

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel
Wilmington, NC**

December 6, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Executive/Finance Committee

David Cupka, Chair
Dr. Michelle Duval
Charlie Phillips

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Martha Bademan

Council Members:

Tom Burgess
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Tom Swatzel
Dr. Wilson Laney
LCDR Scot Gibson

Steve Amick
John Jolley
Doug Haymans
Mel Bell
Anna Beckwith

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
John Carmichael
Mike Collins
Dr. Mike Errigo
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Chevront
Julie O'Dell
Anna Martin
Myra Brouwer
Amber Von Harten

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Otha Easley
Capt. Jim Kelley
Doug Boyd
Jason Walker
Pres Pate

Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Phil Steele
Scott Sandorf
Red Munden

Other Participants Attached

The Executive Finance Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel, Wilmington, North Carolina, December 6, 2012, and was called to order at 9:15 o'clock a.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: We'll get started with the Executive Finance Committee. The first order of business is the approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? I have two items that I'd like to add on the other business. One of them is the visioning exercise and the second one is the discussion on ACLs that Roy had asked for.

If we can add those two; are there any other additions to the agenda? Seeing none; then our agenda is approved as amended. The next order of business is approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Are there any corrections, additions, deletions to the minutes? Seeing none; then our minutes are approved. This brings us down to status of calendar year 2012 budget expenditures. I'm going to turn it over to Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: I hope you all had time to just take a quick look at this. The bottom line of what we're looking at ending up with this year is in the bottom right-hand corner of the Attachment 1. It looks like we'll finish the year with a surplus of about \$477,000, which we can carry over under the grant we're on into next year.

We also had funds that we did not budget that we had carried over from last year. It looks like we'll probably be carrying over a total of about \$750,000. We are not sure about what the budget – we're going to talk a little bit about next year's budgets. We haven't got a final word on that. We do know we could be looking at as high as a 19 percent cut in our budget next year for 2013.

We have positioned ourselves where we can survive that without any major setbacks. We probably will be able to go through the end of the grant period, which is two more years. We had a five-year grant. I think we've positioned ourselves to last that long. Now I don't know what will happen after that. I don't know how things are going to go for federal budgets. I think primarily because we've been somewhat frugal, even though we have accomplished a lot, we have been watching our dollars very closely. I think we are in good shape going into 2013.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, any questions for Bob on where we are in this year's budget? Seeing none; then we will move into our next agenda item, which is a discussion of the draft 2013 activity schedule.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, what you have in there now, this obviously has changed some at this meeting. First I guess is just to ask if anybody has any questions about the general activity schedule? The way we put this together, we start out with the question that Gregg is to with the technical staff. They look at everything in the pipeline that the council has proposed that we accomplish based on that timeline that we talked about at the last meeting. Mike then gets the actual meetings and number of meetings from Gregg and the staff. He sits down and based on past history he puts the dollars to it, and we come up with our activity schedule. The activity schedule part is the fluctuating costs.

Then the other part of our budget, of course, is the fixed cost like salaries and rent and the types of things that occur every year, administrative costs and so on. We have to continually adjust the

activity schedule as we go through the year and new priorities arise and we go different directions, but it generally gives us an idea of what costs we will incur during the upcoming year. If anybody has any questions on that, I'll be glad to answer them.

MR. CUPKA: Are there any questions for Bob? It is important if you chair a particular committee that you review that activities schedule in regard to that particular committee just to make sure we haven't let anything slip between the cracks. Any question for Bob on council activities? If not, we are going to go on to the SEDAR activities.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, the SEDAR activities are set by the SEDAR Steering Committee adjusted annually or every time we meet actually they're adjusted so it does change also. The folks that are involved in that, for the new council members here, are Bonnie and Roy representing the Center and the Region; the three executive directors from the Caribbean, the Gulf and the South Atlantic; the chairs of the three councils; the two directors of the commissions, the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; and then there is a representative from the HMS program as that is also part of the SEDAR process. We get approximately \$605,000 a year.

We've been level funded in the last four years for conducting SEDAR. It comes as part of our administrative grant. Although as we do expenditures in house, even though it is only one grant number, we keep separate what the SEDAR costs are from our other administrative costs. Then I provide Bonnie and the SEDAR Steering Committee – Bonnie is the chairman of the SEDAR Steering Committee, and she is the one with the money so we let her be chairman.

I provide Bonnie and the group with an update on how the expenditures are going in SEDAR. We're trying all the time to cut costs in the SEDAR. We are shifting more to the format of holding webinars. It has been meeting with some resistance, but I think people are starting to come along a little bit better and are learning to deal with them.

One of the problems we have when we establish the SEDAR schedule is we are very limited on the number of the appropriate bodies we have in the South Atlantic and the Gulf and Caribbean to participate in these SEDARs, especially from the stock assessment end.

By holding webinars, not only do we not require people to be at a meeting all week, which they may only be participating sporadically during the week, we allow more people to become involved in it, including the public that can listen in on deliberations and look at the work products as they are developed as they go along. This kind of lays that out. Again it is kind of a fluid thing, because even though we are always promise Bonnie we'll try to plan five years out, we generally change something every time we get together.

MR. CUPKA: Questions for Bob on SEDAR? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, the webinars are great in the sense of having all the people that want to be on them be on them, but when you have so many of them it makes it really hard for the fishermen to be involved on a continuing basis. I think there were eight webinars in that last cobia and Spanish mackerel assessment.

I think I was able to only see two or three of them, so that's a problem. Having said that, you can get the audio files and you can get anything you need to go back and look at those and then ask the questions that you want to ask at a later date. There are ways to get around it. Going down this fiscal path we're going to be on, it's the only way we are going to be able to move forward, and I agree with the process. It is not without its problems.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments or questions? Seeing none; then we will go on to our next agenda item, which is the 2013 budget. The attachment for that shows both the council and the SEDAR budgets.

MR. MAHOOD: Right, the projected budget is based on the two activity schedules that we just talked about. Again, ideally you know how much money you have and then you develop a budget to utilize the money the best way you can, but that is not how it works in government. You develop your budget and then you hope you get enough money to do what you put into your budget.

All we can do is look at the activity schedule, what the council hopes to accomplish during 2013 and then put dollars to it. At some point we think we will hear – we have a CCC meeting, which is the Council Coordinating Committee meeting that Ben and I and David will be participating in – does it overlap January and February, sometime in that timeframe.

We are supposed to hear at that point about where we are going to be dollar-wise this year. What we have now is a budget based on what we think we will need, what will happen, how much we'll get, what kind of a cut we may or may not have. We just don't know yet. If anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

MR. HAYMANS: I thought I heard Monday the possibility of as much as a 19 percent cut. I mean 10 percent is \$400,000 or a little better, 15 is \$600,000. You've got \$477,000 left over this year; that is going to be pretty close if it is even a 10 percent cut.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, but we had another 300 and some we did not budget this year carried over from last year. I think Mike said about \$750,000 to \$800,000 we'll be carrying over.

