SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SHRIMP COMMITTEE

Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC

September 10, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Shrimp Committee

Charlie Phillips, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
Doug Haymans
Dr. Wilson Laney
Martha Bademan

Council Members

Ben Hartig
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Dr. Michelle Duval
Lt. Mario Gil
John Jolley
Robert Beal
Tom Swatzel

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Mike Collins
Anna Martin
Myra Brouwer
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Mike Errigo
Andrea Grabman
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Julia Byrd

Observers/Participants:

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Luiz Barbieri
Joey Ballenger
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Pam Dana
Anne Marie Eich
Otha Easley

Other Participants Attached

The Shrimp Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, September 10, 2012, and was called to order at 2:06 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Charlie Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right, I'd like to call the Shrimp Committee into order and we need the approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or changes? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. The Shrimp Committee minutes; were there any additions or changes in the minutes? Seeing none, then the minutes are approved. Anna.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, I'd like to give a quick overview of the public hearing comments that we had for Shrimp Amendment 9. This was something you approved during the June meeting for public hearings which were held in August. We didn't have very many comments for this amendment, but we did have one comment letter submitted. This is included as Attachment 1C in your briefing book.

Two general comments were recorded in Cocoa Beach on the eighth of August. This is included in your briefing materials under the additional materials' folder that was sent out with your first briefing book. There are transcribed audio files in there. Actions 1 and 2 in Shrimp Amendment 9; these are the measures modifying the trigger and revising the process for a state to request a concurrent closure.

One comment was received in support of the council moving forward with Actions 1 and 2. The comment discussed that the current method for requesting a concurrent closure to protect penaeid shrimp works to protect the stock; however, it takes too long and a lot of shrimp are killed in federal waters by other fishermen during these cold weather events.

The commenter also discussed that the preferred alternatives identified for Actions 1 and 2 would improve how the states can take action and allow them some additional flexibility and said this would be a valuable tool for the states to ensure a better fall crop. Another commenter spoke in support of the council moving forward with Action 1 for Shrimp Amendment 9 and noted there appears to be no opposition to this measure by fishermen in Florida.

Regarding Action 3, this is the measure that would revise the Bmsy proxy for pink shrimp. One commenter spoke on behalf of Action 3 and recommended the council reexamine the survey methodology used to determine the Bmsy proxy. This fisherman suggested that the pink shrimp stock is in good condition and that environmental factors influence status of the stock. That in sum is the public comments we heard for this amendment.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, Luiz, are you ready to go over your SSC?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes. I am going to, without going into too much detail, give you an overview of what the SSC discussed this last time around at the last meeting that we had in early August regarding Shrimp Amendment 9 and those actions that Anna just described. Action 1, as she explained, is specify criteria that triggers states' ability to request a concurrent closure of the overwintering white shrimp stock in the adjacent EEZ during severe winter weather.

There are three levels of temperature values that would represent the triggers for those closures. The SSC did not disagree with the concept of reevaluating those triggers, but basically felt that

without more detailed information on the actual mortality rates that would be associated with those specific temperature values, it would be difficult for us to really provide anymore specific guidance.

I mean we couldn't really evaluate the role of those temperature values in determining specific shrimp mortality. There were some other concerns regarding the data presented or the actions that are described that would have to do with the time scale used for measurements of temperature and shrimp abundance; that we needed more detail perhaps given the dynamics of shrimp being on a very short time scale month to month.

Information on temperature and information on CPUE would be more valuable if presented on a monthly time scale other than an annual time scale. In summary, the SSC just felt that it didn't really have any major concerns regarding this action, but it didn't feel prepared really to provide specific scientific advice without further analysis. It really requested formally that this additional data and analysis be presented to us at our upcoming October meeting and that we reevaluate the information and provide more specific guidance.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are there any questions? Okay, thank you, Luiz.

DR. BARBIERI: Going to Action Number 2, which is modify the process for a state to request a concurrent closure of the overwintering white shrimp stock in the adjacent EEZ during severe winter weather; the SSC just felt that this is a purely administrative measure and there was no need for scientific advice. It basically excused itself from providing any specific comments but had no concerns with that request.

Lastly, regarding Action Number 3, which was to revise the overfished status determination criteria, that being the biomass at MSY proxy for the pink shrimp stock, the SSC felt that unless the council has any urgency in going forward with this evaluation, that it would be more informative to all of us and the committee specifically to see some of this analysis that will be done; you know, the stock assessment process that is going to be pursued by the Science Center for the three species of shrimp using a more complex stock assessment model called Stock Synthesis.

That not just would give us a better idea of the actual dynamics of the stock, but this model is also able to explicitly incorporate some of these environmental parameters into the analysis, and provide the environmental variability perspective that is needed to better inform the stock status. Based on that, we requested the council to wait action on this item until we can see the stock assessment results. We are going to have a presentation by the Science Center at our next SSC meeting in October and that will basically lay a path for us to evaluate whether we are going to go forward with this more complex stock assessment process or if we are going to just not go there. Unless you are in a very short time scale here, in a hurry to get this action completed, we recommend that you wait on this until we can provide you more specific guidance.

DR. CRABTREE: Luiz, can you tell us again when are we expected to get this analysis; what kind of timeline would we be on if we wait?

DR. BARBIERI: The timeline for getting the actual analysis completed is still unclear. The Science Center is going to have representatives come to our October SSC meeting to describe

what they would do to present how the model structure would be. We have just, by the way, gone through this process for the Gulf, and the SSC felt that use of this more detailed model was very helpful in describing dynamics of the stock. This is an attempt for the Science Center to basically request SSC input on whether we see that as a worthwhile effort.

