

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEMBER VISIONING WORKGROUP

**Doubletree by Hilton New Bern/Riverfront
New Bern, NC**

December 1, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

Ben Hartig
Jack Cox
Charlie Phillips
Doug Haymans
Anna Beckwith
Dr. Wilson Laney
Mark Brown

Dr. Michelle Duval
Mel Bell
Jessica McCawley
Lt. Morgan Fowler
Chris Conklin
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Myra Brouwer
Kim Iverson
Chip Collier
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Chevront
Amber Von Harten
Julie O'Dell
Dr. Mike Errigo

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Kevin Anson

Dr. Jack McGovern
Phil Steele
Pres Pate

Additional Observers Attached

The Visioning Workshop of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Grand Ballroom of the Doubletree by Hilton New Bern/Riverfront, December 1, 2014, and was called to order at 9:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: All right, we are going to go ahead and get started. Welcome to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council December Meeting. This is the start of our Snapper Grouper Visioning Workshop. We have a lot of material to get through. I want to thank everybody for having to give up a little bit of their Thanksgiving break to get here. Folks traveling from out of state, I know it is never good to give up that family time, but we definitely appreciate it.

I think the first thing we're going to do is run through just a recap of the October Visioning Workshop that we had. Amber has prepared several documents to try to corral all the good stuff that came out of that particular workshop. I think those are Attachments 1 through 3 in the visioning folder of your briefing book. I am just going to turn things over to Amber right now to just kind of run us through that.

MS. VON HARTEN: Attachment 1 is the breakout session themes that we discussed at the October workshop. This is the same table that we looked at towards the end of the workshop that had the seven topics here at the top; sub-regional management, data collection and reporting, bycatch, year-round access; and then stakeholder engagement, habitats and ecosystems, and allocation.

Then the cells underneath those topic headings are those kind of main headers that we came up with on the sticky wall, so just to refresh your memory of where those came from. These actually helped guide me when I was writing the objectives and strategies for the management and communication goals; so you will see some of these same themes come through in those documents. That is what this table is here, just to refresh your memory.

Then the next document is what I kind of dubbed the draft sector vision. This came from the exercise that we did at the beginning on the first day where we asked you to list concepts and ideas of what your vision for each sector would be once the draft vision blueprint was in place. These were kind of the major themes in these columns here that came out.

Then I also included the strategic goals to refresh your memory there. As an appendix I included that exercise that we did where on the last day we went back and went to those flip charts and asked you to look at each of those bulleted lists and figure out if there were any ideas or concepts that you would want to remove from the list and then any that were missing.

That is what these red exes are. If there is more than one red ex by a concept; that means that more than one of you marked that off as something that you would possibly want to remove. Again, this was broken down by each sector. You will see lots of exes under the recreational one for different concepts of things that you would possibly want to remove later on as you all move forward with developing the blueprint. If there are any questions about those first two things, I can take those.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions for Amber about sort of the draft sector vision and what we did with those exes, where we went up to all the different types of strategies that we came up with from our discussions? Okay.

MS. VON HARTEN: One of the things that I did add to this was some stakeholders have asked we have a vision statement; are we going to have a mission? I kind of just pulled this. This is kind of what is in most of our documents, headers, what the council does as the mission statement. That is something we could look at as we finalize stuff.

Then one of the things that we had talked about doing was doing a gap analysis after the October workshop to see where your discussions held up against what was being heard at the port meetings. I pulled these tables together from the sector summaries and kind of just went through each concept; these recommended solutions that came from the port meetings. That is what this column is here.

I either checked off that you addressed it at the October workshop or put an ex if you didn't, and then added any additional comments. I will just quickly kind of go through some of the things that have the exes by them. Some of them are repetitive throughout the sectors, but this first one was the idea of training dealers on the new weekly reporting requirements and forms.

You guys discussed other types of angler training but not specific to dealers, so that is why that has an ex there. Allow for third party review of stock assessments and aim for real-time assessments; that specifically didn't come up during our October discussions. The same thing with this use of underwater cameras on vessels; you talked about using new technology to collect data but not specifically underwater cameras.

Climate change; some of that came up in our habitat discussions but not truly specifically about shifts in abundance. These are all commercial sector ideas. The next thing is giving credits towards the ACL for the use of descending devices. You had lots of discussions about descending devices and other tools to reduce discard mortality, but not necessarily something specific to incentives for ACL use.

Some of these that you will see are very specific recommendations about size limits for specific species that came out of the port meetings. This one is about a 12-inch minimum size limit on red porgy. Again, you discussed size limits but not specific to red porgy. The next one is address latent commercial effort in the fishery to determine true capacity of the fishery.

You discussed about looking at permits, but not necessarily looking at latent permits. Also considering the value of owner/operators when making management decisions; that wasn't specifically addressed; nor were any real changes to the endorsement programs for black sea bass and golden tilefish; or another suggestion was no new endorsement programs from the port meetings; and that didn't come up either.

Changes to the jacks complex; I know that has been in some of our discussions, but I couldn't see anything specifically coming out from our October discussions about changing things to the jacks complex. Then Goliath grouper; you didn't really discuss that too much, because most of that is being handled through the South Florida Issues Group and the Ad Hoc Goliath Group. This was an idea that came out of one of the South Carolina meetings, was to develop separate

joint agreements between federal and state management agencies for regional management. You obviously discussed regional management, but not necessarily some type of joint agreement similar to the law enforcement agreements that you have with different states.

Sunset clauses on closed areas; we did not cover that. The idea of no new MPAs also did not come up in October. Again, like I said, there is going to be some repetition here between the sectors. That was one on underwater cameras. This one is talking about joint agreements with states for data improvements; that did not come up.

Complex-specific permits for recreational sectors based on the HMS model; you did discuss some complex-specific permits, but not necessarily in this way. Step-down approaches currently used in the commercial sector to be used in the recreational sector; step-down approaches were discussed, but not necessarily for the recreational sector.

Then there are some very specific management measures for black sea bass, lane snapper, mangrove snapper, mutton snapper, all of which were not specifically addressed at the October workshop; and hogfish as well. Regional stock assessments on economically important species; South Carolina folks wanted to allow the state to manage certain species like black sea bass for the recreational sector.

For stakeholder engagement strategy, this came out of one of the Georgia meetings, was to have regional stakeholder meetings with forecasting during the meeting, kind of like what is coming up on the council's agenda in the next year, and having some liaisons with different local clubs. That came up somewhat in the stakeholder engagement, but not specific to those types of forecast meetings. Then PSAs; the radio PSAs didn't really come out. Other types of public service announcements came out in the stakeholder engagement discussion.

MR. HARTIG: Amber, what is the forecasting in relation to?

MS. VON HARTEN: What does that mean?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MS. VON HARTEN: I think what they were talking about was having stakeholder meetings with different fishing clubs and things like that where staff or council members could sit down and say, okay, here is where we are in December 2014 and this is what is coming up in 2015. Improving recreational discard estimates, headboat versus charter versus private recreational; some of that came up in some of our data collection discussions, but not specific to that issue; and then again no new MPAs.

Then there were a couple under the chef, restaurant, seafood consumer sector. Some of our meetings with chefs; they suggested having a one-stop-shop type of web portal for chefs or consumers to access regional information about what fisheries were open, what the available quota was, openings and closures all in one location versus in several different locations how they are now; so we didn't talk about that. Then more representation of this sector on different council advisory panels, activities and outreach programs. That is it.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions or comments for Amber regarding the gap analysis? I feel like we discussed a huge range of things; and it is surprising to me that there weren't more of these items that came up at port meetings that we actually didn't get to given the time that we had available and the breadth of topics that we had to discuss.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to ask you is there a need to sort of address the gaps with council or we'll come back to it as we move forward?

DR. DUVAL: I specifically asked Amber to run through these things that we actually didn't get to; because I think as we go through the draft blueprint for the management objective and the communication objective, we can use this to help inform whether or not we want to add certain things, modify certain things, or remove them. Folks should keep that in mind definitely. Anybody else? Okay.

MS. VON HARTEN: I would like for us to spend a majority of the time looking at the next few hours are the strategic goals for management and communication. I will just preface this by saying that the workgroup had a meeting between October and now and decided that there is so much stuff in this management strategic goal; that it was probably going to take us a good portion of this meeting at this workshop to go through it.

The timeline for how we were going to proceed with the draft vision blueprint has shifted a little bit. At this meeting we are going to cover management and communication and then in March our goal is to look at the science and governance strategic goals and then go out for public comment between March and June and then see where we are.

Remember, we did also talk about having a second Council Member Visioning Workshop to start looking at prioritizing after we get the public input and see what is fleshing out; start prioritizing the items into long-term management strategies that you want to address over time versus short-term actions that you can start implementing into the next snapper grouper amendment, which would be Amendment 37. That possibly could happen in – I think July is what we had said tentatively if it is needed; and then for you to look at the final draft of the vision blueprint in September 2015. Does that sound good?

DR. DUVAL: Are there questions? Mark.

MR. BROWN: Is it necessary to move this towards an amendment? The goal is to make this an amendment; is that correct?

DR. DUVAL: Well, amendments are how we get things done; so if we want to do something, then we would generally need to put it into an amendment. If you look at Amendment 37, as Amber has referred to that as a vehicle that we could use to implement some short-term changes such as season changes, bag limit changes, things like that that might come out of this vision blueprint. I think other things like with regard to communications or governance; those are more I think operational changes, particularly with regard to communication.

You wouldn't require an amendment to say, okay, we would like to have these sort of industry forecasting meetings where we sit down with stakeholders and say here is what is coming up during the following year that might be on the council's agenda. But in terms of implementing

any changes to how we manage the fishery, an amendment is the vehicle that we use to do that. Does that make sense?

MR. BELL: The vision itself would be existing outside of the context of the amendment. It is just the amendment becomes the tool if there are things in there that need to be done; but it still exists. It is not codified in an amendment or anything. It is an existing document or whatever.

DR. DUVAL: That would be my vision for the vision; and I think that is how the Mid-Atlantic has operated with their vision. Theirs is a strategic plan, which contains their vision and their mission. Then what they have also done is they have taken their strategic plan and they have developed an implementation plan for items for say 2013, 2014, 2015; so it lists out the things that they are going to try to tackle in that year.

MR. BROWN: We're going to refine this down; we're going to do a revision of this before it ever gets to that point; and what is the timeline on that?

DR. DUVAL: As Amber stated, we're going to review what she has drafted up for the management goal here today, and we're also going to try to get through the communication goal here today. Then at our meeting in March we would try to get through the other two strategic goals, which are science and governance.