MR. HAYMANS: We can absorb it; you can absorb one year, maybe.

MR. MAHOOD: One year. Well, we would hope we wouldn't get a 19 percent cut every year from here on out.

MR. HAYMANS: It sort of goes back to council activities. My apologies it is way out of line, 340 or something, but it deals with the budget, so you guys have budgeted for travel to Managing our Nations Fisheries for council members?

MR. MAHOOD: Well, we have budgeted to some degree for that. I can't remember the numbers. Okay, then we have; I guess that's what we decided on, but that is going to be up to the chairman of who.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm just very interested in it, but I don't think that my –

MR. MAHOOD: I think if you want to attend that you need to let the chairman know. We have had a couple members let us know they would like to attend.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions or comments? Seeing none; then we will move on to our next agenda item which is the joint South Florida management issues and to schedule 2013 meetings. We've talked about this a little bit this week. Most of you know that we have created a joint council committee that will be meeting to address South Florida management issues. It will include representatives from both our council and the Gulf Council.

Our council will be represented by the Executive Committee, which is Ben, Jessica, Charlie, Michelle and myself. The Gulf Council has named five members to the committee from their council. We'll also have representation from the state of Florida and also from Roy's office, I hope, because we all need to be involved in looking at this process. There are a number of stocks in the South Florida area that are currently managed by both councils. We have some inconsistencies in terms of regulations.

This group will be getting together trying to address some of these problems and see how we can deal with them to try to make things maybe a little easier for the fishermen and also for our operation. I'm going to ask Bob to comment. I know he's been talking with the Executive Director in the Gulf, Steve Bortone, about this, and see how we want to proceed from here. I guess first thing would be to schedule our first meeting, but, Bob, I'll turn it over to you.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, two things I wanted to talk about. Roy, I guess I need to ask you. I don't know if Steve Bortone told me this or you told me this, but I believe you volunteered your facility to meet at. Am I mistaken?

DR. CRABTREE: I'm sure I did and I'm happy to do that. We need to get the dates worked out, though, and probably some estimate of how many people we're talking about to make sure we can handle it.

MR. MAHOOD: We know how many people; I think we're talking probably about 10 people, 10 or 12 not counting your staff. I think what I'm going to have to do – I tried to go back and forth a little bit with Steve on dates. It's tough when you're dealing with 10 people. I think what I'll do is one of those little doodle polls and see when most folks are available to participate. If we can do that, I'll let you know as soon as possible what kind of dates we're looking at.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I plan to be there and it is really good for me to see the South Atlantic and the Gulf Council working closely together.

MR. MAHOOD: The other part of that is I would like to at least get some ideas on the table of what we need to look at. Obviously, the staffs need to know beforehand the types of things we need to look at with this group. I think a number of them – obviously, we've talked about some of the various species that are primarily managed or occur in Florida. We definitely need to try to do something about not breaking the law when you're fishing on the wrong side of the bridge on Highway 1 going down the Florida Keys. That is the one thing I think probably we hear a lot about and how we're going to deal with those types of issues. I think Martha has some input.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, I've talked some with Martha and also Jessica. I know Jessica alluded to the fact they've been having discussions and maybe listing some things. I don't think they've actually put them on paper, but I know they have had discussions on some of the issues, and I think a lot of this Florida is going to have to take the lead on a lot of this. Martha, do you want to comment on that?

MS. BADEMAN: Yes, we are certainly happy to do that. Some things that come to mind, of course, the yellowtail snapper; there are some grouper issues. One of the things that came up a couple meetings ago was expanding some of those closed areas for acropora into state waters. That would be something we might want to look at; also dealing with the potential listing of all these additional corals that was announced last week, but we can definitely produce a list and send it to you pretty quickly.

I was also going to say if Roy's facility falls through, we can certainly help find another location if you all need it. We are certainly willing to help however we can. Then one more thing, in terms of FWC folks, I'll be representing the Gulf and Jessica will, of course, be there for being on the Executive Committee. I think we want to see Luiz Barbieri there and then probably John Hunt. He is from our Keys Lab and he is very familiar with a lot of the issues down there. It's just a couple of ideas that we've kind of been milling around with.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Martha. Are there any other questions or comments? Of course, we'll be keeping both councils apprised to where we're headed and anything we look at, of course, will have to be brought back to the respective councils before any kind of action can be taken. This is kind of more or less a steering committee to get started on some of these things. Then once we flesh some of them out, they will have to be brought back to the council for any action or any recommendations on actions and go on from there. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: My overriding goal in this was to try and bring more consistency to the regulations in Munroe County. When we had those back-to-back two council meetings in Key West in June, I went out on a charterboat with my kids over the weekend. I got an earful about you go over here it is this regulation, over here it is this, over there it's that. It is kind of a mess.

Then the other thing is we need some sort of a framework or a process so that when we get new assessments for some of the species down there we have a process in place to jointly change things, because right now we get off kilter on them and one council gets ahead of the other. I think that is another big part of it is how do we interact together on these stocks to change things, have common ACLs and all of that sort of stuff? I think that would be beneficial to the fishermen down in Munroe County.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, I agree there is a lot of work that could be done that needs to be done. We're looking for some positive steps forward out of this. All right, are there anymore questions or comments regarding this particular issue? Seeing none; then we'll move on to our next agenda item, which was develop a position on SSC review responsibilities.

Now this really ties in with some of the discussions we had earlier this week about third party assessments and the role of the SSC. You have an attachment here, Attachment 5, which is kind of a current job description for SSC members. I know Bob has done some work on this and I'm going to ask him to lead us off on that.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, it is really two parts. One is kind of to jog everybody's memory on what we have put together relative to the job description for the SSC. We did that; it has been like four years ago maybe, so it has been some time ago. There have been a lot of lessons learned since the most recent scientific responsibilities have been enacted and ACLs have come into play and changes in the SEDAR process.

John is going to go over kind of a background and talk a little bit more about their responsibilities to the councils in the review of SEDAR and other type of things. Then the most recent thing like David said came up at the most recent SSC meeting was two presentations. I don't know if you'd call them back of the envelope stock assessments. Maybe they were a little bit more than that, but they were by outside parties initiated by industry. I think we are going to see a little bit more of that. I've queried the other councils to try to determine how they deal with third party stock assessments. I've got a little bit of a report on that, but first we'll let John start out.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You said there are really two components to this, and I'll first talk about where we were initially heading on this is discussing the FMP peer review responsibility to the council. Bob mentioned our job description. It was last revised in 2010. I think it may have been done in 2009 or 2008, but it was a time when we revamped the SSC. There had been a lot of people serving on the SSC for a while.

At that time the responsibilities of the SSC changed under the revisions to the Magnuson Act. It made some people question whether or not they could meet the commitment that was now being expected of the SSC members. We developed this to make it clear what is expected of those who were there now, then as well as anyone who comes on in the future.

