

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEMBER VISIONING WORKGROUP

**Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel
Wilmington, NC**

December 2, 2013

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

Ben Hartig
Jack Cox
Charlie Phillips
Doug Haymans
Anna Beckwith
Dr. Wilson Laney
David Cupka
Jessica McCawley

Dr. Michelle Duval
Mel Bell
Lt. Morgan Fowler
John Jolley
Chris Conklin
Zack Bowen
Rob Beal

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Myra Brouwer
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Anna Martin

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dr. George Sedberry

Dr. Jack McGovern
Phil Steele
Pres Pate

Additional Observers Attached

The Visioning Workshop of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Cape Fear Ballroom of the Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel, Wilmington, North Carolina, December 2, 2013, and was called to order at 9:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: We'll go ahead and get started with our Visioning Workshop. I did just want to note for everybody that it was actually a year ago at this meeting in this very room that we launched this visioning process. We had Chairman Rick Robins from the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council come and give us a great presentation on the Mid-Atlantic Council's efforts, which I think was very helpful in getting us started.

Personally I think that we have done a lot in what was pointed out to me as being only 12 council hours from the December meeting last year until this meeting here, and probably six or seven visioning workgroup calls. I think we've made a lot of progress thus far. We have a lot left to do, and I just want to encourage everybody to maintain your enthusiasm for this process.

I think that is one of the things that it can be tough to do in something that takes quite a while like this, but the word is getting out. There are a lot of people who are very excited about the fact that we are undertaking this, so I would encourage us all to keep up our resolve. Thank you all for your past efforts and we'll continue moving forward.

I just wanted to give a brief recap of the September Workshop. If you will recall, we went over the Logic Model that Amber had prepared for us. All these things are in your briefing materials from the last council meeting. If you don't still have them on your computer and you need to refer to them, they are all on the website.

We did a brief review of the Mid-Atlantic Council's five-year strategic plan, which they had just adopted in August. Then we went into a little bit of guidance from the council on questions and comments for stakeholders. We reviewed the draft goals that we had already developed and settled on for major goal theme areas.

We went through a discussion of the port meeting structure and format, and that is actually where we are going to focus the majority of our efforts today because we really need to nail down general areas within the states where we would like to hold these port meetings; the format and structure of those port meetings moving forward.

We're not going to spend a lot of time today discussing goal themes or goal statements and objectives or doing any major editing by committee. We did a little bit of that last time so we're going to try to get to the meat of it, which is really focusing on the port meetings. With that, I am going to turn it over to staff to just quickly review your briefing materials, the draft goal statements that they have put together based on visioning workgroup input. These are for your review. We're not going to edit those, because clearly these are likely to change based on input that we get at the port meetings. Amber or Myra is just going to quickly run through those draft goal statements and themes that we have thus far.

MS. VON HARTEN: As you recall from our last workshop, we've kind of settled on these four strategic goals of management, science, communication and governance. The workgroup spent some time kind of drafting one common statement for each of those strategic goals. That is what was in your briefing book and what is on the screen now.

Yes, it is Attachment 2. I will just read them and you guys ponder them for a second and if you have any feedback let us know. Strategic Goal 1 is management, and it reads adopt management strategies that rebuild and maintain fishery resources; adapt to regional differences in the fishery; and consider the social and economic needs of fishing communities.

Strategic Goal 2 is science and it reads management decisions are based upon robust, defensible science that considers qualitative and quantitative data analyzed in a timely, clear and transparent manner that builds stakeholder confidence. Strategic Goal 3 for communication reads employ interactive outreach strategies that encourage continuous stakeholder participation and build greater understanding of science and management.

Strategic Goal 4 for governance reads commit to a transparent, balanced and timely decision-making process that follows flexible yet well-defined protocols and strategies. As Michelle said, these are likely to change. We just kind of wanted to have these four main goal statements to serve as a framework for some of the discussions that we have at a port meeting, so stakeholders kind of know the realm of what we're trying to focus the conversation on. We appreciate any feedback on these statements.

DR. DUVAL: I did just want to bring up we received some comment over the weekend, very well thought-out articulate comments regarding framing the vision around the ten national standards as opposed to these four broad goal themes. I think Amber can send that comment letter or we can have Mike send that comment letter to everyone.

I think the premise was that this way if our vision was framed around the ten national standards, that these subsume all of the broader goals of management that are required under the Magnuson Act. It is definitely a valid framework. I think one of the things I noted is that the council is bound by the ten national standards no matter what we do; so we could not adopt any strategies or management actions that would be inconsistent with the ten national standards.

I think we would probably receive some input should we go down the road of starting to develop objectives that might be inconsistent with the ten national standards; but I did just want to bring that up as an alternate framework, organizing around the ten national standards and having goal statements underneath each of those ten national standards that was one of the comments that we received. Jessica, did you have a question or feedback?

MS. McCAWLEY: The communication one – and I can't remember our past discussions about this – but the way it is worded right now, it is more us maybe telling folks what they think and doesn't really reflect maybe a complete two-way street that we're trying to get the information from the stakeholders. I was wondering if we could tweak it just a little bit.

DR. DUVAL: That is great input. I would agree that it seems to be more what are the tools that the council is going to use to talk to our stakeholders as opposed to how can we also encourage our stakeholders to communicate effectively with us. Are there any other broad comments on the goal statements? Amber, I think the only thing that I would note is that under science it seems like "clear and transparent" are probably saying the same thing. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: From a broad comment, I think they are fine for goal statements. As we started to have our conversation a few days ago under the science, I think it is great that we have

the goal of decisions based on robust, defensible science; but we really need to address the council's role in directing that defensible science with the Science Center.

DR. DUVAL: Agreed. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say in reading this I noticed like in the Strategic Goal Number 1, management, we discuss regional differences. That is something that is obviously going to come out in discussions with the public. We've mentioned that in there, so that may be something we find ourselves doing in the future is more regional fine tuning of things.

It is nice that is in there. Another word that pops out in Number 4 under governance, timely decision-making, and that is something we've always been kind of dealing with is the process. We talk about flexibility and that sort of thing. Those are just some things that stuck out, words that we used.

Also related to science, I think one thing that has hit me recently I think in particular, after listening to the testimony at the Senate hearing, was within the context of science, science drives everything that we're doing. It is just paramount. We know we need the science, but there is sort of a lack of accountability I guess in terms of delivering sometimes.

That can be funding issues and it can be prioritization or whatever, but I expect folks don't question the fact that we need the science. It is just that are we as a council or are we as a government committed to providing the science and actually the funding, the prioritization and that sort of thing?

I am sure that will come out in the discussions. Related to the ten standards, I like the simplified organization with our four goals, but we should definitely make sure wherever one of those standards touches in those areas that we include it or mention it or something. You could roll them all into these four areas.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I agree, and I think probably sometimes I feel like the language of the ten national standards is not as accessible to all stakeholders or not as understandable to all stakeholders. I often sort of jokingly refer to National Standard Number 1 as thou shalt not overfish.

Sometimes I feel like if we could almost translate those ten national standards into something that is a little bit more understandable, that would be helpful. That is certainly something we include in any materials for port meetings just so folks have a sense of the legal framework that the council is bound by as well. Are there any other broad comments on the draft goal statements? Again, as Amber mentioned, these are likely to change.

DR. LANEY: The broad comment; it seems to me that in some of our earlier versions of these we did have the word "habitat" worked in there somewhere. I think it is captured under Number 1 where we say adopt management strategies that rebuild and maintain fishery resources. As long as we all acknowledge that we can't do that unless we keep the habitat in good enough shape to support and sustain those resources, I would be more comfortable with that word "habitat" in here somewhere, but I can live with it the way it is.

DR. DUVAL: I think that will probably come out more specifically under objectives, Wilson, as well.

MR. HARTIG: Just one thing. I think I got this at a reading in Time, the Clinton Initiative stuff that they're doing, just reading from the different big players in that; they are making changes in the world that measurement matters. These goals and objectives and in our science side especially measurement does matter.

One of the things I was wondering; are there any other public processes that are developed and are run similar to ours that have any numbers of people that they interact with; like what should be the number that you are trying to reach to participate in your process? That is what I was getting at.

I got kind of wrapped up in that, but that was the basic. If you give us a number of recreational fishermen, a number of commercial; how many people do you expect to reach; how many people do you expect to participate based on who you have reached? I was just wondering if there is anything in the public about other public processes, government-run processes where that has been done.

DR. DUVAL: Where there has actually been some metric or target metric that you are trying to achieve with regard to your communication and outreach efforts in order to ensure that people know that they have the ability to participate in your process. I am not aware; and I don't know if, Bob Beal, ASMFC has any kind of metrics like that. No; Bob is shaking his head no.

MS. VON HARTEN: I know that there are other natural resource agencies that do – I think what you're talking is like an implementation plan and that includes evaluation. Is that kind of what you're talking about that has performance measures for each goal or objective? Typically that is what people use is something called the smart objective that is measurable, obtainable, time-bound and things like that that can actually measure your impact of these different objectives that you create. That is something that I view as a next step. After the port meetings and we get all the input and actually develop, quote-unquote our strategic plan, then you start talking about an implementation plan where you can actually evaluate.

DR. DUVAL: I will say that I believe the Mid-Atlantic Council just recently adopted their implementation plan to carry forward. It is like a two-year implementation plan to help guide their efforts over the next couple of years as they work towards achieving their objectives that they set out and their strategic plan. Bob.

MR. BEAL: ASMFC takes a similar approach. We develop annual action plans based on our five-year strategic plan; and within that annual action plan there are a number of FMPs that we're going to amend in a given year, a number of stock assessments and those sorts of things. That is where we put the measurable annual activities; and then we can sort of measure how well we're doing with achieving those. Even that doesn't get to the number of individuals that we want to interact with. It does include public hearings and those types of things that are obviously where we interact with folks; but it doesn't have goals as far as numbers of individuals to talk to.

DR. DUVAL: I'll also say that ASMFC is also taking public comment right now on its draft strategic plan for the next five years, so there is a great PowerPoint presentation that the

commission staff has put together; and a number of states are going to be holding hearings on that or have also posted that PowerPoint on their website. I would encourage folks to take a look at it. It is a nice review of what the commission does. Are there any other comments on these broad goal statements? Pres.

MR. PATE: I think the goals as you have them drafted currently cover the major responsibilities of the commission. I was sent this weekend a copy of a white paper that was prepared by the fishing working group of MAFAC, which touches on some of the major points that you have in your –

DR. DUVAL: For folks listening in on the webinar or trying to listen in on the webinar, we appear to have been afflicted with a fire alarm. We're trying to figure out if it is real or fake. We're going to go ahead and take about a ten-minute break until we figure out what is going on here. Thanks, folks, sorry about that.

DR. DUVAL: This isn't normally when I would have elected to take a break; but when a break is forced upon us, we will take one. First of all, I want to go back to Pres Pate, who was so rudely cut off by our fire alarm in the middle of what he was trying to say, so, Pres, back to you.

MR. PATE: If I can remember where I was. What I was trying to explain is the general themes of a white paper that was prepared by the Recreational Fishing Working Group of MAFAC, which the white paper is very extensive. It is about 20 pages long. It covers most of the themes that you have organized to be in your workgroup, but goes into much greater detail and makes recommendations on changes in the Magnuson Act that could be recommended or made to meet the changes that they feel are important and included in the white paper.

I encourage you to read the white paper, because the way they have their recommendations worded and the points that they chose to cover could have some bearing on the way that you word questions in your port samples. That is not to say what would happen if the recommendations are adopted.

If they are adopted, it would have major impacts on this council and the other councils as well. I'm not going to speculate on that right now; but the way they have their major points laid out, there could be some wording changes that you would want to incorporate into your port samples. If you don't have it, I will send it to you.