Hopefully at that point, by the March meeting we would have a completed draft blueprint after the March meeting that could go out for public input and comment. Once we get public input and comment, then we would take that and make any modifications to the blueprint after public input and comment. After that presumably we would have a final blueprint. That is where Amber was discussing that in October we talked about potentially having another council member two-day visioning workshop to take the results of the public input and then modify the blueprint as we see fit.

MR. BROWN: I was just trying to get it in my head what the process is. Once you got the public comment back, then there will be another revision, correct?

DR. DUVAL: That will certainly be just like we take an amendment out for a public comment where we may or may not have a preferred alternative. We may modify that based on the input that we receive from the public. I see that as being the same type of thing, public comments on the draft and we make modifications based on that.

MR. BELL: Just an observation as we move forward – and this is all great and the format is great; but we've got things kind of divided into commercial, for-hire, recreational, and then we've included now the restaurant aspect and all. We need to be aware that there is sort of another group, I guess, which I am not sure what you would call them; but it is sort of the non-consumptive folks that have an interest.

That might be divers or it might be folks that are just interested in the maintenance of those ecosystems and habitats. It may be that some of these things we've already covered are things that touch on them, but I don't know if we want to create another little subgroup. I'm not trying to complicate things, but that is just something we need to be aware of; that these major groups

that we've kind of defined, there is sort of this group of – for lack of a better term, we'll just call them non-consumptive or non-extraction users or folks that are interested.

MR. VON HARTEN: Yes, I agree, Mel. As we get into this management document, there are actually some action items that would address some of those sectors, those stakeholders. But if you all feel we want to have a specific vision laid out for those folks, we can work on that as well so it is included in that sector vision.

MR. HARTIG: I think there are a couple of parts to the blueprint. There are specific things that the public wants to see us do in one aspect of it. The other aspect of it is this will be a guide to other actions that we develop in the future. There will be things that are pertinent in this that will relate to the action item that we deal with that we will want to consider what the vision is in the future.

It is kind of two parts; one, things that the public wants us to do; and then as we develop other alternatives, things that are pertinent to our blueprint, we will take into consideration as we develop those actions for an amendment. It is kind of two things working together.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Mel's point; I'm not so sure we necessarily need another sector for that non-consumptive, because part of those people are going to fall into the recreational group and part of them are going to fall into – say if you've got a commercial dive operation that wants to look at Goliath grouper or something; that is going to fall into a commercial group. I think they would probably be covered, anyway. Just my thoughts.

MS. VON HARTEN: To Ben's point; that is right; every amendment from this point forward, as you develop your alternatives and actions, they should somehow be able to be linked back to one of these strategies or objectives. That is a really great way to evaluate what you are doing as well.

Typically a strategic plan; you have your plan and then you have an implementation plan, and then you also have an evaluation plan of where you are evaluating how well you are meeting your strategic plan. That is what is so great about this is you should be able to take those amendments and be able to link them back to this blueprint to make sure that you are meeting your objectives.

MS. McCAWLEY: We might be about to get into this; but I guess in the document that we have here on the screen; the items that are listed under action, these are actions that the council is definitely going to try to take as we move forward? I guess I am a little bit confused about how the document is set up.

DR. DUVAL: I think Amber is going to explain that; and I think I would just remind everybody that this document that is up on the screen that you see in front of you, which is Attachment 4 in your briefing book; this is the first cut at trying to corral everything that was spit out with regards to the management goal in October. Nothing in this document is set in stone. If the council would like to add things, remove things, modify things; this is what we are here today to do.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay I just want to pull up the Mid-Atlantic. This is their implementation plan that they released about a month and a half ago.

DR. DUVAL: Attachment A-6.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes, A-6; and just so you can kind of see how I got some inspiration from what they did. This is their strategic plan, which is their equivalent of our draft vision blueprint. It is set up where they have the goals, objectives, and strategies. Then earlier in the document they are linking these goals, objectives and strategies to actual implementation activities.

You can see how they have it set up by year of how they are going to address those. They have strategies to get them towards those actions; and where our plan will differ, I'm thinking, if this is the way you would like to have it structured, is I've gone ahead and put the action items into this document.

This is really more than just a strategic plan; it is also part of the implementation plan. All of the action items that are listed under these strategies; these were all things that you all put up on the sticky wall as potential ways that you wanted to accomplish that strategy. This is everything that was on that sticky wall in October. These were just proposed ideas.

These are not necessarily the ones that you all decide to actually pursue. This is just everything that was part of our discussions in October. Again, as we look at this, don't get hung up on the wording; the wording can change. This was just my attempt at trying to condense all the discussions that we had into a more concise format, so that you could actually see all the different themes that you talked about and topics, and then the different actions that you discussed during the breakout sessions. With that, I guess we can get started. Do you want to say anything else?

DR. DUVAL: I just want to make sure we don't fall into the trap of editing by committee when it comes to like wordsmithing. I mean words are important, but we could get ourselves down a rabbit trail trying to pick and choose every little word that way.

I don't know, Amber; I was going to suggest maybe if we go objective by objective – there are six draft objectives here within the management blueprint – and perhaps run through each of the strategies under Objective 1; and if folks have particular comments or input or things that they would want to see added or removed or combined or something like that; this may be the time to do that. I don't know if you had a particular way in which you wanted us to go about providing that input.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes, I think it would just be helpful, like you said, to go through objective by objective so we could tackle Objective 1 and discuss each strategy; and then kind of look at the action items after we've had that discussion to see if there is anything that you feel needs tweaking or doesn't really convey what you discussed or things that you have had second thoughts about and maybe you want to remove; also if there are things that you've thought of since October that you want to add under the specific idea.

You will see like this first objective. I just went through our topics in our breakout sessions; and this first objective is really all of our discussions talking about sub-regional management. That is kind of what this Objective 1 is focusing on, if that helps. So get in the mindset of your sub-regional management discussions, and we can go through each strategy. Then we'll look at the actions underneath each.

Objective 1 is – and again remember objectives are kind of a little bit more broad and should convey what you are trying to achieve – develop management measures that consider sub-regional differences and issues within the fishery; so very broad in scope. Then the strategies start getting down into some of the details.

Strategy 1; consider development of different types of quota-based management systems. This is all your discussions about different types of ways to manage the fishery based on quotas. Strategy 1.2 is identify the design elements needed for a development of these different types of quota-based management systems.

You had pretty lengthy discussions about how different design elements that should be considered for these quota base management systems. Strategy 1.3 is the use of alternative sub-regional management strategies that are not quota-based. You also talked about looking at seasons and different regulations for size limits and state-by-state types of things that were not necessarily quota-based. Those are the three strategies under that objective that kind of talk about sub-regional management; so quota-based management systems, design elements for those systems, and then alternatives that are not quota-based, if you want to ponder on that.

DR. DUVAL: How do folks feel about those three strategies under the objective of management measures that consider sub-regional differences? It is really different types of quota-based management systems, the design elements of those systems, and then alternative measures that are not quota-based.

MS. McCAWLEY: My question is thinking about the topics that the South Florida Committee has been pondering; do you think that is covered here? I see under Strategy 1.1 we've listed out particular species, but the different things that we've been discussing by the South Florida Committee; is that really captured here because I am not sure if it is or not?

DR. DUVAL: I guess I am wondering what things would you want to see considered in here that the South Florida Committee is undertaking? I think we've gone a couple different ways, like when Amber went through the gap analysis. I think some of the things that were in there that weren't discussed in October were items that are being discussed by the South Florida Committee. We felt like that was the place they were being addressed.

MS. McCAWLEY: We don't need to go back to this document and add the strategies that we're using in the South Florida Committee since we are using kind of some new items. We don't need to go back and add them to this document?

DR. DUVAL: We can if you would like to. I can't recall off the top of my head what a few of those strategies were.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes; I would have to go back and look at my notes as well. I haven't seen the most recent decision document from that South Florida Committee, so I am not going to be a lot of help right now either.

DR. DUVAL: I guess maybe, Jessica, I sort of think that the whole South Florida Committee is – that is one step that we've already sort of proactively taken under this objective to try to

address sub-regional differences. We know that South Florida is a pretty unique area with regard to the species composition, with regard to the overlapping management jurisdiction.

It might be subsumed under some of the action items that we already have in here. I think probably what we have discussed most are those things under Strategy 1.2, which is identifying the design elements needed for development of different types of quota-based management systems as well as 1.3.

Like sub-regional management systems with the discussions we've had about modification of spawning season closures, modification of what the boundaries of the area are that we would be considering for management of South Florida species; what are the species that we are considering for that, et cetera? I don't know if that gives you any level of comfort there.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; like Action 1.3B is talking about set regulations based on designated sub-regions; that could kind of be addressed to include the South Florida stuff. But if you feel like we need to specifically say something about that the council has taken this effort to do South Florida issues, we could certainly add something there. Then we would actually have a check-off of something that we accomplished already.

MR. BREWER: Forgive the newbie of I guess a stupid question; but under Strategy 1.1 we have Actions 1.1D through 1.1G. It speaks of a voluntary sector-share management system. It speaks of a state-by-state quota – I understand that one; but then we have community-based quota management for commercial and for-hire sectors. Then we have development of individual quota-management systems. I am not sure what those terms mean; if you could please let me know or explain for me.

DR. DUVAL: Action 1.1D, F, and G; those are all different types of – the common phrase used is catch shares. I personally find that something of a misnomer, because it is not very specific as to what you are talking about. A voluntary sector-share management system; that is similar to how some New England fisheries are managed.

A sector can be a gear sector; it can be an area sector whereby fishermen have done things like pool together available quota history; and so that group of fishermen is able to manage their joint quota as they would like. It requires that they have a manager for the sector; so that is what that is. Individual quota-management system is a typical ITQ or IFQ system where you would allocate shares of allowable catch to individual fishermen.

Community-based quota management; I think that could be interchangeable with sector-based management if you are just looking at a group of fishermen who are in a particular area, belong to a particular community, and they want to be able to ensure that they have access to the resource based on some historical catch allocation or something like that. Does that help?

MR. BREWER: It does, but I have a follow-up question. Didn't this council vote – I believe it was by resolution but I am not sure – just a few years ago that catch share programs were not going to be pursued in the South Atlantic?

DR. DUVAL: I believe it did. I was not on the council when that vote took place, and I think a few of these –

MR. HAYMANS: It was just two years ago.

DR. DUVAL: I was not on the council I'm just saying when the council voted for that resolution. I was here when a group of individual fishermen came up and wanted to do a voluntary catch share program. There was no resolution that was voted on at that particular meeting.