We provide this to them and it gives them a clear understanding of what is expected of the SSC members by the councils. Largely it reflects what is in the council's SOPPs and what is in the Magnuson Act as far as the charge to the SSC and then what is expected of SEDAR, which also brought a lot of responsibilities to the SSC and expectations that they play a bigger role in our activities.

The question that we have about this really relates to dealing with fishery management plans. It is not real clearly specified just how a council goes through getting an SSC to review management plans and whether it is obligated that the council have the SSC review every aspect of the management plan. That's really the core of the first question here is what role should the SSC play in reviewing management plans?

It really is what role would you guys like the SSC to play in reviewing your management plans? Our practice has been to put every management plan and every amendment and every regulatory amendment before the SSC and ask them to review it broadly. Well, you ask scientists to review something broadly and tell them like, review and comment, you may get lots of stuff that is really detailed and other times you might get no comment.

You've seen that at this meeting where you get a range of comments from the SSC on different topics within the plan. We've known for quite a while that is really not all that effective with the

many technical issues before the SSC, the stock assessment issues. It is probably not necessarily the best use of their time given the current management program that we're dealing with.

We now have things like the IPT, which brings in a lot more people into the plan development process, and that is more eyes and such on it. They are developed over a longer time. A lot of that past practice of asking the SSC to review every aspect of a management plan may not be the best way to go today.

We also have a Socio-Economic Subpanel which reviews and often in great detail the social and economic aspects of those plans. They are handling that side and we've seen from their reports to the SSC that they really tend to get into that quite thoroughly. They get into it as thoroughly as our SSC members get into things like stock assessments or reviewing the area type of closures that we've been looking at for the speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

What we'd like some guidance from you on is what type of role should the SSC play in reviewing FMPs? I think our preference at the staff level and probably from the SSC members as well, based on what stares I get from them sometimes when we are going through a very long FMP with a lot of actions that don't really have technical consequences, is that they would really like to focus on the technical aspects of the FMPs; obviously the stock assessment analysis that go into it, analysis of how management actions may work, the raw analyses themselves and not so much every alternative and comment on all of your preferreds and things of that nature.

But within that, I think anytime you have an FMP or you have something specific that you would like their comment on, you ask that of us and we will take it to them. That is really the other aspect of it, too, which from looking at some other SSCs it works really well when the council poses specific questions to them.

We had the example of black sea bass where you said give us a recommendation on the probability of rebuild that would come from your ABC Control Rule. Specific questions like that we get great discussion and great comment. When we have an FMP with 30 actions and we say discuss and comment on each one, then they do some and they don't do others. If we could maybe get a little relaxation of our past practices and a clearance to focus on really technical issues with them, I think it would help our process. Do you want to pause here and talk about that first, David?

MR. CUPKA: Yes, why don't know we cover that first. The SSC really is a technical body and their main responsibility is to provide this council with technical advice. They are being called upon to do more and more; and if there is any way we can perhaps not get them quite as involved in some of the things in the past like reviewing FMPs.

Part of the FMPs, of course, are technical and we do need them to look at that, but there are other parts in there that really are clearly the prerogative of the council in terms of policy decisions and in management decisions, and we really don't need to get them involved in that. In fact that is really not their role. Anything we can do to streamline that process I think will help. I can envision that they are going to be called upon more and more in the future to look at some of these technical things, particularly if we start looking at some of these things like third party assessments and whatnot. That is just my personal thoughts on that, but I would like to open it

up and see if anyone has any other comments or questions for John or any guidance he wants to provide.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, John, do you think it would be more helpful as the council goes through a particular amendment and we are choosing our preferred alternatives, if we maybe pause and see if those are particular actions that we would want to request that the SSC actually look at. I'm thinking about Amendment 28 for opening of red snapper, clearly looking at the formulas that were being used to calculate what might potentially be available for harvest was a good thing. I guess I'm just trying to figure out how the council could go about just narrowing down within an amendment just those things that we might specifically warrant the SSC to look at.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think that would be a great way to handle it, if you identified things where you say please comment on these different alternatives for calculating, and that is a great example because that was so technical. In then the other one, I know there were options about when the season starts, so that might be something where you said we'd be interested in what the SSC feels about alternative start dates versus perhaps discards or the spawning seasonality of the fish. If you put the kind of questions you have to them we'll get really good comments back from them.

MR. BELL: Along those lines is an example when they were going over Amendment 9 to the Shrimp Plan. I was listening in and they were kind of spending a lot of time and energy getting into some technical aspects of the science related to shrimp mortality and temperature and things. I understood why they were asking those questions, but it really didn't matter because we weren't worried about those particular details.

They were doing what they do as scientists; they were analyzing things and trying to ask some questions. They were kind of spinning their wheels in some areas we didn't need them to. I was concerned; they were sort of taking some of their valuable time that they could have been using on something else.

To Michelle's point, maybe if we would have given them some specific questions or something related to that particular amendment, that would have been helpful. I could see where if you just sort of leave it wide open, they can go down all kinds of rabbit trails and all and take up a lot of time.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that makes a lot of sense to me. I think we need to keep them focused on the science that is the underpinning of what we're doing. I think the Red Snapper Amendment and those equations was a great example of something we really want them to look at; but I think to have them just as a matter of routine have to go through everything we're doing and every management plan is very little value added from that. They don't have time to do that given all the other more important roles they have for catch levels and things like that. I think that is a very reasonable approach.

DR. DUVAL: I guess one of the things that I can do, as we go through these amendments, is just make sure to keep in the back of my mind is this a particular action that we might want to ask the SSC to look at for some technical issue; whether it is a change in a season opening or something along those lines where we would want to say do you guys have concerns about are we impacting the spawning season here; would we be impacting discards? I guess, John, I might

also rely on you for some staff input on actions that you think it might be good or beneficial to have that SSC review as well.

MR. CUPKA: John, of course, works very closely with the SSC. One of the things that they try and do, if I'm not mistaken, John, is that we always try and provide them a roadmap on things to cover. That seems to me that would be the point of trying to get some of these things down on paper, John, and got input from the staff or whatnot.

If we want to look at this particular issue, we could make sure it was on that roadmap, but they do try and provide guidance to the SSC on areas they ought to be looking at. Sometimes it seems to work better than others, but that may be one way that I would think, John, that we could maybe provide some guidance to them on those particular questions or issues we really want them to focus on.

MR. HARTIG: I certainly agree with everything that has been said. The realization has come through the process. I've talked to some of the SSC members at the meetings as well. It came up that the Mid-Atlantic nor New England Council do not do this process. Certainly, you guys know and we are going to go down that path trying to get to more technical aspects.