DR. CRABTREE: If we held off on this action for now, we would by the December meeting have some reasonable idea as to what the timeline would be?

DR. BARBIERI: Most likely yes; and I see Dr. Ponwith there shaking her head positively.

DR. CRABTREE: If that was what we wanted to do, Charlie, I guess our option would be – are we contemplating taking final action on this at this meeting, right?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Then I guess what we would do would be to take no action on Action 3 and move the rest to the amendment. Then depending on what the timeline was in December, we could revisit this if we felt like we couldn't wait on that. I can think of ways we might justify some of these other alternatives and making change to it, but none of them are very satisfactory it seems to me.

MS. MARTIN: I just want to clarify what Luiz is talking about with that SS-3 Model. The SSC in October is going to listen to Rick Hart's analysis from his assessment of the Gulf penaeids. Our SSC will talk about how that could be comparable to South Atlantic stocks. The penaeids are unassessed, but John and others have pointed out that assessment would have to make the SEDAR schedule. You would be looking at adding on – no, is that incorrect? Okay.

MS. PONWITH: We have typically done the Gulf assessment as an aside from the SEDAR process because that is treated as an annual crop. The process for conducting that stock assessment and reviewing it is somewhat different. Technically I think that we also as an annual crop we could work on that outside of the normal SEDAR process.

But certainly moving from one approach to another, forging some new efforts going into Stock Synthesis 3 in this region, you would certainly getting started want to have a pretty good peer review process set up for that in its first go around. Fortunately, having gone through that over the course of the last year in the Gulf, that sets a template to be followed.

I think it is an important discussion. I think that stock assessment approach is quite a bit stronger than the standard procedure that was used prior to that. Just for your information, in the Gulf the situation we ran into is the assessment was pretty stable and pretty reliable until we got to a point where we had some fairly dramatic reductions in effort. The model was unable to dissociate a change in effort, in other words a decline in effort from an actual decline in parent stock, which is a pretty serious flaw.

It didn't manifest itself until we actually saw those declines in effort. Stock Synthesis-3, as Luiz has said, brings in the ability to incorporate environmental queues just as we're talking about in here in a way that has been very valuable in the Gulf.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, I would also speak in favor of Roy's suggestion. We are slated to approve this at this meeting, and I think it is important to get something in place on the first two actions so that if we need to do something during this next winter period we will hopefully have something in place to do that.

The third issue or the third action item here has to do with the Bmsy of pink shrimp. We've had a problem with that in the past. We've asked our shrimp review panel to convene. They've done that several times and come back to us with their opinion that the problem is due to environmental conditions and not overfishing.

Since the Stock Synthesis-3 Model also is supposedly able to incorporate some environmental considerations, which has been what the problem has been in the past, I think it would be well to look at that. I would guess that when we go through the document I would be willing to offer a motion at that time maybe to take that action out of this particular amendment so we can go ahead and take action on it, try and get it in place in case the states need it during this next winter season and move ahead with that.

MR. HAYMANS: According to the agenda, I am not on the committee but I believe I heard from staff that I am back on the committee. I want to verify that for the record.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, during our conference call the other day I told you that you were back on the committee.

MR. HAYMANS: I want to make sure. We are still discussing this in regards to Luiz' comments; we haven't gotten into the action-by-action items, right? Okay. Luiz, instead of Alternative 1 of Action 3, which is no action; if we simply chose to go with Alternative 5, which is to update the time series; status quo on the method but we just go to 2011, that still allows the SSC to look at the data that is going to be presented from the Gulf. If nothing occurs in the near future with it, at least we have a new reference point that we can look at, right, that we can use, which in this case would be 2010?

MS. MARTIN: You are talking about Alternative 4.

MR. HAYMANS: I am talking about Alternative 4; thank you.

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, Doug, that is correct. However, I think the main point is the use of SS-3 is going to potentially give us a completely different perspective on the dynamics of the stock and really be much more informative in terms of where we are and our ability to even use a reference point like Bmsy or a proxy for Bmsy as our MSST level.

MR. HAYMANS: To that point, if I may; I understand that, but it may not. We don't know what it is going to show us at this point and at least if we update the years we're not working with data or CPUEs that are eight years old; then we've at least updated them to last year.

DR. LANEY: I just wanted to ask Luiz relative to Action 1 what sort of additional data are you looking for there? Are you looking for something like information on critical thermal minima and lower insipient lethal temperature values and associated mortality? That is what it sounded like from your comments.

That information is available not necessarily for the penaeids that we are dealing with, but I'm looking at a paper here that was done for Penaeus semisulcatus, which I think is an Indian Ocean species. We do have some information for a species that might serve as a useful surrogate for that. I didn't know whether you had looked at that or wanting specific information for the penaeids that we deal with here. I just want to hear a little bit more about what you were looking for on that one.

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, Wilson, all of the above is the short answer to that question. Ideally, of course, we would have those temperature survival thresholds or mortality thresholds associated with the penaeids that we deal with here, the stocks that we manage; but that may not be possible, I don't know.

The SSC did not have that information at the August meeting, so at that point we couldn't really even consider any of that. It is easy to understand that the issue is mortality due to overwintering lower temperatures and that the lower the temperature obviously you expect the higher the mortality.

