlantic's yes and maybe they comprise.

So say you're at 7 percent right now and your target is, I don't know, 20, 30, 40 percent. The way I envision it is you get a table of all the alternatives for the MPAs and you get these percentage rankings of the different types of habitat, so yes and maybe habitats, and then you just select the MPAs iteratively until you hit your target, and then the way you might use a selection algorithm in terms of trying to make it as efficient as you can would be to look at the CPUE.

So you've got your fishery-dependent CPUE and then you've got your fishery-independent CPUE for speckled hind here and for Warsaw grouper over here on the right. Clearly, if you're looking at these three MPAs, the hypothetical ones, it appears that MPA A does a really nice job via CPUE of protecting those stocks.

It's smaller than the other two but maybe you get a bit more bang for your buck out of it. The idea would be let's look at a target of percentage of habitat and then if we iteratively select them based on CPUE, well, we know that these stocks don't occur uniformly across the geographic range of the South Atlantic.

If they did, if they were 100 percent perfectly distributed, then theoretically if you closed 40 percent of the habitat you'd protect 40 percent of the stock. That's not going happen because they're constrained in space. If you choose a target like 40 percent and then you're only looking at places where they occur, well, at that point if you're picking by CPUE you might be picking places that have higher than that uniform distribution of percentage.

For example, if you're closing 20 percent of the area, well, if you're picking the 20 percent of the area that has the highest CPUE in it, you're probably protecting far greater than 20 percent of the stock, so I guess that's where I'm trying to go with that argument. Now, can we quantify exactly what percent of the stock that you're protecting? No, not given the data sets that we have, but I think you could at least reasonably make the argument that 20 percent of the habitat that is yes or maybe is probably greater than 20 percent of the stock if you're picking it based on the higher ranked CPUEs. Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: And maybe you'll come to this, but in addition to looking at how much protection of speckled hind and Warsaw a given MPA gives, can you look at how much lost yields to other components of the snapper grouper fishery would be lost so that we can get at a cost benefit kind of thing?

DR. FARMER: Yes, sort of is the answer, and I think that would be a good addition to the table. I will get to that. I will show you some maps and then I'll have some caveats as to how that might work. That next slide, Roy, actually you read my mind, MPA impacts on other stocks; so is it possible to determine what happens when your proposed MPA overlaps core fishing areas for other stocks.

Well, there is one big problem there and it is that it is impossible to predict what the fishermen are going to do in terms of redistributing their effort. Obviously, if the MPA is so huge that they can't possibly go outside of it and fish, then it did something and they probably can't make up for it.

If it's kind of a reasonably sized reserve that is carefully selected to reduce socio-economic impacts, they might be able to redistribute their effort along the fringes of the MPA and still catch what they've caught in the past. All the catches right now in the South Atlantic are constrained by ACLs.

Most of those ACLs are within achievable grasp of the fishery in terms of reaching, so there is a pretty good chance with the type of reserves that I think we're talking about here that there probably wouldn't be an actual impact on yield. Now, in terms of a socio-economic consequence, yes, if a guy has change his behavior and drive twice as far and use twice as much fuel to catch the same amount of fish or double the hours on the water, there is a consequence to that individual.

But I think when you're looking at the snapper grouper fishery as a whole, I don't think the economists in our group have looked at it yet because we don't MPA alternatives on the table, but my suspicion is if the reserves are reasonably sized the socio-economic consequences to the snapper grouper fishery as a whole would be relatively minimal.

The consequences to individual fishermen off of certain locations might be relatively substantial. It just really depends on how the MPAs are shaped and sited, which is why we weren't able to address at this meeting what the impacts of the MPAs would be because we don't know what the MPAs look like yet.

But, I can show you where some other fish are caught within a reasonable of confidentiality, so what I've done here is the commercial logbook basically provides information on depth of capture from 2005 onward, and then it reports to these large statistical areas, these big 1 degree by 1 degree longitude/latitude stat areas that I'm sure you guys are pretty familiar with.

In the past what we have done is we have kind of said, okay, well, this huge area right here is some percent of red porgy landings. What I did was say, well, maybe we can do a little bit better than that and let's look at the depth reported, which isn't the most reliable field in the logbook but it tends to tell a relatively consistent story if you aggregate it across all the fishermen.

You can see red porgy following kind of this bathymetric contour here across these three stat areas. That is kind of the core of red porgy. You can see the geographic distribution of red porgy landings is pretty broad across the South Atlantic, but there is this core area here that I've kind of dialed in on and I have expressed it as percentage of the total landings from the 2005 through 2011 time period.

If you were to slap a reserve somewhere on top of this red, then, yes, that might have an impact; but in looking at red porgy you can see that the stock itself is pretty reasonably well distributed, so there might be opportunities to redistribute the fishing pressure that is making the red here and then turn this into the red down here. That is kind of what I'm driving at is if the reserve is reasonable sized it is hard to say if it is going to have any impact on the overall catch. Question?

MR. CUPKA: Well, not a question so much but it seems to me one of the things that we need to keep in mind as we go down this road and we run through all these analysis is that we are talking about speckled hind and Warsaw, but the MPAs that we have in place now weren't established just for speckled hind and Warsaw.

We were looking at other species and other types of habitat. When we start looking and tweaking the alignment on some of these things, it might be good for speckled hind and Warsaw, but it may be impacting some of these other species that we were trying to protect at the same time when we first established these. I think this figure here may show some of that, the fact that there are species that we created those for and not just speckled hind and Warsaw. We don't need to lose sight of that fact as we go down this road, I don't think.

DR. FARMER: Yes, that's an excellent point like, for example, I showed you earlier the Georgia MPA didn't really have any speckled hind or Warsaw in it, but that wasn't designed for those. It was designed for golden tilefish. You definitely probably want to look at the rationale for why those were put there in the first place.

Looking the red porgy landings within the headboat, you can see again broad geographic distribution, core off of South Carolina, basically in the same area as the commercial core for that stock. I should mention that we really don't have this kind of spatial information for the private recreational sector and the charter, so determining the impacts of any MPAs on those two sectors is going to be far more challenging and require a lot of assumptions.

With regards to scamp, which was another commonly occurring species with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, you see a very similar commercial core distribution as for the red porgy, and then again for the headboat sector. Vermilion snapper, a similar story; and then vermilion snapper headboat actually is very different. We have got a different core shifted down here off of Northeast Florida.

That is kind of the conclusion of this part of the presentation. I've got a lot of people to thank. I'm not going to read all their names, but obviously going through all those different data sources required a lot of collaboration with a lot of different sources, and I wanted to make sure that all these people got recognized in some way because it has been a huge collaborative effort; and like I said, I keep getting new information each day so I really appreciate all their input.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Nick, very much, good job. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Nick, can you can go back to I think PDF Page 4 where you were talking about what is the stock status. In that first line, Grimes, et al, it has got in 58 percent of sets fourth most common shelf edge stock for speckled hind.

DR. FARMER: Yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: That means speckled hind could have been anywhere from 24 percent of what was on the sets to 1 percent; could you refine that a little bit more?

DR. FARMER: I guess I don't really understand the question. Basically Grimes went out and looked at a bunch of data from the seventies and found that in 58 percent of the sets that were made – so he went out and did this fishing study. I actually have a lot of details in my notes; let me pull that up.

They sampled along reef and rocky outcroppings along the shelf edge and inshore live bottom habitats between North Carolina and South Carolina. It was a spatially biased but significant study. Speckled hind was encountered in 58 percent of the sets, and it was the fourth most common species on the shelf edge behind red porgy, vermilion snapper and blueline tilefish.

MR. PHILLIPS: I guess my point is the first three could compose 99 percent of those species and 1 percent could be speckled hind, which puts it as the fourth most common shelf edge or the other three could have been 70 percent or 75 percent or 76 percent, rather, and then it could have been 24 percent. It doesn't tell me very much. I'm trying to get a grasp of what was there in history and this doesn't tell me very much.

DR. FARMER: Yes, what you need to look at with a stock like speckled hind and Warsaw grouper even more so is the presence/absence of it. What this information is saying is at least during that time period you had a relatively high likelihood if you went out and made a set on that kind of habitat of capturing a speckled hind or more than one speckled hind.

I don't have the paper in front of me – I have it on my laptop – so we could look at the absolute number of speckled hind that were encountered. I think the point is that relative to if you went out in the same area right now and dropped a hundred sets, probably in less than 58 of them you would encounter a speckled hind, maybe even significantly less; or even if you look at Ruderhausen, et al, maybe zero sets.

DR. DUVAL: That is why I was trying to clarify and I think Charlie was trying to get at what was relative abundance of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper in some of these papers as opposed to the likelihood of encounter. I think that is really what you were asking.

DR. FARMER: Yes, and I could e-mail that paper out to everyone if you're interested. It was in the SSC briefing book if you have access to that, which may still be on the South Atlantic Council Website.

MR. CURRIN: Nick, I have a question for you. In going through the charts it appeared that – and it's not unreasonable – that the unknown habitat is by far the greatest percentage of the habitat. Clearly, that has got to have some habitat that is of value. I guess I'm just struggling with how we can – if we set aside some unknown habitat it seems like we ought to get some kind of credit for that. I don't know what an appropriate percentage is, but it makes some assumptions that even though we don't know exactly what is there, it is likely that there is some percentage that is valuable habitat that we're protecting. Have you thought about that at all and any way to approach it?

DR. FARMER: Yes, one of the great laments in the South Atlantic is just the lack of really high-resolution bathymetric and also just fishery-independent data. That just is a weakness that we come back to time and time again. One thing we could do is we've looked at speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and tried to kind of sub-categorize habitat based on whether or not they were seen there, so they are reef obligate.

If we looked at some other reef obligate species – and I know that is something Roger has talked about and is very interested in – would be let's look at point observations of other things that we know occur on reef and only on reef. If you caught it there, then that would suggest that it is on reef and maybe that would be a way of at least crediting it as a maybe instead of an unknown.

But one of the risks of that is then you had a huge unknown which might drastically reduce the percentage of yes and maybe that you have in your MPAs that are currently there, so it is hard to say. The areas within the current MPAs are by far the best described. There is not as much unknown in there relative to yes and maybe habitat. You can see right there, you know, 782 and 82, so 15,000 relative to 6,000 unknown versus yes and maybe across the South Atlantic relative to 782 versus 436, so that ratio is way different. The MPAs are actually pretty well described.

So if you start assigning unknown to maybe outside, then you're going to reduce the credit that is given to the MPAs that are currently there.

MR. CURRIN: Good point; thank you. Yes, John.

MR. JOLLEY: Nice presentation; a lot of creativity there. I really liked the creativity. Chris Koenig and I were having a discussion about mitigation potential. Throughout Southeast Florida we have been embarked on an artificial program for over 50 years, and we have been doing it where people – you know, encourage people to go fishing in those spots or diving, and it has been a big economic engine to the state.

What about using artificial reefs now – are you guys giving any thoughts to instead of creating these things for people to use, start creating these things to mitigate some of the problems and leave some of the other areas open. We have impacted fishermen all over the place so much; and when you think about the cost of these artificial reefs they can be quite expensive; but when we think of the total cost of the loss of fishing opportunity, that is expensive, too. Maybe there is some room here where we could use, for example, ship sinkings on the east coast in deeper waters for Warsaw grouper. I think they love those things. Just a comment and I wondered if you guys have been talking about it at NMFS.

DR. FARMER: I'm certainly not an expert on artificial reefs. I've done most of my work on natural reefs; but from what I've read, the results in the peer-reviewed literature have been very mixed on artificial reefs. I've seen studies that have said, yes, these are rebuilding fish stocks, they're great for them.

I think there is even a consideration of deeming a lot of them as essential fish habitat. And then you hear the other side that what they're doing is they're redistributing stocks off of natural habitats onto the artificial reef and aren't supplementing the fishery at all, and in fact they're creating an area where there is actually higher fishing pressure on the stock and worsens the stock. I've heard it both ways and I'm certainly not an expert on it.

DR. CRABTREE: My concern, John, we're talking in the scale of hundreds or thousands of square kilometers. Boy, that is an awful lot of artificial reefs, and I don't know that we'd have the capacity to put enough out that it would actually amount to a measurable amount of the amount of hard bottom that is out there just because there is so much more of it.

MR. JOLLEY: Well, I do know when you put them in deep water they're not accessible to divers. They're very hard to fish in a swift current, and so those animals are pretty well protected where there is a lot of current and where it is pretty deep. Anyway, I thought it was worth a thought. I remember they're sinking that aircraft carrier up there off the coast of the Panhandle, and I thought, Boy, wouldn't have that done something if we had had it out in 600 feet of water.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, Mac, one thing, Nick, in the Oculina and the HAPC I think we prohibit anchoring in a much larger area than is actually closed, and I think in that area you have got the Gulf Stream just ripping right up there. I would be curious whether it is possible to go

out and fish these creatures if you can't anchor up, and so have we effectively protected more bottom than we think in that. That might be something to think about in terms of how much protection do we actually have. I don't do this kind of fishing and never have done this deepwater, but I'm not sure you could fish out there if you couldn't anchor up.

MR. CURRIN: You can't fish out there every day if you can't anchor up, but there are times when you can fish out there because that current reverses and it is not always running hard and all of that. To that point, Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, where I fish it is the easterly most point of Florida right where I fish and it is where the Gulf Stream runs the hardest of anywhere in our jurisdiction. Yes, you can still continue to fish. We power fish with ten pounds of lead in four knots of current. Is it as effective as anchoring up; no. And do I still anchor up in that depth when the tide gets below two knots; yes. Even though you may only get a few days, you could have a significant impact on those two animals in particular on the days that you could fish that effectively. I wish what you said was the case.

MR. BELL: Just to follow up in the discussion of artificial reefs, the reason we have the Charleston Deepwater Artificial Reef MPA was to try to see what a reef could do in deep water and particularly if you left it alone. It was our original intent to sink portions of the old Cooper River Bridges which we hoped to get. That didn't work out.

Our fall-back plan was to try to convince the Navy to give us an aircraft carrier and we came this close. I just found out a couple of months ago that the Navy has basically abandoned their desire to give ships away as reefs because of pressure from the scrap industry and some other groups. The ability to get these large structures probably isn't there right now.

What we were trying to do was sort of create our own snowy wreck, if you will, because there had been some examination of what had gone up in North Carolina on that wreck. And so if you figure if you take a ship the size of an aircraft carrier and put it down there, you might get similar results; the idea being not to fish it other than fish the pelagic fish over it, but it would be an MPA.

We'd like to try that; we just haven't been able to do it. As Roy said, it is expensive to build reefs and you start scaling up – we did some computations early on about trying to build a shallow water MPA, say a square mile. You could sink a million dollars into a square mile of habitat; and using concrete, literally a million dollars to try to achieve about a 25 percent coverage. I think the results would be good; it is just the cost would be pretty significant.

DR. FARMER: I just wanted to clarify also with regards to this approach, this is based on the assumption that when you close that area you have no fishing that would interact with speckled hind and Warsaw grouper occurring any longer in that area. Now, that doesn't necessarily mean a no fishing zone.

There are different types of fishing depending on the water depth and the behavior of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper in that area might not interact with them ever. I just wanted to be clear

on that. Also, I wanted to let you guys know that where you had a discussion earlier about the expert working group and some MPAS that have been proposed by them, and I've applied this type of approach to those in case you were interested in looking at those.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think at some point that would be very instructive. I guess the question I would have for you now is based on your analysis did you see other areas outside those indicated by the expert working group that might be reasonable areas for consideration as we move in our next step to start defining some alternatives that we might look at some analysis of in the future.

DR. FARMER: I designed these maps so that they could be used for that purpose. Anywhere you see substantial areas of red and yellow kind of sandwiched next to other on any of these graphics, that would be a place where you'd be interested in potentially considering an MPA impact there. Even more bang for your buck if you can find a place where you've got red for speckled hind and red for Warsaw grouper in the same area, that way you get two birds with one stone.

MR. CURRIN: Now have you, Nick, overlaid some of the boxes that were suggested by the expert working group on the maps and figures that you have shown us today?

DR. FARMER: Yes, I've got a separate presentation for that if you want it.

MR. CURRIN: Well, let's see what the committee wants to do. I personally think that might be instructive. Our next task is to try to give the staff some guidance on developing some alternatives and an approach. Michelle indicated that she might like to look at some kind of step-wise approach.

David more or less said the same thing, let's look at the analysis for the existing MPAs maybe with some realignments or whatever and then see where that gets us, an additive sort of process if I understood everybody correctly. What is your pleasure here, folks? Would you like to see how Nick's maps relate to the boxes indicated by the expert working group as a first step and then we'll try to give some advice to the staff on laying out a set of reasonable alternatives that we might consider in a step-wise sort of approach to this, depending on the level of protection that we deem as necessary.

DR. FARMER: Just a separate comment, I'll show this other presentation. It's currently in PowerPoint; but if there were a desire to zoom on areas and get a bit more refined with approaches, I do have my laptop if we can hook that up and then I can just do it in GIS, which will be a lot easier. Another thing would be when considering some boxes on map, we have Roger's excellent public GIS tool that he can draw some boxes on and get the coordinates for us, so we can kind of do a tag team approach I think that would really help expedite this.

MR. CURRIN: Do you need a little bit of time to get set up to do that or do you want to take a first shot at it here?

DR. FARMER: Yes, I'll just burn through kind of the presentation version of it; and then if you want to look at some alternatives to these alternatives, then probably it would be good to set up the GIS and that way we can really dial in on stuff.

MR. CURRIN: Well, let's see how it goes and see how much headway we can make here.

DR. FARMER: Looking at the impacts of suggested MPAs from the expert working group on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. I didn't have a chance to look at their impacts on other stocks, but I was able to look at speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. I think I have kind of explained to you how you might look at it for other stocks.

So going off of North Carolina, there were two that I could make out from the expert working group report. There was one that was north of Cape Lookout and there was one south of Cape Lookout. You can see I've done the speckled hind underneath it. I haven't shown the Warsaw grouper on these maps, but I do have that in the GIS. You can see the points and also the habitat categorization is kind of falling under here.

You can see a lot of points south of it as well. In here you've got a big stack of points on south Cape Lookout. Just anecdotally I was speaking with a fisherman with a lot of commercial and also headboat experience up here, and he said that this actually was a really hotspot for him in terms of speckled hind; not so much Warsaw grouper but definitely speckled hind back in the day.

MR. HARTIG: Nick, do you have the areas of those?

DR. FARMER: Yes, I think I have them in a table at the end. No, I have them in a table in excel over on my laptop. I think they're in Roger's expert working group report as well. Here is off of South Carolina; you've got your Snowy Wreck extension. That one is catching a couple of points there, but there seems to be kind of this habitat feature going around the bend that it's missing.

I guess one of the things that I would ask the council is in terms of developing these things, what shapes are we looking at? Obviously, if you do kind of these kinds of extensions here or this awkward finger coming off of northern South Carolina, those might be a little tricky to enforce; whereas, if we draw some right angle quadrilaterals that would be obviously a lot easier to enforce.

Now if you do those right angle quadrilaterals and you don't orient them with the shelf edge, then they have to be a lot bigger to cover the same amount of essential habitat, which is good and bad. It is good in that it provides a big buffer so it gives you that extra benefit or assurance of a benefit to the stock, but it is worse in that it covers more area and cuts more people out of fishing.

MR. CURRIN: Just for your information, I asked Chris Koenig what the area of those boxes were off of North Carolina and he said about 37 squares miles was he remembered. I think the

Snowy Wreck is five by ten miles, so that's fifty square miles and that is roughly the same scale, I think.

DR. CRABTREE: Question for Otha; in this day of modern technology and GPS, I can see why having simple shapes is a good thing, but it doesn't seem to me that having the lines orient east/west/north/south versus following an orientation on the depth contour ought to make that much difference.

I just wondered about your perspective on it because it does look like with a lot these parallel-o-grams, if we could shift that or tilt a little bit of them we capture a lot more of the habitat with a given amount of area, and I would like your input on that.

MR. EASLEY: Having the lines follow north/south/east/west, the lat/longs is not as important as it used to be. What is more important is the longer straight lines and whatever direction they're going to be in. Parallel-o-grams versus direct rectangles are easier to deal with now than they might have been at one time.

DR. CRABTREE: You just don't want really complex shapes that are bending and going all over everywhere.

MR. EASLEY: Definitely correct on that one, right.

MR. CURRIN: And VMS on all the boats would even make that simpler; wouldn't it?

MR. EASLEY: Yes, but that is whole 'nother five, ten, or fifteen minute discussion there.

MR. CURRIN: I understand; I think we have heard of that before.

MR. EASLEY: I agree with you, though, VMS would make it better.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, just the two areas off North Carolina, the northern Cape Lookout area – and this is, as Nick referenced, in the expert workgroup report – the northern area is 37.5 squares miles whereas the southern area is 67.8 square miles.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you for that correction and clarification.

DR. FARMER: I've got the areas and I think Myra and I can probably provide them to you as we go from the report here. Yes.

DR. DUVAL: In the report it says square miles and you've got square kilometers up there.

DR. FARMER: Yes, sorry about that; yes, it is hard to read; it's really small. All right, off of South Carolina we've got an extension proposed for the Snowy Wreck. We've got this finger for northern South Carolina. Obviously, I probably need to do some work. If we do end up wanting to go with that as an alternative, it should probably blend into the northern South Carolina MPA a little bit better since right now it is overlapping it.

We have a spawning observation from Ziskin that is outside of there, so that seems like something where you might get a little extra bang for your buck by reconfiguring that a bit. Then we have the Devil's Hole/Georgetown Hole area here, which is a really dynamic bathymetric feature, and that definitely was a place that as soon as I started plotting this stuff I starting look at. Well, that is where there was a lot of stuff going on.

We got a couple of different proposed reconfigurations of Edisto. As I pointed out to you when we were looking at that earlier, there is this spawning observation that is deeper than the current deep edge of Edisto. When you're reorienting Edisto, you're cutting out that deep edge for the most part, so maybe what you'd actually want to do is just make it kind of a bigger square or a bigger rectangle. I mean, that's by far – that and the northern South Carolina MPA are the most effective MPAs that you have in place right now in terms of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper; so expanding those would probably help them a lot.

And then the St. Simon's MPA seems to get a lot done. Like I pointed out, you've got this Georgia MPA for golden tilefish, which you may be – you know, if you're not worried about golden tilefish as this point, maybe you move that over to right here to cover these speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

And then you've got a St. Augustine MPA here that was proposed, and then you've got obviously quite a bit of points in this area north of the North Florida MPA and then south of it. And then you've got Warsaw Hole, which they didn't really provide MPA-proposed coordinates for Western Dry Rocks and Warsaw Hole, so I just kind of drew the smallest boxes that I could around the areas that were provided.

Western Dry Rocks I gather has a lot of spawning fish of various types, permit and mutton snapper and the like and maybe some observations of speckled hind out there; and then Warsaw Hole has potentially spawning Warsaw grouper out there and apparently still has Warsaw grouper being observed out there.

In terms of quantifying the impacts, this table is pretty overwhelming so I'm going to try to walk you through it. On the top here are the MPAs that are currently in place in the South Atlantic. These are the number of points, actual lat/longs of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper within those MPAs and the number of point samples within those MPAs.

This is the percentage of overall South Atlantic yes habitat for speckled hind that is contained in each of those MPAs and the overall percentage of yes habitat for Warsaw grouper that is contained in those MPAs. What I think is more important is probably the yes and maybe because that reduces the bias of the oversampling of the current MPAs, and you're looking at the percentage of yes and maybe speckled hind here and the percentage of yes and maybe Warsaw grouper here.

And then this is fishery-independent ad hoc CPUE. It is more like a percent positive observation per sample ratio, so how many times did you look there, how many times did you see one, so you

can see a relatively high percentage for Edisto and North Florida and northern South Carolina and either no sampling in the Oculina Experimental Area.

Keep in mind that is per point sampled so that is SEFIS trap, SEFIS video and MARMAP. And then you've got your fishery-independent ratings here and that is for reef fish observer and headboat. Basically, I guess the conclusion would be that right now your most effective MPAs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are the northern South Carolina, North Florida and Edisto MPAs with northern South Carolina being the most effective for Warsaw grouper.

Looking at the proposed alternatives from the workgroup, we have got a couple of them. We've got the Edisto reconfiguration one and two; first Devil's Hole/Georgetown Hole; north Cape Lookout; northern South Carolina extension; south Cape Lookout of North Carolina; Snowy Grouper Wreck extension and so on; and so I have these all in a table as well.

Basically, I guess kind of my vision would be is maybe we could – once you have a document developed with a bunch of alternatives in it, we could go through it and maybe add a couple more fields to this type of a table, which would have the economic impacts on certain stocks or some sort of pro/con weighting term there.

And then you could go through and maybe with a checkbox or something select yes we want that closure or no we don't, and then you get a total at the bottom of the ones that you had selected as yes in terms of the total percent yes habitat, percent yes and maybe habitat, and that sort of thing that had been covered in the South Atlantic to see if you had hit your target.

And maybe when you're doing those checkboxes you would be basing that off of looking at the CPUEs and the socio-economic consequences and trying to balance that out so you're kind of picking the places with the best chance of covering a pretty high percentage of the population while minimizing the impacts on the industry. That's all I've got.

MR. CURRIN: All right, thank you very much. What is your pleasure; what are your thoughts here? I'm hearing for sure from a number of people that it would probably be best to let's look at what we've got now with the existing MPAs so that we've got a baseline. Then we've got some suggested reconfigurations, enlargements, extensions, that kind of thing of the existing MPAs. That might be the second tier approach that we could look at.

Then we've the addition of new boxes and they're off of every state. If there are some that some of the folks from the various states think are just no-goes at this point, let's go ahead and not consider them anymore within reason and then we might consider eliminating some of that analysis now, too. Does that sound like a reasonable approach and guidance to the staff to make some headway on this document? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think so. I'm looking at this kind of like that top group is the status quo, and then you've got 12 potential alternatives down there below it. They're pretty much down the coast so it seems like a pretty good starting point to me for a set of alternatives. I agree with you, if there are some that are just no-goes for whatever reason, we could drop them out

now, but otherwise work those up and take a look at it. Then we I think would be in a position for public hearings at that point.

MR. CURRIN: Does that sound like a reasonable approach to everyone? Before we get to this is a no-go kind of thing, let's get rid of that one. Is everybody in agreement that as one level the status quo is at the top block? I think it would be best to have a block which just modified the existing MPAs as the next kind of level or block to look at. Then you can see what that gives you relative to what you think you want or need, and then we can look at the addition of additional blocks. Is that the best way to proceed? Mel.

MR. BELL: I agree with the options that modify the existing blocks. What I was wondering is when we talk about like Edisto Reconfigure One/Two, that's what we saw. If you look at that, it's kind of a natural rotate at 45 degrees and it works. I don't know that's necessarily one or two perfectly. I guess the modifications he showed us, that is what that is and that is what we would go with; no further tweaks on it?

MR. CURRIN: No, I think we have the capability of tweaking them some more. If we get these out in a little more detail and in a resolution where you can better decide, oh, man, if we just move that up here, if we decrease it a little bit here, then we're really not losing much or we're gaining a whole lot, then we can have that capability to do that and modify the area of those blocks.

MR. BELL: Okay, so we're not necessarily locking into exactly –

MR. CURRIN: No, no, we're trying to get, as far as I'm concerned, a first stab at it; let's take a look at some things that are a result of some advice and some analysis that we already have at this point. Is everybody okay with that; do you like that approach? How about no-goes as far as that list? Throw that table back up, Nick, if you don't mind, just so people can take a peek at that. Are there some no-go areas for folks in various states? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, quite honestly with regard to speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, you're getting no bang out of the status quo. Now I realize there is probably sand and mud there for golden tilefish. Nick, if you could go to that one, please. If I could slide that existing shape down over St. Simons without creating an additional box, it is even larger than the one that is proposed, and you could probably still get some of the same substrates incorporated into that. I would prefer to look at one box off of a hundred mile coastline than two.