I think that will be welcomed and we'll get much more directed input on that, doing it that way. The questions are really good. The questions that have been put together over time have been really focused and focused the SSC into some good answers for the council. That type of way has really been productive.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think this is good guidance. The language that we have from the Magnuson Act, and it is similar in the SOPPs and in their job description. Really it is pretty general about what the peer review is. I think we can take this guidance and use it as we frame our questions for the roadmap.

That has really worked out great over the years and rely on the staff of each amendment to give me a sense of what questions we want to ask of the SSC for each topic and not feel that we're obligated. If we have an amendment that is going fast and it's administrative that we feel we have to hold a special SSC meeting perhaps over a conference call, to make sure we just get them to sign off on it, this will free us up quite a bit.

MR. CUPKA: I guess the bottom line is you don't see any need to particularly change your job description, but with the direction you've got, a job description allows you to move in that direction and do something along those lines, is that correct?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think that is correct, David. I think we're okay on the job description on this, because it says more of a practice than a written requirement that we were falling under.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, other comments? If not, we'll go onto the second part of this, and I know Bob has looked into this for some of the other councils.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, and the second part of this deals with what I guess we're calling third party stock assessments. That is really broken into two types of third party stock assessments.

We're calling it third party if it doesn't go through our SEDAR process, which is our stock assessment process.

I've had a chance to talk to Bonnie some about this and kind of look at what we hope will happen down the road, but basically there are two components. One is solicited third party. The State of Florida has been very helpful in conducting several stock assessments at our request, and the same thing for the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission which is part of the SEDAR process.

Generally those are conducted – the first two phases, the data workshops and the actual stock assessments are conducted by the third party. Then they go through the peer review of the SEDAR process, which are the CIE Review and the final step. They then go to the appropriate SSC body. ASMFC has its own I guess, and then in the case of the Gulf it would go through the Gulf SSC.

That to me seems to be where we ought to be steering all third party stock assessments. Most recently the SSC was presented with two stock assessments that were conducted by two different scientists on wreckfish. There was some conjecture and some confusion on our SSC on what direction to go with this. We have quite a heavy load for our SSCs that we schedule every year.

For them just all of a sudden now to be a peer reviewer for third party stock assessments, unsolicited third party stock assessments, it seems like it is going to disrupt the process we have. I think what the council needs to do is talk about what do we want them to do? What kind of criteria should a third party stock assessment have prior to it even going to the SSC?

Can anybody off the street that can put some numbers together come in and say, "Well, I've conducted this stock assessment. I want to present it to your SSC, and I want them to give their opinion on it." I talked to Bonnie about it. I think at the very least it should follow and have the same criteria that a normal SEDAR stock assessment would be required to have.

Obviously, at some point if you are going to allow these, you would have to have some sort of a peer review that it went through. Now whether it should be the SSC, I don't think so. I think the role of the SSC is after the final peer review such as SEDAR has happened. They then look at it and give their advice to the council.

I hate to see them get put in a peer review position on anything that just comes in off the street. I know some of the other councils have had to deal with this in the past. Primarily I know the North Pacific has. I queried all of the other executive directors. Mike, do you have that to project? I didn't bother to send out a copy, but I just put together short report on what I found from the other councils.

There is really no clear policy across the board that anybody seems to have. In the New England Council their SSC has addressed third party stock assessments in the past. At times they have used the SSC to peer review those although their preference is and what they are trying to steer towards is that the peer review occurred during their SAW/SARC process.

For some of you that may not be familiar with the Northeast SAW/SARC process, it is very similar – as a matter of fact it is probably could be considered one of the parents of our SEDAR

process. We took a lot from that and, of course, we improved it in the South, but we did borrow from the SAW/SARC process up in the New England area.

They are trying to steer everything through the peer review taking place at their SAW/SARC stock assessment process. Then their intent would be after the SAW/SARC peer review, their SSC would develop advice to the council on that. To me that seems to be the kind of format I think would work the best down here.

Again, it would require more scheduling of SEDAR resources so again that can be problematic in that area. The Gulf is very similar to ours. Their history has been they've had a couple of solicited third party stock assessments. One was on yellowtail, and one was when also Dr. Jerry Ault did a hogfish stock assessment, which was ultimately rejected by the SSCs.

They haven't really dealt with any constituent group third party stock assessments. They have had some outside consultants review some aspects of the SEDAR assessments and that particular report was presented through the SEDAR process after that consultant review took place. They would be willing to have third party stock assessments presented to the SSC if they used the same parameters as was compliant with the SEDAR assessment.

Now all of this I better preface by saying has come from the executive directors. Their council has not necessarily addressed it and has any kind of policy on it. I don't want to get anybody in trouble for saying what they think they basically would like to see. The Caribbean hasn't had any experience with it. In the North Pacific, which I think it is more routine – I know I sat in on one of their SSC meetings up there.

There were two different groups that came and presented kind of mini stock assessments that ran counter to the major stock assessment they had on some of their species. What they do up there, they have addressed this, and they also have NGO groups that have commissioned stock assessments. I think one particularly was on the stellar sea lions and it was a big court thing up there.

They say that their third party stock assessments are treated just like any other public comment to the SSC. When a scientist comes and he presents this to the SSC, it is considered just like any other public comment. Now upon occasion, and I suspect this is related to lawsuits and some major issues, they will hold an independent workshop where the SSC and the council do look at the stock assessments or they have their stock assessment scientists and some of their plan teams look at a third party stock assessment.

Then from that the council will make a decision on how they want to proceed with it. The Pacific Council, they have addressed third party stock assessments from constituent groups, which have included state agencies, tribal governments and international bodies. I assume that is probably through the Halibut Commission. I'm not sure whether they're an international body.

They may have something going on with Mexico, too, I don't know, but they have not dealt with any from fishing industry groups or from NGOs. Their SSC job is to determine the best available science, and its appropriateness for management decisions regardless of the source as assigned by the council. It is a council decision of what they look at and what they base their recommendations on.

They have no official policy on how to address third party stock assessments. Nobody really came forth with an official council policy on how to deal with this. That is kind of what the other councils have done that responded. Five out of the seven responded and it kind of tells you what everybody else is doing.

MR. BELL: Sort of a question and a comment; I can see the need to decide something fairly quickly on how we need to proceed, because we I guess sort of set precedent here in this one case. I know from talking to some of the SSC members that they've got a lot on their plate, and at a meeting it is enough to just kind of stay on task with the stuff they've got. I could see this growing into something where they could get – if we were relying on them to do the peer review, they could get overwhelmed.

At some point it would be nice if we could create possibly some independent first-step peer review panel or something. I don't know if that could be done or not. By the time it gets to them, if we're going to ask them to look at that, it has at least gone through some sort of peer review and you're not asking them to basically do that sort of first time, because that can be kind of time consuming.

MR. CUPKA: I think that is one reason why Bob is kind of suggesting an approach which makes a lot of sense, and that is that they undertake an assessment but at some point it has to be reviewed. It has to go through the SEDAR review step before it gets to the SSC. I can tell you at the last SSC meeting there was a lot of discussion by the SSC members and some concern over an assessment of this type.

