

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SHRIMP COMMITTEE

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 13, 2011

SUMMARY MINUTES

Shrimp Committee

Robert Boyles, Chair
David Cupka
Dr. Wilson Laney

Dr. Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips

Council Members

Dr. Michelle Duval
Mac Currin
Duane Harris
LT Robert Foos

Tom Burgess
Tom Swatzel
Bill Teehan
John Jolley

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
John Carmichael
Anna Martin
Julie O'Dell
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson

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

Observers/Participants:

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dr. Mike Travis
Dr. Jack McGovern
Kate Michie
Steve Wilson

Monica Smit-Brunello
Bob Gill
Rick DeVictor
Fred Dockery

Other Participants Attached

The Shrimp Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, North Charleston, South Carolina, September 13, 2011, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Robert Boyles.

MR. BOYLES: Good morning everyone; my name is Robert Boyles, I am Chairman of the Shrimp Committee, and I would like to welcome everybody here to the Shrimp Committee Meeting. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. The agenda was sent out to you in the briefing package.

In light of some comments that were made at the joint AP meeting yesterday, under other business I would like to ask Dr. Ponwith if she would be willing to comment on some of the discussions about the bycatch presentation that was to be made yesterday during the AP meeting. With that, are there any other additions to the agenda? Seeing none, are there any objections to adopting the agenda as amended? Seeing none, the agenda will stand adopted as amended.

Next is the approval of the March 8, 2011, committee meeting. Those were also included in your briefing package. Any changes to those minutes as submitted? Any objection to adopting those amendments as submitted? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. Next we will begin our discussion on Shrimp Amendment 9.

Note for the committees purposes; note that we are scheduled to go until noon today. It would be my objective to see if we could move well through this process, giving it the time that it does require, but recognizing that we have got quite a bit of business in front of the council later in the week.

If we could get a little bit ahead of schedule, I would certainly appreciate it and I know the council as a whole probably would appreciate that as well. If we can keep that in mind, what I will do now is turn it over to Fred and Steven, who are here representing the Shrimp and the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels, respectively. Fred, do you want to lead off?

MR. DOCKERY: I'm just going to read the notes – I will try to read them quickly – from yesterday's joint AP meeting of the Shrimp and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels. The AP members received a review of the current process for concurrent EEZ closures after severe weather events and an update on the South Carolina shrimp fishery after this year's closure.

Next the group heard presentations on bycatch levels and monitoring, scoping for the draft environmental impact statement, the DEIS, for sea turtle bycatch and mortality and results of the economic survey of the South Atlantic Shrimp Fisheries. The council is considering a new amendment to the shrimp fishery management plan, and the AP members reviewed items that may be included in Amendment 9. The list below outlines each of these items and points of discussion, questions, and recommendations from the AP.

Number 1; add royal red shrimp to the fishery management unit and develop MSA parameters for the royal red shrimp. As at the previous AP meeting, there was a consensus that royal red shrimp should not be added to the fishery management unit, and there was a motion to that effect.

Number 2; remove the limited access program for the rock shrimp fishery. AP members felt that there were too few boats in the fishery and the limited access permits are a barrier to new entrants. Although permits can be bought, many fishermen cannot afford them. There should be options for shrimpers, including rock shrimp.

There are many permits not in use. The limited access program involves a burdensome paperwork process. The AP passed a motion to have staff conduct research on the current limited entry permit holders. Number 3; modify the protocol for concurrent EEZ closures during severe weather events.

South Carolina representatives expressed interest in developing a process by which the state could directly request a closure from the NMFS without having to wait for the March council meeting. The APs supported amending the FMP to allow the state to make a direct request to NOAA fisheries and eliminate council review of the request.

There are two comments here from a panel member who was not present, but sent the comments in, Megan Westmeyer. The council and AP should still be notified of the request so they can participate in any review at the federal level; that is Megan's comment. A South Carolina representative would like to use environmental conditions such as temperature, water, water temperature and possibly a predictive model as opposed to the 80 percent mortality standard that exists now.

Another comment from Megan Westmeyer; the AP supported using environmental criteria, and one AP member noted that shrimp survey data is extremely important and should be reviewed in conjunction with environmental data. At the March 2010 Joint Committee AP meeting, the committee passed a motion to include in an amendment a modification to the process by which states could request directly to NMFS, based on critical water temperatures.