DR. DUVAL: That would be great, Pres, if you don't mind e-mailing it to either myself or Mike Collins, and Mike can get it around to everybody. That sounds like a great resource and a good segue way for some of the next items we're going to discuss.

MR. HARTIG: Pres brought up a point about Magnuson that I was thinking about. As we go through this process and fishermen bring up things about Magnuson; how do we handle it? Do we just say we can't do that or should we say we'll include that under the council's umbrella of what we think should be changed in Magnuson? A positive answer to that question may be better than we can't do that.

DR. DUVAL: I completely agree with that. I think that we should collect those types of responses and comments with regard to changes to Magnuson and note those and include them in

whatever summary document that comes out of port meetings is put together, so that we have that as a reference as the reauthorization moves forward to say this is what we're hearing from our constituents in the region with regard to some changes that they would like to see in the law.

I totally agree rather than no we can't do; that we'll say that is great input and we would like to include that in a section of our summary document. The next thing I wanted to move on and discuss – and this is Attachment 3 I believe in the briefing materials – the draft strategic goals and objectives that we were running through during the last workshop.

Amber has that projected up on the screen there. There were a number of them. We went through these in some detail last time and were doing some wordsmithing and editing by committee. The point of going through this is not to go through and edit by committee again or sit here and try to spin our wheels by coming up with additional objectives under the different goal theme areas but really to get to a little bit of brainstorming around this table with regard to what are the major issues in the fishery that we would like to get some feedback on from our stakeholders; what are those major issues?

I was just going to ask Amber if she would run through this document sort of quickly. This is something that I would hope that folks would take as homework – certainly, additional objectives and strategies will come out of the port meetings, but just as a reminder of sort of where we ended up after the last meeting.

MS. VON HARTEN: The first one is science. The first goal talks about obtaining quality data to monitor all the different impacts to management. One of the objectives was talking about expanding and enhancing current methods of data collection. Goal 2 was consider localized depletion, and we didn't really have any objectives created for that.

The next strategic goal is management. The first goal is promote effective stewardship of the resource, and we kind of went through these first four here: mechanism to vest the fishermen in the fishery, decrease incentives for overcapitalization, regional differences in the fishery and continual dissipation of returns from fishing through open access.

Then these three additional objectives were ones that we added with some editing options to make them a little bit more succinct: promote predictable fishing seasons, minimize waste in the fishery, and encourage habitat protection. Goal 4 is provide for flexible management. We had this first objective already created talking about temporal and aerial distribution of the resource, and differences on how to manage that; and then these additional three objectives. Goal 5: minimize habitat damage from fishing and non-fishing activities. We had a lengthy discussion about that I recall, about the non-fishing activity portion of this.

Some of the additional objectives were consider strategies that reduce gear interactions and discussions about habitat protection and conservation. Goal 6 dealt with public compliance with regulations, ensuring that they are enforceable. Goal 7: provide a management regime which promotes stability and long-range planning in all sectors.

Then the objectives around that talked about market-driven harvest and continuity of product, availability of product, and some of those additional objectives there. The Goal 8 was consider strategies to address localized depletion. In communication and governance we really didn't

have any strong set goals; except for Goal 9, which promote public understanding of regulations and communication. We needed to develop just some basic goals for governance.

Just looking at these briefly, what I think we're after now is a level of specificity that is lacking in this right now in terms of specific key issues and topics that you would like feedback from at the port meetings based on these goals and objectives and understanding that these are going to drastically change as we get through the port meetings.

DR. DUVAL: I think some of the things that we have heard about and that we've talked about before in terms of major issues in the fishery, discards is one of them. We have regulations on our species such that what we have heard is that while fishermen are targeting a particular species that may be open, they are unfortunately having to discard large amounts of fish for a species for which the season has already been closed.

Discards is one major issue I think that we've all heard about during public comment. I think another thing is that there are too many regulations; they are confusing; not enough fish, which that is always going to be an issue. I think one of the things that I have heard about is competing regulations with other fisheries.

In other words, perhaps there are certain regulations for HMS species that are really hampering the ability of fishermen to participate in the snapper grouper fishery; that some of the way some of the regulations or seasons are set up is disadvantaging fishermen from one end of the region to another, so regional differences is another thing that we have heard about. What are some of the major issues that we hear about that we would like to get some input on during the port meetings? That is really what this discussion is meant to be about here. Mel.

MR. BELL: We'll talk about this a lot later, but something that struck me was the role of electronic reporting or electronic monitoring. Both of those sort of touch in the management area or the science area, because it is a way of collecting data; but it is also data that is used for management decisions like when you have reached an ACL.

Definitely an understanding from the public's perspective of their – and we know a little bit from VMS about their willingness to accept some of it; but that is useful technology I think that needs to be applied, because it is a way of improving efficiency and quality and timeliness. But we really need to get a sense of their – we need input from the public beyond just talking about VMS.

DR. LANEY: We talked about it a lot last time, Madam Chairman, but we still haven't settled I think on a definition of localized depletion. I don't know how big an issue that will be. I noticed it came up as a concern of the advisory panels; but I still think if we're going to leave it in here, which we have it in two different goals right now, we need to define what we mean by that and whether or not we're talking about the resource that is the target for commercial and recreational fisheries being depleted; or, whether in the case of the one that ASMFC has had to deal with, whether it is a prey.

Well, in that case menhaden is actually I guess a commercial and to some extent recreational as well; but it is also a very significant prey species. I guess you could almost talk about – and I'm thinking about Monty Hawkins and the numerous e-mails I've read from him about black sea

bass. You could almost say, well, you could define localized depletion in terms of habitat maybe as well.

To the extent that we can quantify how much of an organism of interest to us is produced by a given area of habitat and to the extent we could document a reduction in habitat; I'm thinking that would probably be most easily done with habitats like oyster reefs and inter-tidal vegetation within estuaries probably less easily done offshore. But to the extent we could do that, we could say, well, we have localized depletion of a habitat within a particular area. I guess it could be all three of those; and I think we just need to get specific about what we mean by that term.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with that, Wilson; it would be good to provide some example or definition for what is meant by localized depletion. I think a lot of folks probably – it is a matter of perception, really, which is what we talked about last time as to what localized depletion is.

MR. HAYMANS: When an angler is suggesting no size limits and things; would that fall under Goal 4, the last objective listed there, consider alternative management strategies?

DR. DUVAL: It sounds like it to me.

MR. HAYMANS: That is what I hear the most, and it is really a localized group of fishermen, but they are vocal. That is kind of the other tools that we haven't really used up until this most recent red snapper management. As long as there is a place for that, I would appreciate it. I also have a question going back to the broad comments about best available science, whenever you want to get to that question.

DR. DUVAL: Go ahead.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, under Goal 5, which it talks about habitat, there is a note there that says it is a national standard and it may not be needed. Isn't that the same for basically Goal 1 in that best available science is a national standard? That is just really a comment, but the question is I guess maybe Gregg or Bob or somebody could answer; when we do our research priorities or our needs, what is that? I know we've done it before, and I'm sorry I don't recall the title for it, but what is the title of that document; when do we send it in; how much influence does it have over NMFS in actually directing the data collection?

DR. DUVAL: While Gregg is making his way up to the table, that is a document that is reviewed annually by the SSC and they provide input and comment on that. I believe they did that at their April meeting this year, I want to say. The council maybe approved it in June or September. It was at one of the past two meetings.

MR. WAUGH: That is my recollection is June; and John Carmichael works on that with the SSC. That goes into NMFS, and I believe we review that and approve it at our June meeting. It is sent to NMFS, and they are supposed to use that in preparing their future budgets and research.

MR. HAYMANS: Do they?

MR. WAUGH: I can't answer that.

DR. McGOVERN: Andy Strelcheck and I use it to look at priorities from MARFIN and that sort of thing, and so we do use it in the region.

MR. HAYMANS: So I guess where I am really going is when we develop this goal that says we obtain quality data; is there anything that the council can do to increase the quality of the data that we're receiving? That is what we're hearing most from the anglers and most from the commercial fisheries is the better science, better data. Yet is there anything really the council can do to influence that?

DR. DUVAL: I think if the council puts something into an amendment that is passed and we say – for instance, the dealer reporting amendment is a good example – we want more frequent reporting of landings through electronic means. That was the vehicle through which we do it. As soon as the rule to implement that amendment comes out and is effective, we will have weekly electronic reporting.

I think the way for us to influence things is to put them into an amendment. Clearly, we've had a lot of discussion on the record over the past year in the Data Collection Committee regarding sampling targets and the appropriate levels of sampling targets and what we can do to help the Science Center and other agencies that are collecting that information to achieve those targets or determine the appropriateness of those targets. I think in my mind the specific tool that we have is really an amendment that says we would like X and such collected at X and such frequency or something along those lines. I saw a number of hands come up.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a brief follow up; I think we need to keep that in mind as we address future amendments. When there are specific data criteria that we think need to be collected, we need to put that in the amendment.

MR. HARTIG: Michelle gave a good explanation of what the council can do. Certainly, in the northeast I think you've seen that they're reviewing their fishery-dependent data collection system within and without, which is a great process to do; and maybe that is what we need to do as well.

That is the Center that is doing that; it is not us. I think we need to just continue to do what we're doing. If we don't get to where we need to get doing that, then go to an amendment basically to get what we need done. I think we're making progress with what we're doing. Is it the progress that I would like to see? Probably not; and if we don't get there pretty quick, then I think we need to go the amendment pathway.

MR. BELL: Just something Doug talked about we'll put it in an amendment if you have a need. I am thinking specifically like with Amendment 14 and the MPAs; we had a sense of what we needed to understand in order to evaluate whether or not they were working adequately. Stuff was going on, and we're going to find out about that obviously at this meeting a lot more.

I don't know if just putting in an amendment it rises to the level of being a priority. I know Roy was asked I think a question like this at the Senate hearing was how does NMFS or how does NOAA decide what is a priority or what are the priorities or what gets funded to what level? That is just sort of the bigger picture of all of this.

We can establish needs, because I view us as we're a customer, if you will, for needing data provided to us or things provided to us from the Science Center or whomever. We can establish it as a priority; but does that really mean it is going to get funded or it is going to get done? I don't know how to make that happen, necessarily.

I think clearly the way we operate, we have the plans, we do amendments; and that is sort of our piece of it. Of course, we can establish each year what we think research priorities should be, but how that actually gets operationalized into actual research activities I don't really know.

DR. DUVAL: I think in terms of the specificity of this issue, with a major issue in the fishery, we need better data, better information. That is a comment that we hear from fishermen that they don't necessarily trust this particular data source or that particular data source or they have a question about the results of an assessment.

I think for most people who touch the fishery in some way, their direct experience with data collection, if they are a commercial fisherman it is through their logbooks. If they are a recreational fisherman, it may be through intercept sampling or an effort survey or something like that. I think there is probably a good amount of information about, say, our fishery-independent data collection programs that a lot of stakeholders maybe are not aware of or don't necessarily – that they haven't had much experience with. I think we need to be really specific if we're going to ask questions about improvement in data as an issue. I'll just say that.

MR. HAYMANS: Mel was kind of getting to my point. We can affect management communications and governance directly by our actions at this council. What we can't affect directly is the science and the data collection. I guess my point of talking about putting it in an amendment or asking these questions is so that when we go to these port meetings the public doesn't think that it is the council who has direct influence over what information comes in. We're asking for it but it is – maybe I'm not making my point clear.

DR. DUVAL: I understand what you're saying. You want to make sure that the public distinguishes between the council's desires for improved data; but that we are not the ones who actually go out and collect the data and that there is a limit to what we can do to ensure that data collection is improved or that there are sufficient resources for adequate data collection.

MR. HAYMANS: Said much better than I could ever say it; that is what I meant.