MR. CURRIN: And I think that is a reasonable suggestion and I think the staff can take that into consideration and as an alternative move that block with the caveats that David raised earlier.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, that box has got a snowy grouper airplane wreck that is probably half the size of this room; and when I found it a long, long time ago it had snowies stacked up on it 90 feet high. It supposedly hasn't been fished. I don't think we want to take that box off of those snowy groupers. There is another wreck inshore that those guys catch amberjack on.

If I had to guess and it was sampled, I'd say there is a really good chance there are some Warsaw grouper on it. I know what is out there now. It might could be moved – actually the snowy grouper are in the golden tile bottom. I don't know that you want to give that up because that wreck has had protection for a long time.

On the other hand, our little hundred mile coast, if we put another box off of St. Simons, it would take out over 10 percent of the ledge. You'll hear the crying all the way down here. I'm not sure how to deal with that. I don't know to stretch the box a little further inshore where it might do something, but there is just a lot of rollie bottom that doesn't have much of anything on it. I really don't think we want to lose the protection of that snowy wreck and that other wreck.

MR. CURRIN: Well, you're going to have all kinds of choices and alternatives and some time to sort all that out, but I think Doug makes a reasonable suggestion at least as an alternative for consideration. As you proceed forward, you can decide what is the best approach.

MS. BARCO: Kathy Barco, Chairman, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission. I just can't figure out a way to give the question to them to get it out the way that I'm trying to get a grasp on this. In looking at these areas and what is going on, I'm still trying to grasp with what is the goal and is the goal to protect bottom habitat or is the goal to protect a certain amount of fish at a certain percentage.

Just like you said in this presentation, if you go with all these spots and the biggest bang for your buck, are we then going to go back and look and say we just protected 20 to 40 percent of the bottom, but we protected 70 percent of the fish; or do we only need to protect a certain amount of the fish and less of the bottom.

I guess I'm having to grasp with that as you sit here starting to choose which of these bottoms you're going to close or to protect and whether you set those other goals first and then see which ones of these fit into that category or do you just keep manipulating the numbers with that total at the bottom. I guess that's what I'm trying to grasp in this process. Am I missing something somewhere? I can't come up with what is the goal in the end of what we're trying to accomplish. I got a part of the goal; I got that. I mean to quantify it is to give us a number of what we're shooting for.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, if you're asking whether we can quantify it, I think the answer was provided by the SSC –

MS. BARCO: Which is no.

MR. CURRIN: – is probably no. Do we feel like that providing some additional protection for these two species of fish is going to be of benefit to the conservation of those two species, I think you'd probably get everybody to agree that was the case; but if you're going to ask us for a number and exactly how that relates to where we're now, we could only I believe, when this is all said and done, only give a relative answer based on perhaps some of the analysis.

MS. BARCO: Well, I was just wondering if there was some goal somewhere. You don't know exactly what they're going to do, but what are we aiming for? Are we aiming for closing 20 to 40 percent of the bottom? He said 20 to 50 but I think it is more like 20 to 40. Are we aiming to protect X amount of the fish, because that's a huge difference if you hit the stuff that is the biggest bang for you buck.

MR. HARTIG: Kathy, your questions are exactly the same questions we had and we posed them to the SSC trying to get a definition of that. We haven't got that so we're kind of evolving. Nick's presentation said you can get a pretty big bang for your buck in a relatively small area in some places.

I think as we go through this I think we'll weigh those as we go and look at these different areas; and if we can get some significant bang for our buck in some really small areas, I don't see any big problem with that. I don't think in these two species that the classical size of MPAs is as important.

At least in my fishing and my experience with them, wherever I've had multiple encounters with Warsaw grouper it has been specific site spots. It has never been an area. It has been a pinpoint. Those areas, if you were able to close those effectively I think you would have incredible increases in your protections from small areas. Now, we don't know how these fish move.

There has been some tagging done on Warsaws which shows there is a north to south movement on some of the smaller fish, but the bigger fish don't seem to do the same things that the small fish do at least in my observations over the last 40 years. The bigger fish seem to stay in those particular habitats and on those particular spots where they are and they don't seem to make wholesale movements that much.

Now, feeding movements, certainly moving around to feed in certain areas, but they seem to line up on the same spot day after day after day. I can go back to the same spot, one in particular, and catch about the same numbers of Warsaws that I've seen but they're tiny compared to the 300 pounders that we caught back in the nineties. I think this is going to evolve and answer your questions as we go for all of us as we go through this process.

MS. BARCO: And I'm hoping that you go with the biggest bang for your buck spot so that the smaller areas that get the most effect for the shortest length of time and space and everything else. I was just worried with what comes out going which way are you going. Thank you for indulging me and letting me ask the questions in the middle of this.

MR. CURRIN: No problem and I think Ben made a good point. It is an evolving process and we're very early in that process. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I think that is all fair enough. I think our number one priority has been with the areas we've already closed. Can we make some changes and reorientation of those and get a lot more benefit from them without actually any others? I think we have a general agreement that we'd like to provide a higher level protection than what we have now, but I think we've got to look at how much benefit can we get for what cost to the impacts on the other

fisheries. I think as we go through that and have a better understanding of that, we could set up some sort of strategy of what we want to get to over some period of time.

MR. CURRIN: Clearly, I think everyone's goal is to minimize the impacts as best we can while providing some protection. Nick.

DR. FARMER: I was just going to try to address her question a little bit more specifically. Not having any stock assessment to get a specific target out of, we looked at a meta-analysis of MPA literature and the range was like 8 to 75 percent with the bulk of it being 20 to 50 percent. The point I tried to make was that if you close 20 percent of that yes/maybe habitat and you're iteratively selecting it, then you can be almost certain that you're well beyond 20 percent of the stock.

That is the mature stock because you're in 25 to a hundred fathoms and we've shown that is where the mature fish are. So if you're thinking of it kind of from an SPR perspective, it's not exact, you can't assign a specific number to it, but I think you're reasonably certain that you're protecting greater than 20 percent of the mature spawning potential of the stock.

MR. BELL: Yes, just kind of stepping back big picture – and Kathy had a good point – is that when we went down this road with MPAs I guess there should have been and I guess there is a clear understanding of what are success criteria, how do we know that what we did achieves a goal or how do we measure that.

From Nick's presentation, I didn't realize we had collectively been out there in those areas and done survey work and a lot of the monitoring work. I'm pleased to see that we have actually been out there and done some of that. Now the public that is watching this are probably looking at that and saying, okay, well, how did it go, how did it work, did it work?

That's the kind of questions we're going to get asked; and we as go to whether it's sort of tweak these areas, adjust them and expand them a little bit, they'll ask those same sorts of questions; well, if you started out and the box looked like this, how did it work, do you know, do you not know; and now you're going to twist it or expand or whatever, there is going to be a desire for them to want to know. Where I'm going with this is need to have a commitment somehow to continue the monitoring and continue the evaluation, however we're doing that.

There is an assumption that we set aside so much area, it will offer some degree of protection for these species, but our ability to quantify that I think and put it in understandable terms for the public is going to be important and showing that what we have done worked or didn't work. That's just something I struggle with; how do you do that? And then given the economy and given cutbacks in funding and programs, are we going to be able to keep it up, are we be able to dedicate the funds to do that in the future?

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and I don't know and maybe Bonnie or Monica can answer that; but to your point, one, I don't think we're going to be able to quantify it for the public. Can we give them an indication that there are positive benefits? Yes, I think we can. Stacey Harter has been doing some of that and making some observations in and around those areas.

She has been giving regular reports to the council. My impression of those reports and the results of their work is that, yes, they're seeing more fish, they're seeing bigger fish. What does that mean exactly? To me, I don't know exactly, you can't quantify it, but it means that there is a positive benefit there for these areas. You have to make the assumption that at some point if the population within those areas get large enough, they're going to move out and that is going to benefit the fishing public as well.

MR. BELL: And I guess that is what saying is we need to do as good a job as we can of documenting that kind of stuff and getting that across. Even if we can't be really quantitative about it, we have to give the public some sense that this was worth it. It was a sacrifice but it has paid off in some degree somehow.

MR. CURRIN: Bonnie, I don't know what the plans are as far as Stacey's plans to continue the work that she others have been doing.

DR. PONWITH: Well, the thing that I would say is that we are in a time of high scrutiny on budgets; and if I were a betting kind of gal I would bet that the budgets are going to become more challenging rather than less challenging. The demands for at-sea data continue to spiral upward, the resources available to obtain those remain challenging.

I agree with you that whenever you take a management measure having a measurable outcome, understanding what the desired outcome and a way to monitor that is really important. One of the biggest challenges in that for a species that becomes a rare event species is that if you have an MPA and the purpose is to be able to improve the density of an abundant species in the MPA area, doing a compare and contrast of the protected area relative to an unprotected area is simpler because you have high numbers in both, just higher in one than the other and you have the statistical power to do that mathematical comparison.

When you have a species that is sparse in the unprotected area and hopefully less sparse but probably not spilling out over the edges, you know, abundant on the inside, that statistically comparing those two areas becomes more challenging. I guess I would summarize by saying it is always harder work to quantify differences in low abundant species than it is in high abundant species. I agree with you that it is important. I'm not sure how we're going to be able to get the resources but I will take a note that this is the council's interest in being able to focus on that.

MR. CURRIN: I think it's very important to the council and to the public in general. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: To Mel's points, again the AP asked those questions; what have we seen from the existing MPAs. Mac has indicated that there have been presentations made to the council previously. Obviously, I haven't been around because I haven't sitting here that long. I would personally love to see sort of a summary presentation of the monitoring that has been done as related to the existing marine protected areas.

Clearly, that information is at least not necessarily being conveyed or it is not in a location that is as accessible to our constituents, the folks on the AP as we would like to be. I would love to see

some of those reports. Also, I think the other thing that you mentioned that was very important and was on my laundry list when I went on my little soapbox earlier was measurable criteria. If we do make some changes to the existing MPAs in order to benefit speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, what are the things that we're going to be measuring and what kind of changes are we looking for to say, okay, we did this and it looks like it is working.

MS. BROUWER: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to give you a little extra information and it pertains to what Mel was asking about monitoring of the MPAs. The council receives a grant from the Coral Reef Conservation Program. That program has been funding management projects for corals for a number of years.

They changed the structure of how that grant and how that money is disbursed, and now it is being done every five years. Well, the current grant is going to cover MPA monitoring through Fiscal Year 2013, so at least we know that the funding is there to continue that monitoring of the existing MPAs, and that is done through the Panama City Lab, Andy David and Stacey Harter and those folks.

MR. CURRIN: So that is good news. All right, are you guys okay with the direction? What else do you need from the committee, Myra, to begin moving forward on this?

MS. BROUWER: Well, I suppose we would need guidance to develop alternatives if that is how the committee wants to proceed. I think there is some desire out there to reconfigurations of the existing MPAs first. Do we want to put those alternatives out there and analyze them and bring them back to you in September or do we want to add more to those and go from there.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I'd like to see some reconfigurations. Nick had some up there that talked about reconfiguration, but I'd like to look at some of those new sites that Nick went through, too.

I'd like to see you come back with alternatives for both reconfigurations and new high quality areas along the lines of what Nick showed at that table, present that to us, and then we can go through and make some decisions at that time.

MR. CURRIN: Does that sound like a reasonable approach to everyone? I think from our discussions that is what we're all thinking about. Mel.

MR. BELL: I just have a question – and again the new guy here – I guess there has some monitoring that has gone on in there perhaps by different entities or whatever, but it would be nice to kind of get a sense of what all has gone on in terms of monitoring thus far. As far as monitoring in the future, if we've got programs that have been there and kind of have a history, I don't know if it is appropriate maybe for them to continue some of that or at least to work with whatever the future monitoring program is.

I mean you just want to take advantage of what you've done already and perhaps continue some of that in the future. It certainly needs to be coordinated across the board, and you've also got a number of sites as well.

MR. CURRIN: Well, to my knowledge, Mel, besides Harder's and Andy David's work that they have done in the existing MPAs, there have been some opportunistic sort of approaches through sub dives that Steve Ross – and I don't know who funds all of that stuff, but on occasion Steve and I think some other researchers as well have gone into these existing MPAs and done a little bit of work and some fish counts and that kind of stuff. That's not a regular monitoring program but it happens as available funding and interest in a particular subject –

MR. BELL: Yes, and since a lot of what you see is off of South Carolina, I know our MARMAP guys have been out there some in those areas and that probably makes sense to continue that type of –

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I would hope so. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to add for council members that haven't been around very long, the science center does provide an update to the council. They do give us an annual report for the monitoring of MPAs, and they have been doing it since 2004. Those reports are available and let me know if you'd like me to pass them along. They also have come to the council meetings to present those results to the council.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, that sounds like a good idea; especially the new members around the table ought to receive those. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Mr. Chairman, we've got Chris here. He gave an excellent presentation the AP. We certainly can go back and read those minutes, but he is here. His take on research and enforcement is pretty significant. Having worked in these things, his ideas, if you're going to more forward with these, are pretty specific about what you need to do to be able to get protection in these. If you want to hear some of that, it will take him about five minutes.

MR. CURRIN: It's up to the committee. I'll tell you what, if you want to do that, let's do that as soon as I get motion from the committee to direct the staff to develop some alternatives. They said they would like a motion. David.

MR. CUPKA: I was going to move that we ask staff develop alternatives looking first of all at reconfiguring existing MPAs and then a second tier would be looking at new MPAs and then a third might be a combination of those two, because it seems to me that would be a progression from the least impact to the most impact. Maybe impact is not the right word, but to use a tiered approach or sort of an additive approach starting with –

MR. CURRIN: **All right, David's motion is to direct the staff to develop alternatives to look at reconfiguring existing MPAs as a first tier or level and new MPAs as a second tier and a combination of the two as a third tier.** Is there a second to that motion; second by Duane. Discussion? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Is this to come back at the September meeting? My other question was I can't remember what was decided. This is not going out to public workshop in August; is it?

MR. CURRIN: There will be additional public workshops where we will receive more input that may allow you to consider modifying some of these existing boxes that we have seen and recommendations. We will get additional recommendations that the committee and council can then consider to add, delete, may reinforce what we've got now, hopefully. Is that clear? This document will not go out to public hearing between now and September, but there will be public workshops between now and September. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: For clarification, the first tier is reconfiguring; the second tier, if you add MPAs and you've already got a combination, so I'm guessing your third tier is a combination of what we got and adding one, two, three or four new MPAs; is that what I understand?

MR. CUPKA: Well, we were given some indication that we could reconfigure some so that would be one group. Then there was a second group that were entirely new, so that would be the second tier because that's probably going to be more impact, so to speak, than just reconfiguring, and then the third would be to look at both of those, looking at both the new areas that have been suggested plus the reconfigured areas.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, but I'm still confused because if we make new MPAs we're not going to take the old ones away, I don't think, so that automatically puts us in the third tier. I'm not following something.

MR. CURRIN: I think you're making it more complicated than it is. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I wouldn't make too much of the tiers. We might decide to reconfigure a couple of the current MPAs and we might decide to get rid of one of the current MPAs and then we may decide to add no new ones or we may decide to add a bunch of new ones. We don't know until we see it all.

MR. CURRIN: And as far as the relative impacts, I think it depends on the magnitude of the combinations as to which is more onerous than the other. I could envision a combination that is less onerous than even reconfiguring the existing MPAs. Anyway, I wouldn't get too wrapped around the axle on it yet. **Other discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** Nick, did you have something?

DR. FARMER: I was just wondering for example the northern South Carolina MPA extension that had been proposed by the working group; can we clean up some of those alternatives as an IPT? For example, that one is overlapping the northern South Carolina MPA whereas I think the intent was for it to be an extension of it; so just clean up those SHAPE files so that they snap to grids and that sort of thing.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think that would be good advice. We have got some irregular shapes that were suggested, and I know the intent was just to grab and minimize the amount of area but to maximize the benefit from it, but I think it is very important, as Otha indicated, that the final shapes are fairly regular and uniform. Is everybody okay with that as far as the direction? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think you all should use some flexibility here and bring us back a real well thought out suite of alternatives, and I think you need to focus on Otha's keep the shapes of them relatively simple, but orient them in a way that achieves the most protection.

MR. CURRIN: All right, is that sufficient for you guys? If not, let us know at full council and we'll try to help you out with that further if we can. Anything else on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and MPAs at this point? Yes, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I wonder if you might clarify for us and get on the record your intent to continue to get more input. We already have a pretty comprehensive suite of alternatives. Do you want us to go ahead and schedule two more workshops to get more input or not?

MR. CURRIN: I think it would be important personally to continue with the two workshops that we have planned so that we make sure that we've got input from the folks in Florida. We've gotten some input from folks in North Carolina because they're on the Snapper Grouper AP, but I still think there may be some benefit to inviting some of those folks from up that way and try to get some of the researchers as well. Paul Ruderhausen hasn't been involved in this yet and he has got a lot of experience up that way and insight as well. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I would strongly recommend that. I think you're cutting out a lot of input from folks who either didn't have time to communicate anything to the folks who participated in the expert workgroup or perhaps didn't have the opportunity to communicate to the representatives on the AP. And as Mac mentioned, I think this would provide opportunity for some of the researchers in the area to also provide some input on some of the information, particularly those who were cited in here. I would strongly recommend holding those workshops in North Carolina and Florida.

MR. CURRIN: Is everyone else in agreement with that? That is just my opinion and Michelle's opinion. I was delighted to see Bobby Freeman participated in that expert working group, so I feel real good about that as far as the North Carolina perspective and others. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Well, just a followup to that, I will note that it was noted in the workgroup report that there was disagreement between the scientists and the two North Carolina representatives on the workgroup with regard to the additional areas proposed for North Carolina. I just want to make sure that was noted.

MR. CURRIN: And that doesn't surprise me. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I just opened up a few minutes ago the great tool we used yesterday, the Atlas. Would it be possible either before our session starts tomorrow or at some point before we leave to have those suggested areas plotted on that Atlas so we could take a look at them with that tool?

MR. CURRIN: You will have to ask Roger that. You can look at them; they're up. He says they're up, Doug, and you pull them up. You can get together with Roger as soon as we break to take a peak at those on the Atlas. If you guys come up with some rationale to bring those

forward to the committee tomorrow morning very early, I'll consider that, but I would sure like to finish up all of our work by noontime tomorrow. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to reiterate some of the points I brought up earlier. I promised Bob Gill I wouldn't stop picking on the Gulf and the fact that they do allow harvest of these two species, and I don't think that is insignificant; and the fact that the responses to the listing petitions have stated that these are – speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are considered one stock throughout the Gulf and South Atlantic.

I would say that we need to make sure that as we're developing this right here for consideration of additional areas for protection for these two species that we need to follow a parallel track with regard to getting some kind of updated status of these stocks. My suggestion would be that we need to look at one of alternative approaches that I think the SSC is hoping to be able to consider and pooling the data that is available from the Gulf and the South Atlantic, to get that done as soon as possible. Thank you.

MR. CURRIN: Well, one thing I'll throw out and I mentioned it earlier and probably got a couple of snickers, but as we consider drawing more boxes and reconfiguring these things and with the emphasis on the need for enforcement that Dr. Koenig and others have suggested, remember that the Snapper Grouper AP also recommended that we move forward with putting VMS on the – they said everyone but I think that was kind of an overstatement.

I think it is clear that the recreational industry or fishery is too large to deal with at this point in a VMS situation, but certainly the commercial industry is not. I hear it more and more from people in the commercial industry; we need VMS; we really need it. Just think about it, whether this is something you might want to include in this amendment as well. If that makes it too complicated, then keep it in mind for addressing pretty soon in the future. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I agree, I think it is something that if we're going to do these we should at least it on out to public hearing. I agree, I think if you're going to be in fisheries and you're going to be a professional and we need to protect these things, let's tie it all together.

MR. CURRIN: Well, I think we have diddled with VMS long enough that there is probably somewhere in a previous amendment, I can't remember the number, a bunch of developed alternatives and rationale and analysis on VMS that we might be able to tweak and easily bring in this. I would advise you to think about it tonight and maybe tomorrow at full council make that in the form of a motion to include that as another action in this amendment. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: And sort of similar to that, I was going to suggest that perhaps we should consider a specific section on enforcement in whatever goes out to public hearing that would include alternatives for VMS. I believe I mentioned stiff fines or permit suspensions if you're caught with these species since we do have a prohibition on them right now. I mean those are all things that I would like to be considered. That's I think a really significant way that you are going to create a disincentive to take these species.

MR. CURRIN: Regarding your issue on the fines that exist for Goliath and Nassau now; that is not something that the council needs to do other than recommend that OLE and GC consider implementing some fines or does the council need to include that as a part of an amendment, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'll talk with our enforcement attorneys and see what they think is the way to present it and get back with you.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, because I think it's a good point Michelle makes. All right, anything else on this issue? Well, let's move on to our consideration of red snapper; and before we do that Marcel Reichert has agreed to come and make a presentation on MARMAP fishery-independent CPUEs that may give you some good background on historic changes in the fishery specifically related to red snapper and black sea bass as well. Thank you, Marcel, for being here and being patient and being on ready even though you were expecting your presentation I think tomorrow.

DR. REICHERT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the committee for the opportunity to present these data. It's an update of fishery-independent CPUE for Chevron trap data for black sea bass and red snapper. I would like to apologize that we weren't able to provide the presentation to you earlier. We are still finalizing the analysis.

We also had staff at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center review the analysis and the data. We have a report available detailing the presented analysis for you later. The analysis includes SEFIS data and we collaborated with Todd Kellison and Nate Bacheler and their colleagues in these efforts. I would like to recognize Joey Ballenger and Tracey Smart who have been doing most of the analyses. Joey is here today so I'll be more than happy to hand over any questions on the analysis to him today.

This is an overview of fishery-independent data collected by MARMAP and SEAMAP Reef Fish Survey. The SEAMAP Reef Fish Survey data are included since 2009, and SEFIS came on line, as you may know, in 2010. I would like to emphasize that this is a summary of MARMAP, SEAMAP and SEFIS data and analysis and it is not necessarily equivalent to an index that is used in the SEDAR stock assessments. It is also not an equivalent of an assessment update.

This overview includes only Chevron trap data, no other gears including video data, so realize that this does not include the video data. We've presented overviews of the sampling methodology in the past so I will not include that here; but if you have any questions you can let me know and I'm more than happy to provide details.

In our analysis we only including the monitoring stations in the analysis so no trap deployments to investigate new bottom, the so-called recon stations, were included in the analysis. Also, this presentation includes data from 1990 through 2011. It is important to note that the first year was the year after Hugo which may have affected the area coverage and efforts.

You may know that we have used Chevron traps since 1988, but the first two years we have eliminated because a consistent deployment methodology was still being developed. The data

include results from all trap deployments unless we felt there was a problem; for instance, if a trap got stuck or was lost.

That means that we included all traps caught finfish, catches without finfish, but also traps that had no catch in them. The selected soak times were between 45 and 150 minutes, but the vast majority of our soak times were around 90 minutes. The CPUE is expressed in fish per trap per hour. We realize that there are other ways to express the CPUE, but we decided to stick to the method that we have been reporting in the past in our annual progress reports and our annual status of the stocks reports.

In this presentation we present the CPUE in two ways; the nominal and as a standardized Delta-GLM CPUE, and I will explain those in a little more detail in a little bit. The data is also documented annually in our trends report that we have submitted to NMFS and others. This is the first year that we included the SEFIS data in our report, and it's also the first year that we investigated the CPUE using a standardized Delta-GLM method.

The nominal CPUE is basically a simple geometric mean of the catches in all traps, and this is irrespective of when and where those traps were deployed, which means that there is no correction for sampling location or depth or temperature and other factors. However, we obviously know that those factors may affect the CPUE.

The advantage of this method is that it is easily calculated and we can also use all trap data, which is slightly different from the analysis using the standardized method. Of course, that is all within the criteria that I had mentioned in the previous slide. The Delta-GLM standardization is a technique that is commonly used in fisheries research.

This method was also used in CPUE calculations in several recent stock assessments. The CPUE is calculated in the same way in terms of number of fish per trap per hour. However, it corrects for variability in sampling; for instance, the year, where we were sampling, the lat/long, the depth, date or season and also the bottom temperature.

The Delta-GLM Model basically looks at two components. First the model looks at presence or absence. In other words, given a set of conditions, for instance, depth and location, do we expect to catch a particular species in the trap. If the model predicts that specie is to occur, it looks again, again given the conditions, what would be the expected abundance in that trap?

By doing that, the model uses that information to adjust the trap CPUE for a given set of conditions. The Delta-GLM method is considered the better approach to estimate CPUE because it models the effect of the environmental factors and also sampling variables. For example, we might expect that the catch of a particular species changes with depth, and we know that occurs, for instance, in black sea bass, or bottom temperature, which we know occurs in several other species such as vermilion snapper.

By including these variables in the model, we can remove their effect on individual trap CPUE estimates. It is also important because it gives us a technique for the differences in sample and

the changes in environmental variables from year to year. For instance, in 2011 we may have on average sampled deeper depths than in other years.

Without correcting for that, the 2011 CPUE estimate may appear higher or lower than other years that we've sampled, so this technique corrects for that. The nominal CPUE assumes the changes that we directly measure are reflecting changes in abundance; and as I said earlier, we know that there are factors that affect those CPUE. With the Delta-GLM standardized CPUE, we can address the effects of those factors, those environment factors and also the shift in sampling effort and that leaves a signal that is more reflective of what we consider the true changes in relative abundance.

For our Delta-GLM, as I mentioned in the previous slide, we always use year and included sampling location, sampling depth, season and the bottom seawater temperature. We treated all these covariate as discrete variables and creating certain strata or bins and it allows for a non-linear change in the effect of the variables on the CPUE estimates.

One of the disadvantages of this method, however, is that if we are missing data of any of those variables for a given trap, that data is excluded from the analysis. As you can imagine, that will result in the reduction of the number of samples that we can use for the analysis. Furthermore, if less than two observations – and that means an observation is a trap that actually caught the species that we're interested in – if less than two of those observations remained, the year was excluded; again resulting in the elimination of years.

That's particularly important for species that we don't catch a whole lot of, for instance, red snapper as we see later in the presentation. In red snapper we had to exclude two years because of the fact that there were less than two observations. On the other hand, for black sea bass, a species that we catch in abundance, no years were omitted because of the abundance of black sea bass.

Since the absolute CPUE levels may be different using the different analyses, when I show you a graph that compares the two CPUE estimates, the nominal and Delta-GLM, we normalized them to the long-term average so that it is possible for us to give you a direct comparison. Let's move on to the first species, the black sea bass.

In our overall report we have a larger number of species but I was asked to specifically concentrate on black sea bass and red snapper for today. As I mentioned, the black sea bass is one of our most abundant species in the trap catches and we have an extensive data set. Our black sea bass data, CPUE, length, age composition, and other life history information was used for the most recent SEDAR.

However, it is important to understand that the treatment of the data that I'm presenting here is different from that of SEDAR. We have been trying to treat the data in a similar way as we have done in our past trends reports. We are looking into treating the data for different species the way they were treated in the most recent SEDAR assessment, but that means that the analysis is a little more complicated and may take a little more time to accomplish.

The black sea bass data used was between 10 and 96 meters. I think I failed to mention that in one of the previous slides that range is where a hundred percent of catches are caught for black sea bass, and we eliminated the other traps to eliminate a large number of zero values. The Delta-GLM analysis used location. We were six strata of whole degrees latitude. We had ten depth strata, roughly five meters each, from less than 20 meters to more than 60 meters.

Bottom temperatures were divided in three bins; and then we had two seasons, the spring and summer. It is important to realize that our regular sampling season is from May through September so we are usually sampling in the summertime, but we were still able to divide that area up into two seasonal bins. This is an overview of the data. The graphs are the same for black sea bass and red snapper.