The AP passed a motion yesterday for staff to develop an options paper on the process. Item Number 4 was to revise the MSST for pink shrimp. The AP had no specific recommendations at this time. Item number 5; develop measures to reduce take of smalltooth sawfish. The APs recommended not to take further action until there is more information on smalltooth sawfish takes, which will be part of the biological opinion in development for the South Atlantic shrimp fisheries.

Additionally, the APs had questions and concerns about the turtle bycatch presentation and the economic survey. In general, concerns about sea turtles were focused on external factors that affect sea turtles and increase in turtle populations and the data. For the economic survey, AP members expressed concern about the data as well. Not in these notes, but I would include the general tone of the concerns was that the data in both cases did not reflect the reality that the AP members felt was present.

MR. BOYLES: Thank you, Fred; any questions for Fred or for Steven about the joint AP meetings? Okay, seeing none, thank you as well for that. Next we will move into potential options for Shrimp Amendment 9. Kari, are you going to walk us through some of these?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, there are six items that have been in consideration for Shrimp Amendment 9 over the past few years. The first two involve royal red shrimp and adding those to the fishery management unit. This would require also setting the MSA parameters, the ABC, ACL, accountability measures, et cetera. The APs were not in support of adding royal red shrimp to the fishery management unit.

The third one is to remove the limited access program for the rock shrimp fishery, and the APs had the discussion about the latent permits that are in existence and then barriers for fishermen to get into the rock shrimp fishery. The fourth is to modify the protocol for the states to request the concurrent closure of the EEZ.

The two components of this would be for the state to bypass the council review process and then also to use – if the states could use environmental criteria instead of shrimp abundance. E is to revise the MSST proxy for pink shrimp and then F measures to reduce takes of smalltooth sawfish.

MR. BOYLES: Thank you, Kari. Let's discuss this and probably move through these things sequentially. David.

MR. CUPKA: I wasn't going to do that, I was going to say given everything on our plate and whatnot, I personally would like to see us, if we do anything, work on Items D and E in the Amendment 9. F I think is going to come out of the biological opinion, and I started to mention yesterday that recently the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Development Foundation hosted a workshop.

It was last year in Tampa on the smalltooth sawfish where they pulled all the information together, and there were a lot of industry people there who were asked to comment on it. I'm sure we will see all that information again in that biological opinion, but actions resulting from that I think will be driven by the biological opinion.

We probably need to wait and see what comes out of that, but again I think if we are going to do anything we need to certainly put some emphasis on Item D and possibly E at least in the foreseeable future. That would be my personal take on it.

MR. BOYLES: Dave, is that a motion?

MR. CUPKA: No, it wasn't a motion; I was going to wait and see what other people had to say, what their thoughts were.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I agree with David, I think you laid out the situation very well. I would agree and move ahead with D and E for now.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, as far as removing the limited access on rock shrimp, I guess there is a little bit of a – I heard the comment that to get a permit was expensive, but if you have only got a very small limited number of boats and you have got a lot boats that have permits that

are not using them, it would seem like you could lease those permits from those boats for a nominal fee. I mean something is better than nothing if you are not going to use the permit.

And maybe we could figure out a way to lease those permits; to help those guys figure out a way to lease the permits where they can be use and people can go fishing without changing the whole program. That might be something that staff could look at to help people do that in lieu of a wholesale change.

MR. BOYLES: Okay, further discussion? Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Not on that one, Mr. Chairman, but I am prepared to offer a motion on D, if you would like for me to do so. Should I go ahead and read that? The motion would be – and this is just for discussion purposes, I am sure it can be refined – move to include an option for Shrimp Amendment 9 which would authorize the Regional Administrator at state request to close the EEZ to the South Atlantic Shrimp Fishery should; one, water temperatures inshore remain at 8 degrees centigrade or below for; two, over one week – that may need to be longer – three, during the months of December, January, or February. And per my colleague, Mr. Teehan, I added 4; state samples reflect high mortality of the stock. We may or may not want to include that one, but, anyway, that will get us started on it, and I have it written down, Kari.

MR. BOYLES: All right, thank you, Wilson, and give us just a minute when we get this projected so folks know what the motion is. David.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, one thing I think it would help to do is if we would say close the EEZ off the state or states requesting the closure rather than just the whole EEZ. If Wilson is agreeable with that, I would offer it as a friendly amendment to his motion, and I'll second it.