MR. WAUGH: Doug, you do have the ability to specify in an amendment what data you want collected. It depends on how much detail you go into. In Amendment 14 there was a deliberate attempt to make those research needs just a list of needs. George Geiger didn't want us to put in a monitoring plan, because that would take away money from the Oculina Research and Monitoring Plan.

It was just a list of needs; whereas, if you look at something like CE-BA 3 with our bycatch reporting, there are very specific items in there. The agency has expressed their concern that were that to remain in there, they don't have the resources to do that. It depends on how much detail you want to put into an amendment; but you have the control to specify what data, what reporting is done.

The agency, if they approve it, which is a big if – but if they approve it, then it is implemented. We are right in telling the public we don't collect the data; but it is your responsibility to specify what data you need for management. The more specific you are with details, timelines and so forth; that is how you would affect the collection of data that you want and feel you need.

MR. JOLLEY: I agree with everything that has been said, and I would add this one last aspect is that as the data comes in it needs to be fed to ACCSP; and any way we can influence that, because all of the data is not going to ACCSP.

DR. DUVAL: Well, we'll probably hear more about that this afternoon.

MR. CONKLIN: I guess to John's point, since resources are a big issue, I believe there are tons of data out there that is available but has never been used. If we could somehow figure out what is out there that can be used and phase it into what John is saying, it probably would be a lot cheaper than reallocating resources to collect the same data.

MR. PATE: The Executive Steering Committee of the MRIP Program recently gave the operations team, which I chair, a new responsibility, which is to prioritize the implementation of new techniques or improved techniques within the MRIP Program. We reviewed that modification to our terms of reference just the week before last when we met in Jacksonville, Florida.

The majority of the question was how we would do it; and we're working on that how now. One basic element that will enter into the how is to have regional planning partners like the Mid-Atlantic Council and the South Atlantic Council be very specific in what they need in the way of monitoring recreational catch, whether it be precision in the estimates, timeliness in the data delivery. Anything that you can come up with when you're dealing with this broader issue of data quality that would relate to that responsibility would be very helpful.

If you find that your management of a particular species of fish or fish within a fishery is dependent on the precision that you need in the catch of recreational data, you need to state that in some way. It doesn't necessarily have to be an amendment to the plan. It just needs to be stated in a way that we can use it to kind of order the priority ranking of the funds that are available for implementation of MRIP.

If you need, for example, more precise estimates of the landings of gag grouper, then we can put more money into the process of collecting that data. We're a ways away from coming up with the final priorities, but the statements that our regional partners can have on the type of data that they need to regulate recreational fisheries will be very important for us.

DR. DUVAL: We appreciate those comments, Pres, and your experience in helping MRIP to move forward and improve those programs. I have Bob Mahood and then Mel, and we're going to kind of wrap this up and then move this back into issues in the fishery, because I have a couple more that I would like to throw out there.

MR. MAHOOD: There is another front going on relative to how the councils are involved in determining what data is collected. I don't know how many of the council members have been

contacted by the General Accountability Office, but they are doing a study. I am pretty sure Ben has talked to them now.

The staff, we talk about a number of things, everything from how open are our meetings to how much input do we have in the data that is collected for the decisions the council has to make? The folks that we talk to at the staff level were very much surprised that we didn't have a whole lot of input into the Southeast Fisheries Science Center data plans and/or budgets for that.

They were somewhat surprised. There is a General Accountability Study going on that is looking into this. One of the things in our discussion with those folks was that they felt we ought to have some say into what is being collected. Then the other issue is Ben's testimony. Every time we testify before Congress, we ask for more funding for stock assessments and data collection; but yet we don't know what happens or how the money is used.

I'm certainly not one to be into the details of somebody's budgeting or anything like that; but we do need to have a better process that we make sure that the decisions you all have to make; that the data is being collected specifically to that. I think a lot of it goes back – although certainly there is a thousand percent improvement from when I first started in this process, when the centers were their own little fiefdoms that were out doing the kind of research they wanted to do, and the councils were kind of interjected into that saying, well, you are going to collect data and do things that support management.

I think there is still some resistance out there, although like I say it has changed considerably. I noticed since Phil and Jack have been involved it has changed a lot over the years. I have high hopes that that General Accountability Study will have some recommendations about how we would interact with the centers relative to their data programs.

MR. BELL: I was going to say under governance one of the things that you want to make sure we do I think is to have a clear explanation of roles and responsibilities at all levels. That needs to include Congress, because what we're dealing with is a system that is constructed in law. We're held accountable based on that law. That also in my mind makes Congress accountable to make sure this is not an unfunded or inadequately supported mandate, if you will.

If we've built a system that is so cumbersome we can't afford to do what we need to do; they have a piece of this accountability as well. I think clearly defining roles and responsibilities at all levels – and that actually goes all the way down to the fishermen as well or the stakeholders, because they have to participate in terms of data reporting and things. They all have a role. I would definitely make sure under governance we clearly explain all of that.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a great comment and definitely needed. Governance tends to be something I think not everybody has a clear concept of and tends to be more what the council deals with as opposed to the stakeholders. In terms of major issues in the fishery that we would like to see addressed or have questions about; there are two that come to mind that we're going to be talking about at this very meeting.

One of those is allocations; how do we effectively and fairly establish allocations among the sectors? We have an amendment later on the snapper grouper agenda that is going to come up. I think it would behoove us to get some input on that through visioning so that amendment doesn't

get out ahead of this process and make sure that we incorporate thoughts from stakeholders regarding some alternative approaches to establishing allocations.

Another issue is spatial management. Are there criteria that could be established for use of spatial management such as marine protected areas? As we're going on about our business this meeting week addressing different management issues, these are things that I also think need to come out through visioning. I welcome input from others. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: An additional one to consider would be shifting pressure on the different fish. As we manage one fishery or species, are we just shifting that commercial and recreational pressure onto another one and creating this cycle?

DR. DUVAL: Are there other thoughts on major issues in the fishery? Do people disagree that allocations and spatial management should be out there, that we might want to get input on that?

MR. BELL: I'm going to agree with you; I think that definitely needs to be discussed. Yes, they are public trust resources, but at some point – I know in managing our own state oyster resources we use a system of culture permits where you have individuals that are vested in areas; and they manage those much better than we the state could.

At some point getting folks – I mean we definitely need to discuss that as well as the spatial stuff. People may not like to talk about it, or it certainly brings out emotions; but rationally if you look at other things like we do with forestry and other types of resources, it just makes sense to talk about it.

MR. HAYMANS: I would definitely think those are issues that are going to come out in the public. We hear them all the time now. My question is how do you approach those? Is allocations an objective that you want comment on so you get the feedback on allocation? Do you lead the public into that discussion or do you let that discussion happen naturally?

DR. DUVAL: Personally I think you lead the public into that discussion so that you get the feedback that you're looking for rather than waiting and hoping that it occurs naturally.

MR. HARTIG: I look back at the Comprehensive ACL Amendment where we made the allocations; and really there wasn't that much public scrutiny of the allocations, to be honest with you. When we've changed allocations for one species in particular before, we've had much more considerations than we did when we changed it for every species that we manage and put that in place. I think part of the reason was because of the overwhelming nature of the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

I think when we do go back and look at allocations again; it will be a much different scenario when we just focus on the allocation portion of it. The other thing I would say is timeliness of allocation. How often do we revisit them? The less often we revisit them the more controversial they are, in my opinion.

The more often you do it, if you do it on a five-year schedule or something, then people are used to dealing with these things and you get a different kind of perspective, I think. I may be wrong;

but to me visit them on a more frequent, timely basis; and I think you would be on stronger footing.

MS. BROUWER: Just to get back to what Doug had said; the Snapper Grouper AP members have in recent years been talking a lot about allocations for particular species, but it is something that often figures in their conversations. I guess the idea would be to get input from the public so that the council can have information they need to develop the objective or objectives that deal with allocation. I think that is how we had envisioned getting the information. Based on what the stakeholders have to say as far as how the council has thus far established allocations and how they could do it; then we go back and we tweak the objectives for that.

DR. DUVAL: Or develop objectives for that.

MS. VON HARTEN: If you look back at the goals-and-objectives document, there are lots of discussions in several of the objectives about regional approaches to management. Do you all want that as a key issue that you would like input on?

DR. DUVAL: I do; anybody else?

MR. BELL: I think you need to include discussion of that. Remember, we in the word – we had it in actually one of the goal statements, but we definitely need to talk about that at least.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes; and if we're going to talk about it, maybe we should suggest we want some answers to the questions. We don't want to just talk about the inequalities that they see, but we actually want some answers.

DR. DUVAL: I absolutely agree.

MR. HAYMANS: I think those discussions of allocation and if we're going to talk about regional management, it needs to be right on the heels of allocation or linked together.

DR. DUVAL: I would agree it would make sense to approach it that way. Let's review what Amber has got thus far with regard to major issues in the fishery.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay, the first one is discards, confusing regulations, competing regulations with other fisheries, views on electronic reporting and monitoring and the role of stakeholders in both of these two issues; needing a definition of localized depletion; is the resource a target or is the prey species or habitat?

Specifically no size limits; Doug had mentioned that could be an alternative tool under Goal 4. Data quality, allocations and how to effectively and fairly establish allocations between sectors and how often are they revisited? Spatial management; are there criteria that could be established for using tools like MPAs; shifting effort from one fishery to another due to management measures and regional approaches to management and linking that with the discussion on allocations. Think about any new tools that haven't been used that perhaps people don't know about that maybe could be considered in management. I think there are probably more than this that is not on the table yet.

DR. DUVAL: I think in terms of discards, I threw that out as a major issue that we all have heard about sitting around this table; but probably we would want to be more specific and ask folks what do you feel are ways to reduce discards within the fishery rather than just throw out the word “discards”.

Are there tools that the council has not considered with regard to reducing discards that we need to take a look at? I think one of the things that we’ve tried to do is trip limit step-downs when we’re getting within a certain percentage of an ACL – that is one tool – trying to establish open seasons for co-occurring species, and that is going to vary a little bit geographically, and things like that.

MR. HAYMANS: Along those lines, one of the things I think we should be considering in this is a reduction in discard mortality. We’ve talked forever about venting tools and things, but, of course, we’re going recompression these days and yet we don’t really push recompression in the South Atlantic.

I am changing my fishing regulations again this coming January to put illustrations in for folks in my state at least of what a recompression tool looks like or a descending tool or whatever you want to call it. Maybe that goes along with the discard discussion. But also on the data quality, we had an awful lot of discussion about data to bring it down to two words on the list. Amber, add some more words there for it – I mean, just to the importance that the council places on the public understanding how that data is collected.

MR. HARTIG: To me I think you need in that goal review and obtain quality data. We started down this process to review it; and that is what the public is going to be interested in and what we’re interested in; defining what we have and how we move forward to get what we need. We’re not there, as you all well know.

MR. BOWEN: When it comes to discards, we talk about reducing discard mortality but I haven’t heard – what I feel like we would need to do with the public is educate the public on how to discard the fish properly; just an idea.

DR. DUVAL: I agree; there are a lot of folks out there who probably have never had someone show them an appropriate way to remove a fish. I think as some of these new recompression tools come forward, like Doug mentioned, certainly we have a great education and outreach staff. The council can put together some information and educational brochures that can be distributed with pictures showing exactly how to use these devices. I think there is even stuff out there on how to make one yourself for some of these things; so, absolutely, education is key.

MR. BELL: Thinking sort of radically; the one radical thing that sort of flies in the face of how we’re managing now is the concept of maybe in a specific area at a specific time there sort of is no such thing as a discard; everything is open. Then how you turn the switch on and off there, I am not sure, but that is used in other areas. Maybe in particular depth regimes or something where discard post-release mortality would be 100 percent unless you dealt with it some way. That is just another radical sort of tool, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: Full-retention fishery.