MR. HAYMANS: Ben brought up – I guess it was during the golden crab catch shares, I think it was, we had a vote then that basically denied catch shares. There was a comment made during that time that if the entire fishery wasn't for it; that we weren't going to move forward. I guess that was some previous council that had made that decision.

I am of the opinion that no previous council ties the hands of any current council. If this council wants to go back and reexamine any form or part of catch shares, this council should be able to do that. To go back to this particular objective and these three strategies, if we ever want to go back and look at any form of catch shares, those strategies fit; and I think it is good to leave those strategies in.

However, I am really not in favor of digging down in the state-by-state quotas. That is not where I would like to go with it, but those strategies need to remain. If there was a resolution ever passed about it, I wasn't part of the council either, because I don't remember that resolution. I'm just thinking about what Ben did two years ago.

MR. MAHOOD: To that point; the gentleman from Georgia hit it right on the head. No current council is held hostage by anything a previous council has done. A good example of that are fish traps in Florida. There was a raging battle for eight years with the vote pretty much split but enough votes to maintain fish traps in Florida.

Then we had two new council members come on, the vote flipped and fish traps in Florida were gone. You can change what a previous council has done. Just because a previous council voted to do this that or the other, it does not hold you to that in any way unless the law specifies that that is the way it has to be.

MR. BREWER: Point of order. I understand that this council's hands are not bound, but you do have stare decisis and a prior council has voted not to pursue these. It was seem that from a parliamentary standpoint that resolution would have to be rescinded by this council to go forward with this.

DR. DUVAL: I am going to defer any parliamentary questions of that nature to somebody else. Monica has her hand raised. Monica, enlighten us please.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: At this point, I don't think the council is taking action on anything to submit it to the secretary. I believe it is fine to keep it in this document and consider it for discussion purposes. If you all want to move forward, similar to what Bob said in terms of previous council decisions not binding the current council; previously this council has discussed what they consider to be I guess what their policy was at that time on catch share programs and that sort of thing; but I see no reason or a parliamentary reason why you would need to vote to

change that previous council's decision in order to keep it in this document. That is kind of a roundabout way of saying I think it is fine to keep in the document and move forward.

MR. HARTIG: At the time it was an action to move forward or not. It was never a resolution. It is something we do all the time. It was a motion to say that right now the council is not ready to move forward with IFQs. The fishermen were opposed to that at that time; but things change over time.

I mean, my gosh, we've had a number of people come forward and say we've got to manage this fishery differently. That is just a part of how this council evolves in the management. It was never a resolution to say that we're never going to entertain catch shares; it was just to say that the fishery was not ready for them at this time. That is the way that I remember it happening, and that is the way I would consider moving forward with what we have there now.

There are a number of fishermen who think this is a way to move forward and there are still a number that do not. From my standpoint, I think this council should actually take an active role in having an education element to the catch shares and to actually go out and have kind of workshops talking about catch shares; what they can and can't do for the fishery. I think we're probably at that point now based on the number of people that are going out of business, the number of people who are losing their houses based on the current management strategies we're pursuing. That is all I'll say.

MS. BECKWITH: Just kind of a broad comment. One of the things I remember discussing, although it didn't kind of come out as an overall objective, was the idea of simplifying our regulations. Some of that is in there under Objective 4, under some Strategy 4.4, let's say. There are some actions that would consider simplifying regulations.

But I didn't know as we kind of go through this, most of these actions, if we were to move forward with them, would actually complicate our regulations further. I don't know if there is kind of a separate way of organizing some section or actions that would assist in organizing our thoughts on how to simplify regulations.

DR. DUVAL: We will keep that in mind as we move forward.

MR. COX: There were some fishermen that when we tried to do a voluntary catch share program that wrote letters and said they weren't interested in this type of concept. Since then several of those fishermen have come out and said, you know, we can see this thing going to lower trip limits and we're not interested in wearing our boats out on day trips trying to catch different fish.

I think this was put in here basically just for an education for fishermen. This is not like we're headed in this direction. I think it was left in here to say for all fairness of all management styles that are in place; that sector management in the northeast is working for some fishermen. I was just thinking in fairness that fishermen here ought to be able to have somebody from the northeast come in and answer questions and just kind of help all of us understand how management is being done in different parts of the country.

DR. DUVAL: I would just remind folks that my goal here is to look at things and say, are there things that need to be kept in. Are there things that need to be removed, and are there actions that could be combined that are repetitive? Let's just keep that in mind as we move forward.

MR. PHILLIPS: I will be quick, Madam Chair. To Ben's point; I was on the council back then along with Ben. We've been around a while. That was for that time; at that time they didn't want it. But again to Ben's point; it is probably time to bring some people in and let them start telling us what we can and can't do from all of these different options; because until people talk to us, we are going to be shooting in the dark and thinking that they can do this or that. As we go down this road, the quicker we can get educated the better we will be able to do our job.

MR. BROWN: You are talking about looking at this and then keeping or removing some of these things that are in this document. Because I am hearing a conflict in discussion here about this particular item, how can this be recommended for removal of certain things that may be sensitive to some people without a vote?

DR. DUVAL: I think we've always tried to operate by consensus when we have our visioning discussions here. If you guys want to take a vote, we can certainly do that. I am of the opinion that we should be more inclusive rather than less inclusive in terms of the variety of management options available for the fishery.

For instance, you just heard Doug say he doesn't personally like state-by-state quota shares. I personally do. I think if we can – and we have heard both during the port meetings; support for state-by-state quota management and lack of support for state-by-state quota management; just as with an ITQ program or an IFQ program or sector management or whatever. I guess I would err more on the side of being more inclusive, take it out for public input, and then making a final decision on the blueprint later; but I would look for committee input on that.

MR. BELL: I agree; just by having it in here does not mean we are going to necessarily employ this tool or this mechanism. I think just to be smart; it needs to be on the table for consideration for the future. If you notice the way this is all worded, it is consider, consider, consider, explore, and figure it out. We'll figure out if and when we need to employ this particular mechanism, then we would do it.

I am not necessarily a fan of dividing things at the state lines. I think perhaps there are other ways working with the resource and what the resource is doing of drawing lines, perhaps. But however you do it; I think it needs to remain in here as a potential option in the future. If you just exclude it now, we may find ourselves coming back in the future and needing to try to reinstate it.

MR. HAYMANS: I think you said in the beginning part there were actions that we want to combine. I didn't know we were going to do that, but that is fine. In the Strategy 1.1 Action 1; I would have one consider state-by-state management throughout the commercial and recreational sectors and get rid of about four of the others. I would certainly do that.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; and that is what I was thinking as well. I think you could combine Action 1.1B and 1.1E, both of which consider design and development of state-by-state quota management for either sector; just combine it into one action and eliminate that.

I think you could probably moosh Action 1.1A into that as well; explore design and development of a species-specific quota-based management and B, and not be species-specific. I think you can get into that at some point; just really consider state-by-state quota-based management for commercial or recreational fisheries and move on from there.

MR. BREWER: Maybe I can offer some solace or solution. When I first read consider design and development, I read that to mean we were going to consider, design, and develop. In other words, it went beyond just consider. As I read it again, you could also read it to be just we will consider these things. Perhaps if we took out “consider, design and develop”, and just put in “consider”; some of the heartburn might go away.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a great suggestion; “consider a state-by-state quota-based management system rather than – just take out the phrase “design and development”. Very good. Are there other actions here that could be combined? I think Doug and I both made the suggestion that you can combine 1.1 A, B, and E. I think C is probably just sub-regional as in greater than a state. Then D, F, and G are all catch- share-type programs.

MS. VON HARTEN: Do you want to combine those?

DR. DUVAL: Would folks want to combine those into a single action? Yes, so you could combine those into a single action and just list out the different types such as sector-share management, community-based quota management, or individual fishing quota systems.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I would recommend doing that.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, other thoughts; are there other actions that are not in here that folks would want to see under this particular strategy? What about the next strategy; this is all about design elements.

MR. HAYMANS: The first thing I saw was I think you could strike F, because really G encompasses what is meant by F. I would look to Mel since that was one of his discussion points.

DR. DUVAL: Mel, did you hear what Doug said?

MR. BELL: Are you talking about just lumping those two together in context?

MR. HAYMANS: Well, yes, I think G covers biogeographic boundaries because you are really setting it based on the biology of the fish. It may wind up being some sort of river boundary or something of that nature and not a state boundary.

DR. BELL: That is fine; because when you say fishery, in my thinking that includes the whole picture there. Yes, personally I like that a little better than just picking a state line. A quick question; when we say South Florida in relation to what Jessica is working it, where is the boundary for that? How far up does South Florida come?

DR. DUVAL: I think that is one of our discussion points actually is how far up that goes.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Another point is that we haven't really been trying to draw a line across Florida. What we've been talking about – and I'm sorry I don't have the specifics in front of me; we just got the document in this final briefing book, but I will try to look at it and come back in full council with some additions if I think they are needed.

We are not trying to draw a line across South Florida. Instead what we were looking at is taking some species and giving a portion of the ACL to Florida to manage. Most of those species were South Florida specific, where Florida had 98 or more percentage of the ACL Gulf and South Atlantic wide.

DR. DUVAL: Does that help you out, Mel?

MR. BELL: Well, I still don't know. When we say South Florida – I mean I understand the unique nature of things. I am just wondering for context of down there when you are having discussions, how far up the coast do you come and it is still South Florida?

MR. HARTIG: If you are talking about a biogeographic boundary, it would probably be Jupiter Inlet on the east coast. That is where the species change substantially, where vermilion start to fill out to the north and yellowtail drop out from Jupiter north. Really it is about Jupiter Inlet. I can't tell you on the west coast where it is; but probably similar if you do a straight line across.

Jupiter Inlet is pretty much a biogeographic area where things change. The Cape is another biogeographical boundary, but it doesn't really work for the tropical species, because the tropical species drop out before they get to the Cape. It is really about Jupiter is where it all changes.

DR. DUVAL: I am going to suggest we not get ourselves wrapped around the axle in South Florida issues, because that committee is going to be meeting in January. If there are things that need to be added into this draft blueprint, we can do that. We really kind of need to move forward on do we have everything in here that needs to be in here? Are their things that people think need to be moved around or combined or whatever?

DR. LANEY: I just was going to ask Doug if he would be comfortable if we eliminated F, but stuck the word "biogeographic" down there in G as well; so it would read "set boundaries based on biogeography or on the fishery". Ben just gave a good example of a biogeographic boundary. I think fishery boundaries as clarified there as being a species or category may or may not necessarily correspond with biogeographic boundaries. We may come up with a really good reason for including some biogeographic boundary; I don't know.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm comfortable with that.

