

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **SHRIMP COMMITTEE**

**Westin Jekyll Island  
Jekyll Island, Georgia**

**March 3, 2020**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

David Whittaker, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
Jessica McCawley  
Spud Woodward

Steve Poland, Vice-Chair  
Dr. Carolyn Belcher  
Dr. Roy Crabtree  
LCDR Jeremy Montes

#### **COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Chester Brewer  
Dr. Kyle Christiansen

Mel Bell  
Tim Griner

#### **COUNCIL STAFF**

John Carmichael  
Julia Byrd  
Kelly Klasnick  
Cameron Rhodes  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
Kim Iverson

Dr. Brian Chevront  
Myra Brouwer  
Dr. Chip Collier  
Christina Wiegand  
John Hadley

#### **OBSERVERS/PARTICIPANTS**

Shep Grimes  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. George Sedberry  
Dewey Hemilright  
Tony Dilernia  
Pat O'Shaugnessy

Dr. Jack McGovern  
Dr. Clay Porch  
Duane Smith  
Erika Burgess  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Rick DeVictor

Other observers and participants attached.



The Shrimp Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Tuesday, March 3, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman David Whitaker.

MR. WHITAKER: I will call the committee to order. The first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. The committee is composed of Steve Poland, Anna Beckwith, Carolyn Belcher, Chris Conklin, Roy Crabtree, Jessica McCawley, Jeremy Montes, and Spud Woodward. I think everyone is here. Now Approval of the Agenda. Does anyone have any recommendations or changes for the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved.

Approval of the Minutes from the December 2019 Committee Meeting, does anyone have any changes to that? Seeing none, the committee minutes are approved. Chip, you're going to take us through an overview of this change in the shrimp?

DR. COLLIER: Yes. Before we get into that, I was just going to go through a few things. Actually, let me go through the staff report on what we've done since you guys have met last. You guys discussed Shrimp Amendment 11, which is going to be discussing the cold-weather transit provisions in the South Atlantic region, and, at the December 2019 meeting, you guys approved the purpose and need for the document, the option to include in the amendment, and, since then, we've actually added another option, based on recommendations from the Law Enforcement Committee Chair, the Shrimp Committee Chair, as well as the Council Chair. Then we also sent out the draft amendment for public hearings, and so you guys are going to be seeing the amendment for the first time today, and we'll go through that in the decision document.

What we've done since the last meeting is we had a joint meeting, which was a joint meeting of the Advisory Panel for Law Enforcement, Shrimp, and Deepwater Shrimp. During that meeting, there was a lot of discussion on appropriate transit provisions, and it was really good having the law enforcement and shrimpers at the same meeting.

They started off with very diverse opinions on what transit provisions should be required, and the law enforcement, obviously, wanted more stringent requirements, and they recommended some VMS requirements, and then the shrimpers wanted some more lenient requirements, and so they heard each other's recommendations and then came up with a joint recommendation that the group agreed to, and I will show you that new option that's in the decision document.

We also had public hearing webinars, and they weren't all that well attended. I believe there was just four people that attended those from the outside, and we have one comment, and there were no comments on the Wufoo form that we have, the digital form that we provide.

We added the option in the Shrimp Amendment 11, like I said before, and then we also drafted the amendment since the last meeting, and so we've been busy on this amendment, and it came together pretty quickly. Going through the timing of this amendment, right now, we're looking at we had the public hearings between January and February, and then, now at this meeting, we're going to review the effects analysis, the public hearing comments, and then potentially approve for secretarial review.

What needs to be done? First of all, we need to review the public hearing comments. Second is review the advisory panel comments, and the council will need to select a preferred option and

then consider approving for secretarial review. That's it on the background for Shrimp Amendment 11.

Here is a draft summary report of the Law Enforcement, Shrimp, and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels, and it's Attachment 1a, and we broke it up into -- The first part describes what the law enforcement concerns were, what they were recommending and talking about, and you can see that they mentioned VMS, and there were some issues that they had mentioned with AIS as a useful technology to monitor where vessels are.

In general, they made this motion here, Motion 1, which is the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel recommends shrimp vessels transiting in cold-weather closed areas are required to be equipped with VMS and may transit through the closed area if fishing gear is appropriately stowed. Then they continued on to describe appropriately stowed and transit provisions.