MR. HARTIG: That is what I was trying to get at. We don't know the depths that these people are fishing at; we don't have that information. As we go through this process, ask fishermen what are the depths you are catching these animals in could inform our knowledge about what kind of discard mortality we're actually having if we know what depths they are really fishing in and we've got the studies that show at what depth that discard mortality is most problematic.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other major issues or items within the fishery that we would want to receive input on during these port meetings?

MR. COX: Michelle, something that I think about all the time and fishermen are asking me – so when we go out to these port meetings, a lot of the questions I get at the dock – this probably goes under governance or something – fishermen kind of need to understand the – they understand that the council makes these rules and things that they have to abide by; but I think it would be important to show them the structure of how the Magnuson is above us and then you have the science that kind of gives us what we are able to work with.

I think it would be important right from the start, especially for the commercial guys, to kind of understand where the councils play in this whole thing is; and that there are a lot of things going on besides just the decisions that we make here. They would like to understand that.

DR. DUVAL: That kind of gets to what Mel was talking about before in terms of sort of having a clear explanation of roles and responsibilities for each of the involved parties in the process.

MR. PHILLIPS: You would just make a flow chart kind of thing; that would be fairly simple.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, we could certainly make a flow chart. Amber assures me we are going to get to that. I have done similar things when I've given lectures in classes on sort of Fisheries Management 101; what does it look like at the federal level, the state level and the interstate level; and how all those things are intertwined. It gets pretty messy pretty quickly. Generally what I show is a big ball of twine that is all knotted up at the beginning and then move down from there.

DR. LANEY: We don't have to reinvent the wheel on that point. There are lots of publications out there – well, maybe not lots, but a number of publications out there. I think a lot of us have probably seen the Auburn Sea Grant Publication that addresses the whole fishery management process, and it has some very nice diagrams in it. I know Dick Brame at least has given the same sort of presentations you probably have to classes at the university level that show how everything interrelates. As you say, it can get pretty messy. I think we can avail ourselves of the use of those existing tools as we need to.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other comments on this before we move on?

MR. HARTIG: Just to the part about what we need to do at the beginning is based on what we did in South Florida – and I've already mentioned this several times – is a Stock Assessment 101 thing. The basic flow chart about how we collect the data for the assessments, number one, because that is what people asked there; how do you collect the data? How do you do the headboat? That is going to be important.

DR. DUVAL: I think we had talked about this a little bit and perhaps taking some of the tools that have been put together for the Marine Resources Education Program. I think the council has other tools online now on the new website and having those materials available for folks at the port meetings. This is segueing a little bit into the next topic in terms of structure of port meetings; so we can talk a little bit more about that.

MS. McCAWLEY: Before you go into that next topic, we didn't talk a lot about the part about communication. I was wondering if we need to talk to the public about what is the best way to communicate with them; how we want to do that to get some feedback on that.

DR. DUVAL: That is a very good segue way into this next piece, because we've put together some sample questions for folks to take a look at; and several of those questions actually get at that very topic of; how would you prefer to be communicated with or what is the most effective means of communicating with you?

As I mentioned at the beginning, our major goal here is to really hammer out and finalize the details on the structure of the port meetings and locations that we would like to potentially focus on in terms of people hosting these kinds of meetings. There are a few attachments in here. There is one that is planning for port meetings.

I think that is Attachment 4 in your briefing book. Then I think Attachment 5 was a list of sample questions – and thanks to Anna who kind of revised a bunch of these questions – and then those of us in the workgroup reviewed those and made some additional suggestions. I don't know if Mike has e-mailed around these revised version.

For those of you who are fortunate enough to be able to actually get on the internet, you should have a document from Mike in your inbox that contains a revised version of draft port meeting questions. Amber has those displayed up here on the screen. I am going to turn it over to Amber and Myra to kind of review the structure of how they see these port meeting facilitations going, and the experience with the Snapper Grouper AP, and then reviewing some of these questions and see what you think.

MS. VON HARTEN: Myra and I attended some additional facilitation training back in October; and we learned a couple of different techniques that you can use to facilitate meetings of this nature. Kind of what we were trying to test out with the Snapper Grouper AP was something called a focused conversation.

Essentially you develop four different types of questions to ask the group that get them to reflect and then interpret how those different questions or different impacts would impact them as it related to that topic. That is what the original set of questions that you were sent as Attachment 5 were kind of getting at that type of question and focused conversation method. What we did with the AP was we took these management questions that you see in Attachment 5.

What are the components or unique characteristics of the snapper grouper fishery? What could happen if the snapper grouper fishery wasn't managed and how would that affect you? What do you think is working with current management? What do you think is not working with current management? Then what strategies, either existing or new, would you want the council to use to address your needs as a stakeholder?

We kind of used those questions to walk them through this process of trying to gather information. This focused conversation method is very different than any public hearing or scoping meeting or council meeting in terms of it is a lot more interactive. We're not using microphones – although we did use microphones – you don't use microphones, you kind of sit around as a group.

We had this really neat facilitation tool called a “sticky wall” that you stick on the wall, and it is sticky and you can actually post pieces of paper. Fortunately most of you council members were there to see all this happen. It is just a different way of gathering information that doesn't force people to actually interact, but they really have no option to not.

There are different ways of getting information from them, whether you go around the table or you get them to write on the pieces of paper their ideas; and then it all gets stuck up there kind of anonymously, so people feel less intimidated. We went through that process and got some good feedback and realized that we needed to do some tweaking of these questions to really get at the specificity of key issues that we wanted to get feedback on management.

We had these four strategic goals of management, science, communication and governance. Then we've had some discussion about whether or not we may just want to focus on just the management strategic goal for the port meetings for some of the reasons that were mentioned today; and also because the communication and governance – maybe communication the stakeholders can relate to and simple questions like what Jessica just suggested we could get information from the stakeholders.

But governance is kind of, yes, squishy, and they may not fully understand what that would be about. As Michelle said, Anna kind of thought about this some more and put together this newer set of questions; and also recognizing that if we go the route of doing sector-specific meetings, that the questions really need to be sector-specific and focused on that particular sector.

The broader blanket questions that we would ask all the groups are what do you think is working? What do you think is not working and what strategies would you want to use to fix some of the issues that the council has right now that maybe they haven't used before, and things like that? Then get into more specific questions on specific key issues.

DR. DUVAL: Some of the feedback that we got from the Snapper Grouper AP as well was that some of the original science questions that you saw in Attachment 5 were probably not that useful for soliciting input. In this new list of questions that you all hopefully have and that Amber has displayed up here – I mean I suggested a couple of draft questions that are science based, that really focus more on how do you see potential means to improve for the commercial sector the commercial logbook. Do you have specific suggestions for that; or, for the for-hire sector, are there specific ways that the for-hire sector can assist in improving accuracy of catch-and-effort information, and a similar question for private recreational anglers?

That is kind of as far as we went with the science, really the data that stakeholders are most likely to have the most direct piece of interaction with. Anna had made the suggestion to really kind of start out with some of those communication questions, which I think those are great suggestions for warming up the port meetings and getting people talking was really how did you

hear about what we're doing and what are some of those communication methods that you would prefer?

MS. VON HARTEN: I just want to say all the suggestions in terms of trying to give an explanation up front at these port meetings about how the council operates and the mandates that we're held to; that is something that we're actually going to develop is having posters that we hang up on the wall with common acronyms that people might be throwing around at the port meetings and what the mandates are.

Then have a quick little PowerPoint about how the council operates and the roles of everybody, including Congress and stakeholders in that process, kind of what you guys did in the South Florida Workshops. If you have other suggestions, let us know. We're kind of just envisioning having this big sticky wall up on the wall and then having these posters beside it so that people can see it as we're having these discussions to help them frame everything. Then, of course, have information available on stock assessments and other useful information that people probably will want to have.

MR. HAYMANS: Amber, do you think your sticky wall is going to work in all locations, physically, because I'm thinking of some port locations, I'm thinking of fishermen's kitchens and outdoor patios or wherever it may be; will that work in all locations?

MS. VON HARTEN: Maybe not, although Ben was talking about having it at the dock in Port Salerno. I said all I need is a tarp that I can just hang this thing up. I think we can make it work. If it is a smaller group and it is a smaller location, then there are other ways we can do it. We can just use flip charts instead of the sticky wall and smaller pieces of paper. It is just really a good way to do it, because it is completely outside of anything that the council has done in terms of format. It seemed to keep people comfortable.

MR. JOLLEY: Amber, are you going to do a pilot first? Rather than schedule all the meetings and then go out and hit the road; are you going to do a pilot and then come back and say, okay, we hit this stakeholder group, here is what we learned and make those modifications and then go forward with the whole thing?

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, we did do a mock port meeting with staff one day. Then, of course, that is kind of what we did with the Snapper Grouper AP to a certain degree, which kind of led us to this discussion of tweaking it.

MR. JOLLEY: But not with the public?

MS. VON HARTEN: No, not with the public. I don't know; it is up to you guys.

DR. DUVAL: Well, it seems to me that each port meeting is going to be a little bit of a learning experience for the next one. There is probably going to be subtle tweaks that you will make for each of the port meetings depending on how many attendees you have there. One of the recommendations that the Snapper Grouper AP made was if you end up having a really large group of people, to allow folks to kind of break themselves down into smaller groups where they could answer some of these questions and put their sticky notes up on the sticky wall. I think to

some extent staff is going to operate a little bit on the fly depending on how many people show up at the port meetings.

MS. VON HARTEN: One thing, I know Anna has brought it up several times, is we were hoping that maybe we can do some kind of registration for the port meetings, so that we will have a better idea of how many people are going to come so that we can kind of gauge kind of what method we need to use. But, yes, the breakout sessions definitely are another tool we can use for large groups, unruly groups that don't seem to be focusing. You can actually shift all this and change it as it is happening, which is kind of the nice thing about this method.

DR. DUVAL: That was also another recommendation of the AP was to have some kind of RSVP thing as well, so that you had a sense of how many people might be showing up. I know Anna had suggested that as also a means of really capturing additional information, contact information for people to make sure we're really capturing as many folks as possible as well.

I am hoping folks are able to take a look at some of these questions. I am thinking perhaps we should run through those and see if there is anything we're missing; if there are questions that may need to be thrown out, just what you think in general about some of these questions, because we also need to discuss location and timing and things like that as well. How do you all feel about starting with sort of those communication questions?

DR. LANEY: All I was going to do is just say I have participated in some of those sticky wall exercises before and they work very well. The ones that I was involved in involved relatively small numbers of people like maybe 15 or 20. You could do breakout by sectors or state or something like that depending on where you were having the meetings.

Yes, Madam Chairman, I think going through the questions is a good idea. I'll weigh in as appropriate with some. I think we should ask them some habitat questions, what their perceptions are about whether or not they think the habitat is healthy and sustainable the way it is or whether there are issues in their areas. If so, what are those issues?

Again, I just got the new version that Mike sent us; but, Amber, do we talk about MPAs or do we even want to risk bringing that subject up? I know it can be highly inflammatory, but still it is a legitimate technique for fishery management. Maybe we should ask them what are your perceptions about MPAs? Have you read anything about MPAs? Do you think they work or do you think they don't work? Are they just something that you see as an egregious management option that you would never support? Those are the kinds of things I think we want to tease out; so I think we should ask the hard question.

DR. DUVAL: I don't think there was a question in there about MPAs, but obviously that came up as an issue that we would like to get some input on, so we definitely need a question like that in there.

MS. BROUWER: That reminds me and that brings up a question that I have is we just went around and came up with this list of issues that are important to the council to get input from stakeholders on; so how do you guys want us to get that input? One of the things that the AP suggested that we could do is to have a list sort of up on the wall and have those specific issues, just one word or two words like discards, MPAs, allocations, to elicit input from stakeholders.