I think they've put together a subgroup to try and develop some guidelines and criteria they feel like an assessment would have to meet in order to I guess be reviewed before it ever got to them so it wouldn't be a waste of time. They felt like even if it wasn't going through the data workshop and the assessment workshop of the SEDAR process, that it ought to meet the same standards and criteria that would be involved if it had gone through the SEDAR process. I think they are working on that is at least my understanding, but Bonnie may want to comment on that or John.

MS. PONWITH: To that point, but also more broadly, first of all let me applaud you for taking this on. I really appreciate the time that Bob put into gathering this information to learn what the other councils are doing with respect to this issue. There is a tension here between wanting more, faster through-put balanced with our commitment to scientific integrity and making management decisions based on information that we are comfortable represents best available, so it is a difficult tension.

We have three things that come to play here. One is time, one is resources, and one is talent. As we all know our time and our resources are finite, our talent is pretty infinite. We just need to be careful about how we partition and how we make decisions about what we're going to do. We've been working together in the collective to create a SEDAR process that needs criteria that are near and dear to us, and that is uphold scientific integrity to make sure the management decisions you are making are based on the best we can do, but also at the same time making sure that they are inclusive and transparent so the managed public and concerned constituents understand how these decisions are being made when they are made.

What my concern with third party is is that we would take people's attention from a system that we worked very hard to create and distract them from trying to improve through-put through that system to be able to turn and take a look at something that was created outside of the system, which is very difficult to do.

When you get a stock assessment that is cold, basically you have had no hand in the creation of it and you have no hand in the process or criteria that are required in how it was generated, it takes a lot to tease it apart and understand how it was done, how the data were treated, where the data came from. The documentation requirements are extreme.

It is not impossible to do; it is just that it takes a lot of time, so if you take your SSC or even your SEDAR process and say go look at that, it comes at the expense of looking at the stuff we have in our very ambitious schedule. I believe that having a discussion like this is extremely useful on behalf of the council.

I think that the SSC's approach of looking at what criteria would be required before they could consider a stock assessment is important, but it is almost a second step. I think they need from you guidance on what your views are on how third party stock assessments should be done so that when they start developing their advice to you on what they would need, it maps very closely to what your preliminary decisions are on how you want to handle this.

My view on this is that if there are stock assessment ideas, the most efficient time to receive outside ideas on how a stock assessment should be run is when the benchmark for that where new ideas and new approaches could be contemplated, is being run. That is the most efficient time to receive outside input on, hey, let's try this, it is the going thing in another country, or something like that.

But failing that, when a third party stock assessment is floated to the council, my view is it can be treated like – I mean if it has been peer reviewed and published, it can be treated like any article that you find in the peer-reviewed literature. This is something that is useful. It is out there as information.

It has had some level of peer review, and it can guide decisions you are making about how you proceed. In other words, you may see a stock assessment that was done by a third party in the peer-reviewed literature or a gray literature, and say, wow, this might influence our decision on where we put that stock assessment in the timing schedule-wise, or it might influence how we make decisions about how we're going to do that stock assessment when it comes up.

But to embrace something that is coming from the outside without proper peer review, it would be dangerous in terms of our commitment to upholding the Information Quality Act, in terms of making management decisions on that until it has been through a level of peer review that makes you comfortable embracing that as if you had done it yourself. I guess I'll stop there, but thank you.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you for those comments, Bonnie. I'm going to ask John to comment, because I think he has indicated the SSC has embarked down this road of trying to develop some criteria and all. The first thing when you hear about something like this, you say, well – and

we're always concerned about through-put and trying to get as many assessments done as we can, but if it is not done right you take a chance on getting something that is not up to standards.

It may not save as much time as you think once you really start looking at the impact these things could have on resources that are already committed to the SEDAR process. John, do you want to kind of bring us up to date?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I'll try to fill you in on a little bit of the history. Those of you who have been running around the steering committee for a while probably recall the steering committee discussed third party assessments quite a few years ago. The preliminary recommendation that came out at that time was that the SSC should serve as sort of the first clearinghouse.

It was discussed along the lines of they know the fisheries and the local information well and if someone were to conduct a stock assessment and want to bring it forth, that they would be the ones who would look at it and see if it even makes sense in terms of what the magnitude of landings and things of that nature should be and is it a link-based model when they know that there are a lot of age data type things, that they would be sort of the first cut.

Then from there obviously it would come up through the council and you would have to decide where it goes into the queue as Bonnie mentioned our very exhaustive planning for stock assessments. That was a couple of years ago. The SSC received the report on wreckfish last fall and led them to thinking maybe they needed a more robust process for dealing with these types of assessments.

They discussed it some in April this year and really didn't reach resolution. Then a wreckfish version came to them again and I think it hit home a little more at their last meeting that they need to have a more robust process. They agreed to develop the subgroup that is going to look into this. Their goal is to try to develop a policy or a procedures guide so that it lets people who want to do third party stock assessments understand what the expectations are, what their obligations are, how the process would work.

It needs to address more than just simple peer review of the methods but the data. That is really where on one hand the SSC is your peer review body and you can throw anything you want at them for peer review; and if it is a journal article or something or a piece of gray literature where someone looks at something, that can be easy enough; but a stock assessment is a very specialized type of scientific product.

Really one of the reasons for that is that it involves an awful lot of data. Validating the input data on the scientific study is beyond the scope of most, say, journal-style peer reviews. Those who have been around here a long time are going to recall the reason we have SEDAR in the first place was because of a peer review article on red porgy that as it turned out had some inadvertent data in it that just simply weren't correct; they were of a different species. That is why SEDAR is so centered around this data validation. That is really one of the core issues with this that the SSC knows they have to deal with.

That is because it doesn't do any good to review the methods and say the methods are great if the data that went into it are not right. That is everyone's sort of concern that people end up – and

Bonnie has voiced this several times that her people end up reviewing data for these assessments that come in.

The other thing that we'll have to consider in that is by someone bringing in a third party assessment, does it move to the front of our queue and all of our things that we have planned, and we have stocks that we'd like to get assessed, but you guys have other priorities. It potentially creates a loophole where someone could sit down and craft an assessment in a weekend with some data from the internet and bring it to you; would that jump that species to the front of the queue?

Those are the things that are going to have to be considered by you guys within this. The SSC's policy is going to look at those types of issues. They were really starting from the Information Quality Act and the expectations and the standards to be met for best scientific information, because they recognize that they are an advisory body; stock status is determined by the agency.

Which is another question; if the SSC were to sign off on an assessment, does that meet the standards of the agency when Bonnie has to be the one that says, yes, the stock is overfished and overfishing and that triggers Roy writing you all a letter and all that stuff. There are multiple levels and our SSC recognizes that, so they started at the ground floor with the Information Quality Act.