Then the Shrimp and Deepwater Shrimp discussed some of the transit provisions, and we provided some highlights there, and then they had Motion 2, and their motion reads: Deepwater Shrimp and Shrimp Advisory Panels recommend vessels may transit with non-stop progression through the South Atlantic cold-weather closed areas with fishing gear appropriately stowed, with doors out of the water, and bag straps must be removed from the net.

Given that the attendees recognized that these are very disjunct recommendations at the same meeting, they wanted to have some discussion and maybe provide a joint recommendation, and you can see there that they provided a joint recommendation, and it was unanimous for this. One thing that we didn't want to do was actually have the panels vote on this, because there was a little bit of concern. There were four Law Enforcement Advisory Panel members there and three Shrimp Advisory Panel members there, and so, automatically, if the shrimp guys -- If the law enforcement guys got together, they could recommend one and kind of supersede the other, but they did come up with a consensus on a recommendation here.

All three panels recommend trawlers may transit the South Atlantic cold-weather closed areas under the following conditions: transit must be non-stop progression through an area, and gear must be appropriately stowed. "Gear appropriately stowed" means doors in the rack, nets in the rigging and tied down, and the trinet on the deck.

This was done prior to the public hearing, that this advisory meeting got together, and we saw this as a potential option for the public to consider during the public hearings, and so we got together with the Chair of Law Enforcement, the Chair of the Shrimp Committee, and the Chair of the Council, to make sure that they would be okay with including this as an option in the amendment, and we wanted to get it in there before public hearings, and so we did put it in there, and the public did review this as an option in Shrimp Amendment 11. Is there any questions about that?

I did provide a summary of public hearing comments, and this will be quick. I was actually wrong. There were two attendees at the meetings, and then each night we had two council members, and there was only one comment that was received, and it was for Option 1 in the amendment, which is the -- It matches the Gulf recommendation, which is doors out of the water, nets out of the water, and bag straps removed.

Now, getting into the decision document, we've gone over some of the background, and we have some of the actions in here, and the objectives for this meeting, as I have said, is we have reviewed public hearing comments, and we do have some recommended changes from the IPT. The council will need to select a preferred option and then consider approval for secretarial review, and the timeline indicates that you guys are going to be reviewing the public comments, reviewing comments from the IPT, and, once again, consider for approval, and then we'll hopefully get this to the Secretary for review by April.

The purpose and need for this amendment is to modify cold-weather closed area transit provisions to match vessel design, reduce socioeconomic impacts for fishermen avoiding the areas if they cannot comply with the regulations, and improve safety-at-sea while maintaining protection for overwintering white shrimp and regulation enforceability. The need is to adjust regulations, because gear cannot be stowed below deck on many vessels. Are there any comments on the purpose and need for this?

MR. BELL: I'm not on the committee, but, obviously, this is not something that we need every year, but occasionally we do, and South Carolina is probably the state that has had to deal with the closures more frequently, and I know Georgia and South Carolina together have done this two times, but I know we've also needed to act independently, and we've had the closure, and so this is something that I have heard about from our shrimpers the number of times that I've been involved in this, and so you may not have had a lot of them show up on the webinar or in person, but they don't mind calling me and venting and explaining the issues associated with being able to transit through closed federal waters under the existing restrictions.

I think one of the biggest problems with the way it's written now, with the nets and everything needing to be stowed below deck, is the net would include the TEDs, leatherback TEDs, and it's just the fishery now, and the gear they even have, is not the same that it was perhaps when those regulations were put in place, and I'm not sure when they went in place, and I think it was maybe the early 1990s or something, or maybe even sooner, but now the ability to even get that gear below deck safely just doesn't really work, and so it puts them in a position of they can't meet the requirement to stow all of that below deck, because they also are wanting, obviously, to bring back catch with them as well, which is either in coolers or stowed below deck, and so that's the issue.