But there has to be some functional relationship there that I think would be very informative in setting that threshold. That would be one point. Another point would be can we get a little more detailed information in a short time scale that we can see some of the seasonal patterns? Depending on what data is available that would be a little more informative for us on those seasonal cycles instead of just on an annual basis, because that is what we had before, so pretty much what you mentioned.

MR. BELL: Yes, if I might, in fairness to Luiz, they didn't have the luxury of some of the information we have. In fact, in your decision document on Page 9 there is a very useful table which actually looks, from South Carolina's perspective, what we've been looking at for years and years and years as far as temperature, our monitoring data, both fishery-independent and dependent data. It is what ties it all together for us.

There is nothing magic about a particular temperature although we do have literature or published work which suggested 8.3 degrees is kind of a magic temperature in terms of when you start seeing some mortality. I didn't know if this was the time to kind of get into that table or not or maybe we can wait until we get into the decision document or whatever.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I think we'll wait until we get to the decision document and hash that out.

MR. CUPKA: I was just going to point out that there is observational data and that is the very data that Mel was referring to. We didn't pull that eight degrees out of a hat. It is based on many years of data in South Carolina where we've observed mortalities and documented what those mortality rates are associated with various temperatures. We do have observational data at least for South Carolina.

DR. LANEY: Well, I'll provide the paper to the SSC when I can get back to the office and hook into the university system, because it won't let me download the whole thing. But what they did was use four different acclimation temperatures and then they reported on the critical thermal minima of that species of shrimp. It is in the ballpark of what South Carolina's observational

data shows. I don't know how much more we could gain from having a detailed lab study here. For my purposes, I think the South Carolina data are pretty definitive, it seems to me.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, I don't think you are going to gain anything, Wilson. I think, if anything, if we wait to go through all that we're just going to lose time. Again, I think we need to get this in place. It is based on empirical data; it is not just a guess at least for South Carolina. There have only been two states that have ever even applied for this; that is South Carolina and Georgia.

I don't know what the situation in Georgia is; I'm just speaking in terms of South Carolina, but for our state it seems to me that the eight degrees serves the purpose. We've seen what impact that has had on the shrimp, so to us that is a good trigger. I understand later on that there may be a motion made to change it where there is a double trigger where a state could use either the existing trigger, the 80 percent reduction in population, size, or the temperature trigger, which would give more flexibility to the states. But I think again speaking for South Carolina, the temperature would serve its purpose. If Georgia wants to include both of those, then that is fine. I wouldn't have a problem with that either.

DR. BARBIERI: Just a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman, given this discussion, the SSC did not have any concerns with the proposed action other than it didn't feel prepared at the time to provide more specific scientific advice regarding those specific values, because we had not seen the data and the analysis. But nothing in the narrative there associated with those actions as they are presented right now was of concern.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, Mel, is this data – I mean, '76 is the first year that you have collected this type of data?

MR. BELL: I think we actually have it back to the sixties, don't we? As far as the table, we started at '76, it fit on the page. I believe we have data all the way back into the sixties.

MR. HARTIG: As far as experiencing the winters as we've gone through time in fishing; you just see that the dramatic difference in water temperature changes from '88 through '76 in your table; and then you want to talk about climate change, pretty significant changes just in this one table.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, is there anything else? All right, I think it is time for us to go ahead and start with the decision document, Anna.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, I have the decision document for Shrimp 9 projected here. This is Attachment 3B in your briefing book. However if you are interested in following along, the amendment is Attachment 3A. We are asking the committee to consider final action for this amendment. You've heard the public comments and the recommendations from the SSC. What I'd like to do is just to review the purpose and needs since this could be potentially your last time taking a look at this amendment.

The purpose for Shrimp Amendment 9 is to modify the criteria for South Atlantic states requesting a concurrent closure to protect overwintering white shrimp, streamline the process by which a state can request a concurrent closure, and establish Bmsy proxy for pink shrimp which is used in determining the overfished status.

The need for action in Shrimp Amendment 9 is to allow for a more efficient process to facilitate timely concurrent closure requests, to maximize protection of overwintering white shrimp during cold weather events, and to improve the accuracy of the biological parameters for pink shrimp management.

Action 1 is on PDF Page 5 in the decision document. Action 1 and 2 in this amendment are taking a look to protect the spawners that survive a cold weather freeze, so that vessels can't continue fishing on the white roe shrimp in federal waters when temperatures are falling and driving the shrimp offshore.

The spawners produce the more economically significant fall white shrimp crop. That is what Action 1 and 2 are taking a look at improving. Action 1 specifies criteria that trigger a state's ability to request a concurrent closure of the overwintering white shrimp fishery in the adjacent EEZ during severe winter weather.

Here we are actually revising how a state requests a concurrent closure to harvest of penaeid stocks in adjacent federal waters. The IPT has a recommendation here for slightly modifying the language of this action to state "specify criteria that trigger a state's ability to request a concurrent prohibition on the harvest of South Atlantic penaeid stocks in the adjacent EEZ during severe winter weather."

MR. CUPKA: May I ask, Anna, did the IPT discuss here – they've changed it from white shrimp to penaeid stocks even though the thrust of the thing and original idea was to protect overwintering white shrimp stocks; was that discussed at all?

MS. MARTIN: Yes; and if you refer to the Shrimp FMP, that is what is currently in place. We caught that and found that a modification would be important here to maintain the current regulation.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion to accept the IPT's recommendation to reword Action 1.