I think we are going to get a preliminary report from those guys in April. I don't know if it will be the full policy, but they understand then it comes before the council, because you guys give the guidance to them and they make recommendations to you. They know if there is any sort of policy and guidelines, it will have to be approved by the council, and they recognize that it will affect maybe some of their operations under SEDAR.

But what they really want to do is make sure that if someone says, hey, I want to do a third party assessment, they can say, well, okay, here is what is necessary to do a third party assessment and have it reach the level where it changes a status or it changes an ABC at the council level. They don't want people who want to do assessments to feel like they are always facing shifting sands and changing goalposts as they come in and try to do it; that there are a set of standards and they apply to all assessments. Whether it is done through SEDAR or it is done through third party, we really want them all to meet the same quality standards. That is sort of where they are heading in their goal of developing some preliminary guidelines for dealing with these.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, and I think Bonnie alluded to this, also, but the Data Quality Act has some legal obligations in it. Once you accept something, you have got to meet those legal obligations and that needs to be considered as part of this as well. We're taking a look at this I guess from a couple different approaches. I'm sure the steering committee will be discussing this at some point.

The SSC is working on it. I don't know that we're at a stage where we're ready to develop a policy where we say either yay or nay. I think we need to see what is brought to us before we make a final decision on this. But again that is my personal view and I'd be very anxious to hear thoughts from other members of the council on this issue. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I'd agree with that as well, David. I would much rather see – I think the concerns have been expressed around the table with regard to any kind of policy that is adopted with regard to how we treat third party assessments. It certainly is going to be much easier for me to react to something that our experts have put together at the SSC level. I certainly couldn't offer any kind of criteria for data integrity from my standpoint. I look to them to do that. I would much prefer to see what strawmen they put together.

MR. HARTIG: Yes and I agree as well. Looking at this process, you are always hopeful when a new assessment comes out of the blue that something will come of it. Listening to the SSC's deliberations, it is very clear that really nothing could come of that at that time. I was hopeful that we might be able to look at just those two assessments in a different light, but it doesn't look like it is going to happen.

If somebody wants to do an outside assessment, basically once the criteria developed they come and get the criteria and meet those and then we go through this process. It is going to be some kind of hybrid somewhere probably in between what the state does and then what the SSC decides. I think I'm good with what we're doing.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes as far as the wreckfish stuff is concerned, I'm afraid we're leaving fish on the table and we haven't got an assessment on them. Somehow we need to figure out a way to, if we can, give some protocol. If we can use some of this information without it derailing the train, I think we should try to do that. Maybe this can be a test case on what we want, how they want it, but I'm afraid we're leaving fish on the table by not trying to use some of these things if it is practical to do it. We are going to have to set some protocol, and this could very well be a test case on how to go about that.

MR. CUPKA: Well, obviously wreckfish really brought his issue to a head, but the issue is much bigger than just wreckfish. We need to figure out how we are going to deal with these sorts of things in the future. I think in the case of wreckfish, even once these standards are developed, you would almost have to go back and start over and make sure you meet those criteria standards and go through that process. It would almost be like starting over again.

If we don't develop something, we are going to keep running into situations like this. It would have been nice to have something in place before the wreckfish thing came up, but it didn't happen that way, but that is no reason not to start now and try and get something in place. Other comments? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Monica, do you know of any case where something like this, the two assessments came before a judge and then a judge made a reasoned judgment to have an assessment done as soon as possible by the agency. Are you aware of anything like that that has ever happened?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, not quite, but I guess in a case what the judge would do is look to see whether the action that is being challenged is based on the best available science, and that is where that might come into play. Since you asked me the question and I have the microphone, my question is – I applaud you and I think it is a great idea to develop this policy for future things; future analyses that are put before you or third party analyses that are put before you or the SSC.

Am I to gather that in terms of the two that are the table, because they are there before the policy, is kind of the card before the horse, I guess, I just want a clear idea on what you intend to do with those two now. I think the SSC discussed also maybe running it through – and John can speak to this, but some kind of SEDAR process.

You heard Luiz talk about the fact that the analyses that were given to them, they didn't think they had enough information to change their recommendations for ABC and all that, but they did have some suggestions on what could be done with it, whether it was put through a CIE Review or all that sort of thing. What do you intend to do with those two analyses, the wreckfish analyses?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'll talk a bit about wreckfish and the details of the SSC's discussion. What they were faced with was two somewhat similar approaches there. They don't involve a lot of data. These are looking at trends in catches and CPUE over time. It is not as if we're dealing with lots of life history data.

We're not dealing with lots of lengths and ages and surveys and all of that type of information. Given that, however, it tends to be quite sensitive to some of your assumptions about things like natural mortality, shapes of selectivity curves. There are a lot of configuration questions and both of the assessment authors recognize that there were a lot of configuration questions.

For example, the one put forth by Dr. Butterworth sort of concluded by just looking to see if the group thinks this has some promise and potential, in which case we could work through for an acceptable configuration for everyone. Really, what that means is then you are kind of talking about an assessment workshop type scenario where you get people together and they discuss what type of configuration they think would best serve this model.

That is kind of what the SSC did a year before when they took the DC-AC runs done by regional office staff and tried to come up with something for wreckfish. I think maybe they're hesitancy to go down that path now is that, one, they weren't satisfied that much doing it at that meeting. They had to put a lot into it at that time.

They realized that the issue has kind of grown and they would like a more careful and reasoned approach to that and maybe a time to get now different parties together and look at a couple of different models and compare and contrast them. That is where the suggestion was made of kind of looking like the SEDAR standard type approach where you have a workshop where you go through the data and give it a stamp of approval.

Then you go through and you configure the model, and suggested maybe sending it out for an independent peer review given just the history of this issue where it would be nice to have a couple CIE desk reviewers to weigh in on this, and they would serve as peer review outsiders and then the SSC could take the final action.

That is what they would like to see happen and the parties in the room at the time, which was the analyst and the SSC, were all willing to basically do what it takes to get that happening sooner rather than later. The SSC members said, sure, if you guys could schedule a meeting, we can get some people together and we can do it.

Dr. Butterworth said, yes, you know I come back and forth at times to the country so I could do this. But the point that would have to be resolved – and this is where there gets to be an issue – is you have got to validate the data. That involves the Science Center. We know right now this spring we have really stretched the Science Center, their data ability in particular with all the stock assessments that are underway, because we have a lot of data workshops coming up in the next six months. We have a lot of deadlines for data coming up in the next six months.

When I say the data people, I'm talking about the same people that were behind that great quota tracking tool, and the same people who are going to have to be applying that tool to all your different fisheries as the time goes on. Right now within the system the bottleneck is within the data.

That is really where I think the timing issue comes in that may stand in the way of this happening sooner rather than later as much as sort of an analysis side of the equation and saying, yes, we can do it. We'll be glad to step in and do it, because we have the time, but we've got to figure out how we're going to deal with the data.