It doesn't happen every year, and it just happens occasionally, but, when it happens, it's an impediment to them being able to continue to operate, and let's say if Georgia happened to be -- If federal waters off of Georgia were open, they can go to Georgia, but, in the 2018 event, both Georgia and South Carolina had requested that federal waters be closed, and so these were some guys that were able to go all the way to Florida, and they would have to transit all the way from Florida back, in our case, to South Carolina, and they want to be able to bring catch back with them, and they want to be able to transit through, at least in some part of it, in federal waters, and that's, in part, because there are safety issues associated with, if you tried to make that entire trip staying in nothing but state waters, you run into some areas of more shoaling-type waters and all, particularly down at the Georgia/South Carolina interface, and so it's, with direct transit, they're going to go through federal waters.

It's not necessarily a lot of them, and it's not the majority of our fleet, but, the guys that do it, it was a big deal for them, and I would hear from them every time we would have one of these closures, but I think the biggest problem we face right now is just that the restrictions that are in

place are a bit antiquated, given how they operate now and given the requirements for the TEDs and everything in the nets, and so it just wasn't working, and so this seemed like a logical, fairly simple fix, is to just change the gear stowage requirement to allow them to transit occasionally when they need to transit, and that's what took us in this direction.

I did listen in on the webinar, the joint AP webinar that Chip described, and I do commend both APs involved. As Chip showed you, they had differences of opinion on how things should go, but those two APs worked together in that phone call, and they came up with an agreeable option that they have presented to us that they both could live with, and I thought that was great. I mean, when you have industry and you have law enforcement actually agreeing that this will work, and we both agree that it will work -- We don't have that happen a whole lot, and so I was really pleased with that, and I think the option that they came up with will work. I was just very, very pleased with that.

In terms of the why part, it's just that the current restrictions in the regs do not work for the fleet, at least the guys that I've talked to or that I do hear from, and this simple, relatively simple, adjustment will work, and it is acceptable to both the industry and law enforcement, which I think is a great thing, and so that's just a little input from me, and I'm not on your committee. Thank you.

MR. WHITAKER: Thank you, Mel. Speaking of those leatherback TEDs, I looked last night, and those were required -- The really large TEDs were required in 2002, well after the last change in that plan, and so it requires them below deck, and so you would have a very difficult time putting those below deck, particularly in the aft hold, or where they would like to put those nets. Chip, are you ready?

DR. COLLIER: I am just trying to write down some notes.

MR. CONKLIN: All this conversation we've been having on this, I forgot to say, but most of the transit boats, the big freezer boats and stuff, they develop these racks for storing their nets, and it's above deck, for their spare nets, and they don't have storage below deck anymore, and so this makes complete sense.

MR. WHITAKER: Thank you.

DR. COLLIER: The IPT had a slight recommendation to the purpose and need, and you can see it here highlighted in yellow, and it was just basically adding "cold-weather closed areas" into the purpose and need, to make it a little bit more clear, and so we'll leave that option up to you, if you would like to make that modification.

MR. WHITAKER: Do I have a motion to make this change?

MR. POLAND: **So moved, David.**

MR. WHITAKER: Steve moves. I have a second over here. **Any opposition to this change? Seeing none, we've made the changes in the IPT recommendations.**

DR. COLLIER: This is going to be -- Action 1 is kind of how we developed it, and it's modified in the actual amendment to just be more or less the amendment is the action in itself, and describing some of it, and so we have some language here that is a holdover from that, but it's really -- Because of the type of NEPA document that it is, and it's called a categorical exclusion, it doesn't have all the requirements that most of our amendments have to meet the NEPA guidelines, and so it's a little bit different from that, and so it was modified, but I want to go over some of the information, or at least give you guys a little background on why it's going to be a little bit different.

Here, I'm going to show you the two alternatives that you guys approved in December, and then we'll go over three options that are going to be included in Shrimp Amendment 11 that you guys are going to be approving for secretarial review, if you choose.

You guys had recommended these two alternatives that I have at the bottom of the page, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Alternative 1 is the current regulation, and I'm not going to read that all into the record, but you can see that. Then Alternative 2 matches the shrimp closed areas in the Gulf of Mexico, the transit provisions for those areas, and so this Alternative 2 is going to match Option 1, and that's going to be down below in the IPT recommendations.