DR. LANEY: But that would do what you want. It would simplify it and still keep that word "biogeographic" in there and give us that flexibility.

MR. HAYMANS: Mine was just a clarifying question about why we even started the South Florida, so I'll hold.

DR. DUVAL: Great, because we're not going to start any more South Florida.

MS. BECKWITH: I was going to suggest that we combine A, B, and C, and I think you could probably combine D and E, and then as suggested F and G and just shorten it up, because you can usually say “consider design elements including quota transfer, comma, such and such, comma, such and such for A, B, and C.

DR. DUVAL: Combine A, B, and C.

MS. BECKWITH: Then also maybe consider combining D and E, and then, of course, combine F and G. That would get us down to three actions to consider.

DR. DUVAL: I think D and E might be a little bit different. I actually had a question about E with regard to managing sub-regions by effort; because I guess when I read that I feel like that ought to be moved down to the next strategy where you are looking at non-quota-based things. If you are managing by effort, to me that says things like days at sea or something like that rather than actual quota. I don't recall exactly what the discussion was around there.

Are folks okay with combining A, B, and C; looking at consider quota transfer, average landings, criteria for species to consider. Those are all sort of specific design elements. All right, then we will go ahead and do that. Consider allowing the sub-region to set landing limits and openings, closings; that sort of seems to be standalone on its own. How do folks feel about moving the 1.2E down into the next strategy?

MR. CONKLIN: I don't want to get us in the weeds again, but I had a question about Action 1.2D, allowing the sub-regions to set landings and limits and openings and closures. Does that mean we would sub-regionalize the people that are sitting here and we would make our own rules versus all of you or would we have a whole 'nother – I mean, who would make up the sub-region limit setters?

DR. DUVAL: Well, the only example that I can use really is like the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries kind of thing where when you have state-by-state quotas, that is an easy thing to do and that is how those operate. Each state is responsible for setting its own regulations within certain parameters.

Gear restrictions pretty much tend to stay the same, but they can do things like set their own openings and closings, set weekly landing limits, daily landings limits, whatever. Then also at the Atlantic States level, groups of states have done things like develop a set of recreational black sea bass size and bag limits for that particular season.

The states themselves have gotten together, talked amongst themselves, and used the available catch information to develop the opening for that particular fishery under a set of given size and bag limits. That is an example. I could see a situation where perhaps if there is a northern and southern regional ACL or sub-quota; that North and South Carolina get together and say, well, you know, it is going to be more beneficial for our fishermen to open this fishery at this date and time, and then we bring that back and the full council votes on it versus Georgia and Florida would have a similar conversation.

MR. HARTIG: And mackerel.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and mackerel. All right, moving on; are there any comments on Strategy 1.3? These are sub-regional management strategies that are not quota-based like spawning season closures, staggering those; state-by-state regulations, regulations based on sub-regions, which we do for mackerel in the Gulf, certainly.

I think my only comment on this is for 1.3C; set state-by-state regulations for the recreational sector; I think you can make that broader and just have that apply to either sector. Now we're getting into Objective 2, which is develop innovative management measures that allow consistent access to the fishery for all sectors.

These are all focused on access; and we have six strategies there: support development of management approaches that address retention of snapper grouper species, approaches that address effort in the fishery, approaches that account for seasonality; so retention, effort, seasonality, flexibility in ACLs, quota management, alternative management approaches to expand access to the fishery. I think one comment that I had was I felt like Strategy 2.5, which was consider development of management approaches based on quota management, was very similar to like 1.1D, E, F.

MS. VON HARTEN: As we were going through this, obviously in our discussions there was a lot of overlap between some of the topics we discussed. When we developed this, we just decided to go ahead and put it in there just so you could see that there were multiple topics that came up under different issues.

Yes, that is definitely one if you feel that everything is addressed under the sub-regional management objective, then we can remove that from here. It just depends on if – because I heard several of you say during October this is a strategy that could provide more access to the fishery. That is why it was under this topic; but we could definitely just have it under one objective and not repeat it under this one. You'll see that a couple more times, I believe.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that clarification. Let's just kind of go back to the top; anything under Strategy 2.1 that folks feel like needs to be tweaked. Is there anything that needs to be added, is missing?

MR. HAYMANS: Can you explain 2.1D for me?

MS. VON HARTEN: I think it is just talking about those species that don't have any kind of bag limit right now or trip limit; so trying to put in place some kind of limits for those commercially harvested species that don't have trip limits and those recreational caught species that don't have bag limits.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, thank you. I was reading that as for those species we didn't manage and we took them out of management for a reason, but, okay, I understand.

DR. DUVAL: But everything is under a recreational bag limit at this point. It is either the 20-fish aggregate or the 10-snapper aggregate or something like that.

MS. BECKWITH: There were a couple of things that ended up under measures that reduce and mitigate discards that could also sort of fall under here, considering the aggregate trip limits for

the commercial sector in terms of like number of boxes or some aggregate daily limits for recreational sectors that would allow for some consistent access to the fisheries. I don't know if we want to keep that under the discard section or also potentially bring them into this topic as well.

MS. VON HARTEN: You're talking about Strategy 4.4; there are some of those actions under there that could be moved under the access under Objective 2. It is up to you guys.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, we could certainly include those.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes; and I also feel like it goes back to the idea of do we also want to create the section of things that might actually simplify our regulations versus complicate them. I am not really sure where is a good place to put that is. It would sort of end up being like the catch shares discussion where it ends up being in multiple places, because they are under multiple objectives.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am wondering if there is a way for some of these topics that fit under multiple categories; instead of just putting them under every category, if we can just make a note to decide applies to this, applies to that so that when we go back and look at that or the public goes back and looks at it; they don't see it in one place and think, well, that is where it fits, and don't see the whole picture of where it may work. Do you understand kind of what I'm saying?

DR. DUVAL: Right; to avoid having a document that is uber-lengthy and potentially repetitive; that perhaps there be some note next to those particular actions that will indicate that also fits under Strategy 2.1 or 2.2 or something like that. I think that could be done.

MR. HAYMANS: "A" looks pretty inclusive of also B, D, and E with regards to commercial and recreational trip limits. I think I would find some creative way to shorten – just having three actions A, which would have all the bag limits in it; and then C and F seem like they stand on their own; again, getting to three actions like we did previously.

DR. DUVAL: Combine 2.1A, 2.1B, D, and E.

MR. HAYMANS: It is basically considering bag limits and step-down approach for both commercial and recreational as ACLs are reached or neared; something to that effect.

MR. HARTIG: I don't know; the wording, I'm not sure if this was put together specifically by Amber or that she used what came out of the visioning process we had. I think we need to be a little bit careful that we don't lose the flavor of some of what these things are saying. As long as we don't do that, I am fine with putting them together, but sometimes there is something lost in putting things together is all I am trying to get at.

MR. HAYMANS: The one new thing that I see out of all of that is really looking at step-downs to bag limits for recreational. We already do it for commercial; and that is really the only new thing we are being asked to consider, in my opinion.

DR. DUVAL: Certainly, 2.1B, smaller trip limits and bag limits for certain species; that is something we probably have to do in the course of consideration of management, anyway.

When we get a new stock assessment that indicates that we have a smaller ACL that we're dealing with; that is certainly something that we have to do. Doug, what was the one thing you said you didn't see in here?

MR. HAYMANS: I don't know that I did say there was something I didn't see in here. The new thing was the recreational step-down.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; I think if we combine those – and again it is all about whether you are lumping or splitting; and I think if we combine those, perhaps we can keep the level of detail if we maybe put in parentheses some of the specific ideas you all are talking about. I could just reword it to talk about step-down approaches that include looking at commercial trip limits, bag limits, step-downs as opposed to using AM measures. I could put that in parentheses so we don't lose that resolution. Would that work, Ben? .

DR. DUVAL: Yes; because I see step-downs as being one particular type of technique that we can use both for the commercial sector or the recreational sector. Is there anything else under this strategy at this point? I think the next one deals with management approaches that address effort.

MR. HAYMANS: I would just like to make sure we change the word "require" at this point to "consider a recreational". That just leapt off the page at me.

DR. DUVAL: As Amber said; that is what was on the sticky wall, so these were taken directly from our workshop. But I agree, I think "consider a recreational stamp or license for the snapper grouper fishery would be more appropriate".

MR. BREWER: It is kind of an across-the-board statement here. We have, just as an example, Strategy 2.2; "support development of", and then we have "require". That is language that is sort of compulsory. I think my heartburn with regard to catch shares will be solved by saying "we will consider".

It might be a good idea on a lot of these to put language in about consider rather than support, because I am not aware of this council having taken a vote to say that we support this particular thing or we are going to do this particular thing. As Bob mentioned, this council could consider anything it wants to; but when you've got this compulsory language in there, it causes a problem for me.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, Chester, that was something I had written in my notes as well for all of the strategies under this particular objective; to possibly change that to "consider" instead of "support development of".

MR. BELL: Yes, I was just going to say the product we're looking at is what came out of our process and it is what stuck to the wall; so there is going to be all kinds of wording in here. All they did was just take it the way we presented it; but you are absolutely right, we need to go back through this and kind of standardize the verbiage and all so that you don't have things like "require" stuck in there. That will be part of the process I would envision; but that is just why it looks that way.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, 2.2E; is it possible now to insert a request that in March staff bring us some report as to the studies that have been done on overcapitalization of a fishery? I am pretty sure I've seen some results in the past of number of vessels versus ex-vessel value and what they could truly support. Is it possible to see that in March?

DR. DUVAL: I think we can ask staff to go back and collect any resources from previous studies, certainly, and have that available.

MR. HAYMANS: If it is not March, that is fine, because we're still going to be talking about it for a while; but I would like to see what is out there.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; and I think that was one of the things we had in the marina during October along with lots of other presentations that you are going to request in the coming months.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Doug's point; I am not sure we necessarily need a presentation. If we can just get a paper and a breakdown, I don't know that we necessarily need a presentation, per se. But, yes, we've heard numerous people come before us and say we can't make it because of ex, and it would help everybody just make better decisions.

DR. DUVAL: I guess the one thing, before we move on to 2.3, with regard to effort and permits; I know that it did come up, consideration of looking at a cap on the number of for-hire permits in the fishery. I'm wondering if 2.2C, reduce effort permits in the commercial sector might just be broadened to include that for the for-hire sector. I can't recall off the top of my head if it is already in a different objective. Moving on to Strategy 2.3; these all deal with seasonality.