They have the same structure with the year on the X axis, and on this slide the top graph shows the average length in red and then the nominal CPUE in blue, but the vertical error bars are plus or minus one standard error. As you can see here, the average size is gradually increased, and particularly in recent years it increased by about two centimeters, but we noticed the flattening off in 2011.

Since this is the average length, we should be careful with the interpretation of this increase. However, if I look at the catches we notice more larger fish in our samples especially in the last couple of years. We also saw more smaller fish in our catches. The nominal CPUE shows an increase in the catches in recent years, but it is important to realize the high variability.

That is the blue lines, just to remind you, but is important to realize the high variability in the catches in recent years or over the entire time series, but I still think that the increase in recent years is encouraging. The lower panel shows the normalized nominal and that is the blue line without the vertical errors.

Those also show the Delta-GLM standardized CPUE and that is the line with the vertical error bars. The blue line in the lower graph is the same as the blue line in the upper graph. The Delta-GLM standardized CPUE generally follows the nominal CPUE pattern over the time series. However, in the terminal years you can see 2011 the standardized CPUE is considerably above the nominal value.

Because of the increase in sampling effort due to the SEFIS efforts in 2011, we analyzed the data with and without the SEFIS data. The resulting CPUE pattern was generally the same so it didn't make a lot of difference whether we included or excluded the SEFIS data. Joey Ballenger in particular looked at several other ways at the data in trying to see what patterns were geographically; and no matter how we analyzed the data, the pattern of an increase in the 2011 CPUE was consistent throughout the region. We are still working on further analyses.

In summary, the increase in average size and the presence of large black sea bass in our data as well as the recent increase in relative abundance may be an indication that in the past gross overfishing may have occurred and also that the fishing pressure may have been quite severe. The data show an increase in CPUE in recent years most likely resulting from management.

But to clarify the significance of the absolute standardized CPUE, that high number in 2011, as I mentioned we are working on additional analysis. Also the additional years of data will show the relevance of that absolute level of the CPUE in the long time series, the long-term series. In other words, it is important to focus on the trend of that CPUE rather than the absolute CPUE value for the 2011 data point.

I'll move on to red snapper. The red snapper in our data sets have been relatively sparse historically. We catch red snapper or have been catching red snapper in relatively low numbers. As a result, the variability in the data obviously is relatively high. That was one of the main reasons that the MARMAP CPUE data was not used in the recent SEDAR assessment.

Our analysis included red snapper caught between 15 and 47 meters, and that was again the depth range in which we caught about a hundred percent of the red snapper in our catches. The Delta-GLM analysis used categories that are generally the same as the black sea bass categories except that there was one less depth stratum, so six for location, nine bins for depth, three bins for the bottom temperature and again the spring and the summer as a seasonal category.

These are the two graphs. As I said earlier, the setup is similar as in the black sea bass. Due to the low catches, as you can see both the red line and the blue line in the top graph – the blue line as a reminder is the nominal CPUE; the red line is the average length – they're very variable. And just to give you an idea about the number of fish that we caught, on average we caught about 21 red snappers per year over the time series, but there were years where we caught less than 10. In 2011 we caught the highest number of red snappers in the time series, and those were 88 fish.

Due to the variability, obviously the length information doesn't show an obvious trend over the period 1990 to 2011. The nominal CPUE – and again keep the variability in mind – there is a gradual increase in the last couple of years, and again I would say that is encouraging for red snapper. If you look at the lower graph, which shows again in blue without the vertical error bars the nominal CPUE and in black with the vertical error bars the standardized CPUE data.

As I said, there were two years missing, 1999 and 2003, due to the low number of catches. Also, due to the low number of occurrences of red snapper in our catches, we had to eliminate a significant number of data points. What was significant here is that the general pattern of the nominal CPUE and Delta-GLM corrected CPUE generally follows the same pattern, including an uptick of CPUE in the most recent years.

An increase in the CPUE in recent years may be a result of red snapper management, but also the increase in fishery-independent sampling in particular in the southern area where we know red snapper may occur in higher abundances than potentially in other areas played the role. To better understand the addition of the new SEFIS data we explored the standardized CPUE with and without and the SEFIS catch in the 2011 data.

As I mentioned earlier, we did the same for black sea bass and there was no real change in the data with and without the SEFIS data. However, for red snapper that pattern was different.

Without the SEFIS data – and these are both standardized Delta-GLM CPUE values – without the SEFIS data, the CPUE decreased or remained the same in 2011.

Remember the high variability; I eliminated the vertical error bars here. Otherwise, it would be very difficult to distinguish the two lines. With the new SEFIS data, there was an increase in CPUE, and I feel that this emphasizes the importance of the new sampling efforts, in particular the increase in sampling efforts off of Georgia and Florida.

It also shows that the Delta-GLM method may not be able to completely correct the CPUE if the catches are low such as in red snapper and when there is a significant unbalance in the sampling efforts relative to the species distribution. Obviously, we feel that the new data is able to better inform the model as to the CPUE adjustments for the standardized CPUE. Note again that was not the case for black sea bass where there were no differences. Of course, an important factor there is that we catch a lot black sea bass in our traps than red snapper.

Of course, in addition, to inform the model that the new SEFIS effort also includes the collection of video information, which we previously did not have available, so both SEAMAP and MARMAP trap efforts now collect video information. The caveats of the data that I have presented are that you have to realize that this is a summary overview.

As I mentioned earlier, the constraints and the stratification that we have used in our CPUE may be different from those used in SEDAR stock assessments. As I mentioned at the beginning of my presentation, this is not an update of the stock status of the black sea bass and red snapper. As you are well aware, that update would require an update of all indices as used in the stock assessment and it would also require an update of the age composition for all data streams and the assumption that all the data such as life history parameters would remain the same as in the last assessment.

I mentioned earlier that we are working on an annual trends report. It took us a little bit longer this year because we have included so many new analyses, and it will include a summary of the three gears that we have been using. In addition to the Chevron trap, it will include the vertical longline and horizontal longline or what are currently called the short bottom longline and long bottom longline.

It will include 24 species including species that are important for regional management such as gray trigger and scamp, vermilion snapper, red porgy and a variety of other species. Because of the fact that the analysis can be done relatively quickly after we complete our sampling season, we can provide an annual update of the trap and longline CPUE and mean length between January and March of the year following sampling.

We can also provide age composition and reproductive parameter updates for selected species probably by May of the year following collection. Of course, all this depends on sufficient funding. I talked with Todd Kellison and Nate Bacheler. The video CPUE obviously requires a little more processing time.

Analysis of video recordings is very labor-intensive as you were provided with an update by Todd a while ago. Todd mentioned that potentially we could collectively provide some video CPUEs in the summer after collecting the data; but as I mentioned that is a very time-consuming process. With that, I open the floor for any questions.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you very much, Marcel. Questions for Marcel? I think it certainly reflects what you are seeing in 2011 or it reflects what we're hearing from fishermen who are out there on the water and it is encouraging to see the increases in those stocks.

DR. REICHERT: Yes, I think it is very consistent with what we are hearing and also it is consistent with what we're actually seeing on the deck in recent years. We randomly sub-sampled black sea bass, about 33 percent of the black sea bass that we see, for life history. Because of the high volume of black sea bass, we are actually considering lowering that number because it has become very time-consuming to process all the fish during the nighttime hours and be ready again the next morning to start trapping fish again.

MR. JOLLEY: Thanks, Marcel. When you had a low snapper recovery, how many did you have? I saw some numbers up there but I didn't see them fast enough to see –

DR. REICHERT: Say that again.

MR. JOLLEY: What was the sample size on snapper?

DR. REICHERT: In 2011 we caught 88 and in previous years we have caught less than 10 during a sampling season.

MR. JOLLEY: How many traps are you using when you do this?

DR. REICHERT: On average, prior to the SEAMAP Reef Fish Survey coming on board, I would say between 350 and 450. When SEAMAP came on board, we were able to increase that to I think about 600, about. Now with SEFIS we were able to double sampling effort so we are now over a thousand traps per season. We are sampling over a thousand traps per season in the entire region.

MR. JOLLEY: And then how many days of trapping would occur with those traps?

DR. REICHERT: That has varied a lot with the funding. MARMAP for a while was down to I think about 25 days currently, but again we were hit with a significant funding reduction, but we hope to accomplish between 45 and 50 sampling days by MARMAP and I think a little over 50 sea days by SEAMAP, so it's about I would say between 80 and 100 sea days realistically per year; possibly a little more than a hundred.

MR. JOLLEY: And then the geographic range, in mid-Florida to Carolina or something like that?

DR. REICHERT: Yes, it is a little south of Cape Canaveral, the St. Lucie area, and traditionally we have gone to Cape Lookout and we are currently expanding our sampling. Because of the new sampling efforts by SEFIS, we are planning on expanding the sampling north of Cape Lookout to the Cape Hatteras area.

DR. PONWITH: Mr. Chairman, of course, I'm not a member of the committee, but I would just like to add my thanks to Marcel for the excellent presentation that shows the difference in these two analytical approaches to looking at catch-per-unit effort and also just reiterate what a critical collaboration this is for rounding out our fishery-independent data collections.

MARMAP is our anchor. It is a long-term sampling effort that represents the best baseline for fishery-independent data we have got in the South Atlantic; and added to that the combination of that with SEAMAP and the SEFIS represents a really powerful patchwork that has been very intentionally stitched together to represent sort of a comprehensive sampling program.

It is collectively a very modest amount of money, but again it gives us a very powerful tool for evaluating the status of the reef fish stocks in the South Atlantic. And just to reiterate again, the loss of that 40 percent of additional funding to MARMAP was a tough blow to deal with for this collective effort.

A fully funded program was included in the President's budget for 2013. It remains to be seen how that fares in the House and the Senate when they conference the appropriation. But again this is just a critical element to understanding the relative abundance of these animals in their natural environment to link into the fishery-dependent data as inputs for our stock assessments, so thank you.

DR. REICHERT: If you will indulge me one second, MARMAP is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year, so really it's a long-term data set and a long-term monitoring program. I just wanted to mention that. Also, one of the consequences of the funding cut was that we had to eliminate the short bottom longline survey for 2012.

That was a gear that we in particular used in a lot of the MPAs, for instance, to monitor snowy grouper and some of the other areas. A lot of the MPAs, as you have seen, are in the shelf edge area and there is a lot of vertical relief and it is very difficult to deploy traps in that vertical relief, so we have used a vertical longline in those areas. I think for monitoring MPAs in the future I think it is important that we will be able to resume that vertical longline survey so we can keep following what is happening within and outside the MPAs. Thank you.

MR. CURRIN: We hope so, too. Any other questions for Marcel? Okay, we're not going to get into red snapper today; but before we leave Karen Raine came in. She is general counsel with the Office of Law Enforcement. If you recall our discussion earlier about delinquent logbooks, I wanted to give Karen an opportunity to come up give us an update her efforts to address the problems that we discussed in some detail at our last meeting.

MS. KAREN RAINE: I'm sorry I wasn't here this morning, but I'm not sure what all was discussed this morning that I understand it might have been an outstanding question.

MR. CURRIN: Well, Bonnie gave us an update on what her office is doing to encourage participation in getting in these logbooks in a timely manner. They're considerably late and there was some discussion I think about what could be done to encourage or perhaps even fine some of these people for not participating in a timely manner. I don't recall the exact question. Bonnie, you may have a better memory than I or someone else on the committee that was left hanging from our discussion. I looked at my notes and I couldn't pull it out.

DR. PONWITH: Karen, just to put it in context, we discussed the fact that we were going to send a letter out to all the permit holders to let them know that we were going to heighten our level of scrutiny on this issue and that we would be watching for patterns in tardiness in these reports and using that to guide some law enforcement visits to those individuals.

The discussion went in both directions; one, what could we do to penalize tardiness in these reports, what could we do to incentivize prompt and accurate reporting. Those were the discussions that we had. In terms of incentivizing it, one of the things that Dr. Crabtree brought up was the notion that we could build into the buffer system for management uncertainty some formulaic treatment of if X percent of the reports come in on time, the buffer would be reduced by some proportion because we would be actually controlling some of those management uncertainties. That is kind of the context of the discussion that we had.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, there were discussions about punitive measures as well as positive incentives to encourage participation and I think that is where Dr. Crabtree waded in. I think we just kind of where we left off was Bonnie gave us what she had planned to do through her office and that was contact people and tell them that they were late and encourage them to participate. I think the question came up if that doesn't work what do we do next? I think based on our discussions at the last meeting there are some very strong feelings about some potential punitive measures to ensure we get compliance.

MS. RAINE: Well, our penalty schedules do provide for penalties for non-compliance in dealer reporting and vessel reporting as well. Our penalty policy and monetary amounts and permit sanctions are available publicly online. Just to point out for you really quickly, there are a couple of different provisions in the penalty schedule for reporting violations.

I don't know how many of you have had the opportunity to look at our fairly new penalty policy and schedule, but it is a matrix. We have levels of penalties and what we look at is, one, the gravity of the offense. That is one level and then also the level of culpability, whether a violation was unintentional, negligent, reckless or intentional.

As I say, there is a matrix; and for the non-reporting, depending on the fishery involved, if it is a quota fishery or not, the reporting violations would come under a Level 1 or Level 2 in our matrix. And just so know, for example, an unintentional Level 1 penalty would be – the range would be a written warning to \$2,000, and a Level 2 would be a \$2,000 to \$5,000 range. And then they go up to the intentional ranges, which for one and two, respectively, would be \$6,000 to \$8,000 or \$10,000 to \$20,000.

Of course, each time someone didn't report could be considered a separate violation and it would depend on all the facts and circumstances of the case. Of course, if a case is referred to our office, we're going to look at it and review it and determine what we think would be appropriate action.

I think that there has been some question as to whether there could be such things as automatic permit sanctions or that type of thing. That really isn't possible under the Magnuson Act because fishermen need to be given the opportunity for notice of a potential violation and for an opportunity for a hearing, so something couldn't be automatically imposed.

I know some people might be aware of some proposed dealer reporting regulations for HMS dealers, and I know that there is some language in the proposal that, for example, HMS dealers are not authorized to first receive the different HMS species if the required reports haven't been submitted and received in a timely manner.

There is also a provision in those proposed regulations that failure to comply with the recordkeeping and reporting requirements may result in existing dealer permits essentially being sanctioned, revoked or whatever. In talking with HMS folks and an attorney who is my shop who has been working on those, that is not intended to be an automatic permit sanction. It setting up basically for a violation and for an investigation, to go through that process.

Also, I know that when it was mentioned today wondering whether the councils can set penalties and that type of thing, and that is not provided for as well. I mean the delegation of authority has been to the Office of General Counsel, and so that's why we're the ones who put out the penalty schedules and all. However, it is very helpful to us if there is a clear statement that you have provided as far as the importance you place on particular fishery or violation.

That can certainly play a part in the level of gravity of an offense and where that might be placed. I know you might have different ideas about different types of violations or different fisheries, but that type of information can certainly be very helpful. I know that when I have a case that is going to hearing, I'm going through management plans and Federal Register Notices for the proposed and final rules; and if there are comments, to try to gather information out of that as to the importance that the councils and the agency places on the particular action that is being looked at in that case.

That is extremely valuable information for us in going forward when we are going forward with a case and trying to take an action against someone. I would really encourage that type of information to be placed in the record.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you very much and I think you got some of that at the last meeting. I think as a result of the upcoming Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee you will get some additional emphasis from the council there. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I know, Karen, we can't set penalties but the council could set constraints upon permit renewals. We have right now you have to renew within one year or the permit is

lost. What flexibility do we have to put constraints on permit renewals with respect to logbook compliance and things like that? If you'd like to think about that, that's fine.

MS. RAINE: Okay, because I'd like to sort of know what you're thinking about and then we can think about it from that end, too.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think the discussion was potentially saying if you're delinquent on logbooks at some point, then your permit can't be renewed rather than having it open-ended, and my questions would be could we do something like that or would that be denying due process?

MS. RAINE: Well, currently my understanding is that if someone is coming in for a renewal and they are delinquent in their logbooks, that is considered an incomplete application, which we have been considering an administrative action rather than an enforcement action.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and we allow them to send in their logbooks and then renew their permit. I guess the question is could we say "too late, you were late and we're not renewing your permit"?

MS. RAINE: I don't know that you could do that, but you could certainly set up the possibility of an enforcement action.

DR. CRABTREE: Stand in the corner, for instance.

MS. RAINE: I don't know that you could say you don't get a permit.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I don't either and I don't know that we'd want to because I think that would have a whole lot of other consequences that would unroll; but I think that, Mac, was the gist of some of the discussion.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, it was and I think we kind of dropped it because we were going to take it up again in another committee. You might not want to be that harsh with them; but to me when somebody is 100 to 400 days late on submitting a required logbook or a dealer report, that is a fairly egregious violation.

It not only impacts them and it's not an administrative slap on the wrist that is required in my mind. It is something much harsher so it we will see where it all goes. I'm not one to say, look, you're two weeks late and we're going to yank your permit, but I would give serious consideration if I were king of the world – you know, if you're a month late, we're going to fine you; and if you're six months late, then we're going to do something with your permit; and if you're a year late, goodbye, my friend, your permit is gone.

People will do exactly what you let them get away with and for way too long I think we've been letting some of these dealers and fishermen get away with not submitting the information that is necessary for management and feeding into stock assessments.

MS. RAINE: And I can certainly appreciate that, but also as far as enforcement actions, people do have the right to notice and an opportunity before an administrative law judge to contest an enforcement action, and that is what we also have to keep in mind.

MR. JOLLEY: I'm curious, how often do we have an enforcement action as a result of slow reporting or non-reporting; do you have any indication of what that might be?

MS. RAINE: Not off the top of my head. I can say certainly the actions that we have are reported online; and also remember our office doesn't get all of the cases. We get those cases that will be considered for a monetary fine or permit sanctions. From my office I don't believe that we've had anything from the South Atlantic at least in a while, and I'm not sure about the Gulf. On our website we do have nationwide information there, but I don't recall anything for a while.

MR. CURRIN: Go ahead, Otha, maybe you've got some insight here.

MR. EASLEY: Yes, insight but not great news. The enforcement priority of dealing with logbooks has been pretty low until recent conversations and the council has brought to light that it has become important for the council, so it has since been raised in our priorities. That raising of priorities in these discussions here have kicked off some new procedures here that Bonnie mentioned earlier today so that when we start to hit these logbook violators hard, there is at least some advance notice and so we're not jumping on them, so to speak, out of the blue because previously we hadn't done much with the late logbook reporting.

MR. JOLLEY: How about dealers?

MR. EASLEY: The same situation; a little more aggressive with dealers than vessels.

DR. CRABTREE: And I think the dealers is a substantially more significant problem because it directly affects our ability to track these quotas, but what we have to weigh is do you want us to go catch the guy who simply keeps on fishing after the fishery is closed, are you more worried about him or are you more worried about going and knocking on some guy's door who is late with his logbooks, because the fact is we have limited ability and we have to set some priorities, and that is kind of what we're up against and that's what we have to think through. It's a zero sum game so if we're going to put more effort on this, we're going to put less effort on something else. That's the tricky part.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I know it is getting long but aside from a penalty schedule, can you not have a late fee such that we codify it in some form, if the guys is X number of months late, it is a penalty that is applied to it. When he buys his license, his late fee is –

DR. CRABTREE: Or a chairman who lets his committee meeting running late, five dollar fine? (Laughter)

MR. CURRIN: If we get the late fees in for the reporting, that's fine. Seriously, it is a good point, Doug, because not getting your permit renewed until you paid your fine is a different

consequence than not getting your permit renewed until you fill out a logbook that you haven't looked at in six months. I like that approach. Michelle, last word.

DR. DUVAL: I think it is really about creating the appropriate disincentive to not report and that is why we have some of the language that we do in the Generic Dealer Amendment; so enough said.

MR. CURRIN: Karen, have you got anything else? All right, I'm sure this conversation will carry forward. All right, let's recess, Mr. Chairman, for the day unless you have something else and we'll reconvene in the morning ready to go on red snapper and black sea bass at 8:30.

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, Wednesday morning, June 13, 2012, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Mac Currin.

MR. CURRIN: Good morning, everyone. Our next agenda item is some considerations of red snapper openings perhaps via an emergency rule or perhaps some other mechanism. Before we get into that, I just note on the record and hope everyone has received a letter from Southerland from Florida regarding this issue. Everyone should have received via e-mail and I just wanted to note that hope everyone has had an opportunity to read it.

Gregg and Myra brought up an issue regarding red snapper where there is some confusion about whether the council actually selected an ABC and so we need some clarification of that this morning before we proceed because it affects the projections and the amount of availability of fish, depending on where we set that ABC. If you recall, the SSC gave us a range of ABCs and I guess somehow it wasn't clear and didn't get into the amendment that we actually selected a particular ABC. I turn this over to Myra and let's see if we can make some headway here.

MS. BROUWER: Mac is right; the first thing the committee should do is discuss and make clear what ABC is being adopted for red snapper. If you go back to the minutes for the December 2010 meeting when you discussed Regulatory Amendment 10, it is implied that the projection that used the 0.3 weighting for the headboat index is the one that you selected, in a way, because it gave you the right reduction in harvest which combined with the reduction in effort allowed for the closure to be taken off the table.

What I have here in Attachment 8A, first of all, is just a summary of what is in place for red snapper. First of all, there was an interim rule that became effective on December 4, 2009, that prohibited harvest and possession of red snapper. That rule was then extended and then 17A was put into place, which implemented the Fmsy proxy of F 30 percent SPR, and that value is 2,131,000 pounds whole weight.

It also established a rebuilding schedule of 35 years, so 2044 is the last year of the rebuilding plan. The total annual kill allowed under that rebuilding plan is 144,000 pounds whole weight. It also established a rebuilding strategy where Foy is equal to F 98 percent of F 30 percent and the ACL, of course, is zero.

The accountability measure that 17A put in place was a monitoring program and you can see up on the screen – this is directly from the 17A document – the intent was to track the CPUE of red snapper via a fishery-independent monitoring program; to track the changes in biomass and then take action to end overfishing if the assessment indicates progress is not being made; track the biomass and CPUE through fishery-dependent sampling and that the CPUE would be evaluated every three years and adjustments would be made using the framework action.

17A, of course, also established the area closure. Then Regulatory Amendment 10 implemented the following regulation effective May 31, 2011, and that regulation was to remove the area closure that was implemented through 17A. Just to make sure everyone is on the same page, following this very short summary is a timeline of red snapper management measures, sort of just a visual for how it all happened.

And then the results of the latest stock assessment – that was SEDAR 24. If you recall, SEDAR 24 was not done, was not completed and was not even started when 17A was put into place. That 17A was done under the results of SEDAR 15, I believe. These are the results from the SEDAR 24 assessment. I'm not going to go through it all but you have it in your briefing books.

Here are the status determination criteria that resulted from that assessment. I also included the summary of Amendment 17A, which has a lot more detail, and a summary of actually Chapter 4 of Regulatory Amendment 10. That was an amendment that was very short. It was put together quickly so we didn't have a summary, but I included Chapter 4 so that you can see the rationale and the steps that the council took to justify getting rid of that closure.

The text of Regulatory Amendment 10 does not mention that the council selected a specific run for the ABC determination. What is included in Regulatory Amendment 10 is an appendix – and it is Appendix I. This is not included in your briefing book. This is something that I just brought along to inform the discussion and to bring you up to speed to where we are. This appendix includes the ABC recommendations that the SSC provided.

As you can see here, there is a range of ABCs from a low of 374,000 to a high of 421,000, and those three correspond to different weightings of the headboat index. The one that corresponds to the 0.3, which is the one that figures most frequently in the discussions in the minutes from the December 2010 meeting is that 421,000 pound ABC. Any questions so far? What the committee should clarify is whether that is the particular run that they would like to adopt; and then once we get that done, we can talk about allowing harvest and such.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you have laid out what the council did, and I think that is that they did choose that ABC value. Now, I think it is a good idea if we want to say that today, that's fine; but by the council approving Regulatory Amendment 10 with its appendices and everything, that's all part of the amendment, so I think that's exactly what the council did. It might not be stated as directly as we've stated it in other cases, but I think that is, yes, what the council did.

MS. BROUWER: Great, thank you for that clarification, and that is more or less what as staff thought as well, but we wanted to make sure it was on the record so that the public can understand more clearly what was done.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And I think it was probably the time constraints of – remember this all happened very quickly with Amendment 17A; and on the same day the Final Rule for Amendment 17A was published an emergency rule was published to delay the effective date of that larger closure because the stock assessment had just been finished and the SSC approved it. So for the timing factor I think that probably again factored into how this was all laid out and structured. Probably we could have done it even a little more clearly; but given the time constraints I think that's the reason it happened the way it did. But, yes, if we want to lay that out in the future more clearly, that is a great idea, Myra.

DR. CRABTREE: It says up there the ABC ranges 374 to 421,000, but that was for 2011, and we need to be clear that the ABC is not one number. It is a yield stream that is defined by the projection, so it is different for every year.

MR. CURRIN: Is that sufficient for you or would you like to have a motion from the committee to clarify that?

MS. BROUWER: That would be preferable.

MR. CURRIN: How about a motion from the committee to clarify that the council's intent in Regulatory Amendment 10 was to select the ABC at the top of the range provided by the SSC.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. CURRIN: That's everyone's tact. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I guess what the motion needs to say is that our intent was to adopt the projections reviewed by the SSC with the headboat index weight at 0.3.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The ABC projections.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, the ABC projections.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, thank you, Roy. Motion by Roy; second by Charlie. Discussion on that motion? **The motion is the council's intent was to adopt the ABC projections reviewed by the SSC with the headboat index weight of 0.3. Is there any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.** All right, does that clear that up?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, thank you.

MR. CURRIN: Are we ready to move on?

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm going to give a presentation on possible options for reopening. Leading up to this meeting, conversations with the council staff, the regional office, we felt it was important to lay out a few things for you to consider as you make your decision. Certainly, this is necessarily all of the options that you can consider but will hopefully provide some direction in your deliberations.

The first question obviously is, well, why reopen. I think it is a pretty straightforward question. This will allow some additional data collection, especially fishery-dependent age data. It will provide an economic boost to fishermen and communities given that this fishery has been closed for two and a half years.

It would also provide information for managers on the amount of effort and catch that could occur for future reopenings based on this reopening, and it meets the council's intention which is to reopen when feasible. You received estimates of discard mortalities and landings from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. I have summarized these here.

They've also provided a separate report. Just as a way of background, data is self-reported. It comes from three sources, commercial logbook, the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey and the Southeast Headboat Survey. We did have a small amount of landed catch primarily from state waters.

There was discard mortality rates applied based on the SEDAR 24 stock assessment to estimate dead discards. I'll emphasize the last point because I think it's important. The estimates certainly are uncertain given that it is self-reported data. The center noted that it could be possibly biased.

To give you an idea of the discard mortality estimates for 2010 and 2011, I've provided here a comparison of the projected estimates based on the ABC yield projection you just approved as well as what was estimated by the science center. As you can see, the discard mortality estimates are comparable for 2010 and 2011 relative to those projections. In 2012 you start to see a large increase in the discard mortality estimates that are being projected by the stock assessment.

The question really is what are those discard estimates going to look like in the 2012 fishing season? This is really the biggest challenge for us. In-season estimation of dead discards we're unable to do. We can get some estimates in season, but it is certainly not going to be comprehensive of all sectors.

What we do know is that for 2012 86,000 fish are projected to be killed through mortalities, and any estimate of discard mortalities' landings that would come in less than that would allow some level of harvest for 2012. Right now, as I mentioned, discards are projected to increase while the stock rebuilds. However, we're also seeing a declining trend in fishing effort so that might result in a reduction in discards.