MR. PHILLIPS: Motion by Doug to accept the IPTs recommendation to reword Action 1; a second by Wilson. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, **the motion passes**.

MS. MARTIN: Alternative 1, no action is what is currently in place. As mentioned, currently as defined under the fishery management plan for South Atlantic shrimp fishery, states may request a concurrent closure of the EEZ adjacent to their closed state waters following severe winter weather upon providing information that demonstrates an 80 percent or greater reduction in the population of overwintering white shrimp.

Again, this alternative is based on biomass and implemented under the Shrimp FMP. Mel pointed out earlier South Carolina DNR has said that there is a time lag associated with this trigger. White shrimp are vulnerable to fluctuations in water temperature, so Alternatives 2 through 4 identifies temperature as a trigger.

Each South Atlantic state does have a water temperature collection program already in existence. Alternative 3 is your preferred. Under Alternative 3 a state may request a concurrent closure upon providing information that demonstrates an exceeded threshold for water temperature. Water temperature must be 46 degrees or below for at least a week.

What I wanted to do is point out in response to some of the SSC's concerns regarding data associated with water temperature, a table that we do have in your decision document – it is on PDF Page 9. I recognize that is a little hard to see, but at any rate I will try to walk through this with you.

This here illustrates South Carolina DNR's history of water temperatures and related white shrimp catch-per-unit effort going back to 1976. The data we have here is 1976 to 2011. What you can see here in the blue highlighted rows are the years since 1976 that South Carolina DNR has had low fishery-independent CPUE numbers of white shrimp – that is defined as less than 10 shrimp per tow – due to extended cold temperatures.

The temperatures here in these columns correlate to those identified in the alternatives for this action. In these recent two years, 2001 and 2011, these have translated into the years where South Carolina DNR has requested a concurrent closure. It is easy to see from this table from South Carolina DNR's data the connection between temperature and white shrimp catch. Mel, did you have anything else to add about this table?

MR. BELL: Yes, if you would – it is kind of hard to see. You can probably see it better in front of you, but if you pay attention to 1977, '78, '81, '85, and it is like Ben was talking about earlier, there was some really cold years back in the mid to late seventies, early eighties. The zero there, basically that is in terms of our fishery-independent sampling; when we get a zero that means we are not catching any shrimp in our nets at all. That is the monthly mean.

But basically that would also be sufficient to trigger the original 80 percent requirement. The problem is we're into March by the time we have those data. The process right now is just really, really slow. We've got really good correlation over the years. Actually, we have data going back into the sixties, but you can just look at what we've presented here.

You can see that in those particular years we were getting slammed. If you go over there – and again it is like I was saying with Luiz, there is nothing magic necessarily about 9 versus 8 versus 7. It really has a lot to do – and the SSC picked up on this – it all depends on how fast the temperature drops, how long it stays at that level, if it goes up and down.

We're aware of that and we would adjust for that. This would simply allow us whatever we decide as an alternative to move a little quicker in the process and make a recommendation to close. I might also point out, but we've only done this three times to my knowledge. David can correct me. But 1990 we requested a closure, 2001 and 2011. Now looking at 1990, the fishery-independent data weren't as bad as the zeros in 2001 and 2011.

Those are the only three times we've ever done this, so it is not something that we would be doing – we would hope we would not be doing this very often. Given last winter, I don't know if that is reflective of the future winters. Another thing to keep in mind is when we have one of

these really bad winters, so we see if you look at white shrimp landings, which is the next column after the March fishery-independent data; that is basically our spawners.

You can see the numbers there in terms of our landings go down drastically. If your spawners go down, then subsequently what happens is our fall fishery is not good. Typically in these really bad years, our fall fishery can be down to like 19 or so percent of what it should be in terms of the long-term mean.

When we get hit by one of these winters, we are trying to save every spawner we can to bank ahead for the fall, because for us white shrimp, our fall fishery is really our money crop. That is when we get the bulk of our landings is that fall fishery. By taking this action early, we are protecting the spawners, which is protecting that fall fishery. It all lines up very nice for us. In terms of the data, we have long-term data. We are very comfortable with it.

I might also note that when we did close in 2001 and 2011 – remember I said in a really bad year our landings can be 19 percent or so of a mean. When we did that in 2001 and 2011 and we closed the EEZ, our actual fall landings were up to 63 percent of long-term mean. You can read into that maybe it worked. It did something for us. I'm not quoting any statistics associated with that but that is just the raw numbers. 2001 and 2011 fall crops did fairly well, all things considered, but those were the years we actually did close the EEZ.

MS. MARTIN: I wanted to also bring to your attention, in speaking with some representatives from Georgia DNR, there is an interest in combining the triggers to allow the states that much more flexibility. This would be a proposed new alternative, and I can defer to Doug about this, but there is an interest in maintaining that biomass trigger; and also allowing kind of an "or" situation to allow a state the capability to demonstrate a temperature threshold. Did you want to talk about that?

MR. HAYMANS: I did, thank you for explaining it so well. As I am a supporter of this action; but in going back home and talking to our staff they would like to see the abundance levels kept in in some way. I have been reminded that I was the one who made the motion for the temperatures. **I would like to offer this Alternative 5 as a new preferred alternative.**

It is basically to keep the 80 percent as it is and add an "or" statement, and include in that "or" statement the 9 degrees rather than the 8, since we see it is 8.3; but the 9 degrees and the 80 percent allow maximum flexibility for a state – remembering this is simply the ability for the state. It is not that the state has to request a closure at either one of these, but it is simply the threshold. I'd like to offer that as a new preferred alternative.