These IPT recommendations are based on the Law Enforcement, Shrimp, Deepwater Shrimp joint meeting, and including their options in there, and so the status quo, which is current regulations, that has not changed, but you can see, in Option 1, we did modify the recommended text that you guys provided, and so, in Option 1, the IPT recommended a vessel may transit the South Atlantic cold-weather closed areas while possessing brown shrimp, pink shrimp, or white shrimp, provided the vessel is in transit and fishing gear is appropriately stowed. "Transit" means non-stop progression through the area with fishing gear appropriately stowed, and "gear appropriately stowed" means trawl doors and nets out of the water and bag straps removed.

This last bit, there was some discussion at the last council meeting, during the Full Council, to modify this, and what we have provided here is directly from the CFRs, so it matches the Gulf of Mexico shrimp closed areas.

Then Option 2 is the option based on the recommendation from the joint advisory panel, and so this reads: A vessel may transit the South Atlantic cold-weather closed areas while possessing brown shrimp, pink shrimp, or white shrimp, provided the vessel is in transit and fishing gear is appropriately stowed. "Transit" means non-stop progression through the area with fishing gear appropriately stowed. "Gear appropriately stowed" means trawls in the rack, or in the cradle, as some people will call it, nets in the rigging and tied down, and trinet on the deck.

Now we're going to need some committee action whether or not we can take the IPT and AP's recommendations for this, if it was good or if there is other things that we forgot. If we do that, that's going to require us pushing this back another meeting or so, in order to incorporate all the change. If you guys are okay with this IPT recommendations, those can become the recommendations that are currently in the amendment. You guys haven't really seen them, and so it's not really a change, but you do need to approve that these are the appropriate --

MR. WHITAKER: Do I have a motion to approve the IPT recommendations?

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MR. WHITAKER: Motion by Jessica and second by Steve. Any discussion? **Does anyone have any problem with this, approving this? Seeing no objection, it stands approved by the committee.**

DR. COLLIER: Now I will go into some of the effects analysis. Overall, the biological effects are expected to be similar between the three different options, the status quo, Option 1, and Option 2. They should all protect overwintering white shrimp, and there should be a minimal impact. There are some indirect biological benefits due to Option 1 and Option 2. If fishermen are able to transit more efficiently through the area, it could reduce greenhouse gases, as well as reduce some of the noise pollution.

Then, as far as the social effects, Option 1 and Option 2 would improve safety-at-sea, because it would be less handling of the gear. Option 1, you would not have to stow the gear below deck, and, in Option 2, you would not have to handle the gear at all. You would just have to have it in the rigging and be ready to transit with it.

Option 1 and Option 2 would increase trust in management, by addressing some of the stakeholder concerns, as well as law enforcement. Law enforcement officers stakeholders in this amendment, and so it's good to consider their recommendations. Two of the differences here, some of the social effects, Option 1 matches the Gulf of Mexico EEZ regulations, and then Option 2 matches typical stowage for shrimp vessels while they are transiting long distances.

Some of the economic effects, based on the economic analysis from January through June of 2018, this regulation seems to impact thirty-three vessels, and this serves as an estimate of a likely number of vessels impacted by these cold-weather closure transit provisions, and the status quo might have a negative economic impact, because the vessels are unable, or unwilling, to stow fishing gear according to the current regulations, and they might have to offload shrimp at an alternative port, as opposed to their home port.

There is also some potential for lower net revenue, and therefore lower net economic benefits, stemming from increased transit and offloading costs, and they also may face increased shipping costs, because they are having to offload in areas where they typically do not offload.

Option 1 would be easier to comply with, and so these next few are going to be pretty similar between Option 1 and Option 2. Option 1 would be easier to comply with and expected results and direct economic benefits in years when federal cold-weather closures are in effect. Therefore, there would be a higher net revenue, as well as net economic benefits for affected vessels. There would also be increased shipping costs, and also offloading costs, which would not necessarily be there in years when they could transit more easily.

Going into the overall, Option 1 is expected to increase the net benefits for shrimp the most out of the three options considered, following by Option 2, and the main reason for the difference between those is there would be some cost with having to disassemble your gear or bring the gear back down to the cradle, as opposed to directly transiting once you're done fishing.