MR. HAYMANS: Except for 3C; and I don't quite know what depth has to do with the seasonality in this particular set.

DR. DUVAL: I would agree.

MR. HARTIG: What was the question?

MR. HAYMANS: "C" really deals with depth and not seasonality, and I just think it is in the wrong place.

MS. BECKWITH: Just to that 2.2C; I would maybe switch "reduce" to "manage effort permits in the commercial sector" if you are going to add the for-hire; because when we talked about freezing our current number of permits, we didn't discuss necessarily reducing them. We haven't gotten that far, and I think going from the potential freezing permits to also reducing effort might freak the for-hire industry out if they see that.

DR. DUVAL: I would certainly say "consider overall effort permits in commercial and for-hire sectors" rather than "reduce" as that sort of definitive verb that Chester was referring to as well. Depth zones; we did have discussions about this. I agree with Doug that it is not a seasonal thing so it needs to go somewhere else; probably under 2.6, I would say, development of alternative management approaches; or even under the bycatch objectives. I think maybe just a note that it needs to go in a different place.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I think F may be in the same boat as that. It is not seasonality; it is two-week windows. That is timing. Maybe we need a new strategy for those couple of items.

DR. DUVAL: I think if they don't fit into any other place, we could certainly create a new strategy for that.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, maybe since it was in the context of by sub-region, perhaps it should go under Objective 1, under Strategy 1.3 the alternative sub-regional management strategies that are not quota-based. Yes, okay.

DR. DUVAL: Any other comments on this particular strategy? I guess one thing I would say in general is like some of these actions are very species-specific like H, shifting the recreational red snapper season outside of their known spawning season. I tend to think some of this should be a little bit more general where we may want to consider shifting fishing out of any spawning season for any fish; but that is just me.

Let's look at 2.4, considering flexibility in setting annual catch limits; this deals with shifting of sector allocations in season, multi-year ACLs, multi-year catch specifications. I tend to think C and D are kind of the same thing; so we could combine 2.4 C and D. I am wondering if like 2.4E, ensure more data-poor species use the ORCS process or just alternative data-poor approaches or something; we can make that a little bit broader.

MR. HARTIG: Which one did you combine, Michelle?

DR. DUVAL: It was 2.4C and D. Then we get to quota management. Again, this is where there is repetition. Do you want to leave this as it is?

MR. PHILLIPS: Question; I didn't think we could do multi-year ACLs if we had a yearly limit and you just couldn't go over that yearly limit. Are we asking to do something that we can't do or have I missed the boat somewhere again?

DR. DUVAL: I think we might be able to look to some other regions that have multi-year specification processes. I mean, we do set our ACLs for multiple years in a row right now that are in regulation. I am wondering if this is referring to more taking almost an average over multiple years and using that as your ACL for having a consistent ACL for, say, three years, something like that.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I believe I would take Strategy 2.5 completely out. Everything that is there is under the first objective, anyway.

DR. DUVAL: We could take Charlie's approach and simply note that those apply to other strategies as well.

MS. VON HARTEN: Since they are worded almost exactly the same as those ones in Objective 1, do you want me to just to make a note under Strategy 1.1; put an asterisk and at the bottom of that strategy say these actions also address access to the fishery, blah, blah, blah, Objective 2,

whatever; just make a note under the sub-regional management one; is that what you want me to do?

DR. DUVAL: I think that would be sufficient. Then we get to alternative management approaches, which looks at expansion of fisheries, aquaculture, and harvest tags. Is there anything else or any comments on these? Well, silence is nothing so we'll move on to Objective 3, which deals with maximizing social and economic opportunity for all sectors. We really just have one strategy, which is support development of management approaches that assist fishery-dependent businesses to operate efficiently and profitably.

MS. VON HARTEN: Again, this was to try to address some of your discussions about these other stakeholder groups that don't necessarily – aren't consumptive users of the fishery, and also your continued discussions about the for-hire sector and allowing them to make good business decisions.

MS. BECKWITH: I think under maximizing social and economic opportunity for all sectors; I think we need to add another strategy that is non-fishery dependent; hence, the actual recreational community, the non for-hire sector that includes something along the lines of consider strategies that would allow recreational community to achieve their ACLs. Just my suggestion.

DR. DUVAL: No, I agree; there is nothing in there that is specific to just the private recreational sector.

MS. VON HARTEN: As a strategy or an action?

DR. DUVAL: Perhaps an action.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, but then you would have to change the wording of the strategy, because you have approaches that assist fishery-dependent businesses, so that is pretty specific to the for-hire and the nontraditional stakeholders like chefs. I think a specific strategy that looks at non-fishery dependent, so just the recreational consumer.

DR. DUVAL: There are two options. You can either modify the wording of the existing strategy to be a little bit more inclusive and then add an action or add another strategy.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say there is tremendous value and economic benefit from a healthy, private recreational fishery; as long as we capture that. It is not just about the for-hire aspect. It is all of the bait and tackle support aspects of the industry. As long as we've captured that in there, that is part of it, but there is tremendous value in that.

MS. VON HARTEN: How about if we reworded it to say "consider development of management approaches that assist fishery stakeholders and fishery-dependent businesses to operate efficiently and profitably", and then we add an action that specifically addresses the recreational sector?

MS. BECKWITH: Recreational fishermen don't operate efficiently and profitably. I feel like it is such a different little sector, that particular wording probably wouldn't work.

DR. DUVAL: Perhaps an additional strategy that really addresses more of the social goals, because I think for the private recreational sector it is about having the opportunity to go out there. I mean the economics of it is really disposable income, which we have no control over, so we'll leave it to you guys. I am going to suggest we go ahead and take a ten-minute break, and then we'll come back and we'll plow through the rest of this a little more quickly than we have this first part.

DR. DUVAL: We are going to go ahead and get started again. We're on to Objective 4; there were six objectives in here. Again, I think sort of the more broad-scale direction that we can provide to staff in terms of modifying any of the information that is in here, so some of the things that we said about using phrases like "consider" instead of "require" or "develop"; that indicates that these are things that the council might potentially do down the road.

It does not mean that we are actually going to do things, as well as noting that if certain actions fit under multiple objectives, to note that there, so that we can streamline this a little bit, we'll go ahead and do that. I think with Objective 4; this is looking at management measures that reduce and mitigate discards, so there are a lot of strategies here.

The first is considering approaches where closures are based on ACLs, seasons, and spawning in order to minimize bycatch. Objective 4.2 is considering approaches that address impact of depth on bycatch. Objective 4.3; reconsider strategies that use size limits to reduce bycatch. 4.4 is reconsidering retention limits; 4.5 is looking at quota management to reduce bycatch; 4.6 looking at best fishing practices to avoid bycatch and reduce discard mortality; and 4.7 to support development of approaches that consider the use of ACL buffers.

In going back up to the top, is there anything under Strategy 4.1 that doesn't belong in here, is repetitive, could be combined or even could this strategy be reworded. It is a little bit of a catchall, looking at where fishery closures are based on ACLs, seasons, and spawning in order to minimize bycatch of snapper grouper species.

I think my only comment on 4.1A, closure based on trigger species, is we've been down that road with gag, and we removed that. I'm not really sure that is something we would want to retain in there; because if you are basing a closure on a trigger species, you are just going to end up with other species that are closed, which leads to more discards. That is my only comment.

MR. BROWN: I agree with that; can we remove that?

DR. DUVAL: How do folks feel about removing that based on 4.1A, which is really a closure based on trigger species?

DR. LANEY: Well, just to clarify and question there, Madam Chairman; could a trigger species be a protected species? I'm thinking about our current black sea bass pot closure and right whales. I know that is probably not the context here. Is trigger species in this case another species in the fishery that just has a lower ACL versus a protected species? Okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: In the case where we may be using a trigger species to close; do we have a better option if we take this out?

DR. DUVAL: I don't think we're closing things based on any trigger species right now. The only one that we had was the closure of all shallow water grouper when gag closed. Really, our triggers with regard to ACL management are for a particular species complex. Once that total species complex ACL is reached, everything shuts down whether or not the little individual ACLs that add up to that complex are actually achieved. So remove; all right. I'm not really sure about "T" as well, which is the commercial season ends when any ACL is met on any snapper grouper species. That seems to be status quo to me.

DR. ERRIGO: This is in regards to the last one you just did. Trigger species could mean a species where there is a tiny portion, like a small quota or something; but a trigger species could also mean let's say you have a complex that has a bunch of small minor species and one species that is assessed with a very large ACL; and when you hit the ACL for that species, then you close the whole complex. That is another way of treating that one. The trigger species could be the species with the large ACL; so you manage based on the assessed species, but you manage the entire complex of species that you can't assess because you don't have enough information.

MR. BROWN: Mike, are you talking about like with the porgy closure?

DR. ERRIGO: I'm sorry; I'm not sure what you are referring to; but let's say you had all the porgies in a complex and red porgy was in there with them, and red porgy is the only species that is assessed; you have the fishery go until the red porgy ACL is met and then you close porgies. That would be another way of treating the trigger species as opposed to fishing on a species until some bycatch species ACL is met. That is the other way of treating trigger species.

MR. HAYMANS: I also think that E and G – really, E is the more all-inclusive and G is very specific with regard to species, but they are both saying the same thing; let's set a known season and stick to it. We can split it out by species when we get there. I think G could go.

DR. DUVAL: I agree. Based on what Mike said, how do folks feel about 4.1A; closures based on trigger species? The way we have operated is that when a species is assessed, we pull it out of a complex and establish its own ACL.

MR. BROWN: What I was referencing is that the recreational closure for the porgies this year came; and I don't ever remember that happening before. I guess it is because some of the species are unassessed. I still am a little bit clueless of why that fishery closed.

DR. DUVAL: Because that overall ACL was met.

MS. BECKWITH: Sorry, I missed that Doug, were you going to keep E and get rid of G; is that right?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, because E also for recreational.

MR. HARTIG: I think you can remove it. Based on what we have now in our groups of species that we manage, all of them have an ACL and they are all lumped together into one group. Even in the porgies that are unassessed, we still have landing limits for each one of those species that

are all grouped into the group. The whole group's mortality is considered in that closure in setting the ACL. That is all considered, and we don't use a trigger species in porgies to shut it down. Everybody is considered and I think that is the way we should continue to do it.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to step back to "I", which is commercial season ends when any ACL is met on any snapper grouper species; I think I might recall that that was you meet an ACL and all commercial fishing would shut down. Is that kind of what people's recollection was, which doesn't seem very feasible. Okay, remove. Moving on.