As mentioned, harvest can only be allowed if there is some level of difference between the estimated mortalities and the projected mortalities, and I'll get into that in a little bit more detail

in the next few slides. This slide provides lots of detail. I won't go through in great depth, but essentially what it does is it looks at four different methodologies for estimating what would be killed through largely discard mortalities in 2012 and compares that to the projected estimates.

The first estimate is essentially taking those 2010 and 2011 average mortality estimates and saying that is going to be essentially what would be discarded or killed in 2012. That would allow your largest amount of landings of close to 20,000 fish. In comparison, some of the other options factor in increases in stock abundance and/or decreases in fishing effort; and depending on the amount of increase that would be assumed in terms of increases in stock abundance in fishing effort you could have as little of a harvest as maybe 2,000 fish or in the midrange of those two values somewhere around 10 to 13,000 fish.

The bottom line is there is certainly a lot of uncertainty surrounding how much the allowable harvest could be and a lot is contingent on how stock abundance is proceeding as well as how fishing effort might change discard mortality rates. This just graphically shows the falloff in fishing effort that we're observing for both the charter/private sector as well as the commercial fishing sector.

Certainly, we don't know how 2012 will proceed, but given the trends in recent years you can see that there has been a decline in both the number of angler trips taken recreationally as well as the trips and days at sea taken commercially. The remainder of the presentation essentially is set up contingent the allowable harvest that I just discussed, and so the three options that we're going to lay out for you here essentially are contingent on those landings' estimates being allowable.

The first option is you don't reopen, essentially maintain the status quo, proceed as you're currently proceeding for the time being. The second option would be to move forward with an emergency rule this year or some framework measure and that would reopen both the recreational and commercial sectors for a short period of time under strict bag and trip limits.

The third option would be a little bit more administratively rigorous and it would be to develop an exempted fishing permit and come up with a methodology for selecting vessels and fishing tournaments through a lottery to participate in that exempted fishing study and to provide data and other information for scientific purposes.

I'm going to go through the benefits and drawbacks of each option and try to compare and contrast them just to give you an idea of what the pros and cons might be of each. For Option 1 I think all of these are fairly obvious, but the bottom line is the benefit here is by continuing to keep the fishery closed we're going to reduce the likelihood of overfishing and increase the likelihood of stock rebuilding on time.

This also would allow for increases in future surpluses of fish that could lead to longer season openings, so you essentially delay the immediate benefits for future benefits by allowing larger harvests or longer seasons in the future. The drawback is this is not optimizing yield as required by the Magnuson Act if mortalities are projected below current levels.

It doesn't provide obviously any immediate social and economic benefits nor would it provide any benefits to data collection through additional fishery-dependent aging data. I won't go through all of this. Certainly, Monica or others can discuss emergency actions and our authority under emergency actions, but what I did want to emphasize is that emergency action can be justified under multiple situations.

In this instance probably the most appropriate is under economic and social considerations. Emergency is defined as a situation that results from an unforeseen event or in this instance really a recently discovered circumstance, new data and information is coming to light, and it presents conservation and management problems. With that, I'll let Monica and others discuss the merits of emergency action if that is the avenue that you wish to proceed.

In terms of benefits and drawbacks, certainly this compared to Option 1 is going to provide an immediate social and economic benefit to fishermen. It will provide useful information to you as managers and to scientists in terms of how long future reopenings could be based on effort and catch trends. Also, it would provide some additional fishery-dependent data collection, although the value of that data might be limited just because of the short timeframe in which it could be collected.

One of the major challenges and drawbacks to a short reopening is it is going to be very difficult to estimate private and charter landings since these are done through survey methodologies, and it will require additional sampling and expenditures on behalf of the National Marine Fisheries Service and states in order to try to better estimate landings during that short period of time.

As I'll get into in the next few slides, the estimates of the season length are going to be highly uncertain from our standpoint and the short opening could increase safety-at-sea issues especially if bad weather occurs on a weekend or during a week in which we decide to open. There is a potential for increased discards relative to Option 1 as more fishing effort is going to on the water targeting red snapper and relative to Option 1 the likelihood of overfishing is increased.

Before I get into the estimates of season length, I just wanted to note that there is certainly a lot of analytical challenges here. One of the primary challenges is the fishery has been closed for two and a half years, so historical data pre-closure isn't necessarily going to be representative of future conditions.

There also could be regulatory changes that are considered with a reopening such a size limit or the bag limit that might differ from historically what has been the management measure put in place. Not knowing how you want to proceed, we weren't able to estimate what those changes might result in. Although we have seen this decline in fishing effort in the EEZ over time, it doesn't necessarily translate to a decline in fishing effort if you have a short seasonal opening, and then environmental factors such as wind and storm events can really dictate the amount of fishing effort and the amount that would be landed on a particular weekend.

You can see from this graph the buoy data from St. Augustine, Florida, and the wave height during 2011, and you can see how much higher it is during the fall than it is during the winter and spring. The conditions certainly get worse as you get later in the year, which is not

surprising, and that can certainly affect our landing and discard estimates as well as effort estimates.

We took two approaches to estimate what the season length might be if it was reopened. The first was to look back at the historical landings and take the maximum landings observed during 2007, 2008 or 2009 and use those essentially as a proxy for what we might expect could be landed in 2012 during a particular month.

We distributed landings essentially uniformly within a wave based on the number of days within that time period. We did not adjust these estimates based on changes in exploitable abundance. I'll show you a second methodology where we actually factor exploitable abundance into the projections.

With the second method, for those that were at the December council meeting, I presented information on black sea bass. We used the same modeling approach as we did for black sea bass here for red snapper. It is essentially a model that takes into account seasonal and yearly trends in landings and the projects forward what would be estimated to be caught based on those past trends as well as future trends in exploitable abundance.

The inputs for that data are recreational landings for 2001 to 2009 and exploitable abundance which is obtained directly from the stock assessment. Now here is the exploitable abundance and what you'll note here is that there is a huge spike in 2006 through 2008, and that corresponds to the large increase in recruits that were entering the fishery. Landings went up and then they tail off as the fishery closes in 2010.

Right now the exploitable abundance is being projected to be increasing but it is not at the level at least pre-closure where we saw the recruitment. There is a lot of uncertainty here in terms of how quickly is that trend increasing after the closure and is it realistic to estimate that exploitable abundance is actually lower right now than it was when we had the large amount of recruitment entering the fishery.

Essentially what the projections are indicating is that a large portion of those recruits were harvested and removed from the population and no longer exploitable in the current population. Now, a complicated graph here and I will try to simplify for you. All these lines that go across the graphic essentially indicate the various amounts that could be allowed based on an earlier slide I showed, so that blue line, for instance, corresponds to the maximum amount of landings that could be harvested and that is partitioned into the recreational allocation, which is approximately 71 and 72 percent of the total harvest.

The lower green light is essentially the lowest amount that could be harvested and then obviously lines in the middle are intermediate to those. The red bars represent the maximum landings that were observed during 2007 through 2009 for those particular months. To get an idea of what the season length would be, essentially you can look, for instance, at July and you can see where that blue line crosses right above that bar in July.

It would take approximately one month, the entire month of July to land the 14,098 fish. In comparison if you looked at January, it would take probably about 15 to 20 days to land that amount of fish during the month of January simply based on maximum landings observed during the pre-closure timeframe.

To put that in numbers for each of these months, it gives you an idea of the variability from month to month in terms of how long the season could potentially be open. For the months of August, September, October you get the longest seasons because low levels of landings were observed pre-closure timeframe; whereas, during January through June the season would be open much shorter because landings were observed to be much higher during the pre-closure timeframe.

How this relates to obviously a future reopening we're certainly unsure of, and this might not be representative obviously of what could occur in the future given changes in fishing effort. That was essentially our first attempt in terms of using maximum landings. The second way that we evaluated this was through that seasonal auto-regressive model, and so the black line up until January 2010 essentially – well, excuse me, the dots up to January 2010 essentially represent observed landings amounts that were seen in the fishery.

You can see that increase in landings that occurs beginning in 2008 and going up through 2010, and then the fishery is closed. What we did is we used this model to fit what would be landed, and you can see it provides a pretty good fit, and then starting in January 2010 through January 2012 it estimating essentially what could have been caught if the fishery had remained open and given patterns of exploitable abundance.

I plotted both that mean value, which is the black line, as well as the red dotted line represents the upper confidence limit of our estimates, so you can see there is a lot of uncertainty surrounding these estimates. What we're most interested in is essentially that last set of data starting in January of 2012 as a way of estimating what could be landed in a particular month during a reopening from January to December 2012.

So a similar graphic to the one I just showed you; it looks like we're missing a line on it, but the bottom line here is that these estimates tend to be higher in terms of the actual landings that would occur during a particular month if it is reopened compared to the previous approach, and so therefore this methodology is going to estimate a shorter fishing season than the previous approach.

Just to give you an idea of the previous approach especially in like August, September, October was estimating season lengths that were on the order of 30 days or more. Here you can see that the season lengths are less than 30 days and are fairly comparable across all months, so a lot of that month-to-month variability has been washed out just because of the difference in methodology.

But depending on the amount that would be allowed for landings, you could be looking at anywhere from a couple of days open to a two to three weeks reopening. I will mention that in

calculating the season length that we are essentially assuming that the landings are homogenous or equivalent each day within a month. Certainly, that is not the case.

There is more effort and more fishing occurs on weekends versus weekdays and we're not able to partition that, so this certainly could be kind of an upper bound, so to speak, in terms of the amount of days open if you considered not reopening continuously but wanted to reopen for weekends only or short periods of time compared to a continuous reopening.

For the commercial fishery I took a little bit different approach. We did take historical landings in 2009, which were the highest in a recent timeframe. We imposed trip limits on the landings. This is all based on logbook data for 50, 100 and 200 pounds. Then we re-estimated the monthly landings based on those trip limits.

Now, these projections don't account for changes in effort, stock abundance or fishermen behavior, so that is certainly a huge caveat. If effort and landings are higher than historical levels, then we're certainly underestimating how long the season might be reopened. The benefit of the commercial fishery is we do have a commercial quota monitoring system in place; and if the trip limit is set at a fairly low level, it is going to deter directed harvest of red snapper and should result in a fairly slow harvest rate relative to the amount that is allowed.

So a similar graphic to the previous few slides I've shown, and once again the difference bars represent different trip limits or no trip limit, and the lines represent the amount that could be landed. And here instead of presenting in numbers, I'm presenting in pounds gutted weight; but anytime a bar goes above one of those horizontal lines, it means the season length would be shorter than a month. Any bars that are less than the horizontal lines are going to be greater than a month.

I don't have a similar table unfortunately for you to show how long the season length would be, and that is partly because we have the quota monitoring system. This should give you at least an idea of the harvest rates back in 2009 and how much they would have been reduced by imposing these fairly low trip limits.

Now, the third option is quite different than the second in that it is an exempted fishing permit. NMFS can authorize such a permit for limited testing, public display, in this instance primarily for data collection. It exempts from the regulations to allow target or incidental harvest of species that would otherwise be prohibited.

The Regional Administrator can impose terms and conditions associated with the exempted fishing permit. When an exempted fishing permit is issued, there is a comment period where the public can provide input on it, and the following information must accompany the exempted fishing permit.

Essentially it is going through the environmental impacts and regulations that without the exempted fishing permit would be prohibited. Similar to Option 2, it is going to provide immediate social and economic benefits although it might take longer to get an exempted fishing permit in place. The fishery-dependent data once again could be collected.

The value of such data might be greater than Option 2 because it could be collected over a broader seasonal timeframe as well as spatial distribution, and landings could be closely monitored as part of the terms and conditions of reporting under that exempted fishing permit. The drawback is depending how it is set up you might disproportionately distribute benefits across sectors where some sectors might be included and some might be excluded.

As mentioned, it might take longer to implement and the potential for increased discards and the likelihood of overfishing might be greater relative to Option 1. Some ideas that have been tossed about if you pursue this as an option is to select vessels and/or tournaments to participate in the exempted fishing permit through a lottery.

We don't really have any programs in place right now at the federal level in the southeast that do this, but certainly are aware of state programs especially for wildlife that commonly do this. Vessels could be stratified geographically and temporally to allow harvest and data collection throughout the red snapper range.

Increased reporting requirements could be used to enhance data collection such as hail-in and hail-out; limiting effort to one trip per day and reporting landings after each trip. There have also been comments mentioned to me about possibly issuing tags to fishermen as way of also limiting harvest.

As a way of background, if you wanted to pursue the exempted fishing permit we've put together this slide for previous amendments, but it gives you an idea of where a bulk of the red snapper are harvested. Certainly, they occur throughout the South Atlantic, but the primary range is between Cape Canaveral and Charleston with most fish being caught off of Northeast Florida and Georgia.

In terms of vessels that potentially could participate, I won't go through this in great detail, but you can see that there are 210 charterboats that currently have home ports between the Georgia/South Carolina Line and central east Florida and another 18 headboats that are also in that area. In terms of the entire South Atlantic we have over a thousand permitted charterboats and 59 headboats.

There is a large pool of vessels that potentially could be interested in participating in such a study and the EFP could decide what areas might be eligible to participate and what number of vessels you want to include. Certainly, the more vessels you include the less days that they could spend fishing or less fish they could actually individually harvest.

The same for the commercial fleet, if you pursued a commercial exempted fishing permit, the number of vessels varies greatly throughout the South Atlantic. Currently we have 467 vessels that reported landings species that are commonly associated with red snapper. This is based on 2011 data, and so I essentially presumed that if they're harvesting species that are commonly caught with red snapper that they would be capable of catching red snapper.

From that, you can see that there are about 100 or 110 that exist between Georgia and central east Florida. The regions I indicate here aren't the number of vessels by state but they're the number of vessels fishing in areas off of each of these states. In conclusion, if the fishery remains closed, it increases the likelihood of stock rebuilding; reduces the likelihood of overfishing not occurring; and provides no immediate social and economic benefits.

The bottom line is this one is going to provide you the greatest biological benefits, the least social and economic benefits. Emergency rule or framework measure will provide you the most immediate benefit to all sectors. However, as I mentioned there is a lot of uncertainty related to the season length estimates and catches for certain sectors or segments of the fishery will be difficult to monitor.

Opening through the exempted fishing permit would provide the greatest scientific benefits because you could stratify catch and effort throughout the range of the fishery. However, this might provide limited benefits to managers in terms of evaluating the effects of future reopenings, but would provide a more accurate way of accounting for the landings and would be the administratively burdensome and likely the longest to implement of the options considered. With that, I'll take any questions.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you, Andy; and before we get into questions for Andy I think Bonnie has some words to explain regarding the projections that your office did. After Bonnie finishes, we'll it up for questions for both of them.

DR. PONWITH: One of the questions that came up on the projections was what recreational estimates we used for the private vessels and the for-hire charter vessels. The data that we used for those were the MRFSS data. The reason is because sort of the inputs were from MRFSS. We've got MRIP now and we've got a new estimation process, but the workshop for evaluating how to calibrate those new methodologies into the time series was held very recently. Those adjustments will have to be made in the future, so this is why for the sake of consistency we're using the MRFSS data.

MR. CURRIN: All right, questions for Andy or Bonnie? Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure who to address this question to. It has to do with an exempted fishing permit. Who would be the applicant? Could the states be the applicant and could they then administer a tag program? That is what is of most interest to me is going down the exempted fishing permit road with states being the applicant and states administering the tag program based on some formula for division that we set up here.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, there are lots of ways that could go. We have an application for an exempted fishing permit in the Gulf of Mexico right now to allow some tournaments to take red snapper after the season, and that application was submitted by Louisiana Fish and Wildlife, but they worked with Florida, Alabama, Texas as well and some of the tournaments are in those states. There are lots of ways to do that.

I would point out, too, that the option of fish tag and a lottery, that could be done outside of an exempted fishing permit. One decision we could make is that we're going to reopen this fishery with a fish tag. We've got 13,000 fish and we could set up a website, people come and apply. There is some random selection of who gets them. We send them a letter, send them the fish tags. We would have to decide how long is the fish tag valid. There would be a number of decisions that you would have to make. That tag would entitle them to go catch a fish.

That could be done and that could just be the management regime we're going to put in place, and then the numbers of fish would follow the projections somehow corrected. There are advantages to that. The disadvantage of that route is it is going to take more time. We would have to get Paper Work Reduction Act clearance to set up a website and have people apply.

We would have to figure out a way to have them pay for the fish tags, but I think it's doable. An exempted fishing permit will take time because we'll have to figure out all those questions; who is the applicant and how is it going to work and everything. The advantage to either one of those is the likelihood of running over is pretty minimal because you're going to issue a set number of tags.

The other thing I would point out is if we went to a fish tag system, presumably the fishing would be spread out over the year. From a data collection standpoint, it seems to me it would be easier to examine a whole lot of fish if they all came in over a couple of weekends. You could send people down to the dock and I'm pretty sure they're going to see a lot of red snapper come in.

The risk of reopening from, say, a few weekends or something like that is that we don't have a lot of control what is caught. As Andy said, it is difficult to know how many people will actually go fishing. I expect quite a few will. You've got weather issues. We could have a hurricane show up the weekend we decide we're going to open.

There are all kinds of things like that that we have to consider and the tradeoffs really are to have more control over what is going on means a more complicated system, which means it going to take longer to get it set up. I doubt we could get a lottery system set up before the end of this year, but we could probably have it in place next year and then they'd have all of next year I guess to use their tags. There are a whole lot of different permutations of this that we could talk about.

MR. CURRIN: Duane, did you have a followup?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, so we could set up a tagging system without going the exempted fishing permit route is what I heard you say, and that was kind of a surprise to me. I didn't know we could do that; but if we don't have to go the exempted permit route and we can set up a tag system, I like the idea of the tag system simply because I think it affords us a better opportunity to collect data from these fish that are landed.

I still think we could set it up on a limited basis. We don't have to set it up for the entire year. We might set up a three-month period where you can fish under your tag, and I like that better

because I don't want to see people fishing for these fish and landing these fish all year and us not having the opportunity to sample all or almost all the fish that are landed.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roy, if we were to go to weekends instead of a tag permit, do we have a payback? Obviously, we haven't been very good about keeping track of the recreational black sea bass and they were going over a lot. Is there a payback if they go over, which I'm afraid they might?

DR. CRABTREE: No, there isn't anything like that set up in it because the fishery is being closed. Now, if we decide we're going to reopen in some fashion, we may need to look at that. Remember where we were was we were just going to have discards and nobody wanted to get involved in paybacks with discards because the data is so inherently uncertain, and it is self-reported and you don't want to produce incentives for people to stop reporting.

Now, if we reopen for weekends, I guess in theory we could talk about if we go way over that's going to affect what we do next year, but the difficulty is going to be if you allow just a couple of three-day windows to fish, MRIP/MRFSS isn't really set up to capture that and it is going to be very difficult to really tell what they caught on it.

With a fish tag system, presumably if it works and if the states all recognize the tags and require them, too, it doesn't to be that there is much risk that you would go over; and if you did it would be minor and violations I think.

MR. CURRIN: Bonnie, you had something to that point and then I'll get back to my list here.

DR. PONWITH: Roy touched on it and it is just that the MRIP program is designed to be a steady as you go type of monitoring program. It is not designed around estimation for acute events like a tournament. I would liken opening the fishery up in the recreational more like a tournament than would be typical behavior.

If that were the approach that the council had an interest in, it would have to be done with the notion that negotiations with the MRIP Program or with the states and my shop to be able to put some focused effort not only in the sampling but also designing how that sampling would be done so that we were able to do a good job estimating what the actual landings were in the aftermath because, of course, that number is going to be a very important input to the next stock assessment.

MR. BELL: Bonnie was kind of going in the direction where I was going to ask. One of the benefits of this is the collection of data. Are we set up; when I say we, we the Service, we the states – I'm not sure how this will work but are we set up to receive the data? In other words, who is going to – if we're talking fish; you know, who is going to interact with the various fisheries and what is the thinking on that? Can we actually receive the data right now or would that take some doing?

DR. PONWITH: That is a very good question, and the answer is that I see a series of steps here. The first step is to go back to Andy's presentation, which did a really good job of outlining the

situation, and looking at those bycatch estimates and evaluating those scenarios to make a determination, first of all, are there enough fish left over in any of those scenarios to support some level of reopening?

Once that decision is made, the second decision is what would that reopening look like. The answer to your question depends on which of those scenarios, because I would say without exception, regardless of the type of opening that the council is interested in, it would require dramatic changes to status quo monitoring. What we need to do is almost look at this iteratively this is the opening style that manages risk of overshooting the best, that maximizes economic and recreational opportunity the best; and then given that, what would it take to actually monitor it adequately. The catch is monitor it in a way that it doesn't compromise the ongoing monitoring that we're doing for all the other species as well, which is just critical data for these stock assessments. That in my mind seems like the steps.

When we get to the point where you're evaluating, then we can enter from the science side into the discussion and say the pros of this from a monitoring standpoint are; the cons of this from a monitoring standpoint are; and we're prepared to help you with that.

DR. CRABTREE: I've had discussions with Doug and Spud Woodward in Georgia and with Luiz in Florida, and they're willing to put people out on the docks if we open for a short enough period of time and sample fish. There is a lot of uncertainty in here, and I think what we ought to do probably is decide, one, do we think we have enough fish to open and do we want to do that; and if we do, then which scenario are we going to go with and how many fish are there. Then we can start talking about, okay, what are the terms and how do we want to open it? It seems to me the first thing to decide is are there enough fish available and are we comfortable with the risk entailed with all this and do we want to open this thing?

MR. CURRIN: That's a very good step-wise approach and probably the way we should proceed, but all of it is really tied together and the final answer depends on how all the pieces of the puzzle are put together. I am going to go ahead and allow a little bit more discussion on this and then I think Roy's suggestion of how to proceed is a good one. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I had a couple of quick questions and the first one was to that point, Roy. I heard you say 13,000 fish and I know that's within the range but I didn't know if that was already predetermined number or not.

But even if we went with the maximum of 19,000 fish and 14 of those being recreational, might we encounter enough fish to make some meaningful contribution to the next assessment if it's only 14,000 fish. And then I wanted to ask Andy real quick what was that number of commercial vessels that you said might be affected – might be harvesting? I know we've got 467 vessels across the region, but I thought you said 110 and I wanted to find out.

MR. CURRIN: I think it was 400 total.

MR. STRELCHECK: The 110 vessels I mentioned were ones that were operating in statistical areas primarily between the Georgia/South Carolina Border and central east Florida; whereas, the 467 would include the entire South Atlantic range.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, the catch levels haven't been predetermined. Bonnie can comment on it, but I think the science center has some real heartburn with just using – the 210 and 211 average would give you 19,000 fish, but part of what you will have to do and whatever rulemaking you do if you decide to open is you're to have to respecify what the ACL is because right now it is zero, so we're going to have to set a new ACL. That's something that would need to be determined.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee but should at some point the council decide to open a fishery on this, New Jersey operates a bonus fishery using their commercial striped bass allocation for recreational fishermen and it involves them applying for basically a tag and receiving some sort of card and then having to follow up and document the fish that they caught online I think is the way they have it set up so that might be a useful model or at least something to explore whether or not it might have any utility in this case.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, Wilson, and North Carolina operated a catch card system for striped bass I think during one season. I'm not sure whether that's still in effect or not, but they had some experience with that as well. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I guess my question was somewhat along the lines of what Doug brought up. I was just wondering what is the error around the estimated discards. Andy, do you have a sense of that?

MR. STRELCHECK: We don't have error estimates for any of this that were presented in the document. Certainly with MRFSS estimates, we could generate some CVs, but I would say it is large at this point but the amount I don't know.

MR. CURRIN: I guess the best measure of that is the comments that were made about the amount of uncertainty associated with it, so my guess it would be large as well. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: The reason I mentioned the states in the first question/comment I made is because the state is already set up to do lotteries for a variety of different things. If we could figure out how many fish – and I think my thoughts are in the 10,000 fish range is what I'd like to see us go with. I do think that is enough fish to reopen the fishery.

But if you allocated the number of fish between the states and allowed them to do the lottery – and I can't speak for the state directors, but I really do think the states could do this effectively and quickly. I think you would need to limit the timeframe, whether it is two months or three months, for you to use your tag.

You have to report every fish that is landed and I really think the biological information from that fish is critically important and there has got to be a way to collect the biological information from every fish, the otoliths, the length, the weight, and that has got to be turned in. 10,000 fish,

I don't think that's undoable, but I think it's easier perhaps for the states to do it than it is for NOAA Fisheries to do it. I think they obviously have to coordinate but I do think it is an easier way to do it.

MR. CURRIN: We're kind of getting into the weeds a little bit, so let's make we've got all the questions answered based on Bonnie's comments and Andy's presentation and then we'll kind of step into this as Roy suggested. If there are questions or pertinent comments, go ahead. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Andy, I think it is going to take a little more time to set this up and do it right. Now, my question would be if it took a year to set something up like this, do we get some benefit from fish because it would take a little longer and we could have little more fish for the fishery.

MR. STRELCHECK: There is potential for that but there is also the potential that we have 2012 discard mortality estimates at that time and it showed that there is no buffer between what has been projected and what has been estimated. That's essentially the crux of the issue here is that we cannot estimate in season what these discards are going to be, so we're trying to estimate here based on some different ways of projecting it. You could get to this point next year and find out the discard mortality estimates continue to be comparable and in line with the projected estimates.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, I have I guess a weed-type comment to some extent. I like the idea of a tag because I think it's more important to control the harvest of these things, but at the same time I'm concerned about getting the biological information that we need. I know at one time before I retired from South Carolina that South Carolina and Georgia both I think had a program in place to try and get data on red drum and they had a freezer program where fishermen could leave racks and they periodically collected them.

Of course, that wouldn't give you weight but it would give you lengths and otoliths and those sorts of things. I don't know if those programs still exist or not. Of course, then somebody has got to work those racks up. I was curious whether states still have a program like that that might could be used. It seems to me there would be a lot of incentive for fishermen to do something like that because it would be to their advantage to provide that information. Again, I was curious whether states have something like that still in place.

MR. CURRIN: Michelle, does North Carolina have a program like that set up or have they ever had a rack program, freezers? It seems to me that at some point we were doing that years ago.

DR. DUVAL: There certainly has been interest in having a rack program, and that is something that has been included actually as a priority for a long time.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, Jessica, how about Florida?

MS. McCAWLEY: We do have a program like that set up for snook.

MR. HAYMANS: We have 14 freezers, give or take a couple, that collect about 2,500 carcasses a year, primarily spotted seatrout.

MR. CURRIN: Mel, how about South Carolina?

MR. BELL: Yes, we have a program as David recalls. It was initially for red drum and all but we do sheepshead and other things.

MR. CURRIN: So this would probably put some strain and stress on it depending on the capacities and how you run, but it is going to require some space, but it looks like everybody has got some capability that might be able to expand it as well perhaps.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I had one for Roy. Roy, didn't we open the Gulf on a weekend type scenario for red snapper due to a hurricane or something, the Gulf Oil Spill or –

DR. CRABTREE: It was the oil spill; and because so much of the Gulf was closed, there was quite a bit of uncaught quota left over, and we reopening I believe starting in October on three-day weekends. I can't recall exactly how many weekends, but I think we had around six or seven weekends that I thought fishing was allowed.

MR. HARTIG: And you had the totals from what was caught? You guys had a way to look at the effort and how many fish were caught in that timeframe for the Gulf?

DR. CRABTREE: We got the catch estimates straight from the MRFSS system. I don't know, Andy, if you recall if the CVs were particularly high for those waves; probably nothing to compare them to but –

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't recall what the CVs were, but there were 12 days open in each wave so there was four weekends for each wave to at least generate some sort of estimate during that timeframe.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think it would be interesting to see what those were and see how that worked out. The other thing I had was Andy made a pretty strong statement about those big year classes and maybe the effort at that time really drug those back down and we may not be getting the bang for our buck from those year classes currently. I think it would be relatively simple to go back and do a cohort analysis in the hard parts that have been collected so far to see if those strong year classes are still contributing to the fishery. I think that could inform our judgment about how many red snapper we can take.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, there is likely some sort of signal there to gauge the magnitude and interpreting it might be difficult. Bonnie, did you have something to that point?