With that, we need the council to -- We can go over more, if you would like to see more, and these are just the highlights that we selected from the amendment, and so what we need now is a preferred option selected by the council, if you guys choose to select a preferred. I will go back up to the three options.

**MS. MCCAWLEY: I move that we select Option 2 as our preferred.**

MR. WHITAKER: Okay. Do I have a second? Steve seconds. Any further discussion?

MR. BELL: Just something else to put on the record here, related to the justification for all of this and the importance of it, is that, originally, before I think it was Amendment 9 to the plan, it was much more difficult to close federal waters. The process was fairly complicated, and, the few times we did it back in the past, we were lucky to get federal waters closed by March, and so I think it was Amendment 9 that we changed the process, and now we're able to work very directly with National Marine Fisheries Service, and we've been able to, the last couple of closures at least, we've been able to make that happen fast, and so we've been closed by January.

The whole layout of a closure now is different from what it was back when this was all established and the original regs were involved, in terms of the stowage, and so there's a much longer period of time now, because we are able to respond quickly, and so the impact of that being able to not transit through those waters is a lot more than it used to be way back, and so I think that's one thing that has changed. In addition, David mentioned the leatherback TED requirements and all, but another big thing that's different in these closures is we're able to have National Marine Fisheries Service enact the closure a lot sooner. I mean, I can remember it taking well into March, I think, back in time, and so that is a difference now, and that's why this is a bigger deal now than it was let's say ten years ago, perhaps.

LCDR MONTES: I just wanted to add that I think all three of the options, status quo, Option 1, and Option 2, are clearly defined and easily enforceable at-sea, and so I'm glad to see that. I just have one question, for clarification, under the AP, and we've got all the comments we got from the joint AP and the motion that they passed all together, but it says that the Shrimp Deepwater Shrimp AP recommends Option 1, and then, the next line down they recommend Option 2, and just to confirm that -- It seems like maybe the timeline of the Shrimp Deepwater Shrimp was first, and then they got together with LE, and I just wanted to confirm that that's what happened.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, that's exactly what happened, having the discussion. Taking up a little bit on what Mel said, two years ago, we had a winter freeze, and we were able to close relatively quickly, thanks to the council's previous action, and we did save a lot of shrimp that year, and we had a fairly decent spring harvest of roe shrimp that year, and so we actually did some good with this rule, and I think, in some years, it's doesn't make so much difference, and everything is wiped out, but, that year, it definitely did.

The point I wanted to make about the doors in the cradles is, in talking with law enforcement, if those doors are swinging out the outriggers, that's a boat that is about to work, or is working, and that's the way they look at those. If the airplanes are flying over and they see that, they're going to send a boat out there to check it, but, if it's got the doors in the cradles, that's obviously a boat that is in transit, or at least thirty or forty minutes away from getting the gear overboard, and so it's not a law enforcement concern, and so, anyhow, any further -- Monica has a question.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: We've had some great discussion today, and it's really helpful, because, to take you back a little bit, remember this specific amendment was part of, I think, an amendment to golden crab, an amendment to shrimp, an amendment to something else maybe, and then it was pulled out very quickly, and the first time you saw it was in December, and then now is the second time you've seen it, and so I think a number -- I just found, because we were kind of hurrying to get this done, I found just some gaps, just logically, and, if the outsider reader was supposed to come in and read this, would it make sense to them and the reasons why, and so I think that -- I'm sure, if you do approve it, to give staff latitude to incorporate some of that discussion into the document is really helpful.

I just note, Chip, in Figure 1.2.1, the cold-weather closed area is actually the entire EEZ, and it's not just that twenty-five miles that goes to where you can trawl and not trawl, and so I would just like to ask a couple more questions, just to kind of tie up the record for this.

What is the law in South Carolina? When you close your waters, and that's the only reason federal waters would close, and the same with Georgia, what are the state laws that are in effect, so that it would be potentially problematic, I guess, for a vessel to transit through as well, or maybe they eventually could home port back to you all, if they fished in Florida.