I think under the next strategy, under 4.2, some of those language issues where we've got "require" and "establish", perhaps we could change that to "consider". This strategy is all about depth, except for E, which looks at time/area closure. It seems like 4.2E, since this is a time/area closure; that is already contained under 4.1C. It is a season thing.

MR. HARTIG: Under the require vessel monitoring systems; can we replace that with some kind of other terminology so we don't specifically site VMS as what we may use in the future as far as some other monitoring technologies. Just reword it somehow, because I'm not leaning towards VMS in anything, but there are a number of other things we can use that are much cheaper that we could get the information.

DR. DUVAL: Perhaps consider alternate electronic monitoring methods to obtain data?

MR. COX: Yes, Ben, a little bit more to what you're speaking about there; you just say take VMS completely out of it or just using VMS and other methods?

MR. HARTIG: Well, if you keep it specific to the technology of electronic tracking, VMS is in there. I don't want to eliminate VMS, per se, but I don't think based on what we went through before we are going to go to VMS. There are other technologies. AIS is probably a pretty good one to use as well where you can go back in time and figure out what went on with a specific vessel, which is much cheaper. There are a number of other technologies we could look at.

MR. COX: I would agree with you as long as you don't exclude it, unless better technology is out there.

MR. BOWEN: Remove the word "require", but consider I guess would maybe come across better, "consider VMS and/or other technologies".

MS. BECKWITH: I would even go a step further and say "consider data collection technologies to obtain data on depth". Because Ben said tracking; we always have to come back to what is a potential goal? Do we need the data or are we trying to track for enforcement? It depends on what the goal is.

MR. BREWER: I am rising to agree. I think that the language needs to be more inclusive rather than just saying VMS, because there are other technologies that are being put in place. Like in the Gulf they've got iSnapper. That is being used there and I don't know that is being used over here; and it might well be something that we would want to consider. I'd use that word "consider". It may be more inclusive of different technologies.

MR. PHILLIPS: You may just want to use a broad range of “consider suitable electronic monitoring”, and that way it fits whatever you need.

DR. DUVAL: I think the point has been made; we need it to be more inclusive and consider. That is something that we’ve already said anywhere in this document where there is something that says require, we’ve already given direction to staff to go ahead and modify that language so that it is not prescriptive.

MR. BELL: I was just going to agree that we could use a general term like electronic monitoring systems because VMS is a specific one. We’re going to find ourselves on Thursday talking about the electronic technologies plan; so generic is best.

DR. DUVAL: Great. Okay, moving on; strategies that use size limits to reduce bycatch – sounds good? Retention limits; we’ve got aggregate daily bag limits, aggregate trip limits, charter boat limits, in-season bag limit reductions, which I think was contained under another strategy as well.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; I was going to say these are the ones that you had said that we could put these under Strategy 2.1, under the access to the fishery objective. It talks about retention, management approaches that address retention. I could move those under there.

DR. DUVAL: Are folks okay with that? Then we could simply note that they meet multiple strategies. Certainly, the same thing for the next one; Strategy 4.5 and the action that is under there are already covered in other places, so we can simply note that. Then the last couple deal with avoiding bycatch and reducing discard mortality.

These are all dealing with research, investigating equipment that can be used to reduce bycatch mortality, research on hook types. Is there anything in here that would be repeated somewhere else or is there anything that isn’t in here that should be included?

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to say that A, B, E, and G all are looking at gear for reducing. I would think that research, cooperative research, investigation, development, and evaluation all kind of go to that same thing. I would combine those into one action.

DR. DUVAL: These were A, B, E, and G?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: Combine those into one action.

MR. HAYMANS: It’s all a research and development sort of action; research, development, and evaluation; but that is part of research.

DR. DUVAL: Certainly, noting some of the specifics with regard to hook type in use, a gear competition, et cetera. Sound good? Well, certainly, we would want to modify require. Yes, G and H are pretty much the same thing; so I think we could just eliminate H and leave it at G. Are D and F roughly the same, an incentive program for avoiding bycatch or bycatch avoidance network?

MS. VON HARTEN: No, D was more for the recreational sector; so creating some type of incentive program for the recreational sector to avoid bycatch. Then the other one is more for the commercial sector. That was something we heard about at the Fisheries Forum, these bycatch avoidance networks.

MR. COX: Yes; and maybe we should just put those words in there, recreational and commercial, so we can identify.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; it is the same concept. I guess you could either put those words in there or combine them and note that you would want to have a similar type of incentive program both for the commercial and recreational sectors. Then 4.7 is really looking at management approaches that consider the use of annual catch limit buffers.

I'm thinking that we may want to reword this strategy, because a buffer for an annual catch limit is actually an annual catch target. It looks to me like the actions that are here of allowing some kind of bycatch set-aside limit per commercial trip or some bycatch allowance multiyear catch specifications aren't really ACL buffers. It is really almost just a bycatch quota or something like that.

I don't really know; I don't have any bright ideas on that, but it needs to be reworded, I think. It almost sounds more like retention limit buffers. I think in the Mid-Atlantic there is bycatch set-aside, so there is a specific piece of an ACL that may be set aside for bycatch or something like that.

All I'm saying is that the wording of the strategy doesn't match the actions that are underneath there, so let's reword it. Now we start moving into ecosystem and habitat considerations under Objective 5. We've got four strategies: enhancement of habitat; evaluating the impacts of ecosystem and habitat management approaches; consider approaches that support monitoring and enforcement of managed areas; and use spatial management to conserve ecosystems and habitats.

DR. LANEY: It seems to me that maybe we need an additional strategy. I will just throw it out there and see what the council thinks; but another way to support management measures that incorporate ecosystem and habitat considerations would be to improve our modeling to include good science that documents linkages between environmental factors and population abundance or productivity and also to include climate change effects.

Have we already included this in here somewhere else? Maybe we should add that in as another strategy to just consider improvements to existing assessment models that would include climate and/or environmental variables where we have the science to document that those are linked to species abundance or productivity.

My suggestion is prompted by rereading a paper by John Hare and coauthors that looked at the relationship between minimum winter temperatures in the North Atlantic oscillation and Atlantic croaker populations on the east coast. They did a very excellent job, I think, of laying a foundation for inclusion of those factors in a stock assessment model.

It occurs to me that we may have that same opportunity with some snapper grouper species in the future to the extent that someone does the science and provides the council to science to make

those kinds of changes. Then our SSC would decide, yes, this is something we can do easily. We could plug it into the model and it helps us to improve our forecasting and our understanding of how the stock dynamics operate.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes; for the science strategic goal; there is a whole separate objective for habitat; and all those things you just mentioned are going to be in there.

DR. DUVAL: I am just wondering in terms of evaluating biological, economic, and social impacts when developing ecosystem and habitat management approaches; the only action number under there is to consider impacts of human population migration on habitats, but that doesn't seem to really have anything to do with evaluating the biological, economic, and social impacts when developing these ecosystem approaches. I'm not really sure; it almost seems like the strategy is the action.

DR. LANEY: Well, to that point, I wonder if we're really talking about population migration or population growth and how concentration of human population in certain areas certainly is going to have biological and economic – maybe more economic and social impacts than biological impacts.

Exactly how we consider it I think is currently being discussed quite a bit by the South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative in more than a terrestrial context than in an aquatic context and more inshore possibly than offshore. I would suggest maybe we change that word “migration” to “human population growth and distribution”, maybe, as opposed to migration.

Although migration certainly comes into play, for example, for fisheries that are highly seasonal in nature and highly confined geographically. For example, if somebody wants to fish for yellowtail snapper, they are going to go to the Florida Keys, probably. There is an element of migration involved. Also, I suppose tournament fisheries would enter into the migration aspect of it. But I agree with you, it may all be captured within the strategy as opposed to that specific action.

DR. DUVAL: Wow; that was a lot. All good stuff, Wilson, but, yes, I agree probably changing the wording a little bit to indicate human population distribution. I think as we get more into ecosystem approaches and consider the fishery ecosystem plan, we just need to keep in mind that the ecosystem includes the humans, too.

DR. LANEY: I sent that Terando Et Al paper to everybody on the council and council staff, so we have an idea already of what the landscape is going to look like in terms of future human population distribution across the southeast.

MR. HAYMANS: To the Strategy 5.3; again, the way we've reworded some of the other VMS stuff to be electronic monitoring; I would do that with A and B and lump those two into one. Then C, I don't know why it is there. I don't know why we're talking about penalties when we really don't have any control over penalties. I would remove that all together and have that as a one-action strategy.

DR. DUVAL: Some suggestions there for editing. For the next strategy, similar types of comments, replace “use” with “consider”.

MR. HAYMANS: When you said the next strategy, are we now at 5.4?

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm going to look at Mel when I say this. Mel, are you looking at 5.4B? I don't know how that one got past me. But if you look at 5.4B, all of Georgia and South Carolina is artificial reefs or SMZs. That is a non-starter for me to consider closing those SMZs to the harvest of snapper grouper species. I would be in favor of removing that one. I can't see how we would even consider that; existing SMZs as it is said there, not new.

DR. DUVAL: I was a little confused only because our existing deepwater MPAs are closed to harvest of snapper grouper species at this point in time. It seemed a little redundant.

MR. BELL: Yes, things kind of got jumbled together, I guess; but when you design the MPA or you design the SMZ, you factor in how you are going to manage it. I agree what Doug is saying, our artificial reefs are SMZs. They are existing and we wouldn't want to close them. However, what might have confused this is maybe in discussion of new ones related to like Area 51 or 53; that would be how we would design that or intend it to be used, but they don't exist at the moment. I think that was the point you were making.

MR. HAYMANS: Exactly, and you've got A and C, which speak to developing new ones with no harvest, and also evaluating those new ones; evaluating areas that may be suitable. I would combine A and C with regard to evaluating new SMZs that may or may not have harvest; but I sure don't like even the thought of putting out there existing SMZs getting closed.

DR. DUVAL: I'm seeing heads nod around the table on that one in terms of removing it. I would agree also with combining of A and C and again "consider" as opposed to develop managed areas. I think that would speak to that. Is there anything else under this strategy? If not, then we are moving on to the last objective, which is developing management measures that support optimal sector allocations for the snapper grouper fishery.

We have I think five different strategies here: support management approaches that consider what sectors will receive allocation – maybe again that is sort of broad-scale consider as opposed to support – identify the social and economic considerations; identify different management strategies for determining how sectors will receive allocation. This is sort of like the mechanics. The next strategy is allocation shifts in determining alternative methods for establishing and managing allocations.