DR. PONWITH: To that point, that is going to be a really critical question that we will be asking of the data when we do the red snapper evaluation in 2013, and that is what patterns are we seeing not only in what happened to that big, huge pulsed year class; but if you'll remember when we did SEDAR 24 there were decisions that needed to be made on assumptions for recruitment into the spawning population.

The decision was made to work under the assumption that there would be very high recruitment into the population, which that is another assumption that needs to be tested did that bear out or did it follow what has been traditionally kind of a common pattern which is recruitment ambles along at some low level and then all of a sudden you get this giant burst of recruitment success.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that is something that we need to look at because if you look at that graph Andy put up of the exploitable biomass, those year classes were fished out by the time we closed the fishery. That is not really consistent I don't think with what we're hearing from fishermen that they're still seeing a lot of fish out there.

Bonnie, we did make an assumption at one point to use very high recruitment, but that was in the projections from SEDAR 15, and so that went away when SEDAR 24 was done. We made that assumption then trying to account for those big year classes. I assume they're using some varying of the stock-recruitment curve in these projections, but it doesn't look like to me it is projecting particularly high recruitment since it fell off so much.

You can look at the age structure, but if you see those year classes still persisting then you have got decide, well, is that because you have had poor recruitment following them or is because you didn't fish them down as hard as you thought. I think as quick as we could take look at some age structure data, that it would be informative.

If I could just make one other comment, Duane said something about it would be less complicated to let the states run a lottery fish tag program, and I actually think it would be much more complicated if the states do it. I know, for example, in Florida if they want to charge for the tags, they would have to get authority from the legislature to charge fees, so I think there are a lot of complications.

If we did just a very straight-up lottery fish tag program, we could put aside the whole issue of whether you're commercial or recreational and just be you've got to go on a website and you enter your name. There is a window of time people have to apply and we generate a list, we randomly pull names out with replacement until we've got 13 – now many thousand fish there are, we've got that many people names. Then we mail them all out a fish tag and we can send them a card to fill out and report their fish or we could have a website where they do it.

MR. CURRIN: You're getting in the weeds pretty deep now.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, but I think you could do that pretty straightforward.

MR. CURRIN: I don't disagree, but we're going to have that discussion again I've got a feeling.

MR. BELL: Kind of out of the weeds a little bit, we're talking about a one-year one-fishery event, but as Andy said each year is going to be different. Each year you may or may not have an exploitable margin of fish to work with. But once we do this, we'll have started something and it's probably going to be an expectation from here on out that we do this if there is a measurable exploitable margin each year. I kind of answered my own question; this is just this

one year that we're talking about and what happens beyond here we'll kind of see how it goes, I guess.

MR. CURRIN: You did answer your own question. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Roy pretty much said what I was going to say, that if we're going to do a tag program administered by the states and we're going to charge a fee, then it would take time. We would have to go through the legislature.

DR. DUVAL: My point is sort of somewhat opposite. I like Duane's idea of a state-by-state program for tags, as I'm sure it doesn't surprise anybody here. I think we could pull that off with no problem. We have a card program in place for striped bass during the summer. We've done for bluefin tuna. We have actually, Mac, had a rack program in the past for red drum and I think maybe Spanish as well. We also have a pretty broad state statute that allows us to require folks to allow our ballot just to go out and collect the information that we need.

MR. CURRIN: Well, we may have a limiting factor and I think South Carolina as well may have to go to the legislature as Jessica does to set up something new like that; and that becomes a non-starter then if we've got one or two people that can't do it or are going to drag it out. Even though you have got the capability and Georgia has got the capability or somebody else does, it is going to cause significant and unknown delays. That's in the weeds as well.

All right, that is everybody I had on my list. I think Roy's suggestion is a good one. The first step is to decide whether we should consider some sort of opening. I'm hearing what I interpret as fairly generalized support for considering something like that. I'd make one comment just to kind of frame the discussion from here on out, and then I'll ask for a motion. Keep in mind the potential fishing power that we've got here.

Andy laid out some areas in the midst of – the numbers of charterboats and the number of headboats that are in the midst of the range. We've got red snapper to some degree and to some abundance all the way up into Morehead City and perhaps north. I heard of one being caught actually out of Hatteras, north of Hatteras recently. They go down almost to the end of the Keys to some degree. Again, they're not abundant there but they occur.

If everybody fished, we've got greater than 11,000 charter and headboat permits. Headboats carry 60-plus people. My guess is if we have a weekend opening they're going to be fairly full. The charterboats, not all of them bottom fish all the time, but I suspect if they think they can take a customer out to catch one of these fish, they're going to try to do it.

That's a lot of people and pretty quickly in one day, if everybody goes after it, 9,000 fish or 10,000 fish not a whole lot of fish, so just keep that in mind as we talk about how to lay this thing out. Of course, that's on the upper end and that is assuming that everybody goes. I guess an analogy, you can call it free beer or free steaks.

You go in the bar after the meeting every day, there is a reasonable number of people in there buying a drink. But, if they made an announcement today that there was free beer in the bar,

how many people do you think you're going to see in there today? Well, a whole lot of them. Anyway, just keep that all in mind because I think there is a lot of angst among the community to have this fishery opened back up again, and I would anticipate that the participation in any sort of event like that is going to be close to the maximum. All right, is there a motion from the committee? I guess that is what you guys would want to try to proceed down this path with consideration of a reopening for red snapper. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: **Mr. Chairman, I would move that we establish a reopening of the red snapper fishery with an ACL of 13,067 fish.** I'm not married to that number, but that is just a number that was in front of me just a second ago.

MR. CURRIN: 13 thousand how many?

MR. HARRIS: 13,067 I believe is the number.

MR. CURRIN: Zero six seven. All right, second by David. Discussion on the motion? **The motion by Duane is to consider reopening of the red snapper fishery with an ACL of 13,067 fish.** Discussion? Mel.

MR. BELL: Just a question; so if we blow through that somehow and there are 15,000 landed, what happens?

MR. CURRIN: We will have to decide that as we go along and how much constraint we want. I think a lot of it depends on how we set this whole thing up, whether you allow for the possibility of overshooting this particular ACL; how you constraint it. Any other discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: From my perspective if we said we were going to reopen and allow 13,000 fish to be caught and 15,000 were caught, I would say, man, we're good, that's a bull's eye. You've got to consider the error in all of these estimates in terms of what is really over and what is not.

MR. CURRIN: You've got consider the error in the estimates that we're using to establish this ACL as well, so we've got to be careful, I think. It depends on your risk tolerance, I guess. **Other discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none; that motion is approved.** Now it is time to get in the weeds.

We have had some good discussion and some suggestions from Duane and some counter from Roy about how the states can operate this. I think it's pretty clear now with the constraints that Florida and South Carolina have that a state-operated system would be very difficult to establish in a timely and predicable manner. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Another motion would be that we control the harvest of red snapper during this opening through a tag system to be administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service and that the tags not be divided between recreational and commercial fishermen but be tags that anyone can apply for.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, motion by Duane. I presume that anyone can apply for it, indicating a lottery system of some sort, so maybe we can capture that language in there somewhere, Myra. Duane, is that motion okay; does that capture your intent?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. CURRIN: **The motion by Duane is to control harvest of red snapper during the reopening through a tag system to be administered by NMFS. The tags would not be subject to commercial/recreational allocation, and they would be distributed through a lottery system.** Is there a second to that motion? Second by Ben. Discussion on the motion?

MR. HAYMANS: So are the tags transferable; do you have to be in compliance? I guess the main thing is are the tags transferable? Then with regards to the charter/headboat fishery, can individuals who aren't necessarily participating in the various surveys be eligible for those tags as well? What are the criteria for being eligible to get a tag?

MR. CURRIN: We haven't defined those yet; that will be up to the committee.

MR. HAYMANS: That is the purpose of the question is to be able to start answering those questions.

MR. CURRIN: I have Charlie. Duane, I'll give you an opportunity if you have some ideas along the lines to address some of Doug's questions. It seems like that may determine whether he supports or doesn't support the motion. I'll give you an opportunity to respond.

MR. PHILLIPS: Duane, when you say not subject to commercial and recreational allocations, so you're taking the whole amount of fish to go for the tag and you're not going to let the commercial guys work on a 50-pound trip limit, a hundred pound trip limit? Is that the intent of the motion; and if it is, then I see the commercial end not having access to very many fish like this.

MR. HARRIS: That is my intent.

MR. JOLLEY: I would question that. I think that is a good concern, Charlie. I'm not convinced that the legislature is such a big obstacle, but maybe I just don't understand it well enough. The question I want to bring up is a credibility question. I think that the state people on the ground involved more deeply in this adds a bit of credibility to this whole thing. I just think that my colleagues ought to consider that. I know that in our state at least the credibility gap is different between the state and the feds, and I just think it needs to be considered.

MR. CURRIN: Jessica, do you want to respond to how big a deal having your legislature approve a system in a timely manner is?

MS. McCRAWLEY: If there is a fee associated with it, if there is a fee increase, we have to go to the legislature. It couldn't go until 2013 session and getting a new fee through the legislature, it's anybody's guess but it could be more challenging than you think.

MR. CURRY: Especially in these days and times. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess my concern – I mean, that's why I really like the sort of state-by-state approach that Duane had proposed. If we have this lottery system, my concern is that the tags are appropriately distributed geographically. You could have and I would expect that you would have a huge chunk of folks from Florida; but, Mac, as you pointed out there is red snapper all the way up through North Carolina.

I myself was out on a headboat just a month ago to see what the guys are seeing out on the water and we threw back quite a few red snapper. I just want to make sure that if we're going to do a tag program like this and it is focused on collecting usable biological data and that we make sure that the distribution of those tags is sufficient to give us a good sense of what is going on throughout the range of the species.

MR. CURRIN: And there is no reason we can't set up a system where we ensure that occurs, I don't think. Mel.

MR. BELL: So you've got 13,067 individual tags and that means every recreational or commercial fisherman in the region could apply individually for one each; so if I'm a commercial fisherman and I get lucky I've got one tag. Does that then exclude the rest of the country? Can we do that, can we run something like that and say, you know, you're in Tennessee and you can't apply? Can the federal folks do that; is that okay?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I think that people from Tennessee could apply. Whether they would want to is another questions, but, sure, they could.

MR. BELL: Because a lot of our recreational fishermen come from other places that fish in our state, so that is just something to consider in terms of diluting. I go back to I guess in my mind one of the benefits in this is the ability to collect some useful data. Now, with 13,000 individuals out there, you have kind of complicated the ability to reach out and touch those 13,000 data points, I guess. If it was somehow clumped or clustered or something, it would be a little easier to interact with, I guess. I was just trying to imagine how that was going to happen again, and I guess that is down in the weeds far.

MR. CURRIN: Well, no, I think that bears on whether you like his particular approach to the opening as opposed to a more open approach, so I think that's relevant to this. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Is it appropriate to dive into the weeds now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CURRIN: You can dive just as deep as you want right now.

DR. CRABTREE: So, number one, my initial thought on this, if we set this up, would be that if somebody gets a tag and they happen to have a snapper grouper permit, they're allowed to sell their fish. Now, I don't think we will have 13,000 individuals apply for these things. Maybe I'm wrong but my gut tells me we won't.

My thought had been that we would have a list of applicants and then we would then randomly sample it with a replacement. If you're chosen and you get a fish tag, you're still thrown right back in the pool and you could be chosen again, so some people would likely be chosen for multiple fish tags just through sheer luck. Obviously, if we didn't have 13,000 applicants some would get multiple tags. That's one thing.

Now, I had thought and I guess I'm coming from this is to keep it a simple notion at least initially and then if we want to put bells and wheels on it, that's fine. In terms of the different states, well, they will be proportionally represented based on how many people apply. If only ten people from North Carolina apply, they will have the same chance of getting chosen as anybody else. Now, you wouldn't have to do it that way.

You could go in and allocate a set number of tags to each state and then we would sort out the applicants by state and then sample them out that way, but it is another complication on it. The transferability, I would say, no, let's not do that at least initially. That makes it a lot more cumbersome if we're going to actually try and track it.

Now, I guess if somebody gets a tag and they give it to somebody, as long as we're going to say if you have the tag you can use it, well, then, people could sell them on their own if they wanted to and we wouldn't even have to be involved in that, but I wouldn't want any system where we would have to track transfers and things.

Now, in terms of letting the states run the program, I'm probably all for it because I'd just as soon not run the program, but I suspect that you will find that you can't even get this program operating in 2013 because we would have to figure out how do we then amend the plan to set this up and we'd have to have cooperative agreements with the states and that kind of thing.

Those are just some of my thoughts as to how you want to do it. Now, if you're concerned about recreational and commercial, you could take the fish tags and split them up based on your allocation and then you could have applicants have to enter their permit information on the commercial side and then the recreationals, and you could designate the tags out that way.

It's just the more bells and whistles and complications you put in it the more we've got to go through to deal with it. In terms of the data collection, I think having fish come in anywhere in the region at any time makes it much more difficult, but you could set it up where we're going to have fish tags, but we're only going to allow fishing to occur over some series of predetermined times. You could pull that window of time down or you could do a fish tag program and say all the fishing has to take place during this month.

That would make the data collection easier. It would probably tick a lot of people off if they didn't want to fish that month; and then if the storm comes through and nobody gets to go fishing that month because of weather, you'd have some unhappy people. There is some balancing and some tradeoffs in here that you have just got to figure out how you want to handle it.

We could also have people come in on a website and enter their catch; and we could say if you don't enter your catch, even if it's report no catch, you're not eligible for next year's lottery and we're going to check on all that. How good the information they're going to give us would be, I don't know. I really like the idea of carcass drop-offs.

I think that would need to be voluntary, though, and the states would have to run that because they have got the freezers and everything. I suspect a lot of these guys would voluntarily participate in something like that and we could get lengths and otoliths and that sort of thing out of it. That's just some thoughts.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, some good thoughts, I think. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I guess my question would be is there definitely going to be a fee associated with this tag? If there is no fee associated with the tag, then it could be more likely that Florida could get this done faster, move through the process faster, but either way I still think we're looking at 2013 whether NMFS does it or whether the states do it to get it in place. When we say we only want to do it for this year, if we mean calendar year I'm not sure if we could get a tag program in place by the end of 2012.

DR. CRABTREE: To that point, I don't think we can get this no matter who does it in place in 2012. I'm not thinking of this as a one-time deal. I'm thinking about this as the management plan until we change it; and given our projections and the numbers of fish we allow to be taken will go up each year.

Now, we will still have to monitor the discards and take a look at how that all plays out, but I'm looking at this as this would be how we're going to manage red snapper until we have enough fish that we can open it up in some less constrained system, but not just a one-time shot. If the states want to do this, then that's up to them whether they would want to charge fees or not. If we did it, we would charge administrative costs.

I don't think it would be much, but I think we would have to, like we do with all permits – and this really would be a permit – we would probably have a fee and my thought was we'd set up some of kind of Pay Pal so that when you went and applied and if you were selected, you would be notified and then to get your tag you would have to go in and pay your fee and then you get your tag.

MR. CURRIN: Jessica, did you have a followup?

MS. McCAWLEY: It wasn't on that point. I'm still on the point that I had from earlier. We had a discussion about will there be a certain number of tags out allocated per state. Well, one of the points that Mel brought up was can somebody from some other state, Tennessee, apply for one of these tags. If a certain number of tags are allocated per state, it just seems like it might be a little bit more difficult for someone in another part of the U.S. to apply for those tags.

MR. CURRIN: I don't know; that's probably a question Monica would have to answer of whether we could legally restrict the applicants to residents in one of the four states within our region.

DR. CRABTREE: Would you repeat that question?

MR. CURRIN: Well, the question I guess that arises from Jessica's comments about whether people from Tennessee would be allowed – if we allocated the tags proportionally to the four states in the region, is there a legal problem there with prohibiting people from California and Colorado and anywhere else from having access to one of these tags?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My first thought is, yes, it probably would be a legal issue. I would need to jump into the Magnuson Act and think about it a little bit further and hear why you would want to limit that, what were the good reasons. There is a national standard about treating folks fairly no matter where they live. Basically that is a big paraphrase on my part, so we'd really have to look at that and see what the rationale would be to support that kind of limitation.

MS. McCAWLEY: To that point, also say if someone from Georgia wanted to use one of Florida's tags? It wouldn't necessarily have to be from outside of the region, but what if Georgia wanted to use a Florida tag or someone from Florida wanted to use a South Carolina tag, how would we go about solving that problem?

MR. CURRIN: I think there is an easy solution to that problem if you can allow it. You allot them to the state, somebody in North Carolina gets a tag, it is just a red snapper tag. It doesn't say you have got to harvest a red snapper in North Carolina. It could but it wouldn't have to, and they could take that to Florida and go fishing and say here is my tag, I have a legally caught red snapper. I live in North Carolina but I caught it in Florida; I don't see that as a big issue. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess that is something the state would have to decide because if they issue them it would be really under state rules. But back to the question about I don't see any way the program could – I don't see any way it could work if it only was available to residents of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida. I think it has to be available to anyone in the U.S.

MR. CURRIN: Okay. Well, that prevents allocating proportionally to the states, I think, as a consideration. We still have this motion on the floor here, folks. All this is relevant because it impacts whether this is the way we want to go.

DR. CRABTREE: Mac, can I make one more comment? I believe the states would only be allowed to charge administrative fees as well, and I don't think you would be allowed to charge somebody more who was out of state. Otherwise, I think then we would have to set up an alternative federal tag that charged only administrative fees. This is what I mean by we can get this really complicated if we want to.

MR. CURRIN: And I don't think anybody has a desire to make it that complicated. Jessica, did you have a quick followup?

MS. McCAWLEY: Just to that; that even administrative fees would have to go through the legislature.

MR. CURRIN: Bonnie, you had your hand up and I think it was to a point a while back. If it is still relevant, go ahead.

DR. PONWITH: It was to a point a while back, and that is the same thing that Roy had mentioned is that the tag program is a way to manage effort, which is the wild card in how long it would take to harvest some number of fish. It is a way to carefully control that. The advantage of the federal side running it is consistency, and the advantage of the states running it is they're good at this.

They have the rapport and they've got the systems in some cases already pre-existing, so it would be easy for them. My request from the science side is regardless of what way we decide to do this, that we bear in mind the data are one of the reasons we're considering this at all; and that if the states do manage this, that we all consult in the collective on methodology and make that as sensitive to high data quality as we can and consistency so that in the aftermath we've got what we're looking for in terms of the data.

MR. PHILLIPS: I can live with tags. I think that is probably a good idea, but I don't think what we need to do is start reallocating red snapper, and Roy said this is probably hopefully not a one-time thing. If we don't set aside the commercial allocation – and you can allocate the tags to the commercial however you want to – you have reallocated everything.

I don't think that is where we really want to go. I don't think that's a road we want to start down. Two, if we give the commercial their share of the tags, then you've got that commercial catch-per-unit effort. They can bring in whole fish that can be measured and you can get a lot more data and better data through the commercial. Then you get a lot more bang for your buck.

I really don't want to tell people, restaurants and retail stores that, yes, we used to get 33 percent of the fish and now we're now going to get 2 percent of the fish. I don't that's where to go, but I think if we can amend the motion to where we split the commercial and use the snapper grouper ID's and use that as a universe and let them apply for tags, then I think it starts working.

MR. CURRIN: And you can offer a motion if that is your desire to amend this motion to allocate it among the two sectors based on the current allocations in Amendment 17A, I guess. Isn't that where it was done or was it the Comprehensive ACL; where the red snapper allocation is established; which amendment? It is not important at this point, but if that is what you want to do, so a substitute motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a substitute motion to control the harvest of red snapper during the reopening through a tag system to be administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service. The tags would be subject to the commercial/recreation allocation and they would be distributed through a lottery system.

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Charlie; second by Ben.

DR. CRABTREE: Point of order. That substitute motion doesn't seem to have the heart of the original motion which is to control harvest through a tag system and all that the way it is set up there.

MR. CURRIN: We will make sure we capture that verbiage because I think that was the intent, Charlie. Okay, motion then is to control harvest of red snapper during the reopening through a tag system to be administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service. The tags would be subject to the commercial/recreation allocations and they would be distributed through a lottery system. Second by Ben. Discussion on the substitute motion. I've still got a list; so if you've got relevant comments. Have you got a question, Roy, to this?

DR. CRABTREE: Now, at this point we're talking about a plan amendment and not an emergency rule. We need to understand that, I think. This is a complicated system and we don't want to put it in place for six months. We're talking about putting a program in place.

This would be brought back to you in September with alternatives, et cetera, and we'll have to write a NEPA document and go through all those kinds of processes. If this passes, I can ask my staff to lay out the outline of how this will work and clarify as much as they can, but I'm sure we're going to go back and start drafting some things up and find out there are lots of things we didn't think of.

MR. CURRIN: You didn't bring that issue up when we had that previous motion on the floor, but I presume that there is not any difference between these two motions.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, the problem would be if you did it through an emergency rule it would only be in place for six months and then it would go away, so you'd then have to amend the plan in order to extend the emergency rule. I guess once we developed all this, if we wanted to then talk about an emergency rule to put it in place a little bit earlier, we could have that discussion then; but if we're talking about this for a program that is going to persist more than six months, it's a plan amendment.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I understand that, but there is a timeliness thing here as well. That is a decision the council has to make.

DR. CRABTREE: My point is I don't think we have to make it today. That is a decision we would make when we actually knew what the program was going to be when we're ready to put it in place.

MR. CURRIN: All right, I'm going to get back to my list and see if you've got – now we've got a substitute motion and I want to get back to this as quickly as we can. Mel.

MR. BELL: Charlie was actually heading in the direction of this question was that one of the four reasons we had on the opening slide or so that Andy gave was an economic boost to fishermen and community; so one of the points being that we need to get good data out of this.

Another point should be that we try to maximize it I think for an economic boost to fishermen and communities and bringing in the other sectors like that maybe helped. And also being sensitive to the letter we received signed by the various congressmen, I think that economic thing is important as well as the data, and I think bringing in the other sectors is one way to do it.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, Monica already answered one of my questions I think and that is that I didn't see how you could restrict applying for a tag recreationally because it seems to me if you have a valid saltwater license for any state, you're part of the NMFS Angler Registry and you should be able to apply for a public trust resource, and I think she said, yes, that is the case.

The other thing is just another option for data collection might be to work through a university. We did that for striped bass so the state of Maryland and the Fish and Wildlife Service funded a diet study of large striped bass from offshore and worked through Anthony Overton at East Carolina University and very successfully collected all the data including the otoliths and the scales and the guts and everything.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, there are lots of possibilities and I think the states can handle that, hopefully. I think, Wilson, you're not correct in that you would have to have license to be apply. You would have to have a license to be able to harvest. You could get tag without having a license, I think. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm listening to this discussion and it is a good one. I'm starting to think in my mind how would we accomplish what you're talking about and would it be via an emergency rule, would it be via a plan amendment, would be via a regulatory amendment? I just want you to know in terms of the allocation, allocation is not something that you all have authorized yourself to change via a framework or a regulatory amendment, which a regulatory amendment is an abbreviated process, so you change the allocation scheme necessarily with that.

MR. CURRIN: And I don't think there is attempt to change it here. We're just kind of apportioning the fish as per the existing allocation.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's fine; I just realized when I stepped out of the room that I'd better let people know that depending on how you want to do this – and I know we will get to that part soon, but I just throw that in the hopper.

MR. CURRIN: Roy, to that point.

DR. CRABTREE: To the structure of the motion, what it really should be is to develop a plan amendment to do this. Well, even if we decide we're going to do it through an emergency rule, we've still got to do a plan amendment or it is going to be in place for six months. We've clearly decided we want this to be a more long-term program than six months.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I agree that the emergency rule would only be in place for six months, and I also will tell you, as you know, that if you want to extend that for another six months you have to be working on a plan amendment or something to put permanent regulations in place. I guess we would need to hear whether some of these things could be – so the great

thing about an emergency rule – and I think that some of these things could fit under the emergency criteria – is that you get it implemented more quickly.

It would be for a short-term duration. If you're talking a longer time scheme in terms of for the future, if you get these kinds of estimations and it allows some fish to be harvested, this is the way you want them harvested, then, yes, I guess that is not really for an emergency rule. If you're talking about maybe we want to open on some weekends or whatever to get these 13,067 fish caught – allow those to be caught, then you would think about doing an emergency rule.

MR. HARRIS: To that point.

MR. CURRIN: To that point, Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Well, we're talking about plan amendments and emergency rules; what if we do it through an exempted fishing permit, that is not for six months, is it? If you set this system up through an exempted fishing permit; how long is it good for, one year?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think normally they're for – I'll have to look at the regulations – for one year, yes. I think it's the possibility of getting that extended and maybe saying for two years if you say that at the outset, but I'll look at those regulations right now.

MR. CURRIN: But if there was an existing exempted fishing permit, that could be continued pretty easily, could it not, if you wanted to operate it under that same system into the future?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Theoretically it could be continued but then I would ask you it sounds like you're amending the snapper grouper plan so why would you not want to stay within the structure of your fishery management plan and set it up that way as opposed to trying to manage it through an exempted fishing permit.

DR. CRABTREE: To that point, exempted fishing permits are generally for research purposes. That's not really what I see here. We're talking about a way to manage this fishery and to me that is a plan amendment. Now, I think we could get this thing figured out at a future meeting and say, hey, let's make this happen faster and let's request an emergency rule to make it happen quicker. That might be fine, but it doesn't really seem to me to be in line with an exempted fishing permit, and we'd still have to go through all of the hoops and steps to figure out how to do this. I'm not thinking that way, I guess.

MR. CURRIN: Well, my only hesitancy with saying, okay, this is a plan amendment is that I see 18 months instead of potentially six to get this in place or eight to get it in place. I like the idea of let's – we know we're going to be working on a plan amendment, but let's get this in place via an emergency rule as quickly as possible and at the same time start working on a plan amendment so that we don't have that lapse. I guess that's my thinking and I presume that we can do that. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to answer directly to Duane's question, the exempted fishing permit is issued for one year unless another time period is specified, but you can only issue it for

certain things: may authorize for limited testing; public display; data collection, which I think is what you want in this case; exploratory fishing and other kinds of things; health, those sorts of things.

MR. CURRIN: Myra, you had a point to make?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, I don't know if this helps your discussion at all, but just for the record we did scope a tag system for red snapper as part of Amendment 22.

DR. PONWITH: Mr. Chairman, the preceding motion was approved by the council, the number of fish, that number pertains to the 2012 bycatch projections. What I'm hearing in the conversation is that it is going to be difficult to get something in place within 2012. What that means then is that number goes away because the analysis has to be conducted a second time. The number is relevant in 2012 and 2013 because we'd have to go back to the projections and that number would have to be re-evaluated.

MR. CURRIN: I guess that is all timing and the like and when those numbers are available and whether this action would be in place before those numbers were available. I think the intent is to get that in place before all of the Wave 6 numbers from 2012 are available, I would presume. If we had this effective January 1, you wouldn't have the complete data set from 2012 to make that assessment, would you?

DR. PONWITH: If all of this were in place in January 2013, the bycatch estimates that we use to arrive at the potential number that could be harvested in 2012 would have to be re-evaluated for 2013, using the projections for 2013. Here is the thing. In Andy's presentation those bycatch estimates are going up, and this is good news because the reason they're going up is because the population is projected to be more abundant.