MR. BOYLES: All right, we have a motion; **the motion is to move to include an option for Shrimp Amendment 9 which would authorize the Regional Administrator, at state request, to close the EEZ off the state or states requesting to the South Atlantic Shrimp Fishery: should, one, water temperatures inshore remain at 8 degrees centigrade or below for over one week during the months of December, January, or February, and state samples reflect high mortality of the stock.** That was a motion by Dr. Laney, second by Mr. Cupka. Discussion on the motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: So these are not definite guidelines; that is just kind of their parameters, because, as we know, if the temperature drops slowly it is not nearly as devastating as those sharp drops like we had in December. This is just general guidelines and then they decide if they want to ask if they can meet this.

MR. BOYLES: That is correct, that is how I interpret that.

DR. LANEY: Yes, Charlie, and I wasn't sure about that over one week part. Based on the graphs that Mel had yesterday, you might want to extend that and make it over two weeks. I don't know, I will defer to the state biologist on that point.

MR. HAYMANS: I don't know that I understand why the 1, 2, 3 and 4 when it seems to be reading through as one sentence; and, secondly, this provides no option for Mel's predictive modeling to close if we get to that point.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think the motion is too specific and it is trying to lay out the specific criteria. I think that is something that staff ought to work with the states and develop a series of alternatives for us to look at. I would make it a more general motion, I think. Because I don't know if that is the right temperature or numbers of days, and I think that is just something that ought to be worked out in the document when it comes back to us.

MR. BOYLES: I wonder, Roy – and that is a good point – I wonder if maybe the best course of action; the first part of that motion seems to get to where we want to go. Maybe a second sentence that direction to staff would include some of those more specific directions as potential options.

DR. LANEY: Sure, Mr. Chairman, so maybe we should just split it. Roy, would it be appropriate to just put a period after the word "fishery", and then the rest of it could just be guidance to staff to consider using the following criteria as triggers? That works for me.

MR. BOYLES: All right, is that suitable to the body now that we have discussed that? I am seeing heads nodding in the affirmative, so let's see if we can clarify that. Let me read it again. **The motion is move to include an option for Shrimp Amendment 9 which would authorize the Regional Administrator at state request to close the EEZ off the state or states requesting to the South Atlantic Shrimp Fishery.**

That is the motion. Guidance to staff will be staff should consider water temperatures inshore, duration of cold water temperatures inshore during the months of December, January and February, and results of state sampling efforts that might reflect high mortality of the stock.

DR. LANEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could we just say the staff should consider using the following criteria as possible triggers, just to clarify it a little bit?

MR. BOYLES: Just what you said, that is right. Fred

MR. DOCKERY: I have a question; can this be done without an amendment? Can it just be done administratively or not?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, it will need an amendment.

MR. BOYLES: Okay, we have got a motion. Further discussion on the motion? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I realize I am not on your committee but I just wanted to make certain the clause "at state request", so if say a state like North Carolina did not ever want to participate in this closure – the closure has to be at the request of the state I guess is what I am getting at. That is the intent; I just want to make sure that was the intent.

MR. BOYLES: Yes, I think that is a necessary condition. Further discussion on the motion? **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** David, you had a second item you wished to pursue?

MR. CUPKA: Well, I think we passed a motion – I made a motion at our last committee meeting that we have staff look at seeing if there is any way to better develop an MSST for pink shrimp, and I would certainly like to see us include that in this amendment as well. **I would move that staff examine options for an improved method to determine the MSST for pink shrimp.**

MR. BOYLES: That is a motion, is there a second? Second by Wilson. Discussion? **No further discussion, any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** Further items for potential inclusion in Shrimp Amendment 9? Steven.

MR. WILSON: I just have a question. I understand that the council needs the amendment process to make these changes, but the members on both AP committees are concerned about the necessity of a whole new shrimp amendment. They are concerned because we didn't know about an amendment being made at the time really until yesterday.

Their concern is a necessity of a shrimp amendment because they are wondering – we were pretty clear on these issues that were brought forward. Are there going to be lots of additions and things coming from other committees going into the shrimp amendment? That is what their main concern is.