MR. PHILLIPS: I have a motion by Doug; second by Wilson. Discussion? David.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, just for the record, I think she said combine them but I think what we really want to do is offer the use of either one, if not together, and not combining them.

MR. PHILLIPS: Either/or.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, and that is explicit in the wording and motion, but for the record we don't want to refer to them as combined.

MS. MARTIN: **Okay, the new Alternative 5; states may request a concurrent closure of the EEZ adjacent to their state waters following severe winter weather upon providing information that demonstrates an 80 percent or greater reduction in the population of overwintering white shrimp; or, a state may request a concurrent closure upon providing information that demonstrates an exceeded threshold for water temperature. Water temperature must be 9 degrees Celsius, 48 degrees Fahrenheit, or below for at least one week.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Any further discussion? Mel.

MR. BELL: That looks good to me. Again, when we originally came with this idea, our number one thing was to expedite the process and this gives us maximum flexibility. Doug and I have talked. We are comfortable. If Georgia is comfortable with working with their monitoring and going with 80 percent, it works for us. Temperature-wise we feel pretty comfortable with that.

MR. CUPKA: Again for the record, even though this is a new alternative it doesn't represent anything that wasn't taken out to public hearing before. We're still able to move ahead with this.

DR. CRABTREE: When we renamed the action with the IPT recommendation, we replaced white shrimp with penaeid stocks. All of the actions we have, alternatives here refer to white shrimp, or some of them don't seem to refer to white shrimp. I'm wondering if that is a problem.

Alternative 1, no action does say overwintering white shrimp, but then the other options don't say that, but then this new one does specifically say white shrimp. When we changed the title to say penaeids, was the implication there this could be applied to any penaeid shrimp? I'm confused.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, that is what I was asking Anna because to me it seemed like we were changing it. At one place we were talking about penaeid, which could be brown shrimp, pink shrimp, and white shrimp; but a lot of the actions were specific just to white shrimp and that is why I was wondering if the IPT had discussed that wording change relative to changing what was covered under it.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, because it seems to me that all of the alternatives we have now don't specifically refer to white shrimp but the new one does. I just want to make sure we're not making a mistake.

MS. MARTIN: Well, if you look at how the regulations are currently worded in the CFRs; states have to demonstrate the 80 percent reduction in white shrimp, but the closure that goes into place is for penaeid stocks, for all three. Even though the data provided is specific to white shrimp, all three stocks would be closed during a concurrent closure.

DR. CRABTREE: So is the language – can we see the new alternative again? It seems like to me this motion is okay.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm not sure how this works out, but in the regulations it refers to brown, pink or white. It is not specific to white or any of them.

MS. MARTIN: The closure; that's right, the closure applies to all but the data the states currently demonstrate is 80 percent or greater reduction in white. I don't think that is included in the CFRs. I think it might refer to the Shrimp FMP.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You're right; it doesn't refer to the 80 percent at all. It just refers to the procedures and criteria established in the FMP. It's not specific to any one.

DR. LANEY: Well, I think Roy captured or Monica captured some of what I was going to say. The data are specific for white shrimp. We have at least three other species of penaeids. Besides the brown and the pink there, is also some trachy penaeids in the South Atlantic that sometimes make up part of the commercial catch as well. I wouldn't have a problem changing the language to just say penaeids all the way through.

I guess because the data are specific to whites, and I think whites do constitute the vast majority of overwintering shrimp, because the pinks and the browns come in during the spring and summer and then usually have left by the fall; so mostly the overwintering ones are white shrimp, right? I think we're good, but again if we need to change it to reflect the fact that it should apply to all of them just to be consistent, I don't have an objection to that.

MR. CUPKA: Maybe, though, when we set that up, what we were trying to do is prevent a loophole for somebody to say, well, I was out there trawling for brown shrimp when actually they weren't. It covers all of the species as far as closing it to trawling, but the closure is based on the overwintering white shrimp. I think it works out well the way it is.

DR. CRABTREE: I agree with David; I think given the explanation that we're okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, **the motion passes.** That is our new preferred.

MS. MARTIN: This takes us to Action 2. Action 2 modifies the process for a state to request a concurrent closure of the overwintering white shrimp fishery in the adjacent EEZ during severe winter weather. Again as with before, we have an IPT recommendation here just to slightly modify the wording of the action to capture the intent and the way this is worded in the CFRs and the Shrimp FMP. The recommendation here from the IPT is to rename the action to state, "modify the process for a state to request a concurrent prohibition on the harvest of South Atlantic penaeid stocks in the adjacent EEZ during severe winter weather.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion to accept the IPT's recommendation for rewording of Action 2.

MR. PHILLIPS: Motion by Doug to accept the IPT recommendation to reword Action 2; seconded by Wilson. Any discussion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, **the motion passes.**

MS. MARTIN: Alternative 1 is the no action, and what is currently in place, a state requesting a concurrent closure – what they have to do is provide data to demonstrate that 80 percent decrease in abundance of overwintering white shrimp to the Shrimp Review Panel and the Review Panel's

recommendations are reviewed at the next council meeting, which typically falls at the March council meeting.

After approval by the council, a letter is sent to the Regional Administrator requesting the EEZ adjacent to the state be closed to penaeid shrimp harvest. The Regional Administrator then publishes an official notice of closure. You can see here the intent of this action is to speed up this quite lengthy process.