MS. VON HARTEN: I just heard Michelle say mechanics; maybe we could combine these three strategies into the mechanics of designing allocation strategies and then just have one strategy instead of 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3; define the mechanisms as considering who, what and how. It is just a suggestion if you wanted to reduce the number of strategies.

DR. DUVAL: I also think that if you are talking about 6.4, identifying management strategies for determining allocation shifts; I almost feel like that is an alternative method for establishing and managing allocations; so perhaps we could combine those. I guess under existing 6.4, it looks like E, consider establishing allocations by permit; each permit holder gets an allocation

that fluctuates based on the ACL – that seems like an IFQ. Since we’ve already got that language elsewhere, perhaps that could just be eliminated.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes; and I kind of want to eliminate 6.4D, because I feel like establishing framework for in-season allocation shifts covers the idea without specifically saying that we are going to consider allocation shifts from commercial to recreational – or rather commercial from recreational if the recreational aren’t projected to meet their ACLs. I think that is really one-sided and I am not comfortable with that.

MR. BREWER: I agree with Anna 100 percent; all of this is really sub sued under something that we are already required by law to do; and that is to manage to optimum yield. These allocations that we’re talking about and the shifts, we should be looking at those shifts so that we are as best we’re able to achieving optimum yield.

MS. BECKWITH: Just to that point, Chester, be careful; because, remember, that for the recreational fishery, optimum yield sometimes is abundance in the water and not necessarily achieving that ACL completely. That has been a fun discussion we keep having around this table. Anyways, we can chat about that offline.

MR. BOWEN: We need to remember Anna’s statement when it comes up to this gag amendment that we have coming up.

MS. BECKWITH: I couldn’t agree more.

DR. DUVAL: We’re not getting into that here.

MR. HAYMANS: I think I would drop G – I’m sorry, I’m back at three; I’m behind. If we went back to 3; I would drop G, because it deals with something we are already doing.

DR. DUVAL: You’re talking about Strategy 6.3, Action G?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes. You were in 6.4, right?

DR. DUVAL: Amber had made the suggestion that we could potentially combine Strategy 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 as something that would consider the mechanics of designing allocations or designing allocation formulas.

MR. HARTIG: I would just ask Doug why does he want to get rid of G?

MR. HAYMANS: We already allocate versus a lot of different gear. Specifically for black sea bass; I mean we’re already talking about a longline allocation, a trap allocation, a hook and line. We already look at gear-type allocations. I just saw that as repetitive specifically for black sea bass.

MR. HARTIG: I think the AP wants to consider an allocation for the hook-and-line black sea bass fishery, if I’m not mistaken.

MR. HAYMANS: Right; and I am not saying we shouldn’t. I’m saying we already do.

MR. PHILLIPS: We're looking at it, but I don't know that we're doing it, per se. I don't know that it hurts to leave it in there.

DR. DUVAL: Well, we could just make it simple and say consider allocations by gear type and just leave it at that.

MS. VON HARTEN: Do you want us to combine Strategy 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, or just keep them separate?

MR. BELL: You could certainly combine it. I think what we're struggling with is just losing some of the detail we have in there. If you are going to collapse it, just retain the thoughts. I think we mentioned that earlier; that is just what we're going through. Whether it is the sea bass thing or whatever; we're just kind of afraid of losing certain points, but as long as we can capture it all – if you can collapse it to a little more generic, that is fine.

MS. VON HARTEN: I'm just talking about combining the strategies, but all the actions would still remain underneath that one larger strategy.

DR. DUVAL: I think most of those are dealing with just the mechanics of how you could potentially structure an allocation, different means of allocation formulas, and the social and economic considerations that need to be taken into account when considering allocations. I think those could all fit under one sort of mechanics of allocation options or something like that.

Is there anything else on that? I think we've made it pretty clear that we want to make sure that this is broad, this is inclusive, and that the language is not prescriptive at all. If we're done with this one, I think hopefully we'll be able to move through the communication goal a little bit more quickly. I think for the most part we've kind of run through the time frame for how we're going to consider this. Hopefully, we can get through this in the time remaining before lunch.

MS. VON HARTEN: This next one is dealing with our discussions about stakeholder engagement. I went through all of the breakout session notes and pulled out the communication outreach, stakeholder engagement types of strategies that you talked about. Objective 1 is talking about communication approaches that provide streamlined and timely information.

The strategies that are under that talk about using innovative technology; so things that we aren't necessarily using right now; using the council's website as a clearing house. There were some suggestions on how to make some improvements to our existing website. Then Strategy 1.3 is alternative approaches.

That was talking about some of the listening sessions, stations we talked about, and more webinars and things like that. Objective 2 is talking about making sure that our communication supports working with a diverse audience of stakeholders and using more targeted communication strategies to increase that stakeholder engagement.

Then Objective 3 is talking about improving awareness and understanding of fishery science and research and working with partners to do that under the first strategy. Objective 4 is also talking about improving awareness and understanding of social and economic issues that are linked to

fisheries management; again bringing in that seafood and fishing business component that you had discussions about on the last day.

Go back to Objective 1 and we can talk about Strategy 1.1 and some of the innovative technology, if you could just look through those actions. We talked about some of the public hearing format changes, using more web-based hearings and these listening stations, looking at different types of webinar software; using video conferencing, which would allow two way face-to-face interactions; conducting scoping via webinars and allowing stakeholders to provide comment in a comment box on the webinars; more Q&A webinars with council staff; hosting webinars on specific topics just for snapper grouper permit holders; and expanding the use of webinars to do more outreach on fishery science topics; and then adding a final resolution to our constant-contact sign-up form that would allow people to indicate what sector they represent.

DR. DUVAL: I was going to ask or suggest if D, E, and F under that particular strategy might be combined in some way. It is talking about using interactive webinar software or video conferencing and then providing a comment box. It seems like all three of those are talking about how we do either scoping or public hearings and just the particular technology that we use in there.

I don't necessarily want to lose the idea of the comment box. But again, I think probably similar to the management goal; some of these are present and some of the others underneath other strategies and a couple of these other objectives. Perhaps we could note where an action meets multiple objectives.

MR. HARTIG: I agree with that as long as we don't lose the things, keep them in parentheses or whatever you are going to do. The other thing I was thinking is that we really need a way to inform the public of the results of our stock assessments in layman terms; somehow we incorporate that into this somewhere. It is critical.

In red snapper we missed a really good opportunity to really explain to the people what was happening in red snapper. Yes, what you are seeing is exactly what the assessment says, but then go on to say why we have to do what we did – so some way to really get the assessment results so that people can understand them.

DR. DUVAL: Perhaps that might be a new strategy under Objective 3 where improving awareness and understanding of fishery science and research and how these inform management; have another strategy that would deal with the methods used to disseminate the results of stock assessments to the public in order to provide a clearer understanding.

MR. HARTIG: Sure.

DR. DUVAL: Anything else under the first strategy under Objective 1? Chester, did you have your hand raised?

MR. BREWER: Yes; just a niggling point on 1.1-J, where it says a check-off box for indication of the sector they represent. I don't know that all the folks that you are going to be having comment – and hopefully you will have a lot more than just “representatives of a sector.” You

are going to have people who are involved with that sector; and so a niggling point just might be which sector they participate in or something like that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Wouldn't H fall under I; can't they be put together?

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, if I recall from our discussion; these webinars would only be for snapper grouper permit holders on topics that were coming up in amendments, so targeting Q&A sessions with just permit holders on different amendments that were going to impact them. It is a little more specific. It is more about targeting that specific sector.

DR. DUVAL: I think "I" probably also fits under this new strategy that we just added under Objective 3 with regard to dissemination of the results of stock assessments. If there is nothing else on that first strategy, the second one is really looking at using the council's website as a clearinghouse for easy-to-access information on regulations, management plans, and management actions; actions that would consider different ways to utilize the website itself. My only comment here was that D and E seem to be very similar, repetitive, and probably also covered under the first strategy under 1.1.

MS. VON HARTEN: D and E; is that what you said?

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MS. VON HARTEN: Well, the comment box under Strategy 1.1; that was a comment box on the webinar. This is talking about a Q&A comment box on the site that would allow people to – like, for instance, like the Gulf Council, when they are collecting public comment, they actually have a form on their site that you can submit your comments electronically on their site.

That was one thing, but this is talking about a Q&A. Then the suggestion box, yes, they are similar. We do have a contact form on our site now. It would just be something that was a little bit more specific to allow users to specifically comment on a topic or an amendment or whatever. But, yes, they could definitely be combined; but I think maybe they should stay, because it is something new that we don't offer on the site now. Does that make sense?

DR. DUVAL: We don't offer a suggestion box right now?

MS. VON HARTEN: It is more like a contact form. I think this was a suggestion box like we put up a specific topic that they provide a suggestion about, maybe not; I don't know.

DR. DUVAL: I'm fine with keeping them separate. Right now maybe just clarify that Q&A might be for a particular amendment or action as opposed to sort of a more general suggestion box; because I have a feeling if you have both of those, you will get sort of a mix of stuff and people will use both items to simply voice opinions about whatever they want.

G needs to be eliminated; clearly, it has nothing to do with this. Then alternative outreach approaches is the next strategy, a whole suite of items in there. We could move 1.3D to that new strategy under Objective 3 about the stock assessment process and communicating that. Then the only other comment I had was that 1.3L and N with regard to informal port meetings for educational purposes and diversifying the locations of in-person meetings; those both seemed to

be a little bit similar to 1.1C, looking at changing the format of in-person meetings. I don't know if those could be combined or just noted that it is also present under another strategy.

Is there anything else under Objective 1? Objective 2 is encouraging and supporting engagement with a diverse audience of stakeholders. There is only one strategy under there. I think my only comment was that 2.1C and 2.1D could probably be combined and just noting that you are maintaining a database of fishing clubs, recreational fishing groups, and bait and tackle shops, fishing businesses; and just note the specific types of groups that you would want to maintain a database on.

MR. COX: In Action 2.1E, there is already a database for the seafood dealers, because we have to have a permit, so you can find that on the SERO Website.

MR. BELL: In that list of groups or clubs or whatever, don't forget recreational dive clubs or those types of groups that have an interest as well.

DR. DUVAL: The final objective is improving awareness and understanding of fishery science and how these inform management – sorry, second to last. We've already added a new strategy and moved a couple actions underneath that. Most of these actions under Strategy 3.1 are with regard to angler education.

It might be that 3.1A could be moved under that new strategy; and then it seems like B and C, I don't know, I would be interested in hearing what others think about combining that; the proper handling and discarding of fish as well as barotrauma and use of descending devices. It seems like sort of one big collection of fish-handling stuff. I see some heads nodding.