That means that with the same amount of effort, the number of encounters of those animals will allegedly go up based on the projections. If effort goes down, that won't hold true. The relationship is something that the final bycatch estimates will tell us those relationships, but until then it is very, very difficult to know.

That 13,000 number that was voted on by the council is all based on FY-12 evaluations of the actual projected bycatch and the actual estimates from 2010 and 2011 and their relationship to patterns we're seeing in effort, those numbers vanish come January 1. Those numbers aren't relevant in 2013 because again the projections are different for 2013.

MR. CURRIN: I understand the projections are different, Bonnie, but you're not going to have the Wave 6 estimates from MRIP available to you on January 1 for discards in the recreational fishery; is that correct? You would be unable to recalculate that I presume unless you did it on a partial year of 2012.

DR. PONWITH: I see what you're saying. The actual estimates of bycatch for 2012 would not be able to be estimated until some time into 2013. It would be right around the springtime because we need the logbooks for the commercial side and we need the MRIP or MRFSS

numbers for the recreational plus the headboat estimates to be able to put it together, so it would be some time into 2013 before the actual estimates could be made.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and I presume then until those new estimates were made that these estimates that we've viewed today would be the ones that we would operate on. How are we going to get to the new estimates until we've got the data to estimate the discards in 2012 to calculate the projections into 2013?

DR. PONWITH: We already have a projection for bycatch in 2013; that exists today.

MR. CURRIN: Right, you have a projection?

DR. PONWITH: Right. We wouldn't be able to do a comparison of the 2012 projection to the 2012 actual estimate until some time into 2013.

MR. CURRIN: And so you would not be able to come up with a number of 13,067 fish that we have today until some time later into 2013?

DR. PONWITH: Right.

MR. CURRIN: All right, I think I'm clear on that. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Two parts; I was concerned in Duane's first motion that the consumer, the largest owner of the resource, was going to be adequately represented, but I think Charlie is attempting to do that, so I wanted to point that out. Number two, in the motion shouldn't we say also the states – are going to be administered by NMFS with the states.

MR. CURRIN: John, you can certainly modify the motion if you like. To me it is implied and from what I've heard from the individual states there is a great desire to participate and make this as efficient as possible. If there is some desire to make that a part of the motion, then we can substitute the substitute if you'd like. David.

MR. CUPKA: Two quick comments, Mr. Chairman; number one, I heard the comment made that if we let the states do it, they could figure out how to do it or they could do this way or that way. One concern I would have with using a state approach is that you might end up with something that is not consistent. I think that is something that would be gained by letting NMFS do the whole program.

The other comment was I heard Roy say that his staff was going to work all this out and bring it back to us. I hope what he meant to say was his staff working in conjunction with the council staff would work all this out and bring it back to us. We certainly need to have staff involved in whatever we decide to do.

MR. CURRIN: And I'm sure that was the intent. Tom Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: I was just going to bring up Charlie's point.

DR. DUVAL: Ditto; I'm good.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, this issue is more important than the timeframe we've got on this piece of paper. Okay, I don't believe that listening to what we said here that we can implement a tag program in the next six months. For that reason, I'll vote against this motion in lieu of us looking at a limited number of weekends or weeks during the month and let's try to figure out how to get a fishery in the next six months, not in 2013, and use part of the day that we've got now.

MS. McCAWLEY: I was going to say something similar to what Doug was going to say is I thought that we were trying to go down this road to get something in place for 2012, and we have just been told for 2012 we can't get that tag system in place. If we want to do the tag system, it looks like that's a longer term prospect. If we want something in place for 2012, it really can't be a tag system. We need to look to weekends or some other limited opening to do that this year.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I was just going to say to Jessica's point, if you wanted to make it really simple you could something similar to what we've done for snowy grouper; one fish per vessel for some very limited time period. That might be something we could put in place very quickly.

MR. CURRIN: There are all kinds of possibilities here. We've got a motion before the committee to set up a particular system to operate under. If you don't like that, you can vote against the motion and then we'll go down another path. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Except the motion needs to be to develop a plan amendment because that is what we're talking about for this. Then we need to return to the question of do you guys want to open the fishery this year with the fish we have through an emergency rule or not, and that is probably a separate issue. But if we want to develop a tag program like this for maybe next year or whatever, that has got to be a plan amendment, I think.

MR. CURRIN: That is the second time you've said it. Charlie, you made the motion; is it okay with you to accept the wording that Dr. Crabtree has suggested?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CURRIN: So the substitute motion now reads to develop a plan amendment to control harvest of red snapper during the reopening through a tag system to be administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Tags would be subject to the commercial/recreational allocation and they would be distributed through a lottery system.

MR. CUPKA: I was going to ask – you know, even if we pass this, it doesn't preclude us from coming back and doing something to open this year. It is not either/or; we could actually do both.

MR. CURRIN: All right, last word, Mel, on this substitute motion.

MR. BELL: New guy questions; when you say “during the reopening”, what does that mean? That is not the short, timely thing we were trying to accomplish I thought. The reopening; that is where we’re going eventually with the whole rebuilding or what? I apologize; I don’t quite understand what we mean by reopening.

MR. CURRIN: You make a good point and I think eliminating that language “during the reopening” would probably take care of it. Is that okay with you, Charlie, and the seconder, whoever that was 45 minutes ago? **All right, the substitute motion now reads the substitute motion now reads to develop a plan amendment to control harvest of red snapper through a tag system to be administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Tags would be subject to the commercial/recreational allocation and they would be distributed through a lottery system. Is there any objection to that motion?**

MR. JOLLEY: Is this the place to put “with the states”?

MR. CURRIN: No, this is the place to vote; time to vote. **Is there any objection to the motion? I see none; that motion is approved and is now the main motion.** Any further discussion on the main motion: John, I didn’t mean to be flippant with you, but I think we can add that as direction to staff and make a note at the end of this because I’m clear that’s the intent, but I will allow you to add that as soon as we finish on this vote. **Is there any objection to this motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** John, I will allow you to add that note to the staff to involve the states as you see fit

MR. JOLLEY: Thank you, sir.

MR. CURRIN: If that satisfies you and if you want to make it in the form of a motion, you can certainly do so but I just didn’t want to confuse that previous motion any further. All right, do you want to take a five-minute break? Yes, Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I did not vote against the motion because it is through a plan amendment. My original motion was to do this very quickly. I think Charlie is right; if this is to be done through a plan amendment, it does need to be based in existing allocations, and that is why I didn’t vote against it.

MR. CURRIN: If we can get everybody back to the table, we will resume. Before we get started and while everybody is easing back to the table, Duane wanted me to announce that the folks from Florida Sea Grant have set up a display out in the hall here dealing with barotrauma effects and some methodology I think. If you want to fill in more details, that’s fine but I just encourage to drop by and talk to those folks and take a look at the display. I guess a lot of it is output from the barotrauma workshop that you attend a while back.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, there have been barotrauma workshops and there is so much new information about releasing fish from depth now that has come about as a result of these workshops. Florida Sea Grant has been doing a lot of work in this area and they had a great display at the last workshop, and so Bob and I worked with them to have them put their display

up here during the meeting. Take a look at some of the new techniques that available, new tools that are available for releasing fish from depth while you're here.

MR. CURRIN: All right, the way I interpret the motion that was passed here recently is a more long-term approach to red snapper management, and that will be decided down the road at some point. I know there is still a desire by a number of people on the committee and the council to look at the more short-term approach. I suspect that may be what we need to start talking about now. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: If you don't mind, I'd like to ask John to clarify. I wasn't clear on what you had meant by the states participating. That's what I wrote up on the screen but I don't know that I captured what your intent was.

MR. JOLLEY: After my consultation with my state representatives, I think we'll drop my suggestion of including the name of the states.

MR. CURRIN: I think it is pretty clear they won't be administering, but my understanding, John, of your intent was that the states would be involved and participating by collecting biological samples and the like. I think everyone is committed to doing that as best they can.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: When I look at Andy's slide on potential allowable landings, that I know where Duane came up with the suggested amount of 13,067 fish. There were other amounts of potential allowance landings on that page. It went from 19,600 down to 2,100. I wonder if we could just have a little bit of discussion as to why at least at this point you think you think that the 13,067 fish is the appropriate number.

MR. CURRIN: My interpretation of that, Monica, was that 13,000 was kind of a 2012 goal; and with respect to the plan amendment, that those numbers are going to necessarily have to change. Am I interpreting that properly, Duane?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, and I said I wasn't married to that number, but I wanted to get something on the table for discussion. I don't think that that is the right number. As Mac said, it is going to change. I was going down the road of a plan amendment with this either. That kind of changes things.

MR. CURRIN: Is that okay, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, it is okay in that now I better understand, except that – and that's fine. I understand for a plan amendment perhaps that is not the right number to use, perhaps it is. I think in a plan amendment I'm understanding that you're setting up a system that will take place in the future; and you will look at the discard estimates and it will depend on the estimation you get for each year, really, so I understand that. If you're going to, though, discuss something for this year, I would like to maybe have some discussion as to whether you're going to go obviously with the 13,067 fish; and if you are why that is the appropriate number.

MR. CURRIN: I think we can have that discussion as we move into trying to set up some sort of system under an emergency rule to open this year. Keep that in mind when you select that number. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I was going to ask it of Bonnie because Roy indicated when I brought up a similar question up earlier that the center didn't necessarily care for the average mortalities from 2010 and 2011, and I was going to ask Bonnie to elaborate on that and why we didn't choose the 19.

DR. PONWITH: Again, as our chairman mentioned, this is relevant if and only if the council comes up with a way – makes a determination that they want a reopening in 2012 and comes up with a way to actually be able to accomplish it, then this conversation is highly relevant. If you take a look at this slide and then you also take a look – just to refresh our memories, let's go back to Slide Number 4. What you see on that slide, on the right-hand side are the projections for red snapper discard mortality.

Those projections were based on the SEDAR 24 stock assessment, and you see that it starts to increase and that increase again is a function of the fact that there are more red snapper out there because that is the intent of the management measure, to make more red snapper out there. That means that your encounter rates would be expected to go up as well.

On the left-hand what we have is the number in that projection compared to the actual estimate of discards that were done when we looked at the commercial logbook, the MRFSS and the headboat survey. What you see in 2010 is a projected estimate of 65,000 and an estimated bycatch of 71,000, so we actually caught more fish than we projected we were going to catch so we have an overrun.

In 2011 we projected that we would encounter 64,000 dead discards, and the mortalities that were actually estimated based on the data that we had were 61, which was below, so we have one year we were above and one year we were below. In 2012 what is going to happen; we don't really know because we're in the middle of the year and there is no way to actually do an estimate in the middle of the year as Andy's presentation gave.

Now let's go back to that other table that we had up, which is Slide Number 6. If you take a look at this, in 2011 and 2010 one proposal was just average those and say that might be what we're going to catch. That mathematically is a way to do it, but logically it doesn't make much sense, and the reason is we expect red snapper to be increasing; it's not logical to think that the population would be increasing in the ocean and we would have static encounter rates.

I'm troubled by that one because it is just not logical. The next one is that you average 2010 and 2011 as sort of what happened in those two years, those differences, and then average in on top of that what the projection is for 2012. What that does is it decreases 2012 by some amount that would be logical from the standpoint of we're seeing some trends in effort and those trends appear to be declining.

If effort is declining, it could counterbalance some of the increases that we're seeing in the abundance. The third example here, it increases by the change in the exploitable abundance but it also makes a correction for the decrease in fishing effort in the patterns that we're seeing in those two years, 2010 and 2011. Then the last one, the smallest one, it just makes the change – help me out with that one, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: The last one is similar to the one above it except it is not altering the estimates based on the decrease in effort, so it is essentially presuming effort will remain constant, but the exploitable abundance will increase.

DR. PONWITH: So those are sort of a range of scenarios and there is no concrete way to say that this one is the truth, it is the one that is going to happen. There is an explanation for each of them and some of those explanations are more plausible or more reasonable than others. It is a matter of looking at that range and deciding what your goals are in terms of managing for risk of disrupting your rebuilding plan weighed with your risk of foregoing a potential fishing opportunity, so those are the two risks you're weighing. You need to make a determination based on that information of which of these scenarios you would select. From the science center's perspective, for me that top one with averaging just 2010 to 2011 is not a viable option. It would be hard for me to justify that one scientifically.

MR. CUPKA: And that is one of the reasons why I seconded Duane's motion because the 13,000 number to me seems like it is more reasonable. It's between the extremes. What we don't know is what that tradeoff is between the increase in abundance and the decrease in effort, whether it is more or less or whatever.

It seems to me the 13,000 is certainly more conservative than the top one, which I agree with Bonnie is a problem. It at least allows you harvest something and it's not at the other extreme of the estimation. When you stop and think about it, all of these numbers are really kind of squishy, so that's why I thought, well, let's go with something in the middle, and I guess that is what Duane was thinking, too, but I won't put words in his mouth.

MR. CURRIN: It points out the problem of trying to decide a trend or determine a trend with two points. If you look at the slope of those two points that we have right there and you drew a line through them that indicates that the mortality is going to go down. It's not very realistic. I don't know, the average may be closer to the truth, but you're just guessing at where that third point is to establish a trend.

I guess it points out the tremendous amount of uncertainty associated with it. All right, how do we want to proceed here? I think we're looking for some guidance on a short-term approach here. Clearly, the tag system that we've indicated we'd like to look at in the long term is not going to be feasible to have in place this year. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Question for Roy; on an emergency rule, 60 days, how long to implement?

DR. CRABTREE: Probably at least 60 days; so if you want to open for a couple of three-day weekends, something along those lines, I don't think we could do it before late August. My

advice to you would be if that is what you want to do, to request an emergency rule to allow weekend fishing and give us some ballpark area of when you would like it to begin; and if you want to specify we'd like this many weekends, that sort of thing, that's fine, and then we'll go back and come as close to that as we can on getting it done. It's difficult for me to really predict exactly will happen.

DR. PONWITH: One thing that I have a question for the council and that is from the standpoint of science, we're interested in data that can be collected on this fishery; and whenever you have a reopener like this, whether it is a tag system or whether or it is just general reopener, one of the concerns is the potential for high grading. That is relevant for two reasons.

Number one, if the intent is to use the data that we collect from this as reflecting the stock and high grading is taking place, that creates a bias or a risk of bias in the data that we're collecting. Secondly if high grading is taking place, it actually increases the number of discards and therefore increases discard mortality. My question is your thoughts on the merits of a first fish component of this.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, why don't we see if we have a motion to do it to begin with and then we'll talk about the specific terms?

MR. CURRIN: I think Charlie is going to do something like that for us.

MR. PHILLIPS: Correct. **I would make a motion that the recreational allocation for red snapper be landed on three-day weekends; the number of which to be determined by the National Marine Fisheries Service; and the commercial portion of the allocation to be landed under a two-fish trip limit and closed when that is caught.**

MR. CURRIN: And, Charlie, I think your intent is that we initiate an emergency rule to provide for the recreational allocation to be landed; is that correct?

MR. PHILLIPS: Absolutely.

MR. CURRIN: Initiate an emergency rule, Myra, at the very beginning; I think that is important. Let's see if we get a second here; is there a second to Charlie's motion? Seconded by Doug.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I just wanted to make sure that I was clear before about the whole allocation idea and you can't change it via regulatory amendment. You need to change it via plan amendment. However, in an emergency rule situation, the emergency rule acts as a plan amendment to the FMP, if you did not want to stick – I'm not advocating that you change this as at all, but if you didn't want to deal with the recreational and allocation division and you just wanted to make the same for everybody, you can do that in an emergency rule context.

MR. PHILLIPS: Monica, I understand that but I think we really need to keep our allocations for a number of reasons that I won't go into right now.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and again this is not an attempt to change the allocation that is in place but just to allot the fish that we're hoping to see during this emergency opening or emergency rule to reopen, that they are apportioned as per the existing allocation.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, and I think that's fine. I just wanted to make sure that you knew you had flexibility.

MR. HARRIS: A couple of questions; the reason I was proposing a tag system earlier today was because I think it is better for collecting the information from the recreational fishermen. I would just like to ask NOAA Fisheries how they intend to collect the biological information from the fishermen based on this system and who they propose will be there to collect it.

Is it at the docks; how is that going to be done? One of the main reasons I'm interested in seeing this reopening is for data collection purposes; and if we don't get that, I've got some problems with it. Secondly, I will just ask Charlie are we better off with a two-fish commercial limit or are we better off with some kind of poundage limit. Because you talk about high grading, I can see some folks out there throwing an awful lot of fish back until they get the two biggest fish.

MR. CURRIN: I think smaller fish from what I understand are worth more, aren't they, but I'm not sure. Charlie, do you have a response to Duane?

MR. PHILLIPS: I guess all things are possible. You could high grade with tags, too, and I'm not married to a two-fish trip limit. I picked it really low because that is going to stretch it out and the bycatch mortality for the fish that far offshore is pretty high, so the longer we can stretch it out, the first two fish they get on the boat, it is going to be better for the resource, I think.

MR. BURGESS: Well, I guess high grading could be considered for both sectors. We've heard from the fishermen that at times a headcount is more appropriate and it's kind of hard to judge poundage on a fish and as we do with red porgy with a headcount.

MR. HARRIS: I still didn't get an answer to my collection of recreational biological data; can we have some discussion about that?

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think your question actually was to Roy and perhaps the science center; but from I see the states are going to have to be very, very active partners as we discussed in the previous approach with the tag system in collecting these hard parts. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And recall I think it was two or three years ago we decided to – we were trying to figure out and document that a big year class had actually hit the fisheries, so we did a big aging project mostly with Florida and Georgia state folks. That would be my view of again we'd get the states to put – we would ask them to put people out on the docks to intercept fish and then come in and then I'm sure Bonnie would have plans as well.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Roy; I just wanted to get that on the record that is the plan and we need to figure out a way to implement that.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to reiterate that we've discussed with Roy doing that and we will even go the extra to advertise the carcass programs even more to try to get additional data that way.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you very much and I hope everybody will. All right, further discussion on the motion? All right, the motion reads to initiate an emergency rule to provide for the recreational allocation for red snapper to be landed on three-day weekends; the number of which would be determined by NMFS. The commercial portion of the allocation would be landed under a two-fish bag limit. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to point out that the two-fish trip limit, right now with the way you're setting this up would result in I think 3,800 or 3,900 fish for the commercial sector. That's about 1,900 trips that it would take to land this. I think that was pretty much the total number of trips prior to the closure that were taking place for red snapper. Certainly, there could be some redirected effort but I expect with a two-fish limit you're going to leave a lot of fish on the table.

MR. CURRIN: Roy, to that point.

DR. CRABTREE: And I'm going to have a whole bunch of questions for you if this passes, but I think the two fish is just the trip limit. We will take the ACL of 13,000 fish and we will then allocate a number of fish to the recreational sector. We will then convert the number of fish to the commercial sector into a pound estimate, and then we will monitor their share of it through the dealer reports in pounds because that is the way the dealers report, and the two fish would just constrain what they can have on the boat, but it wouldn't affect I don't think – does that make sense?

MR. STRELCHECK: The point I'm trying to make, though, is with this limited of a trip limit, the amount that you allocate to the commercial sector might not be harvested because the trip limit is so low.

DR. CRABTREE: I see.

MR. HARRIS: I just think the ACL needs to be included in this motion because this is a whole different motion now.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I've got a whole list of things that are going need to be indicated, but I figured I'd see if this motion passed and then we'd go through the details.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, we can fill out the details in additional motions if this is to pass.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess just coming to Andy's; do you want to make the trip limit a hundred pounds or something different? Well, it's your motion so you'll have to decide.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, after the discussion, if it is all right with the chairman, we will change it to just a hundred pound trip limit.

MR. CURRIN: All right, the motion reads to initiate an emergency rule to provide for the recreational allocation for red snapper to be landed on three-day weekends; the number of which would be determined by NMFS. The commercial portion of the allocation would be landed under a 100-pound trip limit. Further discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, here is the list of things I think you need to decide that I've come up with so far. Number one, the ACL; you're going to set the ACL at 13,067 fish; that is what you're asking, correct?

MR. CURRIN: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Which would then be allocated out to the sectors. Weekends; you're talking three-day weekends. I'm assuming that means Friday, Saturday, Sunday and not Saturday, Sunday, Monday?

MR. CURRIN: Right.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm assuming you would want the Fisheries Service to open this up as quickly as we can make it happen, and I assume it's your intent that the Fisheries Service could modify this if an imminent tropical storm was bearing down on us? Myra, are you writing these down because we're going to need to get a motion. Okay, and that the bag limit in the recreational fishery would be one fish; is that what is currently on the book, one fish? It's two fish currently on the book, right?

MR. CURRIN: Well, that is what was in place before they were prohibited.

DR. CRABTREE: Right, so I'm assuming we're going to want one fish and then you need to say what you want to do with the size limit. It was 20 inches. I'm assuming you're going to not have a size limit when you do this. Those need to be clarified. Then with the commercial fishery, I would suggest that you set it up such that they're able to fish for like five days, but then it is closed for the next five days.

I'd like to have some window of time when it is closed to let us collect the dealer reports with nobody fishing so we can keep tabs on this and not have it run over. If we had the commercial fishery operate in some number of days, kind of mini-seasons, they fish so many days, but then there is a window when they can't fish. That would give the center time to get all the dealer reports and add it all up and see where we are.

MR. CURRIN: Anything else that you've got?

DR. CRABTREE: Not so far.

MS. BROUWER: I have one. Can we specify the trip limit would be 100 pounds whole weight or gutted weight?

MR. PHILLIPS: Gutted weight.

MR. CURRIN: Gutted weight, Charlie? You can leave it in that motion but we will specify that in the next motion which addresses all the various salient points that Roy made. Is someone willing to make a motion that the ACL will be set at 13,067 fish; that weekends will consist of Friday, Saturday and Sunday; that NMFS will strive to open as soon as possible; and that NMFS will maintain the ability to modify the chosen weekends as per weather or related to the weather and bad weather events; that there be a one-fish bag limit for the recreational sector with no size limit –

MR. JOLLEY: Is that one per person or one per boat?

MR. CURRIN: One per person; and that the commercial fishery be opened in five-day mini-season increments, closed and then perhaps reopened subject to available remaining quota – one per person per day with no size limit. What Roy was asking for was some ability to modify the opening dates subject to appropriate weather. That is probably reasonable.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Mac, instead of appropriate weather how about “would be able to modify the opening date subject to weather conditions” or something like that.

MR. CURRIN: That’s good, yes. I knew there were better words for that. All right, does that capture everything, Roy? Myra, are you comfortable with that wording?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I’d ask, Mac, that all of our staff think real hard about this between now and full council to see if there is anything else we forget that we need to specify so we get it squared away as best can.

MR. CURRIN: I’d ask the staff and all the committee and council members to think real long and hard about this, too, and make sure. You’re not going to get another bite at this apple, I don’t think. All right, the motion reads that the ACL for red snapper would be set at 13,067 fish. Weekends would consist of Friday, Saturday and Sunday. NMFS would strive to open the season as soon as possible. NMFS would be able to modify the opening date subject to weather conditions. The recreational bag limit would be one fish per person per day with no size limit. The commercial fishery would be open in five-day mini-season increments subject to the remaining quota.

MR. JOLLEY: Small correction; should we say “fishing weekends”; specify “fishing weekends” rather than just saying “weekends”, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CURRIN: We can say that if you want to hear me read this motion again. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I was just going to ask real quick is there any value to not having commercial seasons be the same week as the recreational season opens, but maybe that’s not something for the motion. That’s something that is more practical; I mean, looking at the competition on Friday.

MR. CURRIN: And I can also see the advantages of recreational folks trying to sneak a fish in for sale somewhere, perhaps. I don't know how common that would be, but it does happen, we all know that.

DR. CRABTREE: And the no size limit; that would apply to both the recreational and the commercial, I'm assuming.

MR. CURRIN: We did not discuss that; is that the intent of the committee?

DR. CRABTREE: And one other thing, if I could; Bonnie brought up to keep the first fish kind of thing. It's not really a very enforceable requirement, but we could put it in there with the hopes that people wouldn't high grade.

MR. CURRIN: And I think we should certainly emphasize that; right, it is not enforceable but just to reinforce that would be good behavior. I think Rob had something on this point.

LT. FOOS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee and I know what I'm about to say is on everybody's mind, but I think it bears mentioning on the record that looking at something like this, certainly a derby fishery and certainly something that we would want to get started as soon as possible, taking into account the weather conditions that we start seeing as we get further and further into fall.

Keep the first fish is certainly not something that is easily enforceable. I think that this is something that we have seen in the Gulf recently having these little two- to three-day weekend fishing, and it is something that enforcement is able to do for a short time period but not something that is sustainable over a long time period because we have to alter our duty schedules, our watch standing to make sure that we're able to account for the increased activity that we expect to see over the Friday, Saturday, Sunday period.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you very much and that is encouraging that you guys do try to adjust your schedules to address issues like this. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Mr. Chairman, just a clarification that the fishing weekends or Friday, Saturday and Sunday should be within a wave and there shouldn't be an straddling of waves. That would be a good thing.

MR. CURRIN: That would be a very good point just so it didn't confound MRIP anymore than it might. Roy, did you hear that comment from Myra? Her suggestion was that we do the best we can to make sure that the openings don't straddle MRIP waves so that the events occur within a particular wave – a particular weekend occurs within a wave.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, we can do our best on that.

MR. HARRIS: Just a question; was this motion made and seconded? No, it was not.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, I'm going to have to read it again. I know it was made by somebody; was it not? I put it together. Maybe nobody made it. I just suggested all this language; so if somebody wants to make this motion. David.

MR. CUPKA: I'll make the motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CURRIN: David's motion is -- everybody is okay with this -- the ACL for red snapper would be set at 13,067 fish. Weekends would consist of Friday, Saturday and Sunday. NMFS would strive to open the season as soon as possible. NMFS would be able to modify the opening date subject to weather conditions. The recreational bag limit would be one per person per day with no size limit. The commercial fishery would be open in five-day mini-season increments subject to the remaining quota. Second by Doug. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I hate to do this, Mr. Chairman, but I really think we need a seven-day mini-season increments because a lot of the boats make seven-day trips and not have to make them break a trip to try to stay in the window. I understand you have to read it again.

MR. CUPKA: I will accept that as a friendly amendment; and before you read it there is one other change. We talked about the size limit for the commercial also but it didn't get reflected in the motion yet; so no size limit on the commercial, also.

MR. CURRIN: Are there any other modifications or changes; is everybody okay with this? Look at it, read it. Recreational bag limit would be one per person per day with no size limit; commercial fishery would open seven days in mini-season increments subject to the remaining quota with no size limit. Let's just add it twice; add no size limit at the bottom right after "remaining quota"; and treat them separately. Go ahead.

MR. BROUWER: We also should specify that the allocation would apply to that ACL, the commercial recreational allocation that was established through the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

MR. CURRIN: I think it was; was it not? It infers that and we have had a lot of discussion that the allocation would no be changed, so whatever allocation is in place would remain. It's certainly everybody's intent. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: And then regarding the seven-day mini-season opening, I think Bonnie is going to check with quota monitoring, but it is not clear based on this motion how long it would be closed before another seven-day mini-season would be reopened.

MR. CURRIN: That would be up to you guys and you've got the landings reports so that you can decide whether in fact there will be another opening.

DR. CRABTREE: I think inherent in all this is the Fisheries Service will have to make some decisions to make this workable, and that would just be something that the Fisheries Service will figure out.

MR. CURRIN: And certainly I would expect that you would have the latitude regardless of how many days guys are at sea, Charlie, that if a second opening occurs and there is inadequate fish to let everybody have a hundred pounds a day or trip or whatever it is, that these guys are just going to have to adjust. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Is it possible to construct this to avoid the spawning season for red snapper?

DR. CRABTREE: When do they stop spawning?

MR. HARRIS: When do they stop spawning? I have no idea.