MR. BOYLES: Steven, I think I'll try and I'll maybe defer to Kari as well, but I think what we have got here is the committee making a recommendation to council that we move forward with examining methods to determine MSST for pink shrimp as one action item. The second action item in the shrimp would be a way to expedite the requesting of the closure of the EEZ.

Should the council approve this, I guess staff will develop the scoping document. Scoping will go out for public scoping, come back to the council and then will go to public hearings. At this point we have got in essence two actions; am I reading that right, Kari?

There is I suppose always an option if someone pops up that there is an issue to be dealt with, but it would have to go through the scoping process as well. Have I butchered that process or is that correct? All right Kari is telling me I am halfway or at least mostly right. Anything else in Shrimp Amendment 9?

MR. CURRIN: I am not on your committee and I don't have a suggestion for inclusion in Shrimp Amendment 9, but I don't have much knowledge or information on the royal red fishery. I don't routinely see landings; I don't know whether we have a permit that is required. I do know it is a fishery that occurs in our jurisdiction.

They are mentioned in our shrimp plan, and it gives me some concern that we are not more actively managing them. I appreciate Monica bringing to our attention yesterday, during the AP discussion, determining whether there is a need for management based on whether it is a threat to

the conservation or some other wording, I forget, but it made perfect sense. At this point I have no concerns about the conservation of royal red shrimp.

But because I don't see the landings on a regular basis, I really don't have a feel for how that fishery; whether it is just rocking along with the same number of participants or whether the landings are rocking along at a fairly constant level based on our tracking effort or whether there is an increase in effort or a decrease in effort or anything.

I guess my bottom line is I think it would behoove the council to monitor as closely as we can what is going on with that fishery, so that if in fact something does change rapidly, which that happens more frequently now probably than it did many years ago, that we are not caught unaware of some perhaps important changes in that fishery that might warrant attention and perhaps stricter management by the council.

MR. BOYLES: Thanks Mac, that is a good comment, and I think we can probably arrange for a briefing on the royal red fishery here if we can schedule it. I will look to David. David and I can work with staff to get something on the agenda maybe in December, but if not December then certainly here, and, Kari, you can confirm that for us. So, good point.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, that was going to be my comment that we not only monitor it, but maybe have a presentation from staff so that council members will have a little better feel for what the magnitude of the fishery is and some of the things that are going on at least to familiarize ourselves a little more with that particular aspect. We can certainly work on that, Mac, if that would make you feel better.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I was just curious, is there a way to track the landings that we can see them, and we are going to track the landings of some of these species we are going to take out of snapper grouper; you know, trying to use the same methodology so we can keep an eye on all of this stuff.

MR. BOYLES: Yes, I think we can do that. Maybe the first good step is to arrange for a presentation here and we will schedule something before the shrimp committee on royal reds status report. Steven.

MR. WILSON: Could the royal red landings be tracked through the trip ticket program that is currently in place?

MR. BOYLES: I don't know the answer to that question. The answer is yes.

MR. WILSON: The reason the AP committee was not pushing to put the royal red on the FMP is that it is a deepwater shrimp fishery, requires a little more equipment, it is more expense to try to get royal red shrimp, so there are just a few boats in that fishery basically right now. We didn't feel like it was necessary to add it to the – to get into a full-blown management plan.

MR. BOYLES: Okay, further discussion? We're comfortable with where we are on moving forward with Shrimp Amendment 9? We are down to other business before we get to timing and

task. Kari told me that the sawfish meeting report is available. Let Kari know if you would like to take a look at that; she can get you a copy of it. We are down to other business, and we are looking for Bonnie to comment on the questions that arose yesterday about bycatch; the bycatch presentation. Okay, she will be here in just a second.

MR. CUPKA: I was going to say, while you are waiting, you already alluded to what my intent was earlier, and that is that we push ahead with our agenda because we are going to need more time I am sure for snapper grouper when we get to it. If the committee chairmen will be thinking about that, I have looked it over, and I don't think there is any reason why we can't go ahead with some of these committee meetings here, so that would be my intent is to push ahead on these things and get as far as we can. If any committee chairman has a problem with that, let me know. Otherwise, we will probably just go right down the line and see how far we can get on committee meetings.