You do have a preferred alternative for this measure and that is Alternative 2. Under this alternative any state requesting a concurrent closure would send a letter directly to NOAA Fisheries with the request and necessary data to demonstrate the criterion has been met. This alternative does represent the most streamlined alternative and it does have some indirect biological benefits.

Under this scenario those fishing in federal waters, while the council is waiting to deliberate this request at a March council meeting, they are still offered the capability to fish in federal waters on the white shrimp that have moved offshore. I think Luiz pointed out there weren't biological benefits associated with this alternative, but indirectly there are.

Alternative 3, as far as a time lag, lies between Alternatives 1 and 2. This alternative does require convening of the Shrimp Review Panel to review the state's data, but it does eliminate the need to wait around for the March council meeting. The Shrimp Review Panel would review the state data and make a recommendation to the Regional Administrator on an action to potentially pursue. Again, you do have Alternative 2 already stipulated as your preferred, and I would ask if you wanted to change your preferred alternative for this action.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any discussion? You are happy with your preferred; okay.

MS. MARTIN: This brings us to Action 3. This is the action that would revise the overfished status determination criteria for the pink shrimp stock. In light of some of the conversations we've already had, I would like to walk through the alternatives that we do have and then maybe revisit some of the discussion that we had when Luiz was up here.

Alternative 1 is the no action. This is what is currently in place. A proxy for Bmsy has been established for pink shrimp using CPUE information from the SEAMAP survey dataset as the lowest values in the 1990 to 2003 time period that produced catches meeting MSY the following year.

This was a proxy that was established under Shrimp Amendment 6 back in 2004, and what happens is that if overfished or an overfishing determination is made the Shrimp Review Panel then convenes to evaluate the data and determine whether management action is required. CPUE from the SEAMAP survey has been below this current proxy since it was established in 2003. That is the issue here and why this is being revisited through this amendment.

The Shrimp Review Panel has pointed out that environmental conditions are the cause, and so management measures haven't been pursued at that time. Another issue with the SEAMAP survey and likely a cause for the trigger since 2003; there is a geographical limitation of its

survey range, so pink shrimp are largely abundant in waters north of Cape Hatteras in North Carolina and south of Canaveral in Florida.

There is a limited sampling from the SEAMAP survey in those areas where pink shrimp are thought to be primarily – their abundance is thought to be high. Alternatives 2 through 4; they don't address the issue of SEAMAP survey dataset not covering the entire geographical range for where pink shrimp are commonly abundant; however, they do use a more recent time series of data to estimate a new Bmsy proxy.

Unlike the no action alternative, the CPUE data from SEAMAP has been updated in these three alternatives. What you see under Alternative 2, a proxy for Bmsy for pink shrimp would be established using an average in CPUE values from SEAMAP during the most recent five-year time period, and that would be 0.273 individuals per hectare.

Alternative 3 would establish a new proxy for Bmsy for pink shrimp using an average and CPUE values from SEAMAP during the most recent three-year time period, 2009 to 2011, and the new proxy would be 0.292 individuals per hectare. Alternative 4 would establish a proxy for Bmsy for pink shrimp using the lowest CPUE value from SEAMAP during the entire time period for the dataset, 1990 to 2011. That would be 0.089 individuals per hectare.

I wanted to point out that this alternative does use the most comprehensive set of data available here for pink shrimp. It uses the lowest CPUE value for SEAMAP using the entire sampling timeframe from this survey. It does represent the lowest biomass that can support harvest of MSY of all the alternatives being considered here.

It does account for all variability in the CPUE data from SEAMAP across all of the years since they have been surveying. This alternative does mirror the no action alternative as far as rationale for establishing that proxy and selecting the lowest in CPUE from the time ranges specified.

DR. CRABTREE: It reflects the status quo because that low CPUE in 2010, 0.089 did produce MSY the following year? I see it produced Bmsy. When you look at the table, you can see that 2011 the CPUE went back up to 0.490, which is above the status quo proxy for Bmsy. I don't know what landings it produced.

But presumably if it didn't produce the landings, that would just be because the effort wasn't there, so it seemed to me you can argue that low CPUE did produce Bmsy. It gets a little confusing because we're redefining Bmsy I guess in the process. I can see how they are similar in terms of the rationale for the two. Am I thinking through this right, Anna?

MS. MARTIN: This has been a confusing one, Roy. Yes I think you are. Jack, you have assisted in some of the analysis for this particular action; do you happen to have any more insight than I do here?

DR. McGOVERN: No, I think what Roy is stating is in 2010 the CPUE was 0.089 and the following year it is 0.490, which is above the old threshold of 0.461. It appears that despite a low CPUE in 2010, the stock appears to have rebounded the following year.

DR. CRABTREE: Just to follow, because Jack has Shrimp Amendment 6 where we set this up, when you look at that with the status quo CPUE of 0.461, that then produced in 1997, 2,115,827 pounds of fish. I assume in that amendment we put in place some poundage level that is MSY for pink shrimp?

MS. MARTIN: Yes, we do have –

MR. CUPKA: There are other years, Roy, when it exceeds the 0.461; yet the following year it is below the 0.461 level so that doesn't always hold.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I don't know that any of it always holds, but I'm just trying to understand the rationale for choosing the lowest – it seems to me the rationale can't just be it's the lowest value. It has got to be more than that and it has got to be that it is the lowest value, but it produced MSY the following year. I just can't tell directly from this whether that is the case or not, because I don't have the landings and I don't recall what MSY is. I guess, Anna, that is something we ought to figure out I guess before we come to full council if we could take a look at that.