MR. CURRIN: Jack, what is the primary spawning season for red snapper, summertime? They're done in October at least in your area, yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, the way this is set up it's either going to be the tail end of August or it's going to be September, I would think, when all this happens. If you want to say not before October 1 or something like that, you can do that.

MR. CUPKA: Would you like me to read my motion so you won't have to read it again?

MR. CURRIN: I'd love for you to read your motion again.

MR. CUPKA: **Okay, the motion is that the ACL for red snapper would be set at 13,067 fish. Weekends would consist of Friday, Saturday and Sunday. NMFS would strive to open the season as soon as possible. NMFS would be able to modify the opening date subject to weather conditions. The recreational bag limit would be one fish per person per day with no size limit. The commercial fishery would be open in seven-day mini-season increments subject to the remaining quota. There would be no size limit for the commercial sector.**

MR. CURRIN: And was there a second to that motion? Who seconded that motion; Doug did, okay. Rob, did you have something?

LT. FOOS: Mr. Chairman, again, I'm on your committee but talking about dates for starting this, I think if we start looking at starting it in October we're looking a little too late in the season for the safety of life at sea concerns with the derby fishery and the conditions that will likely be present offshore at that time. The starting date really should be maybe the very end of August or very early September but not much later than that.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you for that input. **All right, any further discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? I see none; that motion is approved.** Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to mention with the assistance of the able PR folks from NMFS that supplying the states with some information on whenever we know these weekends are coming, we will do our best to let anglers know that we're interested in the

biological to see certain landing sites, the carcass programs and for the high-grading issue we will hit that hard, too.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you very much. Both education and enforcement would go a long way towards making this as successful as possible. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Myra, could you scroll up to the previous motion. The second motion didn't talk about this being part of an emergency rule, but, of course, I would think that it is because your first request was for an emergency rule. The second motion just simply clarified what else would be in the emergency rule.

MR. CURRIN: That's exactly right.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's fine.

DR. PONWITH: So now to Duane's question about how would we do the monitoring on this; absolutely, it would require some have advance work getting the states together with the federal sampling programs to come up with a plan for blanketing the waterfront and get these biological samples and the dockside intercepts.

The real question for the recreational side is how do we account for effort, and, of course, it is challenging. The effort is a challenging piece and I think what I'm going to do is consult with the MRIP folks to find out how well suited MRIP would be to provide the effort component of this and then allow an enhanced sampling level on the docks to do the dockside intercepts and what that does to their estimation process. The bottom line is this is going to take some strong collaboration between the states and the federal sampling programs to be able to do a good job on this.

MR. JOLLEY: Point to Bonnie; is there an opportunity for us to get more information than just on these fish that will be captured in the quota? It would be an opportunity to get – there will obviously be other snappers caught and released at least for the recreational sector. Is there some way that the population could participate further in providing some information?

DR. PONWITH: I can think of many ways that we could gather some additional adjunct information that would be very beneficial. The one that comes to mind that would be the most critical is if we could collaborate with the states to get some observers on headboats and if even possible on charter vessels and get some concrete data on discards. That would help us to understand how the fishing for this event differed from fishing that has been happening along the way in terms of the amount of discards we've got. That would be very valuable.

MR. CURRIN: Other comments or questions? All right, did we vote on this motion? We approved it; yes, we did. Okay, what else regarding red snapper at least at this point? Again, everybody look at this carefully and think about it some between now and full council so that if there are any other issues or stipulations that need to be made, that we get them in place at full council, so spend some time with this. Are you okay, Myra; as good as you can be. Yes, Mel.

MR. BELL: Just a question; so we now have a directed fishery out there. I think you're going to have a lot more discards. I don't have a lot of faith in the no culling. I guess what I could happen is next year we could find the predicted track we were on, you know, we're all of a sudden overshooting that so this becomes a one-time event then. It's kind of an experiment I guess in a way.

MR. CURRIN: It's very experimental in a lot of ways; and you're exactly right, that could be one of the outcomes. All right, our next agenda item is black sea bass management. Early on as everybody was likely aware, the topic was brought up consideration of looking at the projections of black sea bass and whether there might be some fish available based on those projections that perhaps could extend the truncated recreational seasons.

There were some projections made based on the old 50 percent probability of meeting our goals and more recently some additional projections based on our last choice of a higher probability, a 66 percent probability of rebuilding, which affected, of course, any sort of available yield stream. There has been some analysis that has been none. There are a number of attachments here. Myra, who is going to walk us through this? There is going to be some discussion, I am sure, so rather than state the obvious that the latest projections don't allow any additional yield, we'll at least have some discussion on this.

MS. BROUWER: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to locate those later projections. Those were not part of your initial briefing book. They were e-mailed to you last week, so give me just a second to locate those and bring them up on the screen.

MR. CURRIN: Are these the black sea bass projections for revised, issued May 20; revised June 8?

MS. BROUWER: These are the black sea bass projections that were requested from the center. The initial request did not specify that the projections should be at a 66 percent probability of rebuilding, which is under the rebuilding strategy that you chose in Amendment 18A this past year. This new set of projections is done at a 66 percent probability of rebuilding.

If you go to Table 2, it indicates that the allowable harvest at this probability of rebuilding would actually be below what is currently in the books as far as the ACL. It would be below that 847,000 pound ACL. Initially we had intended to discuss a potential adjustment of the ACL, but that was based on the initial projections that were requested. The other item that we had to talk about – and I'm going to ask Andy to come back up here – is the estimate of the length of the recreational season, and that is Attachment 9C.

MR. CURRIN: While Andy is coming up, are there any comments or questions about these projections? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Myra, you mentioned the level of harvest, the ACL for this upcoming year would be lower; what is the value of that? What would be the ACL for this year?

MS. BROUWER: If you look at that table for 2012, you would add the discards and the landings – I’m sorry, I’m being told that it would be just the landings in pounds, the number that is actually highlighted up on your screen, so that is 657,000 pounds and the current ACL is 847,000 pounds.

MR. CURRIN: Keep in mind that as a rebuilding strategy we’ve picked a constant catch. We went round and round about that and tried to get to a constant F approach, and that required that we reduce landings below where they were currently at that time. Nobody really wanted to go that route, I think, and we were frustrated but we stuck with that constant catch strategy.

What that does is kind of average out the landings throughout the rebuilding timeframe; so it is not unreasonable that when you look at a snapshot here, that is under where the current allowable harvest is because it goes up every year with the rebuilding ending in 2016. If you look at the projected yields there or landings there and it is over a million pounds. Somebody correct me if I misstated that, but I think that is an attempt to explain kind of why that number is lower than where we are as far as the harvest rate. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, Mac, that is well put; and if you look at the projections on the screen for landings, you will see that under the previous rebuilding plan that you’ve approved with a constant catch the 847,000 pounds is extended all the way out to 2016; whereas, here you will see that as of 2014, 2015, and 2016 your landings will be much higher than 847,000 pounds. It is similar to the concept of compounding interest that the stock will rebuild to a much larger size if you have lower removals early on compared to higher removal early on.

MR. CURRIN: Any other questions about the projections here? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, is this presentation on the screen – was there another one that went out besides the one that is dated the 29th of May?

MR. CURRIN: Yes, there were two that were the same. The title in my file is “01, black sea bass projections, IV-Revised” and there was another one that – yes, the difference was the date; 5/29 was the first one; this was dated 6/11/12, so there are two with I guess the same name. No, there is an EV/EW on the first one. Did everybody find it? Andy, have you got some additional comments or information?

MR. STRELCHECK: This is Attachment 9C in your briefing book. I don’t have a presentation prepared. With the annual catch limits, we are now obviously monitoring annual catch limits, and we have been in the habit in the Gulf of Mexico for red snapper of doing projections to estimate when the season will close.

We’ve also been doing this for black sea bass for the last couple of years in the South Atlantic. We wanted to just bring this to you for your information. Based on historical landings as well as modeling approaches that we have used in the past to look at trends in historical landings, coupled with exploitable abundance, we’re estimating the sea bass season to be met for the recreational fishery some time in August or September of this year.

We're at a point where the season opens June 1. The first landings for the season will start rolling in mid-August for MRIP. For headboat we might be able to get landings a little bit sooner than that, but we wanted to give you a heads-up that a seasonal closure will be necessary based on when the ACL will be met.

There is some uncertainty surrounding when the ACL will be met because you have implemented new restrictions this year, primarily the increase in the size limit, but I wanted to make you aware of this. Last year I believe we closed the fishery October 17th, so we're now projecting the quota will be met or the catch limit will be met possibly sooner than that, but there is some uncertainty surrounding when that closure date will occur. That is all I had and certainly I will entertain any questions you might have.

MR. HAYMANS: So the 13-inch increase really throws – I mean, the August/September projection is based on past landings, to where we were. You really don't know what the 13-inch increase is going to do with that. It could extend it beyond which is what we kind of –

MR. STRELCHECK: Right, so based on what is up on the screen you can see that there is a difference of two to three weeks up to over a month in terms of no size limit change, meaning you just maintain the status quo versus the size limit change being implemented. Keep in mind that the size limit increase will not occur until July 1, so the first month of the season will be under the lower size limit, so you're not getting the benefit of that size limit change for the first month of the season.

MR. PHILLIPS: Andy, if I read this correctly, it seems like the previous two seasons, both times that the recreational sector went over a good bit; do we feel like you're getting a better handle on when to close it so they're not going to be stuck with these big paybacks?

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't know if I can say we're getting a better handle on it. It certainly is a challenge because there is variability in the data; and the shorter the season gets, really the harder it becomes to predict.

Given what we have seen with landings, there are some landings that are coming in after the season, so we haven't been really factoring that in not knowing that those would be coming in after the season due to state water landings, so we are at least understanding how the fishery is operating once we do close. We'll certainly work on improving our methods to refine when we need to close the fishery to ensure overages aren't as large or there is no overage.

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to add to that point, Charlie, the projections that the center was requested to do were to incorporate the mortalities from 2011, because initially those were estimated. If you recall when you discussed 18A, the council chose to assume that the overage would be 150 percent. In fact, the actual estimated discard mortalities were only on the order of about 20 percent over, so it is sort of good news.

MR. CURRIN: You have to dig deep to find it, but there is some good news. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess really more just a comment instead of a question, and it is in regards to the commercial landings and having less than what we thought we might have this year. I think, Mac, you had brought up the last time the idea of looking at limiting the number of trips per week as a means to try to stretch out that quota as well. When you see those numbers on the board, that brings those kinds of tools back up in mind again.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I won't be here, of course, but I hope everyone will consider that depending upon the results of the season and how long that black sea bass commercial season lasts this year. If there are people churning trips and trying to turn them over as fast as they can, as they apparently did last year, the season is not going to last very long. I would suggest that you give serious consideration to limiting the number of trips that individuals can make during the week. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: And just to follow up to that, I guess maybe this is a question for Monica, but is that something that could be done through a framework when limiting the number of trips. Could that be done through a framework?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Limiting the number of trips could be done through a framework, yes.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, like you I will not be here either, but I sure would like to see this council take another look at changing the start date of the fishing year for this fishery and looking at how that might spread the fishery out.

MR. CURRIN: Any other comments or questions for Andy on black sea bass? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Maybe either Andy or Myra could answer the question. How did we arrive at the 657,000 pounds; is that because of an overage we had or a projection? How we were managing this fishery before, I thought we were like on a constant catch and I thought the 840,000 pounds was going to remain in effect. Now, is that 657,000 pounds due to an overage?

MS. BROUWER: From what I understand, that is due to the probability of rebuilding and putting in the actual observed 2011 discard mortalities in the model, but maybe Bonnie can speak to that in more detail than I can.

DR. PONWITH: So again the question is – if you could just repeat that one more time.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, the question is, Bonnie, really how did we arrive at that 657,000 pounds in the projection? What went into that that changed that number from what we thought was going to be the 840,000 pounds in perpetuity? Was it just the bycatch estimates from what we have now observed in that fishery, it was put into those projections and now shows that the bycatch level is at such a level now that it is decreasing the amount of harvest that we could have had?

DR. PONWITH: When you repeat projections, the things that you would change are the actuals for everything that were based on assumptions, so it would be the actuals for the landings and the actuals for the bycatch estimates.

DR. CRABTREE: And a lot of it is in these projections; you're shifting from constant catch to constant fishing mortality, and you can't switch from constant catch to constant fishing mortality and have the same probability of getting where you're going without cutting the catch at the beginning. And it is in our rebuilding plan now that we are going to try and change the constant F in the last two years, but I'm quite confident – unless a new assessment bails us out – that in order to do that you'll have to cut the catch below where it is. There is just not a way on that, I'm afraid.

MR. HARTIG: Well, can we bring John up? I talked at length with John and having both projections, one at 0.5 and one at 0.66, there was a pretty significant change in what we could have harvested and why that occurred, and then the fishery-independent information was brought forward yesterday that shows the stock is in pretty – I mean, we're looking at pretty significant increases in stock size based on the independent data. I think if John can explain what I asked him to look at, we could probably get down to the bottom of what I was going to ask for.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, I hope so, Ben. Primarily what I did for Ben was look into the progression of the different projections over time and why things have played out like they have here now. I think the point to make is that the projections that you guys had last December or when it was that showed the 66 percent probability of recovery, that was based on the fixed 847,000 pounds over time.

What happened then is your column there on F got progressively lower so that by 2016 it is down to like 0.15 or something. You were catching 847 at a time when, say, in this projection that shows you could be catching 1,220. What this is doing now, this is giving you a projection that you didn't have anything like this in December that showed give us a fixed F scenario, what does it take to rebuild at the 66 probability over time?

The original projection that showed the increase, that was based on 50 percent, so what you're seeing here in the difference in the two-projection scenarios you got over the course of a week is the difference in the higher probability of success for this rebuilding plan. And then the difference between those and what you had last December is really looking at the difference between that the rebuilding and the different approach toward rebuilding.

If you looked at the original assessment there was a projection that showed 50 percent probability as well as fixed landings, and that was I believe 1,149 or so; so you can see all these different numbers, it comes down you have two things you're dealing with. You're dealing with fixed F or fixed landings and you're dealing with the probability of success.

Roy is right, the issue with moving to the fixed F immediately is that the stock hasn't gotten to the point where it will be in a couple of years, so there is some cost versus with the higher probability of success you maintain the status quo until at some point the stock gets big enough that you can start increasing the landings. What this shows you is that maybe by like 2014 or 2015, which I think Roy had just the last two years, you get up to that point where you can start providing some increase.

DR. CRABTREE: John, right now we have a black sea bass update scheduled; when is that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: What we are expecting is at least updated projected projections that account for the actual observed landings because the SSC gave you ABCs for two years, and the uncertainty that they highlighted was with the actual catches versus the predicted catches, so they wanted at the minimum updated projections in two years, so I guess in 2013 they should be getting those to show the actual landings. We see now for one year; we see the actual landings for 2011, and they'd want to see the actual landings for 2012 to give you a value next year. So then when we do a more involved update, I think our intention is to do that maybe the following year.

MR. HARTIG: So that leaves us two years out basically from really doing anything with black sea bass. Some of you will remember that we had the argument before versus going to 0.5 or 0.66, your probability of rebuilding. I believe that I've seen enough information from the fishery-independent information and from the numbers that come out of both of those projections that I believe we're on strong ground it's the only flexibility that remains for this council to have is to go back to the 0.5 rebuilding schedule. **I would make that as a motion now that this council go back and use the 0.5 probability of rebuilding for black sea bass.**

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Ben; second by Michelle. Discussion on the motion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I understand where you're coming from, Ben, and we're kind of in a problem here. I think the only way to get out of this is to try and do a new stock assessment, update the stock assessment and see if the recovery we're seeing is ahead of things. To do what you're talking about here, you have to amend the rebuilding plan, so what you're talking about is a plan amendment. Procedurally that is what you would have to do.

MR. CURRIN: That was going to be my question, and I thought that would be the answer.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, Roy, if we go down that we do the plan amendment, what kind of timeframe are we talking about?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that depends on how much stuff you put in it. If it is just to address this one issue, you'd have to do a couple of meetings, we'll have to determine what the NEPA document is, you'll have to develop alternatives, so potentially some time next year you could get it maybe done.

Normally plan amendments take around a year to get done, but we've done them faster if they're simple. I tell you you're going to have a great deal of difficulty coming up with a rationale for this. Remember, we went through all of this at the December meeting and there was a long discussion.

I went back and reread all the minutes and everything, so we're essentially revisiting a decision we just made. I don't know that there is anything new here; but if you want to try it, we can see. I think really what you need to talk about is do you want to try and move the assessment up and is that even possible?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, the assessment can tell you if you're still ahead of schedule on rebuilding, which I think the last assessment indicated you probably were, but I believe you could specify a different probability of success outside of the assessment process, because that should be something that reflects your risk tolerance above and beyond wherever the assessment tells you where you particularly are at any point in time.

Now, we asked the SSC to look at this. They considered the probability of success but they weren't asked specifically to evaluate a new one. You did not ask them to provide you a new probability of success for black sea bass when they looked at the last assessment. However, the SSC – and you have approved a control rule by which they can consider metrics of the fishery and evaluate a probability of success.

They have given you recommendations on stocks recently that used that, and things like red snapper and red grouper that have been done recently both included the SSC recommendation for your probability of success. It reflects essentially the P-star value where they evaluate that and decide the level of conservation that they think is necessary and it reflects the life history and the type of assessment and how well uncertainty is evaluated and the status and all of those types of criteria that are in the control rule.

So one thing you could do is you could ask that the SSC consider that and apply that new control rule to black sea bass and see what they would recommend in terms of an appropriate probability of success if you wanted to change the rebuilding plan in that direction. It would seem given the assessment that you have that we now have just seen projections at 50 percent and 66 percent, if you perhaps chose something different than either of those you could get the projections that showed you that at least for the next few years as that shows.

And, if we're talking about new projections that you'd get in 2013 that reflect the actual landings and we'd like to know what the probability of success should be used there, so I guess it just comes down to I suppose you have to do a plan amendment to change that probability of success, so maybe asking the SSC to apply the control rule to the last black sea bass assessment, which they just looked at last fall, to see what the probability of success they would recommend given that assessment.

MR. CURRIN: That would seem like a very reasonable approach to me. Further discussion on this motion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think something along those lines – I mean, our problem is going to be building a record justifying what we're doing; and I think if we can get something from the SSC or whatever we could develop along that, maybe that would help.

MR. HARTIG: Well, after what John said, I can withdraw this motion and make a new motion that we take that to the SSC and see what they come up with through their control rule and see the probability of success that they recommend. That seems to be a better way so I will withdraw this motion.

MR. CURRIN: Without objection from the committee, the motion is withdrawn. New motion by Ben to request that the SSC apply the control rule to the black sea bass fishery and advise the council on the probability of success. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think I'm okay with that; John, we're talking about asking them to essentially apply P-star; is that what this is effectively doing? I'm not sure what basis the SSC is going to have to make a recommendation about probability of success. It is not a science question.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Actually under the control rule it is. The SSC gives you a recommendation. Now you can deviate from that and modify it, but the control rule is set up for rebuilding stocks that it uses the P-star to calculate a probability of success. In the normal P-star you think of reducing the probability of overfishing occurring. In the case of the application to rebuilding stocks, it increases the probability that you rebuild by the endpoint of the rebuilding period.

MR. CURRIN: Further discussion on the motion? The motion is to request that the SSC apply the control rule to the black sea bass fishery and advise the council on the probability of rebuilding success. Is there any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved. Anything else on black sea bass before we go to other business. I would like to finish this committee's business before we break for lunch.

I know there are a couple of things under other business, but is that it for black sea bass, Myra? All right, as usual we will rely on the work ethic and ability to capture anything and everything that we do in this committee and not attend to a timing and task motion. Under other business there is one issue that we did not talk about with regards to MPAs when we were dealing with the speckled hind and Warsaw issues.

I was under the impression certainly that the type of MPA that we were suggesting be developed were Type II's, which would allow fishing for pelagic species within those boxes. Is that everyone else's understanding? Is there anyone who was under a different impression on the committee? All right, is that direction okay or do you want a motion? Would that be cleaner or better for you guys? How about a motion then from Michelle?

DR. DUVAL: I would move that the MPA alternatives being analyzed by staff be Type II MPAs.

MR. CURRIN: Second by Tom Burgess. Any discussion on that motion? Any objection to that motion? All right, thank you very much. Any other business to come before the committee?

DR. DUVAL: It has to do in regards to a motion that was made by the Snapper Grouper AP, which Captain Johnson brought before us yesterday. It was with regard to harvest of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper within Florida states waters. There are a number of questions I have related to that, but I was wondering if Jessica maybe perhaps has – is there a list of the species

for which Florida has not complemented federal regulations in state waters? I think I'm aware of a couple.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes, we have an ongoing list that either we have actually made a decision to not go consistent or we haven't brought it before our commission yet. In the case of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper we haven't brought it before the commission yet. We'd have to look into that a little bit more.

DR. DUVAL: I had several questions related to that yesterday in terms of the Gulf Council actions and given the unknown status in the Gulf Council of why they chose not to take action, but I was also – just in looking through some of the other materials for the Data Collection Committee meeting and there is a chart for the South Atlantic Region, black sea bass commercial quotas for 2011 and 2012 where it shows the landings by month.

Between December and April of 2011 there are actually quite a few – I think almost 10,000 pounds of commercial black sea bass landings and the season closed in July, so I am assuming that those are probably Florida bag limit landings; would that be correct? Can someone clarify that?

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm not certain but we have an agenda item at our upcoming commission meeting in September to look at consistency on black sea bass. The reason we haven't brought it forward is there are different issues in the Gulf than there are in the South Atlantic, so we were trying to bring a package that encompassed both the issues for the South Atlantic and the Gulf, and we just needed a little more time to do that.

DR. DUVAL: And I just ask because this is something that our fishermen have brought before us some of the inconsistencies and the fact that this is a shared resource; and so I guess when they see those regulations have not been complemented in state waters, we get a lot of heat for that. To me it sort of speaks for reconsideration of things like state-by-state quotas. It would eliminate issues like this. Thanks.

MR. HARRIS: It is not a comment to Michelle's comments and questions. I just wanted to remind the folks that Florida Sea Grant has a display out in the hallway with respect to barotrauma. I know that when we made this announcement when we first came back into session, a lot of the fishermen were not in the room at that time. I would just encourage everybody to take a look at that display and talk to Holly about it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I don't remember if we talked about VMS for the commercial fisheries concerning MPAs; and if we didn't, I would make a motion to direct staff to look at alternatives of using VMS on commercial vessels to help law enforcement of MPAs.

MR. CURRIN: And, Charlie, it was mentioned at the very tail end of our discussion, and I think my request was that you guys think about it and bring it forward at full council, but if you want to bring it forward it, we can do that and we won't have to remember to do it at full council.
Motion by Charlie to direct staff to include requiring VMS on commercial vessels in

alternatives to designate MPAs. Is there a second to Charlie's motion; second by Michelle. Discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Otha, do you know if there are any funds left in the VMS Reimbursement Fund?

MR. CURRIN: Otha's response was, yes, there are funds left, and I think at last count there was close to \$2 million. I don't know how much less than that or where it exists now.

MR. EASLEY: There is a question on how much is going to be continued to be added back into the VMS Fund, but right now it is setting steady at a few million. We'll just have to play it by ear after that.

DR. DUVAL: I seconded this motion for discussion purposes and it was a motion that was made by the AP. I think I mentioned at the end of our discussion yesterday that I thought it might be helpful to sort of have maybe an enforcement section or enforcement alternatives section because there may be – I know that there are strong feelings about VMS, I guess I'll say, amongst the fishermen, and so there might be other alternatives besides VMS that could be used for enforcement. I would just encourage staff to explore any alternatives that might be viable.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I would note that I guess everyone received an e-mail or letter from SAFA supporting VMS on – and we're hearing more and more support. Of course, there are folks that don't want it and see it as an invasion of their privacy and everything else. We'll hear all those comments as we move forward with this, I'm sure. **Further discussion this motion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Another point that was brought up the AP had to do with hogfish and triggerfish, and I was going to bring a point that at the Gulf Council we have been discussing some non-compliance issues based on gray triggerfish measurement. There is now an issue in Florida where on the Gulf coast in state waters it is measured to the fork and also on the Atlantic coast in state waters to the fork, but the South Atlantic is still measuring it total length.

This seems to be causing some confusion for anglers, and so I was wondering if the council thought that they might want to address that in addition to the size limit request that made from the AP; so if we're going to address the size limit I think we should also address measuring the fish to fork length.

This was on the radar screen and I think we pushed it maybe to 2014 because we were waiting for a stock assessment, so I don't know if we still want to keep it pushed off or we want to address just the measurement technique. I'm not certain, but I can make a motion if that is what we're looking for or I can make a motion during full council maybe after some discussions with other folks.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, let's do that; I think that is probably better; think about it and talk to some of the other folks and see what – I think we can probably do all that through framework, but I'm

not positive, but that would be best to look into before you start going down the path. I think we did in our previous discussion, you're right, this has come up before.

I think everyone is in agreement; it's just the proper time to do it; and with the pending triggerfish assessment and getting into that, I think earlier at least we thought that would maybe be the more appropriate time to do it; but the sooner the better as far as I'm concerned. Anything else to come before the Snapper Grouper Committee? Thank you all very much; we're only ten minutes late, and I don't remember ever being only ten minutes late in snapper grouper.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 o'clock p.m., June 13, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July 3, 2012

INDEX OF MOTIONS

MOTIONS UNDER ACTION 4 IN AMENDMENT 18A

PAGE 32: Motion to recommend to full council to approve the transferability action for formal review. Motion carried on Page 32.

PAGE 32: Motion to recommend to the full council to deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Motion carried on Page 32.

PAGE 33: Motion to give the staff editorial license to make changes and clarifications in the transferability action. Motion carried on Page 33.

PAGE 33: Motion to give the council chairman authority to approve editorial changes in the amendment and deem the codified text as appropriate. Motion carried on Page 34.

MOTIONS UNDER AMENDMENT 18B/EA

PAGE 37: Motion to include Subalternatives 2G, 2H and 2I in the document. Motion carried on Page 37.

PAGE 37: Motion to change the preferred from 2F to the new Subalternative 2G. Motion carried on Page 38.

PAGE 43: Motion to approve wording changes for the transferability action. Motion carried on Page 43.

PAGE 47: Motion to clarify the language of alternatives under Action 8. Motion carried on Page 48.

PAGE 48: Motion to approve Amendment 18B for formal review. Motion carried on Page 48.

PAGE 48: Motion to deem the codified text for Amendment 18B as necessary and appropriate. Motion carried on Page 49.

PAGE 49: Motion to give the staff editorial license to make changes to the amendment document as appropriate and give the chairman the authority to approve changes to the document and redeem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Motion carried on Page 49.

MOTIONS UNDER MPAs and HAPCs for SPECKLED HIND AND WARSAW GROUPEr

PAGE 69: Motion that the committee recommends moving forward with consideration of MPAs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. Motion carried on Page 71.

PAGE 102: Motion to direct the staff to develop alternatives to look at reconfiguring existing MPAs as a first tier or level and new MPAs as a second tier and a combination of the two as a third tier. Motion carried on Page 103.

RED SNAPPER MOTIONS

PAGE 120: Motion that the council's intent was to adopt the ABC projections reviewed by the SSC with the headboat index weight of 0.3. Motion carried on Page 120.

PAGE 136: Motion to consider reopening of the red snapper fishery with an ACL of 13,067 fish. Discussion? Motion carried on Page 137.

PAGE 137: Motion to control harvest of red snapper during the reopening through a tag system to be administered by NMFS. The tags would not be subject to commercial/recreational allocation, and they would be distributed through a lottery system.

PAGE 149: Substitute motion to develop a plan amendment to control harvest of red snapper through a tag system to be administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Tags would be subject to the commercial/recreational allocation and they would be distributed through a lottery system. Motion carried on Page 149.