MR. BOYLES: Thank you, David, and let me dispense with timing and task and give Bonnie a chance to get her legs under her. I think the intent here is for staff to go back and bring options for Shrimp Amendment 9 back for discussion in December. We will move along those lines. We will discuss it and further refine it in December and then be prepared to deal with it in March. Kari, have I got nodding affirmation? That is the way the committee will move. Okay, with that down to other business.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I understand that there were some questions regarding the sea turtle estimates in the AP meeting yesterday, and the AP report specifically said that the data didn't reflect the observations of the people in the fishery, and the fact of the matter is that is exactly correct.

The data are estimates of encounter rates of sea turtles that would have been shunted out the TED opening, so you are exactly correct. These are things that are not seen. What we are trying to do is generate an estimate of an event that is unseen. The way we did this originally was in the late '90s we did what we called naked net studies.

That was basically to put a high number of scientific observers aboard vessels that were towing shrimp nets that did not have TEDs and keep track of the number of animals that were encountered in those nets that had no openings. We used that encounter rate data to estimate how many sea turtles were possibly being encountered in nets that did have TEDs once those regulations requiring TEDs went into effect.

Based on studies that we have done on the TEDs that are currently certified, our estimate is that the TEDs are 97 percent effective. In a perfect world what you would do is put observers aboard vessels and see how many turtles were retained in nets that had TED, and use that to extrapolate the other 97 percent of turtles that you never saw.

The good news is that the number of turtles that observers are seeing is so low on those observed vessels that statistically you can't do that extrapolation. From a statistical standpoint that is bad news; from a turtle encounter rate that is good news. That means that if turtles are down there, they are effectively being shot out that net. That is good.

That leaves us in a situation of trying to quantify the unseen, and so the methodology that we use to do that in this report was to take the 2009 effort data and use the naked net study encounter rates. Now that actually relies on some heavy assumptions, and that is that the numbers of sea turtles that are out there are the same as when that naked net study was done. We are gathering some data on sea turtle abundance in those areas, but those data were not available for the analysis at the time that the analysis was required.

Hopefully we will be able to make some adjustments using these new population size data that we have got to be able to correct for the actual number of animals that we believe are in those areas. But for this estimate, what we did was used a suite of assumptions, and that is that the number of sea turtles out there is exactly the same, and that the encounter rates of those turtles, hence, were the same.

What we did was took encounter rates from the naked net studies that were done in the early 2000s and applied it to the corrected effort for 2009 to extrapolate what the likely encounter rates of turtles were and then took 3 percent of that number and said these are the number – this is our best estimate of the number of turtles that were actually retained in nets due to inefficiencies or some snag in the TED.

Then applied to that was a mortality estimator of those 3 percent that actually got caught in a net, what percent of those die? And then that is how we arrived at those mortality estimates. What you are seeing is a very high number for the likely number of turtles that were encountered and then a lower number for our estimate of those how many likely perished.

MR. BOYLES: Thanks, Bonnie, questions?

MR. PHILLIPS: Bonnie, I have got a lot of friends down in Georgia, and they do turtle nesting. I had a friend of mine send me the numbers for turtle nests in Georgia for '09, '10 and '11; '09 was 1,005, 2010 was 1,774, and 2011 was 2,002 nests. If you think back the maturity of turtles is about 30 years.

What we are seeing now is the fruits of the effort of putting in TEDs 30 years ago. The number of turtle now is going to be a lot higher than they were in 1990. Things have changed drastically for the good. The other thing is – and the Coast Guard can probably back me up – is I remember when I was shrimping, and I would see – we would get our TEDs checked.

A lot of things that were noncompliance was it might be a few meshes not open, it might be just three inches short of what opening, which really it may not be compliant but it doesn't mean it is not working; or the angle may be an inch or two off. Even though we probably have a little bit of noncompliance, I don't think you can assume that they are not working.

I think turtles are in much, much better shape than they have been in a lot of years. You are probably going to have to have some new studies to really get some numbers that are going to match with what we are doing. And we are going to see more turtle strandings because there are just more turtles out there, whether it is from shrimping or whatever. The good news is what I see with nesting. I just thought I would pass the thought..

MR. DOCKERY: I hate to follow such a positive comment with a question but just so I understand these tables in your study; are these real animals or are they projected animals?