We could do that or we could be more specific and ask – as Wilson was saying ask specific very direct questions about those issues, so you that you can get the input you need. That would be something good to give us guidance for how we're going to go about getting the input that you guys want.

MS. BECKWITH: I would kind of envision doing a little bit of both. You could have a poster set up with some of the more obvious things we're looking for feedback on and see if that kind of elicits peoples thoughts in those first non-leading questions that we're providing for folks. I think we also need to have some very specific questions in your back pocket.

You guys are clearly going to see how the room goes. If everybody does their homework appropriately and we come up with all the questions that everyone wants to elicit some answers on; there is likely going to be too many questions to get through in any one port meeting. You guys are going to have to gauge the room and get – some will get skipped, some will get handed off maybe.

A previous suggestion I had made is to make sure that we're providing a list of those questions to folks on their way out of the room with the e-mail address in the hopes that if there is any additional input while it is still fresh in their brain and conversations have occurred that someone might find the time to add in additional input. I would kind of plan for both.

MR. BELL: I was just trying to visualize this. In each of the areas, these are the questions – like when we did the dry run at the Snapper Grouper AP; the question would result in notes and sticky wall interaction. Whatever we do, you can't have too many questions or you will get swamped. I think three or four or so major questions or major areas that you want input on, you want sticky note input that goes on the wall would be good. I wouldn't overdo it.

Then like the first one there; how do you hear about what we're doing at the council? That is a newsletter or website, Facebook or that sort of thing. I think what would be useful is what could we do differently; how could we improve that? I wouldn't have too many questions in each area; you will get overrun.

MS. VON HARTEN: I agree; and I think those first few questions are kind of what they call softball questions that just get people warmed up. I think the sticky wall exercise, posting ideas and things like that would really be focused on just when we start getting to the strategies. When we're asking them, like what you just said, what are some things you would like to see the council try or what are some strategies that could address this specific issue? If you look further as you get into the sector-specific questions; that is the kind of questions that we would use the sticky wall for, the breakout group sessions. The other ones are just a round table discussion kind of a thing.

MR. BELL: And were we also thinking about doing some form of online where you would take the questions or the areas of the questions and have an online capability where they could provide input on line as well; same questions?

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes, as you all know we just launched our new website and have a fabulous web contractor that can do all sorts of really cool things. We just found out that we can actually set up a web comment form that will feed directly into an access database. That would

then allow us to do keyword searches and actually be compiling all the information, so it will make synthesizing all this much, much easier. So, yes, I would envision that we would have one for each sector if that is the route we go and do the sector-specific meetings.

MR. HAYMANS: I like the questions that are presented. I like the tone and the way they are targeting specific issues. Going back to the draft vision statement, we've sort of left out the habitat issue question specifically. I would like to know what the anglers think about artificial reefs as habitat and the council's role in artificial reefs and federal dollars going towards creating more habitat in that manner. I think that is probably specific to the recreational side and maybe the for-hire.

MR. HARTIG: I think the catch share stuff; you may get very different answers. When you go out, you're going to have peer pressure in the groups. I have witnessed this personally and I am sure you have as well. Some people aren't going to speak up based on maybe several vocal people in the group showing opposition.

I think on the internet questions we could have the catch share; how do you personally feel about the catch share? Would you like to have more materials? Would you like to know more about it? Not to do it, but just the educational aspect is all I would want to ask at this point. That is the only thing I would really want to focus on.

DR. LANEY: Amber, do you know or does Myra know – I know that for the federal agencies, if we are going to do any sort of a survey, there are all sorts of hoops we have to jump through. Is the council obligated to have to jump through those same hoops? Even if we set something up on the internet like that; does that constitute a survey?

DR. DUVAL: We talked about that actually a year ago, because the Mid-Atlantic Council did something similar and there is a provision for – it is like constituent outreach or customer service kind of survey that allows you to do something like that but without going through I think the Paperwork Reduction Act.

MS. VON HARTEN: Maybe if it is more of a comment form, it is not necessarily a survey, that is how we can get around that. For instance, the Gulf Council, for all of their amendments, they have a public comment form on their website. That is how they collect their web-based stuff. The same thing, it feeds into an access database, so I'm hoping' but we probably need to make sure.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, we definitely need to double check into those things. We had spoken with Mid-Atlantic Council staff about this back about a year ago regarding what they needed to do to implement their survey.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say if you call it an online public comment forum thing, I think you would be fine. I'm not an attorney; but it would make sense to me. One other point about the sticky wall exercise, I've been through a number of those and what really helps with that is to get people to just sort of free-flow ideas. You might get a little bit different input on the sticky notes than you get on the forum where they could sit there and devise a clever strategy or something. I think it would still be useful, but I would just consider it an additional public comment; it is not a survey.

DR. DUVAL: I want to sort of bring us back to focusing on the questions. We've gotten a couple extra ones. Doug would like to see a question specifically for I think the private recreational anglers on artificial reefs. Wilson has mentioned some specific questions on how folks feel about the quality of habitat for snapper grouper species in the South Atlantic.

I think it is definitely critical that we have a question there on how folks feel about the use of marine protected areas. If folks have read their Snapper Grouper AP report, which I know everybody has, then you saw that the advisory panel gave some great comment on that topic as well that could inform some of those questions. I'm looking for some additional feedback on these questions.

MS. VON HARTEN: Maybe I'll just kind of go through each sector ones. For the commercial sector-specific questions, starting out with asking them about what species they fish for; what are the ones that are the most important to them; which of the species are caught together most often and should be maintained open together when possible to avoid discards; thoughts on full-retention fishery versus use of size limits, which you all listed as some of your key issues earlier; are there certain species which full retention makes sense; size limits make sense?

Then the allocations issues, specifically asking are current allocations between sectors acceptable? Are there some specific species we should take a closer look at? How should the landings' information determine allocations?

Are there other methods other than landings to fairly determine the allocations? Should council consider allowing multi-day trip limits to be taken by boats equipped with VMS, if we are going to get back into VMS questions?

Are there regulations in other fisheries that impact your ability to operate profitably in the snapper grouper fishery? Then the science question that Michelle mentioned earlier; are there better and more efficient ways to collect commercial catch/effort/discard economic data? How would you suggest improving the commercial logbook? Are there any other thoughts on commercial questions?

DR. DUVAL: I think if we include like a question about spatial management, MPAs, in there, that would be good. I think that is probably a question for all of the sectors really.

MR. COX: I was going to say I think the most important one that you've asked already is how they interact with different species and would they like to try to set seasons up different than what we have. That is going to be a big one there. That is good that is covered.

MS. BECKWITH: We can even go through afterwards and really think about, as time allows, which of these questions and what order we want them to be presented, because I think some questions are going to get a more aggressive response from folks. We might even want to think through how we present them in order.

DR. DUVAL: That might also shift a little bit depending on the group and sort of the answers that you get to those first major questions about what is working for the fish and for the fishermen versus what is not. That might inform question order as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are you going to put these questions out somewhere on the web ahead of time, so fishermen will know that that is what is going to be on their things to think about when they get there?

DR. DUVAL: Yes; I think we absolutely should so that people have the opportunity to think about it and come prepared with some answers.

MS. VON HARTEN: Of course, we also want to try to engage the chefs and dealers, tourism folks as well. Anna came up with some questions for those folks as well; so supply chain issues, when are you having the greatest trouble obtaining species for distribution or sale? What species are in greatest demand?

Will the Sustainable Caught Program the councils are advocating help with marketing and price? Then for chefs, not all fish are available year round, so even if quotas/catch limits are not filled, what are the most popular fish on your menu? How can the council help educate consumers on fish availability; on the need to protect species during times when they are spawning?

MR. PATE: I apologize if you've already covered this and I just happened to fall asleep during the discussion; but a lot of the emphasis in fisheries management is going to electronic reporting and electronic monitoring. Are you asking any questions about how they feel about that? I think that is particularly true in some of the reef fisheries that we deal with in the South Atlantic.

DR. DUVAL: I agree, Pres; and given that that was one of the issues that came up as we were sort of brainstorming around the table here about electronic monitoring and electronic reporting; I think it would be great to add a question like that to the mix.

DR. LANEY: I presumed when reading over this thing that those sorts of questions may fall into the science part down there kind of at the bottom, because we have the comment in there that many stakeholders may not be aware of existing science and data collection programs beyond their direct experience.

One question, in addition to asking them about the electronic monitoring, as a relatively novel way to collect data, we might want to ask them if they have suggestions for improving data collection programs. We constantly hear about the fact that, well, there is a lot of criticism of the way the Science Center programs actually collect the data. Who knows; maybe the fishermen can come up with a better way to do it.

Also, new technologies, they may be more aware of those than we are. One that was recently brought to my attention by our GIS person in North Carolina is the use of LIDAR for monitoring fish populations. I guess that is a developing technique that may be useful for some species when the water is clear enough. Things like that; they may know about some things that we haven't heard about yet. It would be worthwhile to ask those questions.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; and I think sort of we were trying to get at some of that with sort of the last bullet I think under each of the sector-specific questions are there better, more efficient ways to collect that catch and effort data. I had thought about that mostly, because I think that is what people are most familiar with in those sectors and maybe not necessarily the independent stuff.

I think that also leads nicely to a question about electronic monitoring. It may be that people bring that up as another method for doing so.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say you could pull some of this together. You've got two separate bullets dealing with VMS specifically, but maybe that could be pulled into just a general question about their acceptance of electronic monitoring in general without using those three letters together, as well as electronic reporting in there as well; just maybe cut down again on the number of questions, but you're covering the areas you want to cover with both electronic monitoring and reporting.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a great suggestion.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just going through your groupings of questions; are you intending to put each grouping of questions to a separate timeframe for that particular stakeholder group or are we going to group some of these stakeholder groups together? I can see the utility of having the chefs in the same room with the fishermen; so the fishermen can say, yes, I can catch grouper this time of year; or, no, I can't catch grouper this time of year because I'm catching something else. They could understand even though it may be open, it may not be readily available. Do you want to just leave that with dealers and chefs, who could probably explain a lot of the same stuff? What is the general method to the madness?

DR. DUVAL: I think that is the next topic we're going to get into. I kind of wanted to make sure that we were capturing all the questions we would want to ask in order to elicit the type of information that we're looking for from each sector; but that is a great question, and that gets to sort of the general structure of port meetings and the different alternatives that we have.

Amber and Myra have put together an attachment to deal with that. I think I would prefer if we could make sure that we've got the appropriate questions or suggestions to eliminate some questions or combine a few; and then we'll move on to what you were talking about, Charlie.

MR. BELL: We've got under chefs and dealers the supply chain, but keep in mind the fishermen have a concept from their viewpoint of supply chain and what works. When you ask a chef, a chef might also give you an answer that they may be thinking of different things. They may be a little more creative. It is not just what they can get now or what they would like to get now; it is what are the potentials there?

The chef side might give you a completely different answer about what they would like. They could expand beyond what they are currently getting; but you need to kind of deal with the supply aspect from the fishermen's perspective, the dealer and the chefs, or the end user. You might get different answers from all of them.

MS. VON HARTEN: For-hire; what are your most important seasons and species? What are you targeting most often, catching together, discarding most often? What species are most important to maintain open seasons together when possible? Are there ways the council can improve fishing opportunity and trip satisfaction? Would knowing the season start and end dates at the beginning of the year help stabilize your fishing years and allow you to plan for your business better than current fishery closures?

Allocations for most species have been based on 50 percent historical landings, 50 percent on recent landings; are there other ways to use landings to determine allocations? These look like the same type of questions for the commercial except should there be a specific for-hire sector allocation for quota/tags?