MR. BELL: Our law is basically nets and doors out of the water, state waters, and I think part of the concern here was that it's not necessarily -- You've also got the Coast Guard out there in federal waters, and it isn't just Georgia DNR or South Carolina DNR officers and the folks that they encounter, but our laws are technically -- Our state laws are technically a little less restrictive, and so these are more -- This would be more restrictive than our own state law, and that, again, came through that compromise with law enforcement trying to make it a little bit more -- As David pointed out, it's kind of a low bar if it's just doors and nets out of the water, and you can drop them pretty quickly, and so this is more restrictive than our own state waters, and Georgia can speak for Georgia.

MR. WHITAKER: In South Carolina, when you're talking about in closed waters, that's internal waters, where we allow no trawling, where DNR allows no trawling whatsoever, and so the typical mode of operation is, when you finish trawling at-sea, you don't want to be handling those doors at-sea, and so you bring them into state waters, into the harbor, and then load them, and it's just a lot safer that way, and so that's why that's written that way. I think Carolyn had a question.

DR. BELCHER: I was just going to speak to -- With Georgia, we don't necessarily have a law that states it, but it has to do, as Mel was saying, with the understanding of what law enforcement expects. When they are transiting in, they pretty much have a look about the boat, and, again, the outriggers are out, but the doors are in, and the trinet is stowed, all of these things that, for them, when they look, they pretty much know a boat is on its way transiting, but the problem was, if they were coming through from federal waters and through OLE, if they were the ones to see them -- Again, although the assessment that they would say they're transiting or not worried about it, they couldn't guarantee, relative to the Coast Guard boarding that same vessel, that they saw them, or NOAA Law Enforcement, and so their point was to give as much of the same language that they would use to assess, so that you wouldn't have that situation, should another law enforcement outside of Georgia DNR look at that boat.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This is all helpful, because, when I looked back at the original 1992 or 1993 when this went in, they wanted to make sure, the council did, that the nets were in an unfishable condition, which, at that time, they defined as stowed below deck. What I have heard today is, because of the size of the TEDs, particularly, I guess, leatherback TED requirements, which went in, as David said, in 2002, this then becomes a lot more difficult to stow these kinds of shrimp nets with the TED in them below deck, correct?

MR. WHITAKER: That's correct.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Then I guess -- We could figure that. I was thinking about to put in the document that it would take, in terms of -- I am not sure how a vessel, if they fished in Florida, and they were from South Carolina, and there was a closure of the EEZ -- I'm not sure how they would get back, I guess, if they couldn't go through Georgia state waters, and I could see that that would be really difficult, and that's what you're trying to take care of.

Then my last question is, and don't laugh at me, but nowhere in the document did we talk about like -- Maybe we could even have a diagram, and I found some in other shrimp amendments, but the kind of what the vessel looks like with the nets and the doors and everything else, and then I'm assuming that, if you're going to be shrimping, it would be with a net with a mesh size of four inches or less, and that's the reason, obviously, this initial requirement was put in, that, if you were to transit with shrimp onboard through a closed area, any mesh -- Any shrimp net, any net with a mesh of four inches or less, had to be stowed below deck, because those would be the kind of nets you would shrimp with.

MR. WHITAKER: Right. Inch-and-seven-eighths mesh, or thereabouts, is the shrimp mesh. Anything greater than that, much greater than that, is ineffective.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So we'll incorporate all of that in the document, and then I think you have tied up all of my little loopholes that I saw.

MR. WHITAKER: Any other discussion? **We have a motion on the floor to recommend Option 2 as the preferred option for Shrimp Amendment 11. Is there any opposition to this motion by the committee? Seeing none, the motion is approved.**

DR. COLLIER: Now we will go into Attachment E, which is the codified text. I wanted you guys to look at this prior to approval, and so the codified text, the way it's written right now, it was written for Option 1, but the text was very similar between the two, as far as non-stop progression through the area. The difference is in the stowage requirements, and so it seems like the stowage requirements could be modified based on your recommendations, and so this part -- The last segment of the codified text could be modified.

I will read it to you guys. It's in Part 622, and then 622.206, Revised Paragraph (a) (2) (iii), and so it would read: Brown shrimp, pink shrimp, or white shrimp may be possessed onboard a fishing vessel in a closed area, provided the vessel is in transit and that the shrimp fishing gear with trawl nets having a mesh size less than four inches, as measured between the centers of opposite knots when pulled taut, is appropriately stowed. For the purposes of this paragraph, "transit" means a non-stop progression through a closed area, and "appropriately stowed" means trawl doors in the

rack, nets in the rigging and tied down, and trinet on the deck of the boat. That's how it would be written. If there is any comments, let me know, on that.