PAGE 156: Motion to initiate an emergency rule to provide for the recreational allocation for red snapper to be landed on three-day weekends; the number of which would be determined by NMFS. The commercial portion of the allocation would be landed under a 100-pound trip limit. Motion carried on Page 156.

PAGE 160: Motion that the ACL for red snapper would be set at 13,067 fish. Weekends would consist of Friday, Saturday and Sunday. NMFS would strive to open the season as soon as possible. NMFS would be able to modify the opening date subject to weather conditions. The recreational bag limit would be one per person per day with no size limit. The commercial fishery would be open in seven-day mini-season increments subject to the remaining quota. There would be no size limit for the commercial sector. Motion carried on Page 160.

BLACK SEA BASS MANAGEMENT MOTIONS

PAGE 167: Motion that the council go back and use the 0.5 probability of rebuilding for black sea bass. Motion withdrawn on Page 168.

PAGE 169: Motion is to request that the SSC apply the control rule to the black sea bass fishery and advise the council on the probability of rebuilding success. Motion carried on Page 169.

MOTIONS MADE UNDER OTHER BUSINESS

PAGE 169: Motion that the MPA alternatives being analyzed by staff be Type II MPAs. Motion carried on Page 169.

PAGE 170: Motion to direct staff to include requiring VMS on commercial vessels in alternatives to designate MPAs. Motion carried on Page 171.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011 - 2012 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SHRIMP

Robert Boyles, Chair
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Anna Martin

SNAPPER GROUPER

✓ Mac Currin, Chairman
✓ Ben Hartig, Vice-chair
✓ ~~Robert Boyles~~ MEL BELL
✓ Tom Burgess
✓ Roy Crabtree
✓ David Cupka
✓ Michelle Duval
✓ Duane Harris
✓ Doug Haymans
✓ John Jolley
✓ Jessica McCawley
✓ Charlie Phillips
✓ Tom Swatzel
Red Munden, Mid-Atlantic Council
Staff contact:
Myra Brouwer / Brian Cheuvront

SOPPs

Duane Harris, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

SPINY LOBSTER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
Robert Foos
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION

David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

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

Deputy Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Assistant Public Information Officer

✓ Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Staff Economist

✓ Dr. Brian 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
Kari Fenske - kari.fenske@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary / Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

JACK MCGOVERN NICK FARMER ROBERT JOHNSON
PHIL STEELE LUIZ BARBIERI CAROLYN SKAMEK
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO CHRIS KOENIG KAREN ANTRIM RAINE
OTHA EASLEY KATHY BARCO
ANDY STRELCHECK ROB BEATON
BONNIE POWWITH
BOB GILL
CAROLYN BELCHER
MARCEL REICHERT
JOEY BAILENGER

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.

SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE MEETING
June 12, 2012

Orlando, FL 32812

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

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

EMAIL
ADDRESS

32120-9351

Justin Johnson 813 386-229-0448 justj2009@aol.com
Joe Williams 772-461-0494 ok88x@aol.com
16311 W. Ellsworth Ave.
Golden, CO 80401

Dick Brown 303-216-9476 brownads@comcast.net
Dale Beaumais 321-960-1663 sherin@wildacresmarket.com
2735 N. 1st St. Ft. Pierce
321-332-1776 pan.gillespie@mail.houses.gov

Sherrin McCoy 772-546-1541 pan.gillespie@mail.houses.gov
Pat Harts 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov
Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov
Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov

Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov
Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov
Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov

Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov
Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov
Pat Gillespie 321-632-1776 karinraie@roa.gov

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.

SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE MEETING
June 12, 2012
Orlando, FL 32812

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

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

EMAIL
ADDRESS

FRANK HEUER	727-724-4949	GSAPP	THURPA, FL	Douglas Florio Sportsman.com	Redfish, NC	feheliess@verizon.net
DOUG KELLY	EDF			mtucker@edf.org	1205 E. 6th St. Bldg	clearwaters FL 33758
Helen Tulek-Hernandez	EDF	850-488-5471	MAK. BEERLEIGH	FRESHFISHFLORIDA.COM	TALLAHASSEE FL 32301	
Melissa Locke	EDF					
MAK BEERLEIGH	FADET Agt Son. Sec.	305-393-0934				
Leta Duvane		910-685-5705		strenovek@pudnets.org		
Sxa Novenak		252-322-7845		hines@pudnets.org	Wilmington, NC	
Hilly Bines		252-646-5041		gmartin@edf.org		
Gretchen North						

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

19655 River St
De Tequesta, FL
33469

Dykoke@Comcast.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.

SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE MEETING
June 13, 2012
Orlando, FL 32812

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Sustainable Seafood	305 451-3516	people@seafood.net	FL 3233
Shawn McCoy	845 386-2390	shawnmccoy@aol.com	32120-9351
Paula Jones	772-461-6599	CEVSEK@aol.com	251 5111111, Dr P.O. Box 34949 16311 W. Ellsworth Ave. Golden, CO 80401
Joe Kosterman	772-461-6599	beaumad3@comcast.net	4320 Horseshoe Bend Merritt Isl. FL 32953
Joe Kosterman (Seafood Consumer)	305 393 0131	BottomDoll@comcast.net	5918 Broken Bay P.O. Box 3010
Lucia Duvvuru	321 536-0802	Fishman@cflls.com	
Brock Anderson	386-566-8813	Fishman@cflls.com	
David Nelson	561-351-1904	Dykoke@comcast.net	
Jim M. Newman			

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE MEETING
June 13, 2012

Orlando, FL 32812

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

EMAIL
ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

Jeff Miller - CCA	352-266-3564	1661 NW 57 th St, Deady Fl. 34475	P.O. Box 56886, Orlando FL 32856
Brian Zaski - CCA	407-854-7002	bzaski@ccaflorida.org	PO Box 5751 Clearwater FL 33758
FRANK HECHES	727-724-4949	DOUG@FLORIDASPORTSMAN.COM	Wilmington NC
DOUG Kelly	321-917-6265	gabaco711@hotmail.com	Wilmington NC
Peter Parik	452 644 5411	gparik@edf.org	Edinburgh NC
Gretchen Martin		mlocke@edf.org	Rule's h, NC
Melissa Locke		mllocke@edf.org	
Helen Lybake-Humacher			

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

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:13 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 3 of 5 (Wednesday)	Webinar ID 970157482
Actual Start Date/Time Jun 13, 2012 07:26 AM EDT	Actual Duration (minutes) 767
Clicked Registration Link 114	Opened Invitation 27
Total Attended 58	

Session Details

Port-Minner,Samantha	sport-minner@oceanconservancy.org
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:36 AM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:36 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:20 PM EDT	431.02
Interest Rating		
Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:		26

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Dunn,Russell	russell.dunn@noaa.gov
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 09:09 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:10 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:55 PM EDT	465.8
Interest Rating		
Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:		21

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Krall,John		southwindfishing@yahoo.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 07:01 PM EDT	
City	New Smyrna Beach	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:02 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 07:28 PM EDT	25.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Michie,Kate		kate.michie@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 11:04 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:41 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:11 PM EDT	449.72

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.

Miller,Janet		janet.l.miller@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 10:10 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:11 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	359.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Adamson,Presley		padamson88@yahoo.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 04:55 PM EDT	
City	Key West	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 04:56 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 07:13 PM EDT	136.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 80

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.

Hesselman,Don	don.hesselman@ncdenr.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 01:36 PM EDT
City	Fair Haven
State	NY
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:37 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:20 PM EDT	223.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 41

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Lelis,Ludmilla	llelis@orlandosentinel.com
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 10:11 AM EDT
City	Orlando
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:18 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 11:30 AM EDT	71.75

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.

sandorf,scott		scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 09:15 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:15 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:33 PM EDT	497.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

laks,ira		captainira@att.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 02:20 PM EDT	
City	jupiter	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:20 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	352.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 47

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Williams,Erik		erik.williams@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:31 PM EDT	
City	MHC	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:54 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:34 PM EDT	419.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Sauls,Beverly		beverly.sauls@myfwc.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 05:23 PM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 05:23 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:08 PM EDT	45.13

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.

solomon,justin		justin.solomon@myfwc.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 11:48 AM EDT	
City	Jackosnville	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:50 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 12:00 PM EDT	10.07

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 56

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Byrd,Julia		byrdj@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:54 PM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:38 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:25 PM EDT	586.6

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.

prugar,larry		lprugar@live.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 02:07 PM EDT	
City	south daytona	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:08 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	182.57

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	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:58 AM EDT	
City	ST PETERSBURG	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 01:02 PM EDT	243.5

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.

Brown,Mark		capt.markbrown@comcast.net	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 05:59 PM EDT		
City	Mount Pleasant		
State	SC		
Unsubscribed	No		

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 06:00 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	132.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 56

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

branstetter,steve		steve.branstetter@noaa.gov	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date		Jun 13, 2012 02:08 PM EDT	
City		St. Pete	
State		FL	
Unsubscribed		No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:08 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:20 PM EDT	71.25

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.

Eich,Anne Marie		annemarie.eich@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:28 AM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:34 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:03 PM EDT	508.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Waters,James		jwaters8@gmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:58 PM EDT	
City	Morehead City	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:22 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 10:45 AM EDT	23.32

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.

Schulz,Paul		schulzpa@hotmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 09:24 AM EDT	
City	Tallahassee	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:24 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 09:35 AM EDT	10.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

fenske,kari		kari.fenske@safmc.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 07:57 AM EDT	
City	charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:57 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:12 PM EDT	683.88

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.

Killer,Ed		ed.killer@scripps.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 01:08 PM EDT	
City	Stuart	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:09 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:38 PM EDT	148.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

potts,john		pottsy18@aol.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 01:19 PM EDT	
City	rockledge	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:19 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	413.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 80

[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.

stephen,jessica		jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:28 PM EDT	456.53

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Chesler,Richard		richard.chesler@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:54 AM EDT	
City	Port Orange	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:54 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:06 PM EDT	353.13

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.

Coggins,Lew	lew.coggins@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:45 AM EDT
City	beaufort
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:45 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	688.2

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Kellison,Todd	todd.kellison@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT
City	Beaufort
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:12 PM EDT	198.5

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.

holland,jack		jack.holland@ncdenr.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	
City	Wilmington	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:53 PM EDT	415

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Gore,Karla		karla.gore@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:40 AM EDT	
City	Sarasota	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:41 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:17 PM EDT	396.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Whitaker,David		whitakerd@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 02:09 PM EDT	
City	charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:09 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:42 PM EDT	58.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 42

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

gerhart,susan		susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:08 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:47 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 11:45 AM EDT	178.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

haddad,ken		kenhaddad50@gmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 09:58 AM EDT	
City	lloyd	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:59 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 10:17 AM EDT	18.45

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

OShaughnessy,Patrick		patrick.oshaughnessy@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 10:51 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:52 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:59 PM EDT	367.18

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.

Latanich,Katie		cal7@duke.edu
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 09:45 AM EDT	
City	Beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:45 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT	128.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Knowlton,Kathy		kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:22 AM EDT	
City	Brunswick	
State	GA	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:23 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:20 PM EDT	538.5

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	Jun 12, 2012 11:45 AM EDT	
City	Hubert	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	703.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Baker,Scott		bakers@uncw.edu
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:45 AM EDT	
City	Wilmington	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:46 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:59 PM EDT	432.72

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.

Smart,Tracey		smartt@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:15 AM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:15 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	240.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Lupton,Dee		dee.lupton@ncdenr.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 01:50 PM EDT	
City	Morehead City	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:51 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:29 PM EDT	158

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.

brennan,kenneth		kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 09:50 AM EDT	
City	beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:50 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:40 PM EDT	521.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Thomas,Janie		fecspi@aol.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 01:22 PM EDT	
City	Fernandina Beach	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:23 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:00 PM EDT	156.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 39

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Beckwith,Anna		anna@pamlicoguide.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	
City	Morehead City	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:19 PM EDT	530.22

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Daniel,LouiS		louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 02:02 PM EDT	
City	Morehead City	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 12:05 PM EDT	186.98

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.

Mehta,Nikhil		nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:55 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:22 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:29 PM EDT	487.4

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 54

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Malinowski,Rich		rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:50 AM EDT	
City	St Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:12 PM EDT	366.38

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.

C,Mike		mec181@yahoo.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 07:28 AM EDT	
City	mtp	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:28 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	764.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Turner,Steve		steve.turner@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:06 PM EDT	
City	Miami	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:26 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:46 PM EDT	379.82

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.

Mumford,Doug	doug.mumford@ncdenr.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 11:46 AM EDT
City	washington
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:47 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:30 PM EDT	223.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 58

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Lemieux,Timothy	timcantfish@gmail.com
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 05:32 PM EDT
City	cocoa
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 06:15 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	117.6

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.

Fitzpatrick,Eric	eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:50 AM EDT
City	Beaufort
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	682.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 48

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

MacLauchlin,Bill	billmac@charter.net
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:56 AM EDT
City	Stockbridge
State	GA
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:56 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:28 PM EDT	571.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 66

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Mann,Charles		charlesmann@paveselaw.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 01:48 PM EDT	
City	Fort Myers	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:50 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 02:07 PM EDT	17.27

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Exley,Gary		river92@bellsouth.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 05:23 PM EDT	
City	Tybee Island	
State	GA	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:53 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	620.22

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

DeVictor,Rick		rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:39 AM EDT	
City	St Pete	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:39 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 07:13 PM EDT	488.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Clemens,Clemens		anik.clemens@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 12:35 PM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:35 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:54 PM EDT	488.88

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Mahood,Robert		robert.mahood@safmc.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 11:27 AM EDT	
City	N. Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:27 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:23 PM EDT	44.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

thompson,mary jean		mjthompson860@gmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 11:42 AM EDT	
City	titusville	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:42 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	407.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 61

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	No	
Registration Date	Jun 14, 2012 08:37 AM EDT	
City	St. petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Devictor,Rick		rick.devictor@noaa.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 06:14 PM EDT	
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](#)

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

NEAT,JASON		jloffshore25@yahoo.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 04:04 PM EDT	
City	ORMOND	
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](#)

amick,steve		steveamicks2@aol.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 14, 2012 05:05 PM EDT	
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.

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:13 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name

SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 2 of 5 (Tuesday)

Webinar ID

352677314

Actual Start Date/Time

Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT

Actual Duration (minutes)

469

Clicked Registration Link

139

Opened Invitation

33

Total Attended

48

Session Details

Knowlton,Kathy		kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:33 AM EDT	
City	Brunswick	
State	GA	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:58 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:40 PM EDT	461.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

MacLauchlin,Bill		billmac@charter.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:55 AM EDT	
City	Stockbridge	
State	GA	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 12:40 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:02 PM EDT	262.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 65

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.

larson,john		john@beachmarineservice.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:16 AM EDT	
City	port canaveral	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:16 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 10:18 AM EDT	2.07

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 69

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Waters,James		jwaters8@gmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:59 PM EDT	
City	Morehead City	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 02:00 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 02:40 PM EDT	39.47

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.

c,ag		asg@citrix.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:58 AM EDT	
City	yes	
State	KS	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:59 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 11:01 AM EDT	2.25

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Miller,Janet		janet.l.miller@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:20 PM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 02:22 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 02:27 PM EDT	5.25

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.

Gore,Karla		karla.gore@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	
City	Sarasota	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:22 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 03:26 PM EDT	303.42

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Mehta,Nikhil		nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:54 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:12 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:05 PM EDT	360.67

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 48

[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	Jun 10, 2012 12:38 PM EDT	
City	Hubert	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:05 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 11:43 AM EDT	103.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

michie,kate		kate.michie@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:23 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:22 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 03:46 PM EDT	323.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

mims,chuck	imims@comcast.net
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:24 PM EDT
City	edisto
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 01:27 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 02:35 PM EDT	67.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Coggins,Lew	lew.coggins@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:52 PM EDT
City	Beaufort
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 02:53 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:31 PM EDT	98.4

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.

Barker,Wells		wbarker1@ec.rr.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:17 AM EDT	
City	Beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:17 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 10:47 AM EDT	29.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 69

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Stephen,Jessica		jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:43 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:02 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:31 PM EDT	389.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

merritt,rita	miridon@ec.rr.com
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 12:03 PM EDT
City	wrightsville bch
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 12:04 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:45 PM EDT	340.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Port-Minner,Samantha	sport-minner@oceanconservancy.org
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:18 PM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 01:19 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 01:19 PM EDT	.58

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.

sandorf,scott		scott.snadorf@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:35 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:35 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:07 PM EDT	392.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Killer,Ed		ed.killer@scripps.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 12:55 PM EDT	
City	Stuart	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 12:56 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:49 PM EDT	233.03

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.

kurt,ben		bkurth@stetson.edu
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:38 PM EDT	
City	pensacola	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 01:39 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 02:31 PM EDT	52.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

OShaughnessy,Pat		patrick.oshaughnessy@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:29 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:08 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:18 PM EDT	429.63

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.

FARMER,NICK		nick.farmer@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:58 AM EDT	
City	ST PETERSBURG	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:09 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:05 PM EDT	416.52

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Fenske,Kari		kari.fenske@safmc.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:13 AM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 01:43 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 03:25 PM EDT	101.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Whitaker,David		whitakerd@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:01 AM EDT	
City	charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 03:17 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:28 PM EDT	131.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Byrd,Julia		byrdj@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:53 PM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:08 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:40 PM EDT	452.42

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

amick,steve		steveamicks@aol.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 05:14 PM EDT	
City	savannah	
State	GA	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 05:15 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:41 PM EDT	25.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

b,a		a@b.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:19 AM EDT	
City	a	
State	CA	
Unsubscribed	Bounce	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:19 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 02:43 PM EDT	4.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 54

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,ash	ash.c@g.net
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:37 AM EDT
City	yes
State	OH
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:38 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 10:38 AM EDT	.9

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 66

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Eich,Anne Marie	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:27 AM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:13 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:28 PM EDT	400.62

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.

DeVictor,Rick		rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:33 AM EDT	
City	Bradenton	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:58 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:28 PM EDT	389.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Daniel,Louis		louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 02:02 PM EDT	
City	Morehead City	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:16 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 10:17 AM EDT	.82

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.

Haddad,Ken		kenhaddad50@gmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:51 AM EDT	
City	Monticello	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:22 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:02 PM EDT	241.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 69

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Latanich,Catherine		cal7@duke.edu
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:48 AM EDT	
City	Beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:37 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 10:38 AM EDT	1.15

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.

Clemens,Anik		anik.clemens@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:06 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 03:49 PM EDT	342.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Baker,Scott		bakers@uncw.edu
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:13 AM EDT	
City	Wilmington	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:22 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:05 PM EDT	343.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

C,Mike	mec181@yahoo.com
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 07:22 AM EDT
City	MtP
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:57 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:40 PM EDT	462.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

fields,mark	mark.fields@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 11:22 AM EDT
City	Port Orange
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 11:23 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 01:17 PM EDT	114.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

prugar,larry		lprugar@live.com	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date		Jun 11, 2012 08:43 PM EDT	
City		South Daytona	
State		FL	
Unsubscribed		No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 03:09 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	60.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 63

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Fitzpatrick,Eric		eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date		Jun 12, 2012 02:02 PM EDT	
City		Beaufort	
State		NC	
Unsubscribed		No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 02:13 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:17 PM EDT	124

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.

brennan,kenneth		kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:59 AM EDT	
City	beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:30 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:41 PM EDT	357.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 42

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Williams,Erik		erik.williams@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:30 PM EDT	
City	MHC	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:09 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:32 PM EDT	303.63

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.

thompson,mary jean		mjthompson860@gmail.com	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 11:24 AM EDT		
City	titusville		
State	FL		
Unsubscribed	No		

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:17 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 11:04 AM EDT	.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

test,test		test@test.com	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:37 AM EDT		
City	test		
State	AL		
Unsubscribed	No		

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:37 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 10:38 AM EDT	.6

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.

Gerhart,Susan		susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:15 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:03 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:19 PM EDT	375.53

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 39

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Smart,Tracey		smartt@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 11:25 AM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 11:25 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:03 PM EDT	338.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Barile,Peter		abaco711@hotmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:33 AM EDT	
City	Melbourne	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:16 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:44 PM EDT	448.22

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 44

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

DeLancey,Larry		delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:37 PM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 02:37 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 04:36 PM EDT	118.47

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.

grubbs,david		heavyhittercharters@cfl.rr.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:18 PM EDT	
City	port orange	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 02:18 PM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:40 PM EDT	202.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Beckwith,Anna		anna@pamlicoguide.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:32 AM EDT	
City	Morehead city	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 10:11 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 05:45 PM EDT	453.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 79

[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	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:43 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Mac,K	kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:59 AM EDT
City	chas
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.

Kelly,Bill		fkcfa1@hotmail.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:10 PM EDT	
City	Marathon	
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](#)

Waymer,Jim		jwaymer@floridatoday.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 11:18 AM EDT	
City	Melbourne	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*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	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:07 AM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Turner,Steve		steve.turner@noaa.gov
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:03 PM EDT	
City	Miami	
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.

sandorf,scott		scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:20 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

McGinn,Rebecca		littleriverfish@yahoo.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:46 AM EDT	
City	Little River	
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.

Harris,Rob		rw_harris@msn.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:39 AM EDT	
City	Key West	
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](#)

Michie,Kate		kate.michie@hotmail.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 11:03 AM EDT	
City	St. petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:11 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 2 of 5 (Tuesday)	Webinar ID 352677314
Actual Start Date/Time Jun 12, 2012 08:07 AM EDT	Actual Duration (minutes) 108
Clicked Registration Link 139	Opened Invitation 33
Total Attended 29	

Session Details

Malinowski,Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:07 AM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:08 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:54 AM EDT	46.02
Interest Rating		
Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:	37	

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Mac,K	kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:59 AM EDT
City	chas
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:59 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:01 AM EDT	1.97
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.

Larkin,Michael	michael.larkin@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:43 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:44 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:28 AM EDT	43.25

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 57

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

michie,kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:23 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:23 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:56 AM EDT	32.62

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.

Eich,Anne Marie		annemarie.eich@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:27 AM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:07 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	107.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Fenske,Kari		kari.fenske@safmc.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:13 AM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:13 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	42.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Gore,Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:29 AM EDT
City	Sarasota
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	85.55

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Whitaker,David	whitakerd@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:01 AM EDT
City	charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:01 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	54.03

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.

sandorf,scott		scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:20 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:20 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:56 AM EDT	35.78

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

DeVictor,Rick		rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:33 AM EDT	
City	Bradenton	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:33 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	81.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 41

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Baker,Scott		bakers@uncw.edu
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:13 AM EDT	
City	Wilmington	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:14 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	41.18

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Barile,Peter		abaco711@hotmail.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:33 AM EDT	
City	Melbourne	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:34 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	20.53

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.

Mehta,Nikhil		nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:54 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:19 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	96.08

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 57

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Gerhart,Susan		susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:15 AM EDT	
City	St. Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:16 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:56 AM EDT	39.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 48

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Beckwith,Anna		anna@pamlicoguide.com
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:32 AM EDT	
City	Morehead city	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:33 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	82.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 76

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Turner,Steve		steve.turner@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:03 PM EDT	
City	Miami	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:37 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	77.98

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.

C,Mike	mec181@yahoo.com
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 07:22 AM EDT
City	MtP
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:09 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	105.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 38

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

OShaughnessy,Pat	patrick.oshaughnessy@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:29 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:30 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	25.32

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.

Clemens,Anik		anik.clemens@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:59 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	56.42

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Latanich,Catherine		cal7@duke.edu
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:48 AM EDT	
City	Beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:49 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:50 AM EDT	1.52

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.

Daniel,Louis		louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date		May 25, 2012 02:02 PM EDT	
City		Morehead City	
State		NC	
Unsubscribed		No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:11 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:20 AM EDT	9.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 54

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

McGinn,Rebecca		littleriverfish@yahoo.com	
Attended	Yes		
Registration Date		Jun 12, 2012 09:46 AM EDT	
City		Little River	
State		SC	
Unsubscribed		No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:46 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:51 AM EDT	4.73

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 66

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Byrd,Julia	byrdj@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:53 PM EDT
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:38 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	77.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Haddad,Ken	kenhaddad50@gmail.com
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 09:51 AM EDT
City	Monticello
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 09:51 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:56 AM EDT	4.28

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.

brennan,kenneth		kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:59 AM EDT	
City	beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:59 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	55.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Williams,Erik		erik.williams@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:30 PM EDT	
City	MHC	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:26 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	88.77

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.

Knowlton,Kathy		kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:33 AM EDT	
City	Brunswick	
State	GA	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:34 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	81.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

MacLauchlin,Bill		billmac@charter.net
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:55 AM EDT	
City	Stockbridge	
State	GA	
Unsubscribed	No	

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:56 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	59.37

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.

Stephen,Jessica		jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:43 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 12, 2012 08:44 AM EDT	Jun 12, 2012 09:55 AM EDT	71.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

thompson,mary jean		mjthompson860@gmail.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 11:24 AM EDT	
City	titusville	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

prugar,larry		lprugar@live.com	
Attended	No		
Registration Date		Jun 11, 2012 08:43 PM EDT	
City		South Daytona	
State		FL	
Unsubscribed		No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Kelly,Bill		fkcf1@hotmail.com	
Attended	No		
Registration Date		Jun 12, 2012 02:10 PM EDT	
City		Marathon	
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.

larrison,john		john@beachmarineservice.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:16 AM EDT	
City	port canaveral	
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](#)

Michie,Kate		kate.michie@hotmail.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 11:03 AM EDT	
City	St. petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

mims,chuck	imims@comcast.net
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:24 PM EDT
City	edisto
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](#)

Port-Minner,Samantha	sport-minner@oceanconservancy.org
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:18 PM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

merritt,rita	miridon@ec.rr.com
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 12:03 PM EDT
City	wrightsville bch
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Miller,Janet	janet.l.miller@noaa.gov
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:20 PM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

sandorf,scott		scott.snadorf@noaa.gov
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:35 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

DeLancey,Larry		delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:37 PM EDT	
City	Charleston	
State	SC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Waymer,Jim		jwaymer@floridatoday.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 11:18 AM EDT	
City	Melbourne	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

c,ash		ash.c@g.net
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:37 AM EDT	
City	yes	
State	OH	
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.

Barker,Wells		wbarker1@ec.rr.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:17 AM EDT	
City	Beaufort	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Killer,Ed		ed.killer@scripps.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 12:55 PM EDT	
City	Stuart	
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.

FARMER,NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov
Attended	No
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:58 AM EDT
City	ST PETERSBURG
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

grubbs,david	heavyhittercharters@cfl.rr.com
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:18 PM EDT
City	port orange
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.

Coggins,Lew	lew.coggins@noaa.gov
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:52 PM EDT
City	Beaufort
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

kurt,ben	bkurth@stetson.edu
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:38 PM EDT
City	pensacola
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.

Waters,James		jwaters8@gmail.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 01:59 PM EDT	
City	Morehead City	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Harris,Rob		rw_harris@msn.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 08:39 AM EDT	
City	Key West	
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.

Smart,Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 11:25 AM EDT
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

fields,mark	mark.fields@noaa.gov
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 11:22 AM EDT
City	Port Orange
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.

Fitzpatrick,Eric	eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 02:02 PM EDT
City	Beaufort
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

c,ag	asg@citrix.com
Attended	No
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:58 AM EDT
City	yes
State	KS
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.

b,a		a@b.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:19 AM EDT	
City	a	
State	CA	
Unsubscribed	Bounce	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

test,test		test@test.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 10:37 AM EDT	
City	test	
State	AL	
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.

amick,steve		steveamicks@aol.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 05:14 PM EDT	
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](#)

Austin,Anthony		redress@ec.rr.com
Attended	No	
Registration Date	Jun 10, 2012 12:38 PM EDT	
City	Hubert	
State	NC	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

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

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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