Then the science question is what is your level of confidence in how catch effort data are collected; and are there specific ways the for-hire sector can assist in improving the accuracy of this information? Perhaps we need to add again the electronic reporting and monitoring. Do we want spatial management and MPA questions? Okay, so kind of copy those from the commercial.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any thoughts or specific feedback on that; adding a question to talk about the electronic monitoring, electronic reporting and a question regarding use of spatial management? Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Maybe a question about the VMS for validation with the electronic reporting, something to see what the for-hire sector's opinion is of the VMS for their boats.

DR. DUVAL: When you say for validation, do you mean validation of data being collected?

MR. BOWEN: Of their reporting.

MS. BECKWITH: I personally don't want to see a VMS question for for-hire. If you want to go in the back and duke it out, let's go.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I do think it's valid. We heard a lot of feedback during the VMS public hearings from all sectors even though it was being applied specifically to the commercial sector. I do think that maybe the approach that Mel suggested of sort of lumping all of this into electronic monitoring and electronic reporting, you could say in parentheses electronic logbooks, vessel monitoring systems that give some examples of it. VMS is not a technology that applies to just one sector.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am guessing you are not necessarily talking the VMS like the rock shrimp guys use, but maybe a VMS for just data collection, that just tracks the data logger that is not going to be used for law enforcement, which would probably be a lot more palatable.

MR. HARTIG: Well, yes, Zack, the VMS would be important as one part of the validation, but you really need observers if you're going to validate what the for-hire fishery is catching compared to their logbooks. That is what you really need. You probably need both at some level.

MR. BOWEN: I totally agree, but we just need to keep in mind when it comes to this MPA material that we're fixing to discuss as well. Personally I just don't see how we can implement MPAs and not have VMS to go along with it.

MS. VON HARTEN: For the recreational sector; what species do you fish for the most? What time of year do you fish for snapper grouper species? What species do you catch most often

together? What species do you find yourself throwing back the most and why? Again, another allocation couple of questions; are there other ways to use landings to determine allocations?

Are there other ways to fairly determine allocations other than landings? That is kind of the same question. Then the science question; are you familiar with how recreational catch and effort data are collected? Are there ways anglers can contribute to improving the accuracy of recreational catch and effort information? Probably again we need to include these same additional questions, I would assume.

DR. DUVAL: Regarding the use of spatial management, marine protected areas, electronic reporting, probably – Doug had the question about use of artificial reefs and how folks feel about that. Doug, please add.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I guess talking about validation; are the first couple of questions simply validating MRIP or do we really expect there to be a different answer from the fishermen about what they catch than what MRIP shows us?

DR. DUVAL: Are you talking about the for-hire questions?

MR. HAYMANS: No, we're on recreational now, right? What species do you fish for most; well, that is a question that MRIP is supposed to answer. I'm just asking do we expect there to be a different answer than what we get out of MRIP and the same for the timing of year and that sort of thing?

DR. DUVAL: We might, depending on the level of intercept information. We might get a different sense of what is being targeted where than what MRIP might be able to tell us.

MR. CUPKA: One thing I think we need to keep in mind as they start compiling the responses to these questions; that not only will we need to do it by sector, and this is probably obvious, but we still need to make sure we keep it in mind that we also need to compile this information geographically since some of this we're trying to get regional management.

There are going to be differences in the responses based on the geographic area of the meeting. I don't think we can just combine all the recreational. We are going to have to combine the recreational and also have a geographical combination of responses, too, to look at some of these issues.

DR. DUVAL: Great point.

MS. VON HARTEN: The last sector was the tourism sector, which perhaps those could be combined with chefs and restaurants as well. I'm not sure; they could be together as a group. What time of year does your most important season occur? What educational outreach information would it be useful for you or your business to have regarding fishing opportunities?

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to suggest that I would think those would follow the charter/for-hire sector, although there are tourists who shore fish and pier fish – well, not in the EEZ are they. I would think those questions would fall under the for-hire.

DR. DUVAL: I think we were specifically thinking about – I’m just recalling I think the Orlando meeting last year where we had a lot of folks from tourism bureaus coming and talking about the impact of the red snapper closure on hotels and businesses like that. I don’t disagree that those could be combined with the for-hire sector. I think maybe we were sort of thinking of a different group of folks.

MR. BELL: Yes, beyond just – I wouldn’t classify it as tourism, but you’ve got folks – all the business associated with bait, tackle, the supply side of the fisheries; they are severely impacted depending on how things go by this, so maybe a classification for just associated businesses or industries.

DR. DUVAL: Marine-related business.

MR. BELL: Yes; because I hear when things get shut down and the fishing doesn’t occur, the folks that are selling the tackle and selling the equipment, they get right vocal.

DR. DUVAL: That is a great comment.

DR. LANEY: Do tournaments fit under tourism as well? We don’t have a specific question in here. I don’t know if we need one; but it might be interesting to know since we ask what time of year does your most important season occur whether or not in some cases those may coincide with the scheduling of tournaments. That just occurred to me.

DR. DUVAL: That is a great suggestion, Wilson. Are there other thoughts or comments on these questions? I think obviously Myra and Amber can clean these up a bit and incorporate the input on here and send these back out around to council for another quick look-see. If there are other specific questions we think need to be added beyond what we’ve talked about here, we can do so.

DR. LANEY: This might be getting out on the fringe a bit, but it occurs to me that we might be interested – I would certainly be interested in knowing whether or not – I guess particularly for the for-hire folks and even for the recreational folks – how important it is for them to see a healthy ecosystem or to assess that the ecosystem is healthy based on the other things they observe while they are out fishing.

Is it important to them to see marine mammals, for example, while they are out there? Do they enjoy seeing pelagic seabirds? I know some of our for-hire folks may switch their activity – and Anna may want to speak to this – at certain times of the year from fishing directly to doing pelagic seabird trips or marine mammal trips. Is that something of interest to us from an economic perspective in terms of the overall management of the council’s jurisdiction in the South Atlantic? I don’t know; I just throw that out for consideration.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a valid question for any of the stakeholder groups and not just for-hire or recreational folks. I think certainly tourism directors are going to have some opinions of a healthy ecosystem for eco-tourism activities. Certainly, commercial fishermen are going to have some opinions on ecosystem health in that regard as well. One of the suggestions I was going to make probably at a future meeting is the goal statement we have with regard to habitat.

I was going to suggest we broaden that to really be more of an ecosystem kind of goal as opposed to just specifically a habitat goal, because habitat would be incorporated in that.

MR. BELL: It just made me think of that when Wilson was talking about it. There are a whole 'nother group of folks here being divers, recreational divers, the recreational dive industry. The importance to them of healthy habitats and systems and that is a big deal in Florida, biggest deal in Florida, probably; but as you move north, we still have a recreational dive industry that likes to go out and either shoots fish or not shoot fish, look at fish. That could be part of the eco-tourism; but it is not just all about recreational fishermen and commercial fishermen.

MS. BECKWITH: To Mel's point, we don't have any questions that are kind of directed towards that scuba sector for fishing. It is all really – I guess in my mind has been more hook and line clearly; so that is something to take into consideration.

MS. BROUWER: Before I forget, somebody mentioned observers. Is that something that the council would want to ask stakeholders about; do they want the council to maybe consider observers?

MS. BECKWITH: My thought and what I was thinking to Wilson's point earlier is I think we're going to answer questions that we don't have a whole lot of control over right now. I'm not sure that mammals and seabirds and observers are what we necessarily want to spend that kind of precious 120 minutes getting feedback on.

DR. DUVAL: Well, certainly, the use of observers may come out during some of the discussion. Observers are a form of data collection; we use them in North Carolina. I think observer data can be very useful as well; so that might come out in terms of improvement in data collection.

MR. PHILLIPS: I wouldn't plan on dwelling on it, but it might be a good question on just are you willing to do this to help with data collection; and just, yes, no, and just get a general sentiment. Then we can go back to the Science Center and say we've got people willing; if you get the money, then our sectors are willing to do this or not willing. It would be a good thing to know and it wouldn't take much time, I don't think.

DR. DUVAL: We have 43 minutes left, and it seems like we've gone through these questions pretty thoroughly. For the most part, folks are somewhat satisfied with the breadth of the questions. I think if there are specific edits or wordsmithing that you would like to see, I would ask that you make some changes and pass those on to Myra and Amber. What I would really like to focus on now is the format of the port meetings. I believe that Attachment 4 was a handout on the structure of port meetings. I think we have some decisions to make here.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; it is Attachment 4;; and pretty much this document just talks about our options. Well, the facilitation part, staff will be facilitating using this focus conversation method if you all feel that is appropriate. What we really need to focus on is identifying locations, whether or not we're going to do sector-specific meetings or group them all together; and how those sector specific meetings might flesh out, the length of them and where these meetings will occur in each state and the timing of them.

If we have time, talk about some of the outreach that we would like to do prior to the port meetings, which is where that last Attachment 8 is the flyer that we drafted up that we would like to send out to all the permit holders. That is what we need to kind of decide, probably first and foremost whether or not we want to do sector-specific meetings or not.

MR. BELL: Just to kind of set this up, we say that the meetings will be facilitated by staff. I guess the limiting factor in this whole thing might be who is staff; how many staff are we talking about and what is the capacity? You can't be everywhere at the same time. That may drive what we end up structuring this around is staff capability.

DR. DUVAL: I completely agree. I saw Mike Collins in the background with his hand raised, and he had two fingers that were held up.

DR. CUPKA: Yes; I've thought about this a little bit, too. You remember last year when we started this whole exercise, I said I thought it could be one of the most important activities this council has undertaken and I still feel that way. We do need to keep in mind that it is staff involvement; and the more meetings we have the more staff involvement is going to be.

There are two people on the team that are particularly involved in other activities; and that is Myra and Kari. To the extent that we have a lot of meetings, I'm sure it is going to impact their work on amendments, too; and we need to keep that in mind. I do think it is a very important activity and we need to do it and do it right. If that involves doing so at the expense maybe of moving an amendment forward or letting it slip a meeting, we need to keep that in mind, particularly as we look at the number of meetings and the involvement of staff.

DR. DUVAL: I absolutely agree, David, and I had sort of assumed that Amber would be the staff person for whom this would be taking up the most amount of time and that Myra and Kari and perhaps other staff might be able to rotate through different port meetings so that burden was spread out somewhat.

I think it is going to be very important for Amber to have another staff member there as support. Certainly, I think all of us are committed to attending whatever port meetings are occurring particularly within our respective states. We're in more or less an observation mode or speak only when spoken to kind of thing. I don't know what other folks are thinking and what has been discussed at the staff level; but I think that was something I was thinking about. Amber I think wanted to respond to that.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; I just also wanted to mention that we also are going to be hiring an intern that is going to be coming to the port meetings. They will have a small stipend and they will also have their travel covered. They will be coming to the meetings to help us do the recording. Me and whoever the other staff person can actually be up there facilitating and running the meetings. The intern will be actually recording and compiling, typing notes and capturing everything electronically.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to suggest Charlie and I have just very briefly talked about locations, and Zack and I haven't at all, why not maybe over lunch or something each state's representatives talk about locations and who they thought might attend those – you know, not on an individual level.

DR. DUVAL: Look at the screen.

MR. HAYMANS: Rather than doing it in an open forum, and then we can bring those specific ones back by state.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a fine idea, Doug. What Amber is displaying up on the screen right now is from the previous meeting's briefing book where we had sort of given a rough list of potential sites for port meetings based on council member input previously. Amber has also included the input that we received at the Snapper Grouper AP with regard to potential locations.

I think the struggle here is, obviously, we have said that we want these to be the stakeholders' meetings; and we would like folks to host those meetings so that it is a bottom-up rather than a top-down approach with regard to holding these meetings. That said, we can't just sit back and wait until someone necessarily raises their hand and says, "Oh, well, I'm willing to do this."