DR. PONWITH: There are multiple tables in the report. There is one table that is the actual observations – are the actual observations of turtle observers. If you look at each of the tables and the headers, it will tell you whether it is an extrapolation or whether it is the actual observed. The main point is that the number of turtles actually observed was extremely low so we couldn't use the actual observed turtles to generate an estimate with confidence intervals.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, to Charlie's point, you are right that when you look at the compliance reports in the TED inspections we've done, you see a whole range in terms of the violations from no TED or TED sewn up to some just very minor things. What we are trying to do in the biological opinion is go through and categorize types of violations and whether it definitely would result in a turtle not being able to escape, for example, no TED to is it not likely to have had any effect on it so that we can better understand how these violations because certainly not all violations are equal.

MR. WILSON: I had a question. I think part of the problem that came up yesterday was they only showed this first page of this table on the screen so people didn't realize there were two more pages. That was part of the problem. It looks like on this first page a lot of tri-net interaction. Is that really observed tri-net interaction, because when I was shrimping and we put this little tri-net out for a 15 minute trawl?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, that is correct that some of the observations were from nets with TEDs where a turtle was retained in spite of their being a TED, but some of them were in actual tri-nets.

MR. WILSON: If they were getting that amount of turtles in tri-nets, a tri-net is like a 15-minute trawl, and we are proposing reducing trawl times; is that really going to have an effect, reducing trawl times?

DR. PONWITH: Well, if you encounter a sea turtle in a tri-net, the shorter the time the turtle is entrained in that net the higher the probability the turtle will survive the encounter. From a regulatory standpoint I would defer to my colleague for that.

MR. DOCKERY: Would you say that catching that many turtles in tri-nets would mean they are pretty thick out there? I mean, it seems like the odds of catching them in a tri-net is a lot slimmer than catching them in a net.

DR. PONWITH: We will have – as I said, we right now are running vessel surveys and aerial surveys in the South Atlantic and we're blanketing the entire South Atlantic. This is very exciting work that we are doing. We are working in conjunction with Boehmer and the work is in its second year.

We are collecting information on the observations on marine mammals as well as sea turtles and gathering the environmental data to understand the relationship of water temperature with how

likely you are to see them on the surface versus them being diving to help us interpret what we are seeing.

Those data are going to be instrumental in helping us to understand what the current status of those stocks are and whether indeed those stock are making a recovery due to the contribution that the fishing industry has made by doing good work with these TEDs. We will have better quantitative information going forward. We are gathering those data right now.

DR. CRABTREE: Just bear in mind if we go into this and we make an assumption that the numbers of turtles in the water has gone up since the late 1990s, then the number of turtle takes in the shrimp fishery is going to go up and be higher than these estimates because they are dependent on what we think the catch per tow is going to be. If you go in and you make an assumption that because of compliance issues TEDs are not 97 percent effective, their effectiveness is some lower number, then the number of mortalities will go up as a result of that. There is a lot of complicated interactions going on and we don't have good answers to those things because we don't really have a good answer for what is TED compliance fleet-wide everywhere, and we don't really have good estimates of turtle abundance.

MR. BOYLES: Thanks Roy; anything further on this? Bonnie, thank you for the clarifications on that. Any other business to come before the Shrimp Committee at this time?

MR. WILSON: Some of the members of the AP Committee asked me to speak because they were hoping to avoid Shrimp Amendment 9, but they realize that is a process that is going to take place. They wanted me to say something about the rock shrimp limited access before the council.

The issue that was brought up was whether to remove limited access entry and just wanted to explain that came up because it seems like the boats are not – there is not as much participation in the industry but certain boats have expressed a desire to get into the rock shrimp fishery. There was a difficulty with the permits and boats.

Some people would sell their permits for a huge amount of money, but we realized yesterday in discussions that the reason why we came up with the limited access originally is because certain boats further up north, particularly scallop boats, scallop dredges when they were not catching so much would come down south and just hit the rock shrimp fishery real hard, which cleared out stocks for the regular shrimpers which became a problem.

That is why it was proposed. That hasn't happened recently and the fishery is kind of not as active as it was, but we realize that possibility it could happen again so we were concerned about boats being able to get into the fishery and we were not really sure how to solve that problem, but the gentleman over here did bring up one good point, and Fred had a comment on that.

MR. DOCKERY: It seems like the bigger concern with the limited access to rock shrimp, if I understood it, was not so much reopening it as the transfer of inactive permits or lost permits isn't happening. Inactive permits, people are holding onto because they are hoping it is going to retain a value, and people who don't renew permits, those permits disappear.