That is one place where the SSC's policy would come in. One of the things they discussed was that, well, if someone wanted to do a third party assessment given the data is a big bottleneck, the appropriate thing to do would be for them to get the data through the proper channels in the beginning.

If they could have a stamp of approval on the data before they even begin their analysis, that would clear one of the major hurdles. I think Bonnie will probably comment on that, but that is sort of where we stand. We are sort of poised to do this, but we'd have to deal with getting the data validated and the timing of such a workshop.

MS. PONWITH: To that point, John, that was a very information-dense conversation. There was one point that I just wanted to pick the thread up on. This is exactly why I think it is important that the council guide the SSC to make sure that what they generate is what you want, and that is what I'm hearing – if I heard John correctly, what I heard was that the SSC would be willing to pull together a special team and get the analysts together who did the third party and kind of start anew while they are involved in it, and that creates a comfort level or could create a comfort level where they would be willing to then advise based on that.

But what that sounds like to me then is that the SSC becomes a stock assessment body instead of an advisory body. The way we're using the SSC right now is, yes, SSC members are involved in the stock assessment, but conceptually what we do is we create an assessment team and assign assessment-competent SSC members to the team so they are involved in the whole process.

You have someone embedded in that process; and then when it comes time to the review, you pick someone completely different who had no hand in the creation to be part of the reviewer. The notion is you have familiarity so you don't get bogged down in I don't understand what you did and why you did it, but you also have independence.

That is a really powerful use of the SSC. If the SSC becomes the stock assessment team, again what happens is they are less available to be carrying out the model that we've created. These

are the kind of decisions that I think are really important for you to contemplate, weighing what you get out of the deal and what it costs in the deal so that you can help guide the SSC in how they parse out their time in meeting their mission to provide scientific advice to you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and that is very much the way the SSC envisioned it, that some of their members would be on this group. It is very much like the standard workshop where you guys appointed like four SSC members for the Snowy Grouper Standard Stock Assessment Workshop. In that case the analyst is from the Southeast Center; in this case the analyst comes from an outside source. Their vision of that was very similar to the standard process with just the analyst not coming from within the agency.

We know within the standard, though, the key difference is you are dealing with a basic data set which has already been through a benchmark process. We need more of a data treatment within this type of scenario so it is sort of a SEDAR-like type thing they are trying to do with a subset of the SSC and then CIE review, if we could swing that, and then come back to the full group.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just for a point of clarification, John – that was really informative, I appreciate it – you mentioned a few things and you talked about an assessment type of workshop, some sort of scenario like that, but you said that the data need to be validated by the Science Center. Would that necessarily have to be done before that assessment kind of workshop was performed?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think it would, because they wouldn't really be able to come up with an acceptable base run without having the approved data before them. As I said, it is not as much data as a catch-at-age assessment, so it may not be involved as it could be, but it still does require somebody putting time and effort into it.

MR. JOLLEY: Just a question; with the workload, John, in developing this new methodology aren't we really looking down the road likely to need to pursue some outside stock assessments because of the workload?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Possibly in some situations, sure, if we could have assessments done by outside folks that meet our standards, that could be helpful. But I know from having a lot of discussions with other bodies such as ASMFC, we've talked about this in some committees quite a bit, what people need to remember is that there is more to it than just running a model and put it forth and getting it through a review panel and saying here is your stock status, because what often breaks these types of things down is the front end and the back end.

It is getting the data validated properly through the right channels with all of the state folks. We have 50 people come to a SEDAR data workshop from all the states and a lot of people from the Science Center and ACCSP. They all make sure that everyone has the right numbers. That prevents that first order error that was so common before we did any of this, and is integral now to every regional stock assessment program.

Then the other side of it is take in mind vermilion snapper, you've got the update. The SSC recommended a different P-star. Someone had to go run that update. Someone had to go run that projection scenario. Take black sea bass, I think the last round that they showed you was numbered like eight. I think we did eight or nine for red snapper. A lot of what goes on with

these and where the third parties often back out of this system is when you tell them, well, you're going to be under an obligation to continue to do whatever the council demands is necessary to get to a management action after the fact.

We have these stock assessments that go on for a year, year and a half where the analyst is running different scenarios for you guys after the review panel has occurred. While they may be very good at running the models, the reality is within a stock assessment that running of the model is oftentimes just a small part of the overall workload and that is why this gets so cumbersome over time.

MR. LANEY: John, just a curiosity question really more than anything else, I guess. When there are third party assessment scientists, do they have the same access to confidential data as the agency scientists or SEDAR scientists do and is that a problematic aspect of this? Because if the Science Center has to review or has to certify the data and these folks don't have access to the confidential data, then clearly something is missing there, I guess.

MR. CARMICHAEL: They would need to have access to confidential data if they were intending to use that. That is an issue with wreckfish, because the actual landings are confidential. The individual who would go and be planning to run the model, that is a point to bring out about Dr. Butterworth's analysis. It used average landings for like the last five or six years, because he didn't have access to the confidential landings. They would need to secure that access through all the appropriate partners.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we're going to need to move on on our agenda, but like I say I consider this to be a work in progress and I'm not sure we're ready at this point to make any final decisions on it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: What do you want to do with the two wreckfish analyses that were brought before the SSC? I'm not trying to guide you in a certain direction. I need just kind of an answer here on what you all want to do with those two analyses.

MR. CUPKA: I'm sorry; I was having a side conversation with Bonnie.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's okay; I have those all the time. What is the committee's preference on what to do with the two wreckfish analyses that were brought before the SSC? I understand a policy is going to be developed, and we've had some great discussion. I'm still in my mind not clear what we are going to do with those two analyses right now.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I'm not completely clear, but it seems to me the first step we have to develop this policy and look at these standards that the SSC is coming up with. There was some indication maybe we could get these in March. It seems to me that we'd have to step back in this process and put those wreckfish assessments through that process to see where we're at unless I hear otherwise. Yes that is right; the SSC doesn't meet until April so it will probably be June. John, you'll have to help me here, but I guess the position of the SSC is that they are not opposed to a workshop like that, but I guess they want to run it through this process; is that a fair statement?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, that's a fair statement. They want to run it through a SEDAR-type process. You guys could make a request that the SEDAR Steering Committee consider that and then Bonnie would tell you, well, what are you going to bump and when do you want to have it done? You know how those conversations go.

I guess one thing is to think about maybe from the Science Center what sort of timeframe they could have to approve data based on this thing. That might give us some sense of what we're dealing with and then you could discuss, well, what do we have to give up if we want to get those data approved sooner?

MR. MAHOOD: One thing that makes this a little bit different I would like to point out is the current wreckfish assessment that the SSC reacted to was not a SEDAR assessment. It was an assessment done out of the Southeast Regional Office by some of Roy's staff, so that puts it in a little bit of different light.