Now, that said, we did get a number of folks on the AP who said, "Hey, I would be willing to host a meeting in this location," even at a specific restaurant or whatever within a city. I don't have a problem with asking council members to put their heads together and try to focus on several areas. I'm sure Jack, Anna and I could probably come up with three major areas in North Carolina that are reflective of the regional differences within the state.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes; I was actually thinking specifics, where; not just the area, but at what location and who might. But, you know, we walk – I don't know, maybe it is not a fine line, but I understand you want bottom up, but the council has directed this process.

We're setting the questions. It is going to be viewed as a top-down process. We're asking for input on what we've already established as questions. That opportunity for the anglers to get in at the bottom; I think we've already missed that train.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think it is a little disappointing for me to hear that, because we said from the outset that we wanted to make sure the input that we were receiving from people was focused; that this was not just an open forum to just complain. Certainly, we're going to get venting, and we do at any public hearing where people show up.

We really wanted some ideas and solutions that could help us improve the way the fishery is managed. I understand what you're saying in that you feel that the questions are top-down; and because we are coming up with the questions, that this creates a perception that this is a top-down kind of process; but the input is meant to be bottom-up.

We're just trying to focus the kind of input that we're getting so that we are asking the public for what are some tools, what are some new things that the council hasn't considered in terms of management of the fishery. I really hope that is seen as bottom-up.

MR. BELL: To Doug's comment; you've got to give them something to focus on or it will turn into just a complaint session or something. I think we have to direct them into some specific areas to get input; otherwise, you will have a two-hour or three-hour session of complaining, potentially; but that is just to help focus the discussion and the input.

The point I wanted to make, going back to the schedule; we've established a schedule right now, so the schedule is kind of driving this process. In other words, if we want to have the meetings take place by the spring of '14, okay, well, there are only so many days between now and then, and there are only so many Amber Days.

We just kind of need to do the math and see what we can really support, because maybe we can only support three meetings in each state if you have got to be at all of them or staff do. That will direct then decisions about do we divide them out into sectors and that sort of thing? It is a matter of capacity. Your other option is you slide the process or something. If there is not enough Amber to go around, then you have to move the date or something, but if we want that date to be fixed.

DR. DUVAL: I think we're all definitely, absolutely aware that it is a huge capacity issue. We have to find the balance of trying to make sure that we're hitting locations within each state where we're likely to get good participation; and balancing that with I think timing of when the stakeholders that we're trying to reach are most likely to actually show up, balanced with staff capacity as well.

MR. MAHOOD: Just so you have some idea of what we're looking at resources-wise; you will be looking at kind of a draft 2014 budget coming at the Executive Finance Committee Meeting. Obviously, we don't know what our budget is going to be; but in the budget we've created, we've funded 16 meetings, which would be four per state if it was equal.

I don't know that you need to have it equal. You can kind of work from that number; and that is as close as we're going to get. That allows for I think 20 travel days, Mike said. Then you also need to – I can't recall Mike, what was the attendance on that; two paid or unpaid council members per meeting.

DR. DUVAL: Well, we know who the unpaid people are.

MR. MAHOOD: You could come to every one of them. That will give you a rough idea what we're looking at. Obviously, that can change. If you want to have more, we can budget for more. Ultimately it will come down to what we get in 2014.

MS. VON HARTEN: I think that maybe hearing that number is why we probably need to do sector-specific meetings; because if there are 16 meetings, that doesn't mean that one whole meeting has to be devoted just to one sector. Ideally these meetings, we're thinking hopefully no more than two hours in length. I think it's feasible; I'm willing to do at least two a day. That way we could reach a couple of sectors in one day and make the most use of our time. That is just my idea.

MR. HARTIG: Well, Jessica and I were just talking about it and I think John might agree that we've got two probably additional places for meetings, Port Salerno and West Palm Beach, but I think West Palm Beach you could focus specifically on the recreational sector and then in Port Salerno specifically the commercial sector. Then that way you wouldn't have to have two meetings in each place, which would help.

MR. CONKLIN: My comment was just to the staffing issue; and with the interest from some of the fellows on the Snapper Grouper AP, we could perhaps just chat with them a little bit beforehand and get them to help us facilitate some of the actions and the organization of the meeting itself. It would be a great resource. If you empower somebody to do something like that, they take some ownership to it and probably get a better input from the stakeholders that show up.

DR. DUVAL: That is exactly what we're looking for. I'll pick on Kenny Fex, because I know he is here in the audience. Kenny had tried to get sort of a town hall type meeting together; it was last year I think right around this time. I think we had a gag reopening that sort of interfered with that along with a little bit of weather. There are folks out there – and Kenny is, of course, on our AP – who are willing and able to do that. That is the kind of hosting that we're definitely looking for to assist in this effort.

DR. LANEY: Chris made one point I was going to make, which was to Doug's original point. I don't think we've missed the train, because we have the AP involved in this, and they certainly represent the grass roots component, the bottom-up buy-in that we're looking for. I think Chris' idea about trying to involve the AP, specifically those AP members in the planning and the implementation of the whole process is a good way to ensure that we do stay on the train to a certain extent at least.

You can't involve every single individual, although to the extent they will participate via the internet you can certainly reach a tremendous number of them. Hopefully, it will be more of a bottom-up exercise. The second point was that we're really dealing with two strata. It is not just the allocation sectors, but David already made the point it is the geography also.

When we're talking about where to place those meetings, we need to consider both of those things. It might be useful to put together some sort of a matrix maybe, I don't know. If you've already allocated – were the four meetings specifically thinking of allocating four to each state? If you did it equally, but you might want to consider what you think the necessity is for having those regional geographic sectors.

What sectors do we want to look at? Do we want to look at four states or do we want to look at it more from a marine bio-regional perspective; north of Cape Hatteras and then Cape Hatteras to Cape Canaveral and south of Cape Canaveral, something like that. I don't know, that might be a useful tool for implementation.

DR. DUVAL: I was certainly thinking geographically like that; just speaking only for North Carolina and knowing that the differences that occur north of Hatteras versus Hatteras south to say through the Morehead City area; then maybe south, Sneads Ferry through to Southport.

There are certainly differences both in terms of the species distribution as well as how the fishery operates and things like that. I'm sure the other states are thinking the same way as well. Doug has suggested that the state delegations, if you will, sort of caucus over lunch and try to come up with some locations that they think would be ideal to focus on, in other words, city and even maybe potentially more specific than that; location within city.

One of the things that Mike pointed out to me is that if there are places such as this that we would want to book these meetings, there needs to be 30 days advanced notice for Cindy to do something like that. I was thinking more along the lines of if we have folks who are willing to host these meetings and help stand them up; that they would be willing to do so at the Oregon Inlet Fishing Center or the Wanchese Community Center or locations where you don't need to book something. It is at somebody's dock or it is at somebody's fish house or something like that; but I realize that there may be a need for greater space than maybe some of those locations offer.

MS. VON HARTEN: I ask that when you all discuss this today at lunch, I can send out the spreadsheet again so everybody can have that for their discussions, but also look at some of the cities listed here, like, for instance, Jacksonville/Mayport area and St. Augustine. It is very feasible that we could possibly be in one location in the morning and another location in the afternoon, so that that would be one day. Think about pairing them and also which sectors you are going to be reaching in each of those different communities.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I will be happy to work with you ahead of time to figure out if we have notice issues; does this need to be published in the Federal Register and all that, and then any PRA kinds of concerns with surveys and all that. We can talk ahead of time and work all that out.

DR. DUVAL: Those were some of the questions that we had early on with Mid-Atlantic Council staff when they were doing this. I believe they noticed the process on their website, and then noted that locations for port meetings would be forthcoming, I think. Those port meeting locations were simply posted on the website as they became available. It might be a good idea to touch base with them. Mary Clark at the Mid-Atlantic Council was the lead on that.

One of the things that the AP also discussed was really the timing of the port meetings. We have in-person scoping meetings and public hearings are going to be happening at the end of January. Some of the input that we've received is that really more the winter months would be best for conducting these port meetings; I think February, March in certain areas; April in other areas. It seems to me probably prior to May 1st when groupers open up is really the input that we've received. I think we need to have a little bit of discussion about that or thoughts that folks have on the timing of these meetings.

MR. BOWEN: For Georgia, I would try to go before April 1st. For the for-hire sector that I'm speaking of, our season kicks off around St. Patrick's Day – with that being said, maybe early part of March or even February.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I know if you are going to get any commercial participation, you are going to have to do it after vermilion close, which is probably going to be – let's just say mid-March. We could do it mid-March, before April. That would probably work best for our guys.

DR. DUVAL: Thoughts from other folks regarding timing at this point? It sounds like this is something that is going to have to be really kind of juggled. None of these are going to occur until after the January public hearings, correct? February will be the earliest that any of these meetings would occur.

I think each of the states might be able to, when you are considering the locations, also think about the timing of when you would want folks there. I am guessing that staff was hoping to be able to sort of go to a state, be in one state in a particular week and just spend a week there and then be able to come back and go to a different state. You can't be in two states at once. That is something to consider.

MR. HARTIG: One time you don't want to do it in South Florida is May. We have fisheries we fish for the whole year. It is just going to be a question of whether or not – March/April, that is a transition time. Jacks are open in March, but it is usually pretty blowy in March, so you don't get a lot of time to go.

DR. DUVAL: Certainly, not everybody might be able to attend a port meeting in March. There are going to be some folks who may be out on the water; but if they can communicate those thoughts to others who can represent them, I think that would be a good thing. Clearly, there are going to be folks who are simply just not able to attend no matter how much they would like to; so something to keep in mind.

MR. HARTIG: To that point, we have the online and you can always give your comments over the internet.

DR. DUVAL: We may need to have sort of intermittent pushes for that at various points throughout the spring, just kind of reminding folks that there are other methods for you to provide your input on this process as well.

MR. BELL: Is the thinking that we would specifically advertise some of these as recreational, for-hire, industry, restaurant versus commercial? I'm just trying to figure out slots. It is a public meeting, anybody can show up; but the idea you would advertise it as recreational or commercial focused, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: Pres is shaking his head; and I know that the Mid-Atlantic council, when they went through and did their port meetings, they were not specifically advertised as being for a particular sector. The location kind of determined that, really. It wasn't advertised as being sector-specific, but the location sort of determined that particular focus.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm thinking if they are talking about maybe doing a couple of meetings a day and not necessarily in the same place; say in Georgia if they wanted to go to St. Simons and catch recreational for-hire and then come later up into the docks and catch my commercial guys, and they are allocating two hours.

Then you get some recreational guys come from somewhere else, but we've only allocated two hours; it could be a problem trying to get everything in. You may want to say we're going to try to concentrate on a certain sector; take any comments we get obviously, because we don't want to leave anybody out. And then just be wise of the time that they are going to spend. Now if we're going to do all of them in one place, then that is not going to be a problem, because everybody is going to show up accordingly. But if you are actually going to try to go to a place for a sector and another sector shows up, and you've allocated two hours; what happens?

MS. BROUWER: I guess what I would do is sort of that is one of the situations that I think a breakout group scenario would work. Like we have said, we would have to sort of be flexible. If there are two of us, maybe one person would take the commercial group and the other person would take the – you know, we would have to be flexible and work around those situations.

MR. BELL: What is helpful though is if staff can handle two meetings a day or something, it gives you opportunities to do that. Then like you say, if people just show up – like, for instance, the for-hire guys, well, they are recreational, but they're commercial; so they may be making a living during the day. They may prefer to come in the evening or something when you've scheduled the commercial one. If we've got flexibility to kind of break out specific interests for them or something; that is great. Then some of them are also dual, too, dually permitted.

DR. DUVAL: I think some of the questions that we've laid out for the different sectors are similar enough that for dually permitted folks you could probably capture both sets of input, I would hope.