MS. MARTIN: We do have an MSY specified for this stock. It is 1.8 million pounds. That was established under the Shrimp FMP.

DR. CRABTREE: Do we know what the landings in 2011 were? I suspect they are going to be below that because the effort was way low.

MS. MARTIN: We do have the landings. I believe this is Table 3.1 in the amendment, and so I can pull that up if you give me just a second here.

DR. CRABTREE: But I guess while we have a lull, you could make the argument that low level in 2010 was capable of producing a biomass the following year, which we have previously seen produced MSY pounds the year after that. I think there is a rationale where you connect all these things that could be made. I didn't mean to hang us all up, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, after Anna finds it I am prepared to make a motion if you would so like.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, here we go; can you all see that there? It is broken down by state.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I guess the point from looking at it is the rationale is not exactly the same as the status quo, because it didn't produce MSY landings the following year. It produced a little below that, but that may well be because effort was so low.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, since we're really not going to be able to put our finger on it and this is pretty much a yearly crop – Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, actually does Anna need to finish the last two alternatives?

MS. MARTIN: Alternatives 5 and 6 here, they present a similar geographical challenge as those related to SEAMAP. These differ to the Pamlico Sound survey for developing a new proxy for

Bmsy for pink shrimp. Alternative 5 specifies the 2007 to 2011 time period, using an average and CPUE values from that dataset.

Alternative 6 is a more recent time period using Pamlico Sound survey and averaging the CPUE values from those years. This is a survey that captures abundance information for inshore areas in North Carolina. It doesn't address the issue of lack of survey data south of Cape Canaveral. We did inquire with the Shrimp Review Panel about a complementary survey that could be incorporated for area south of Cape Canaveral where pink shrimp abundance is relatively high.

However, a recommendation for such a survey set has not been brought forward. We're not aware of one that could be incorporated here; but if you do look at the CPUE data from the Pamlico Sound survey, it is highly variable. That is an issue with this dataset in both of these alternatives.

MR. CUPKA: I think originally the idea was to somehow combine these two surveys and look at the value that resulted from that, but these alternatives really don't do that. They are looking at SEAMAP specifically and then Pamlico Sound specifically. I guess the reason why is because no one could figure out since these two surveys aren't the same how do you combine that data and come up with a value that really means something. Is that correct?

MS. MARTIN: That's right, David. That has been posed and the IPT has talked about this, but there are questions about how then analytically do you combine these two datasets that are seemingly unrelated. SEAMAP is sampling offshore; Pamlico Sound Survey is sampling inshore. They may have similar gear designs and methods, but there are some differences there. No one is quite sure how to combine them for this particular issue.

DR. LANEY: To that point, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would be appropriate to combine them, because for the estuarine values you are looking at smaller, younger shrimp that are usually going to be present at higher densities typically than the ones offshore. It is two different – even though they are within the same year even, you are looking at two different stages almost in the life cycle in that the ones offshore have left the estuaries already. These are usually going to be younger and they tend to migrate out in waves based on work I did back in the seventies, anyway. I don't think it is appropriate to combine them.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, and I don't want to differ with you, Wilson. I'm just pointing out that the original request was to look at combining them. Whether it was a good thing or possible or not, that was what the original request was.

MR. BELL: Just a point I guess of interest; Roy had mentioned in 2010 the CPUE was a low and David Whitaker, who is our shrimp expert, reminded me 2010 was a really cold year. I guess pinks do overwinter in the Sounds. They would be influenced by environmental factors like that, too, but 2010 was a pretty bad winter as far as temperatures go, which probably resulted in I imagine that low CPUE.

MR. HAYMANS: In an effort to do nothing more than to update the data that we're using as a proxy, I would like to offer a motion that the committee considers Alternative 4 as a preferred alternative.

MR. PHILLIPS: I have a motion from Doug for Alternative 4 as our preferred; second from Wilson.

DR. LANEY: The second seconds for discussion purposes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess the rationale for 4 would be that the stock size that produced those low CPUEs doesn't compromise the long-term capacity of the stock to produce MSY, because we've seen that low stock size produce a biomass the following year that appears to be capable of producing MSY based on all the data we have. Is that sort of the rationale?

MR. HAYMANS: That sounds like a very well-worded rationale.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess what we're doing here is sort of an interim change until we get a more comprehensive look at the stock and at that time our intent would be to replace all this.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, that is my understanding, that this is going to be a place holder until we can do a better way of maybe look at the stock synthesis or some other method.

MR. CUPKA: I would offer a motion that we recommend to the full council that Amendment 7 be approved for formal secretarial review.

MS. MARTIN: Shrimp Amendment 9. Did he say 7?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'll get a second. Do I have a second; Doug seconds. **The motion is to approve Shrimp Amendment 9 for formal secretarial review.** Discussion? Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Well, I'll ask David; there was one more recommendation in there from the IPT, which may not be necessary in view of the fact that we picked a preferred, but that was to establish an additional Alternative 7. Did we want to do anything with that recommendation from the IPT?