If I understood correctly, I think the panel would like the council to at least consider a possibility for lost permits, permits that are not renewed, not just disappearing, but being made available to fishermen. It wouldn't be a change to the limited access but a modification to what happens when a permit fails to be renewed.

MR. BOYLES: Thank you, Fred and Steven. I think what we can do in addition to having a briefing on royal reds, if the committee concurs, is we can have a briefing on kind of the status of rock shrimp here, and, Kari, we can maybe get that in December as well with concurrence from the committee. I am seeing heads nodded so we will take a look at that. Any other business to come before the shrimp committee?

DR. LANEY: Just a quick question, Mr. Chairman, to my North Carolina colleagues to ask about the status of – I believe it was black tiger shrimp that were showing up in Pamlico Sound. Do we have any other information on any additional tiger shrimp being caught in North Carolina or anywhere else along the South Atlantic Coast, for that matter?

DR. DUVAL: Wilson, I don't have anything right now. I can certainly ask, but I haven't heard lately of any coming up.

MR. HAYMANS: Just that the reports are they are being caught up and down the coast, including in recreational seiners nets, so they are out there.

MR. BOYLES: Any further business to come before the shrimp committee? Seeing none, any objections to adjourning? We will stand adjourned and yield the time, Mr. Chairman.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 o'clock a.m., September 13, 2011.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 2011

SHRIMP

- / Robert Boyles, Chair
- / Roy Crabtree
- / David Cupka
- / Doug Haymans
- / Wilson Laney
- / Charlie Phillips
- / Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

SNAPPER GROUPER

- Mac Currin, Chairman
- Robert Boyles
- Tom Burgess
- Roy Crabtree
- David Cupka
- Michelle Duval
- Duane Harris
- Ben Hartig
- Doug Haymans
- John Jolley
- Jessica McCawley
- Charlie Phillips
- Tom Swatzel
- Red Munden, Mid-Atlantic Council
- Staff contact:
- Myra Brouwer / Brian Chevront

SOPPs

- Duane Harris, Chair
- David Cupka, Vice-Chair
- Michelle Duval
- Doug Haymans
- John Jolley
- Staff contact: Bob Mahood

SPINY LOBSTER

- Roy Crabtree
- Robert Foos
- Ben Hartig
- John Jolley
- Jessica McCawley
- Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

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

INTERIM VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

Ben Hartig
9277 Sharon Street
Hobe Sound, FL 33455
772/546-1541 (ph)
bhartig@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 *BILL TEEHAN ✓*
Biological Administrator III,
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.,
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/487-0580 x 217(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

STEVE WILSON
MIKE TRAVIS
RICK DEVICTOR
KATE MICHIE

FRED DOCKERY
BONNIE PONWITH
JACK MCGOVERN
MONICA-SMIT BRUNELLO
BOB GILL

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

Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Staff Economist

Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Administrative Officer

Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing/Adm. Assistant

Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

SEDAR/ Staff Administrative Assistant

Rachael Silvas
rachael.silvas@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SHRIMP COMMITTEE MEETING

September 13, 2011
Charleston, SC 29403

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

POBY 9351
Langston Behr, FL 32120

EMAIL ADDRESS

AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER

DF2009@ed.com SC DNR

NAME & ORGANIZATION

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

386-239-0948

Rudolph Anderson EC45

David.Hobbs@ncow.org

252-473-5734

David.Hobbs@ncow.org

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

Ronald Hoke

252-473-5734

sdrevera@poutrucks.org

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

Sara Denverak POW

910-685-5405

schelies@venzen.net

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

FRANK HELIES

813 286 8396

mk@mkuilaw.com

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

Mike Merrill JH

321-615-5228

laurie@compson@aol.com

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

Laura Good

943-755-3690

laurie@compson@aol.com

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

Laurie Thompson

321-268-5000

laurie@compson@aol.com

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

Scott Baker

321-268-5000

laurie@compson@aol.com

Box 1965 Manteo NC 27551

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.

SHRIMP COMMITTEE MEETING
September 13, 2011
Charleston, SC 29403

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

EMAIL
ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

S.C.D.N.R.
217 Ft.
Johnson Rd,
Charleston, SC

Delaney LeDance

Res 8439539099

Harry Delaney S.C. Dept Nat Res

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