MR. CONKLIN: Maybe this is a little bit off the wall; but depending on our participation we could kind of run a real quick survey in the beginning and get a vibe for what kind of crowd we have. Then you can figure out if you are going to do your breakout or whatever. If you get 30 people and you have 25 commercial guys and 5 recreational, you wouldn't want to allocate somebody to a user group that is not theirs. It is not going to be a perfect one-size-fits-all for anything. These people have common sense, too, so we'll make it work.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a great approach. You could do sort of a show of hands at the beginning of the meeting and do something like that.

MS. VON HARTEN: If we do the RSVP thing, that will give us a better idea. Hopefully, we'll have a little better idea beforehand.

DR. DUVAL: More value for RSVP. There was one other agenda item that we wanted to cover today, which was the outreach, in terms of advertising for the port meetings. There are a few different attachments, I think 6, 7 and 8. There is a flyer that the Visioning Workgroup had been working on. We've also got fact sheets and an overview and other materials posted on the website.

MS. VON HARTEN: The fact sheet and overview, those are the ones that you've already looked at before; and they have just been updated to reflect what is happening now. They haven't changed much; but the port meeting flyer is the new outreach document. Just to kind of give you an idea of what we were thinking is first of all we need everybody's help at the table to help promote these meetings once we have them scheduled.

We're hoping that all the council members will do their part in promoting them. We also talked about taking this flyer and actually mailing it to all of the permit holders in the region as well as having it on the website and just trying to hit them at all different angles, and also hosting a kick-off webinar for people that would like to tune in and learn more information about the visioning process and the port meetings.

Of course, use the AP's contacts to help set up meetings and host them and do the registration links for people attending the meetings. Those are our ideas. This has gone through many iterations. We're trying to make it flashy, catchy; really conveying that the council wants people's input.

They need their input to help make a difference in the future management of the fishery. This is kind of just a brief introduction; but the background, the purpose of the port meetings, kind of how they will be structured; some questions for them to kind of consider to get them to start thinking about what the council is actually going to be asking at these meetings; how they can participate and attend; also reiterating that they can always submit written comments via the website or by mail. This would be the backside of the flyer that you would fold in half that would be the attention-getter. We figure putting a red snapper on there would be a good tactic. This is one of the tools, and we would love to hear your feedback.

MR. HAYMANS: Are you frustrated with the Federal Fisheries Management Decisions? Come on, that just inflames – we said already we don't want it to be – I just think that inflames it right from the beginning. I like the second point, do you have new ideas, I think that is great. Now is the chance to have your voice heard – well, we hear their voices at every public meeting. I don't want to minimize the fact that they have public input there. Now is your chance to – I don't know, I have issues with those two statements.

MS. McCAWLEY: I had some of those same thoughts; and I also saw a small error. Above the part that says get involved, there is a run-on word there.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Doug's point, maybe we want to say bring your ideas and just be specific; bring your solutions. We want to hear their voice but we want solutions.

MR. BELL: I mentioned this to the Snapper Grouper AP, but what we really want people to do is come and work. We want them to come and actually participate in a constructive process and work with us. I kind of agree if you kind of focus on the frustration part, you might tend to get a little bit more complaining than you want; but we really want people to come and help us do this, help us actually construct the future and not to come and be frustrated.

DR. DUVAL: What I'm hearing is that the "are you frustrated with federal fisheries management decisions" might not be one of the best questions to be putting on the flyer here. But the other two questions, do you have new ideas and please come share your knowledge, are definitely things that we want to keep.

MR. HARTIG: Those are good points that have been brought out about the wording, Jessica and Doug brought up. Maybe we voice it in what we're trying to actually do with the visioning process; how do you think the council should reframe its management or whatever, however we word it. I won't be the best one to do that; but just reword that portion to frame it more of what we are really focusing on.

MS. BECKWITH: I would I guess take out "now is a chance to," but I would keep "have your voice heard"; because I think we do get a lot of folks that come to public comment at our meetings, but we also get a lot of public that never comes to the meetings and don't necessarily

think they are able to be heard. I would take out the “now is the chance to”, but I would personally leave the rest in.

MR. BOWEN: The first line of do you want to make a difference; again, I am probably not the one to word it perfectly, but maybe please come make a difference. I don't know the word I'm looking for, but it seems a little more –

DR. DUVAL: Inviting.

MR. BOWEN: Yes; thank you.

MR. CONKLIN: Maybe we could do something along the lines of we're looking for constructive input from stakeholders like you to help us in making our management decisions; just to have some sort of a backbone to refer back to when things might get a little bit off the subject or a little bit more vocalized.

MR. JOLLEY: I think it was touched on; I would just say under the first comment that was brought up on your flyer here, I would just say come help us with federal fisheries management.

DR. LANEY: The only thing I was going to say is it strikes me that this exercise is different than all the other public opportunities that they participated in the past. If we could think of some catch phrase, something that really zinged that captures that difference, like we just don't need you; we need your vision or something like that.

That is in there, but something that emphasizes the fact that this is very different from anything the council has done in the past. It is a limited opportunity, because we are not going to do this kind of visioning annually. This is a one-shot thing that is going to stretch for hopefully a period of time into the future. The analogous opportunity I can think of from a habitat perspective is FERC relicensing.

The National Marine Fisheries Service and the states and Fish and Wildlife Service have one opportunity to get that right. It comes along about every 30 to 50 years. Hopefully, we'll be doing this again maybe not that far down the road, but still it is a limited opportunity and it is a unique opportunity. If we can somehow capture that on the flyer, maybe that will help encourage people to participate.

DR. DUVAL: Yes those are great suggestions, Wilson, that this is a limited opportunity.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just an idea along the lines of what Doug had said and then many of you did, too; instead of voice heard, maybe it is their ideas heard. That gets them where they need to start thinking.

DR. DUVAL: Another thing that I just want to make sure – we touched on this a little bit at our last meeting and the workgroup has had some discussion about it, but in terms of getting the word out there, reaching out to any fishing clubs or fishing organizations and making sure that we have that contact information on file. Anna and I have talked a little bit about this in the context of North Carolina, but it may be that these port meetings don't – I mean, obviously we are not going to be able to capture everybody with port meetings.

We may receive requests from fishing clubs or organizations to come talk to them about this during that timeframe when we are accepting comments on visioning. Certainly, we will be doing so for the next many months. One of the things that we had talked about was if Anna and I get an invitation to come talk to a fishing club, perhaps we could use the little PowerPoint overview that staff is putting together and carry with us some of the materials like the list of questions and things like that. It is a more informal means of trying to capture input.

I could foresee one of us taking notes or something like that. I think we need to be mindful that those opportunities are going to be out there and certainly not discourage them if we want to be as inclusive as possible. There are a lot of fishing clubs that are located in inland locations. I think Mel had mentioned Colombia. There are multiple angling clubs in the Raleigh area in North Carolina and I'm sure the same exists in inland parts of other states as well. That is just something I want to throw out there in terms of reaching people.

MS. BECKWITH: To that point; that is actually what I've been doing as I've been listening. I was Googling the saltwater fishing clubs in North Carolina and have found six that we can contact that would kind of consider the expanse of the recreational fishery. I think it is a good way of contacting a subsector.

DR. DUVAL: I want to be mindful of our time and wrap things up; but are there any last thoughts right now before we review our homework assignment, which is that the different state representatives are going to get together and discuss port meeting locations that would hopefully satisfy reaching all the different sectors that we're trying to reach, being mindful that we have limited staff capacity and a limited number of meetings over which to do that.

If there is a way that we can double up on meetings, as Amber and Myra have suggested in hitting a couple different locations and potentially different sectors within the same day; that would be great. If we could have that by Thursday morning, that would be fantastic. So sometime between now and Thursday morning get together and then provide that feedback to Myra and Amber, whether it is by e-mail, handwritten note or whatever. Thank you, everybody, for another three hours of hard work again this morning or almost three hours. Mr. Chairman, I turn things back over to you.

(Whereupon. the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 o'clock noon, December 2, 2013.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
December 30, 2013

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2013 - 2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

✓ **Dr. Michelle Duval**
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell St.
(PO Box 769)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/808-8011 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

✓ **Robert E. Beal**
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

✓ **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

✓ **Zack Bowen**
11 Kingsridge Court
Savannah, GA 31419
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

✓ **Chris Conklin**
P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/543-3833
conklincc@gmail.com

✓ **Jack Cox**
2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@gmail.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

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

✓ **LT Morgan Fowler**
U.S. Coast Guard
510 SW 11th Court
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

✓ **Doug Haymans**
Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
doughaymans@gmail.com

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

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

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

✓ **Jessica McCawley**
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

✓ **Charles Phillips**
Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

*PRES PATE
PHIL STEELE
MONICA SMITH-BRUNELLO
JACK MCGOVERN
GEORGE SEDBERRY
BONNIE POWWITH*

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

✓ Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Staff Economist

✓ Dr. Brian 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
Julia Byrd - julia.byrd@safmc.net

SEDAR Admin/Outreach

Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council December 2013 Meeting

Council Member Visioning Workshop:

Monday, December 2, 2013

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Nick Hopkins Harvesting Systems	828 549-1767	nick.hopkins@noaa.gov	202 Delmas Ave Passapatanz MS 39567
George Sedberry NOAA			
Ersethen Martin EDF	252.646.5641	gmartin@edf.org	1639 Canady Road Wm 28411
Liam Carr	843.819.8169	lcarr@earthstus.org	PO Box Chas. SC 29402
Pastor Livingston SFA PCFS	386-839-0948	pliving@earthstus.org	PO Box 9351 Jayfone Bk, FL 32120-9351
Leta Dunmore	PEW 305 393 0934	LDunmore@earthstus.org	
Kevin FOX Humber	910.620.5847	khumber@earthstus.org	133 NE 38th St SE
Mike Cahall ACCSS		Mike.Cahall@accss.org	
Dale Brown	CCA	dbrown55@gmail.com	

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

15	McElhatton, Ann	ann.mcelhatton@accsp.org	33 min
12	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	20 min
12	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com	30 min
4	c, m	mec181@yahoo.com	10 min
70	Dale, David	david.dale@noaa.gov	5 min
58	kemp, grace	grace.kemp@ncdenr.gov	89 min
53	spain, bill	bill@spainb.com	86 min
53	Lloyd, Vic	vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net	103 min
53	gloeckner, david	david.gloeckner@noaa.gov	188 min
50	West, Katy	katy.west@ncdenr.gov	227 min
49	Hesselman, Don	don.hesselman@ncdenr.gov	173 min
46	Malinowski, Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov	138 min
44	Turner, Steve	steve.turner@noaa.gov	62 min
44	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	437 min
40	Webb, Anna	anna.webb@dem.ri.gov	136 min
40	Queram, Kate	kate.queram@starnewsonlin...	7 min
39	Austin, Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com	228 min
38	Preskitt, Sid	underseas6@yahoo.com	348 min
38	Iverson, Stephanie...	stephanie.iverson@mrc.vir...	207 min
36	Iverson, Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net	374 min
35	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com	437 min
34	Waters, James	jwaters8@gmail.com	101 min
33	Baker, Scott	bakers@uncw.edu	58 min
33	DeVictor, Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	397 min
32	White, Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org	142 min
32	Helies, Frank	fchelies@verizon.net	439 min
31	Byrd, Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	439 min
30	Bresnen, Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com...	401 min

30	McElhatton, Ann	ann.mcelhatton@accsp.org	398 min
29	c, m	mec181@yahoo.com	369 min
28	Takade-Heumacher, ...	htakade@edf.org	382 min
28	Knowlton, Kathy	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org	132 min
27	Strelcheck, Andy	andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov	26 min
26	Bianchi, Alan	alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov	179 min
26	michie, kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov	41 min
26	califf, julie	julie.califf@gadnr.org	99 min
26	Hamer, Caitlin	caitlin.hamer@duke.edu	187 min
25	Davidson, Maureen	mcdavids@gw.dec.state.ny...	142 min
24	cimino, joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.g...	167 min
22	Gore, Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	49 min