The last part of this will be this draft motion that I have on the board right now, which is consider Shrimp Amendment 11 for final approval. **The draft motion reads: Recommend approval of Shrimp Amendment 11 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make necessarily editorial changes to the document and codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

MR. WHITAKER: Do I have a motion to put this draft?

MR. WOODWARD: **So moved.**

MR. WHITAKER: Spud makes the motion. Is there a second? Steve seconds it. Any further discussion on this? **Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved by the committee.**

Is there any other business for the Shrimp Committee? Okay. I don't think we have any further business, and so this committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 3, 2020.)

---

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By:  
Amanda Thomas  
April 3, 2020

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**COUNCIL STAFF**

3/4/20  
3/3/20

**Executive Director**

John Carmichael ✓  
[john.carmic@safmc.net](mailto:john.carmic@safmc.net)

**Deputy Director – Science**

Dr. Chip Collier ✓  
[chip.collier@safmc.net](mailto:chip.collier@safmc.net)

**Deputy Director - Management**

Dr. Brian Chevront ✓  
[brian.chevront@safmc.net](mailto:brian.chevront@safmc.net)

**Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer ✓  
[myra.brouwer@safmc.net](mailto:myra.brouwer@safmc.net)

**Senior Fishery Biologist**

Roger Pugliese  
[roger.pugliese@safmc.net](mailto:roger.pugliese@safmc.net)

**Citizen Science Program Manager**

Julia Byrd ✓  
[julia.byrd@safmc.net](mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net)

**Outreach Program Coordinator**

Cameron Rhodes ✓  
[cameron.rhodes@safmc.net](mailto:cameron.rhodes@safmc.net)

**Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
[cindy.chaya@safmc.net](mailto:cindy.chaya@safmc.net)

**Staff Accountant**

Suzanna Thomas  
[suzanna.thomas@safmc.net](mailto:suzanna.thomas@safmc.net)

**Fishery Biologist**

Dr. Mike Errigo ✓  
[mike.errigo@safmc.net](mailto:mike.errigo@safmc.net)

**Fisheries Social Scientist**

Christina Wiegand ✓  
[christina.wiegand@safmc.net](mailto:christina.wiegand@safmc.net)

**Fishery Economist**

John Hadley ✓  
[john.hadley@safmc.net](mailto:john.hadley@safmc.net)

**Outreach Specialists:**

BeBe Harrison - MyFishCount  
[bebe.harrison@safmc.net](mailto:bebe.harrison@safmc.net)

**Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson ✓  
[kim.iverson@safmc.net](mailto:kim.iverson@safmc.net)

Allie Iberle - Citizen Science  
[allie.iberle@safmc.net](mailto:allie.iberle@safmc.net)

**Administrative Officer**

Kelly Klasnick ✓  
[kelly.klasnick@safmc.net](mailto:kelly.klasnick@safmc.net)

**SEDAR Coordinators:**

Dr. Julie Neer  
[julie.neer@safmc.net](mailto:julie.neer@safmc.net)

**Meeting Coordinator**

Tina Chrise  
[tina.chrise@safmc.net](mailto:tina.chrise@safmc.net)

Kathleen Howington  
[kathleen.howington@safmc.net](mailto:kathleen.howington@safmc.net)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
2020 COUNCIL MEMBERS

~~3/4/20~~  
3/3/20

Jessica McCawley, **Chair**  
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

Mel Bell, **Vice Chair** ✓  
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division  
P.O. Box 12559  
217 Ft. Johnson Road  
Charleston, SC 29422  
(843)953-9007 (ph); (843)953-9159 (fax)  
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Robert Beal  
Executive Director  
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission  
1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200 A-N  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703)842-0740 (ph); (703)842-0741 (f)  
rbeal@asmfc.org

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

Dr. Carolyn Belcher  
GA DNR – Coastal Resources Division  
One Conservation Way, Suite 300  
Brunswick, GA 31520  
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-3143 (f)  
Carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.gov