I think the only thing under Objective 4 that kind of stood out to me was that in terms of improving understanding of social and economic issues and how they are linked to fisheries management is that all of these actions really deal with seafood marketing, so they would be applicable to dealers, to restaurants, to individual commercial fishermen.

We haven't really addressed information on sort of how social and economic information is used from for-hire fisheries or private anglers and how that information is incorporated into the management process when we're considering things like modifications to bag limits or recreational fishing seasons or anything like that. Perhaps we could add an action that would deal with that. Is there anything else that folk can think of? Chester.

MR. BREWER: This is generally under 4. The idea, and it is not expressly stated here, but there is already somewhat of a move underfoot to educate chefs and restaurant owners about underutilized species and trying to incorporate those into menus. You might specifically want to say that would be maybe one of the objectives here. That is something that could be very effective particularly for some of the commercial folks that are then supplying these restaurants and some of the species that now are just considered bycatch and probably put back overboard could be utilized in the restaurants and then fish markets.

MS. VON HARTEN: Chester, since that is talking about expanding kind of the audiences that we reach, could we maybe put it under Objective 2 that is talking about engagement with a diverse audience of stakeholders and have those as an action under there?

MR. BREWER: What you really want to do is the seafood markets and particularly the chefs; you want to educate them as to the underutilized species, a lot of times which are just considered bycatch now, that could be utilized in the restaurant. A lot of times they are a lot cheaper and the quality of them can be pretty good. That is a way to better utilize some of these species.

DR. DUVAL: So really how to market those underutilized or less familiar species to their customers.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, we are already doing it; but in addition to underused species, how about invasive species that are edible and consumable? I am thinking lionfish here. The danger in doing that is that once you create a market for something and an infrastructure for harvesting it, then there becomes an incentive for keeping the invasive species available. That is the downside of it; but the positive side of it is if you can create a market and a fishery for it, then that may help with the ecological impact that it is causing.

MR. BELL: I am going to sound like a broken record here. Objective 4 is improve awareness and understanding of how social and economic issues are linked to fisheries management. We've got one strategy and that strategy deals with seafood and I guess seafood-related businesses and things.

Perhaps another strategy might be – going back to there is great economic value in healthy populations of fish, particularly like with the ecotourism aspect of things, people will pay lots and lots and lots of money to go dive in places where fish populations are healthy. Maybe that is a whole different strategy. That is not seafood; that is people willing to expend large amounts of money to go look at what could be seafood. I just throw that out there. Since the objective itself was talking about social and economic issues in general, I just don't want to miss the boat with the value of that particular use of the resource. Maybe that could be captured in a separate strategy; I don't know.

DR. LANEY: I would support that; I think that is a great idea, Mel. Different sorts of fish-watching other than diving come to mind, like jumping sturgeons. I was just out on the RV Savannah last week, and they were telling me about how many jumping sturgeon they are seeing out in Warsaw Sound now, I think.

Who knows; you could develop a whole ecotourism industry, perhaps, developed around a combination of marine mammals and seabirds and jumping resources. Whether they be sailfish or marlin or whatever jumps out there, somebody would probably pay to go see one jump.

DR. DUVAL: I'm sure that counts as harassment with regard to sturgeon.

DR. LANEY: Not as long as there is a minimum distance away from the jumping species; I think probably that would be a reasonable and prudent measure that our NMFS colleagues would say was okay.

DR. DUVAL: Congratulations! You've made it through two of the draft management objectives. I thank everybody for your attention.

MR. HAYMANS: Do these documents go through an IPT-type process? I had some suggestions to formatting, not wordsmithing, but that would shorten the document and have it be less intimidating to a lot of folks. I didn't know whether it was appropriate to say it here or just talk offline about it.

DR. DUVAL: Fire away.

MR. HAYMANS: All of this discussion about to consider, blah, blah, blah; in this initial strategy note where we already talk about consideration of development of different types; instead of repeating Action 1.1A, sort of like we do in other places, I would go A through G or whatever it would be as a bullet; and drop all of that opening dialogue and say a specific quota-based management or whatever the topic may be, instead of repeating every time.

What that does is picks you up at least a line for every item that we look at and I think shortens the document based on what I see by at least half and maybe more. It just makes it more readable, in my opinion. Do you follow sort of where I am?

MS. VON HARTEN: You're saying bullet the action items and sort of get rid of the action and just have bullets?

MR. HAYMANS: Get rid of the action and rather than saying consider this or evaluate that, include a short opening in the strategy, which, for instance, in Strategy 1.1, under management you already "say consider development of different types of quota-based management systems", and then "by", colon, and then list those as bullets as you go down or something in that nature rather than repeating consider, explore under each one. To me that really shortens the document up; just a thought.

DR. DUVAL: We may have to circle back around to you for some more specifics on that to make sure that staff is able to capture exactly what you are talking about. The only thing I would say about bullets is we need to have some means of referring to which number bullet or something.

MR. HAYMANS: You are leaving that as the bullet, the 1.1A or B or whatever, but it is getting rid of – for instance, in B where we talk about consider; we've repeated that word consider and that phrase multiple times. That phrase goes in the strategy with a colon, and then you just list those things coming down. You pick up at least a line per action.

MS. VON HARTEN: The bullets would be numbered or lettered?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MS. VON HARTEN: Yes, I get it.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other sort of general comments like that? We've got a few minutes left. Just to make sure everybody is clear on the next steps from here, Amber, do you mind just reviewing sort of the timeline one more time for folks?

MS. VON HARTEN: And if you don't remember what I say right now, this is in that follow-up that you will see I think under Executive Finance. The timeline for this is typed up in there. Between now and March, I will revise these two strategic goal documents based on our discussions today.

Then also for the March meeting have the science and governance ones. Now that we've kind of been through this process, hopefully, in March we can move through those a little bit more quickly; but they will be similar format based on Doug's suggestions. That is what we'll work on in March is just science and governance.

Then since we don't really have much time today to talk about how we want to get public input, I would like for you to be thinking about that. We do have some ideas about maybe doing some listening stations to get public comment, where people actually go to, say, the DMF Office in Morehead City.

Michelle is there and she is on the webinar and staff is in Charleston and we have discussion back and forth with whoever wants to come to that Morehead City location instead of sending staff on the road all over the place to do public input. So start thinking about maybe some other ways that you want to collect public input.

We can also do another web-based comment form and things like that. For March we will focus on science and governance. If we have time, we can look at the revisions to these two documents, but we need to do the science and governance first. Then once those science and governance ones have been revised based on the March input, we'll pull together a draft complete document of all four strategic goals and go out for public comment sometime between March and June.

Then based on how we feel we need to proceed, the idea was to have this second Council Member Visioning Workshop sometime in the summer. I hope maybe in July, late July to come back together, look at the public comment, make some more revisions; and then once we have these actions kind of more fleshed out, you start prioritizing of when you want to try to accomplish some of these actions.

We'll go through and prioritize short-term actions that could be started in 2015 and 2016, and that would be what would be developed into Amendment 37, which could have several different actions under that amendment. Then things that would maybe take a little bit longer term over '16, '17, and '18.

I envision you guys looking at this draft vision blueprint on an annual basis. Maybe that is where every December you start looking at it again, especially if we have new council members coming on, to bring them up to speed on the current draft of this vision blueprint. This should be a very fluid document that changes over time.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Amber, I think that is a good idea. Once we get to the point of having a blueprint that is approved, reviewing it at the December council meeting every year, because that is also when we set our priorities for the upcoming year. We look at the chart that Gregg hands out during Executive Finance and we all sort of mark our priorities. I think folding the blueprint into that process is a good idea. Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you for laying out that timeline and how you are going to do it. What I would like to see, though, is a template for the listening stations, how you view that happening. Where different council members will be during these listening sessions; I would like to see that laid out on how you would envision that to happen.

MS. VON HARTEN: Okay; and the Mid-Atlantic Council does this type of listening station, so I can get with them and see how they kind of map it out and see how we could adapt it for our uses.

DR. DUVAL: All right, is there anything else with regard to visioning at this point?

DR. LANEY: Well, one thing that occurs to me – and this is longer range – is that we’re going through this whole process for the snapper grouper fishery because that is the council’s biggest fishery I think. But, shouldn’t we also be thinking as we do this about how some of these measures that we consider for this fishery might apply to other fisheries in the future as well? That is something maybe just to keep in the back of our brains.

DR. DUVAL: I would say absolutely. That was certainly some of the discussion we had when we made the tough decision to just focus on the snapper grouper fishery was that what we learn through this process would be applicable or translatable to some of our other fisheries, certainly, but thank you for reminding us of that, Wilson. If there is nothing else, Mr. Chairman, it is 11:54 a.m. on my computer. I don’t know if you would like to go ahead and recess for lunch.

MR. HARTIG: I think that is a great idea; you got us done early today. We will recess for lunch and be back at one o’clock.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:54 o’clock a.m., December 1, 2014.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
December 24, 2014

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

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

P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

W. Chester Brewer

250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
561/655-4777 (ph)
WCBLAW@aol.com

Mark Brown

3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@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

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

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

PHIL STEELE
BONNIE BONWITH
MONICA STREET-BRUNELLO
KEVIN ANSON
PRES PATE
JACK MCGOVERN

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

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@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

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

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Visioning Workshop
Monday, December 1, 2014

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:	EMAIL ADDRESS:	MAILING ADDRESS:
George Selberry	NOVA		
Tom Swetzel	843-222-7456	CFSF	Tom@SustainableFishings.org
J.P. BROOKER	OCEAN CONS. 727 286 0338	fishnet	brooker@oceanconservancy.org
EMILY HELMICK	801 403 3397		ehelmick@perthst.org
Bree Keery	805-619-0039	FREEA I	@Altman. Com
Wells BAKER	252-728-5637	wbarker@ec.w.com	1857 Hwy 101 - Beaufort, N.C. 28516
Lora Clarke Pew	631-379-6718	lclarke@perthst.org	
Gretchen Martin	252 646 5491	Martin1639@ec.r.com	Wilmington, NC
Bob Lorenz	910-282-4755	RJLORENZ@EC.RA.COM	WILMINGTON, NC
Susan Shufman	912. 222.9206	SusanShufman@att.net	St Simons Island

PLEASE SIGN IN

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

Visioning Workshop

Monday, December 1, 2014

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:

AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:

EMAIL ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS:

JAMES FELTCHER 292 473 3287

123 HARPER RD
MHW 5 HARPER NC 27953

Emily Helmick Rem

ehelmick@pelhub.org

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