MS. MARTIN: I'll address that. In discussions of this after the SSC meeting, one recommendation that came forward was to include a new alternative that mirrored the SEAMAP, the no action alternative using the Pamlico Sound survey dataset. Based on the discussion about that survey dataset, I don't think it is important to bring that up at this time, because it would then require, as you know, the IPT to get back together, convene and refine the analysis for a new alternative that was not selected as a preferred.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any further discussion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none**, the motion passes.** Is there any other business to come before the Shrimp Committee? All right, if there is no other business, then, Mr. Chairman, we will adjourn the Shrimp Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned on September 10, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2012-2013 Committees

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION
Michelle Duval, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Tom Burgess
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION
Doug Haymans, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Tom Burgess
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES
Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Cheuvront

DOLPHIN WAHOO
Tom Swatzel, Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT
Doug Haymans, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE
David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
Michelle Duval
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB
David Cupka, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
Tom Burgess, Chair
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES
John Jolley, Chair
David Cupka, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION
John Jolley, Chair
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Mel Bell
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL
Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT
Mel Bell, Chair
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair
David Cupka
Mario Gil
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL
Jessica McCawley, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
David Cupka
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES
David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Michelle Duval
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION
Michelle Duval, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR Committee
David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP
✓ Charlie Phillips, Chair
✓ David Cupka, Vice Chair
✓ Mel Bell
✓ Tom Burgess
✓ Doug Haymans
✓ Wilson Laney
✓ ~~Jessica McCawley~~ MARTHA BADEMAN
Staff contact: Anna Martin

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2012 - 2013 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

Steve Amick
6902 Sandnettles Drive
Savannah, GA 31410
912/429-3537 (ph)
912/898-0361 (f)
SteveAmicks@aol.com

Mel Bell
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Anna Beckwith
1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com

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

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

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

Lt. Mario Gil
U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6768 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Mario.g.gil@uscg.mil

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

John W. Jolley
4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/732-4530 (ph)
jolleyjw@yahoo.com

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

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

Jessica 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

Robert E. Beal
Acting Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

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

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Staff

Executive Director
Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director
Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer
Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist
Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist
Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist
Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist
Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Staff Economist
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager
John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators
Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Julia Byrd – julia.byrd@safmc.net

SEDAR Admin/Outreach
Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Administrative Officer
Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary
Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator
Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants
Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

Bonnie Ponwith
Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Brunello
Luiz Barbieri
Otha Easley
Joey Ballenger
Pam Dana
AnneMarie Eich

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
Charleston, SC
Monday, September 10, 2012

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
SAFA	843-327-1114	Kquigley@caploggroup.com
Tracey Smart - SCDNR	843-953-9226	CHS, SC
Ken Stump	202-390-9520	WA DC 2008
Holly Binns, PEG	850-322-7845	Tallahassee, FL 32303
Leda Dunmire, PEG	305-393-0934	Key Largo, FL
David Whitaker	843-953-9392	P.O. Box 12559 Chas SC
Larry DeLancey	843 953 9099	SC DNR, 217 Fort Johnson Rd. Chas. SC
Judy Jamison SASAFF, INC	813 286 8390	5401 W Kennedy Blvd #740 Tampa, FL 33609
FRANK HELIES	GSAFF	fchelies@verizon.net

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
Charleston, SC
Monday, September 10, 2012

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
R. Vendetti - SSA	512 222 8796	vendetti@shrimpalliance.com
Rusty Hudson ASA/ECFS	386-239-0948	PO Box 9351 - 32120-9351
Susan Shipman	912-222-9206	SusanShipman@att.net
Melissa Locke	916-881-2909	mlocke@edf.org

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

Attendee Report GoToWebinar
Generated
Sep 17, 2012 06:11 AM PDT
General Information

Webinar N	Webinar ID
SAFMC Cou	9.76E+08

Actual Star	Actual Duration (minutes)
Sep 10, 201	229

Clicked Reg	Opened Invitation
64	54

Total Attended
32
Session Details

Attended	Interest Ra	First Name	Last Name	Registratio	Join Time	Leave Time
Yes	35	Ann	Martin	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	26	Charlene	Ponce	Sep 06, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	31	Richard	Malinowski	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	33	Katie	Andrews	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	24	David	Gloeckner	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	43	Mike	C	Sep 05, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	30	Heather	Blough	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	36	Karla	Gore	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	37	Helen	Takade-Heumacher	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	24	Carolyn	Doherty	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	31	susan	gerhart	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	47	Michael	Travis	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	41	stephen	holiman	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	38	Kate	Michie	Aug 28, 20	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	59	william	Harvey	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	28	miguel	lugo	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	31	Carolyn	Belcher	Aug 22, 20	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	27	Jim	Atack	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	57	rick	hart	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	71	Wayne	Mershon	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	28	Sherri	McCoy	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	26	Erik	Williams	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	52	ira	laks	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	69	Larry	DeLancey	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	32	Rick	DeVictor	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	31	deb	buscher	Aug 22, 20	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	28	Phyllis	Miranda	Sep 06, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	44	mike	murphy	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	26	D	Gregory	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	33	Mac	Currin	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	28	scott	sandorf	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
Yes	46	Nikhil	Mehta	Aug 22, 20	Sep 10, 201	Sep 10, 201
No		Janie	Thomas	Sep 10, 2012 08:59 AM EDT		

No	Anne	Eich	Aug 22, 2012 02:24 PM EDT
No	Dawn	Franco	Sep 10, 2012 12:21 PM EDT
No	Cindy	Chaya	Aug 22, 2012 11:53 AM EDT
No	NICK	FARMER	Aug 22, 2012 12:55 PM EDT
No	Bill	MacLauchlin	Sep 10, 2012 05:07 PM EDT

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