Chester Brewer ✓  
4440 PGA Boulevard, Suite 600  
West Palm Beach, FL 33408  
(561)655-4777 (ph)  
wbsafmc@gmail.com

Dr. Kyle Christiansen ✓  
150 Cedar St.  
Richmond Hill, GA 31324  
(912)756-7560 (ph)  
christiansensafmc@gmail.com

Chris Conklin  
P.O. Box 972  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
(843)543-3833  
conklinsafmc@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

Tim Griner ✓  
4446 Woodlark Lane  
Charlotte, NC 28211  
(980)722-0918 (ph)  
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Representative  
TBD

LCDR Jeremy Montes  
U.S. Coast Guard  
909 SE 1st Ave.  
Miami, FL 33131  
(305)415-6788(ph); (305)710-4569(c)  
Jeremy.J.Montes@uscg.mil

Stephen Poland  
NC Division of Marine Fisheries  
PO Box 769  
3441 Arendell Street  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
(252)808-8011 (direct); (252)726-7021 (main)  
Steve.Poland@ncdenr.gov

Art Sapp  
2270 NE 25th St.  
Lighthouse Pointe, FL 33064  
(954)444-0820 (ph)  
artsappsafmc@gmail.com

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
2020 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

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)  
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

David Whitaker  
720 Tennent Street  
Charleston, SC 29412  
(843)953-9392  
david.whitakersafmc@gmail.com

Spud Woodward  
860 Buck Swamp Road  
Brunswick, GA 31523  
(912)258-8970 (ph)  
swoodwardsafmc@gmail.com

Dune Smith  
Pat O'Shaughnessy  
Dr. Wilson Honey  
Dr. George Sedberry  
Shep Brines  
Rick Devictor  
Erika Burgess  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. Clay Poreh  
Dewey Hemilright  
Tony DiIannis  
J.D. Dussins

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
2020 COMMITTEE MEMBERS continued

3/4/20  
3/3/20

**HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES**

Anna Beckwith, Chair  
Art Sapp, Vice Chair  
Chester Brewer  
Kyle Christiansen  
Tim Griner  
Jeremy Montes  
Steve Poland  
David Whitaker  
Staff contact: John Hadley

**INFORMATION & EDUCATION**

Spud Woodward, Chair  
Art Sapp, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Carolyn Belcher  
Chester Brewer  
Jeremy Montes  
David Whitaker  
Staff contact: Cameron Rhodes

**LAW ENFORCEMENT**

Mel Bell, Chair  
Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Kyle Christiansen  
Jeremy Montes  
Art Sapp  
Spud Woodward  
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

**MACKEREL COBIA**

Steve Poland, Chair  
Spud Woodward, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Anna Beckwith  
Mel Bell  
Chester Brewer  
Chris Conklin  
Roy Crabtree  
Tim Griner  
Jessica McCawley  
Art Sapp  
Mid-Atlantic Liaisons:  
Tony DiLernia and Dewey Hemilright  
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

**PERSONNEL**

Chester Brewer, Chair  
Mel Bell, Vice Chair  
Carolyn Belcher  
Jessica McCawley  
Steve Poland  
Staff contact: John Carmichael/Kelly Klasnick

**PROTECTED RESOURCES**

Spud Woodward, Chair  
David Whitaker, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Jeremy Montes  
Steve Poland  
Art Sapp  
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

**SSC SELECTION**

Carolyn Belcher, Chair  
Steve Poland, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
Roy Crabtree  
Art Sapp  
Spud Woodward  
Staff contact: Chip Collier/Mike Errigo

**SEDAR**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Mel Bell, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Anna Beckwith  
Carolyn Belcher  
Kyle Christiansen  
Roy Crabtree  
Tim Griner  
Steve Poland  
Staff contact: Chip Collier

**SHRIMP**

David Whitaker, Chair ✓  
Steve Poland, Vice Chair ✓  
Anna Beckwith ✓  
Carolyn Belcher ✓  
Chris Conklin ✓  
Roy Crabtree ✓  
Jessica McCawley ✓  
Jeremy Montes ✓  
Spud Woodward ✓  
Staff contact: Chip Collier