Possibly one out would be, Monica, that if there was agreement with the SSC to try to hold something similar to what the North Pacific does, if they get a third party stock assessment they feel has merit to be looked at, they will hold a workshop to vet that through. They use some of the stock assessment scientists and some of the plan team members to look at that and see if it has merit for the SSC to consider making a recommendation to the council. That may be one way we could look at dealing with that. Again, it is a time and resource thing, so I'm not sure. Like John said it is going to depend on Bonnie and the folks that she has available to look at some of this information.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One of the points of discussion about the data on this had to do with the effort series and the CPUE. I believe that Dr. Butterworth was using the CPUE that was in the earlier analysis, but he didn't have the details of how that was created and didn't know if we were dealing with nominal CPUE or if we're dealing with the more refined type of CPUE that brought in other factors to try and improve the signal on the CPUE.

That likely, with the small number of participants, really does bring in a bunch of confidential data. His indication to me at the meeting was that, well, if we could just get a sense of how the CPUE was developed and what its reliability is, then we know if we fit more toward the catch or we fit more toward the CPUE, which was really the core question in which direction you went.

Based on the scenarios they showed, that had a big influence on what MSY you ended up with. That is really the core question is just understanding that CPUE better, which is why they discussed a data component to this process. I'm not sure where the CPUE – I don't recall where the CPUE was from that was in the earlier model that the SSC has already used to recommend ABC.

MR. CUPKA: I'm not sure where that leaves us. Obviously, they looked at those two assessments. They did not provide us any recommendations to change the ABC that we are currently operating under. They indicate a willingness I guess to have a workshop of some type. But again I think Bonnie would have to look at the data that is going into that and whatnot. I'm not sure where that leaves us other than they did look at it and it didn't meet their standards.

They weren't willing to accept them and make a change in their ABC recommendation. If we want to try and support them to have a workshop of that type, I guess we could do that, but it is not just a matter of having a workshop. There are some steps that have to go through before they could do that, and it is going to be conflicting with other activities that are going on. That's kind of where we are in the process, I believe. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I understand or I think I do the gravity of trying to bring in third party assessments and fit them in with their very, very overloaded schedule. I understand they need to get the data from the Science Center and there is a bottleneck there. What I'm hearing is it seems like it is either this way or we can't afford to do it; we don't have time to do it.

I don't know that is the message we want to send the public and the industry. Somehow we've got to get them involved, and it is not going to be easy and it is not going to be fun. But I think somehow we've got to make sure that there is a path to get industry involved so it is not your way or the highway kind of thing. You see my concerns?

MR. CUPKA: Well, I agree with that, but at the same time until we get this process in place I don't think we can just disregard that. That is again a matter of timing when we happen to get this relative to putting a process in place. John.

MR. JOLLEY: Just a thought; when we get ACCSP up fully running and everybody is supplying the data; is that going to facilitate some of this stuff that we're talking about now?

MR. CUPKA: Well, it would improve the data but Bonnie still has to certify that the data is good, and I guess that will help that certification process if it is data coming from a data set that they are involved in. They still have that certification that is involved, I believe.

DR. PONWITH: To that point, yes, if you take a science product that was generated outside of the system that we've created and blessed and you want to make a management decision based on it, it would require coming to the Science Center to say is this acceptable for making a management decision from?

Another idea is if you think about how hurricanes are projected, they never take one model and look at it and say, well, here is the model and here is the uncertainty of the model, here is what we think is going to happen. What they do is run the projections based on several models and it is called an ensemble approach.

My point in this diversion is it might be the right question to ask of – you know, when we were required by the Reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act, we were required to set ACLs whether an assessment had been done immediately preceding or not. We used different methodologies to set those ACLs.

In cases where we didn't have a recent assessment, often those ACLs were based on some permutation of average landings. Right now we would have that ACL based on that approach. We have the analysis that Andy ran. We have the analysis that Dr. Butterworth ran and Dr. McCall ran. It almost represents this ensemble approach.

You can look at what the outcomes of those different approaches are and what the scatter plot of those different approaches are, and it can give you an indicator of how robust your average landings approach was to addressing the true status of that stock. In other words, this is what I was getting at when I was talking about peer-reviewed literature.

You look at that peer-reviewed literature; it hasn't been through a data workshop. You say, well, but it can help me make decisions about how important it is to put this stock in queue for the next stock assessment or not, and it is informative in different ways than just saying I'm going to take that number and I'm going to set your ACL based on it. My question is have we learned anything or has the SSC learned anything from looking at these different approaches that would inform decisions going forward?

In terms of if they're dramatically different than the average landings, they may say, well, we think based on what we're seeing from all these different sources of information we might want to dedicate the very next slot in the stock assessment process for doing a stock assessment on this, because it is so different; or, they may say they are all different but the scatter plot of this ensemble approach hovers very close to what our ACL is based on average landings. Therefore for that reason we're comforted by these analyses and we're willing to live with this until we can find a slot. In other words, use that information to help you make decisions about how urgent it is to put it on the stock assessment queue and use those resources for an actual slot.

MR. CUPKA: I think until they have a policy in place and the SSC finishes its work, that there is probably not a lot going to be done. They suggested holding a workshop and all these sorts of issues can be looked at there, but I think until we get in a position to do that – and wreckfish could well be the test case to run through the system, but we've got to get the system in place first, I believe. That is kind of where I think we're going with this, Monica. Are there any other comments or questions and we need to move on? Wilson.

MR. LANEY: I just had a question for John and that is whether or not – it seems to me wasn't the situation we were in with red snapper and Dr. Hester's independent assessment sort of analogous to this and what did we do that time? I think I remember, but would it be useful at all for us to look back at that one as having set any kind of precedent for this one?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that was somewhat different, because in that case you had a peer-reviewed stock assessment. You had an assessment that had done through SEDAR. You had something put forth as some different ways of looking at some of the information that was in the SEDAR. You had that coming from someone who was involved in that. It was kind of a different situation I think than this where you really don't have an assessment to rely upon.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we're going to move ahead to our next agenda item, which is council followup and priorities. We have a couple things to go here. I think Gregg is going to lead us through some of this, but I will mention to you I guess one of the things we'll be looking at is the operations plan that we have between NMFS and the council staff on priorities and activities and all. In the past historically we've kind of approved these and I guess we got away from doing that. I think Bob's intention is that we give some kind of formal approval to the operations plan. Gregg, are you ready to go over some of this with us?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are going to be using two documents. The first one is Attachment 6 in Executive Finance. That is the followup. The details are included in the body of that document. Particularly for those members who are chairing committees, you can look at your committee and see the detailed steps that we're going through. We also include outlines for hearings that are coming up, workshops that are coming up, and draft committee and council agendas. You can see that information as well.

Then towards the end we have a section that looks at our 2012 priorities and timing. This is where we summarize the major milestones and the current status. What I did was myself and the rest of the staff looked at our priorities that we got from you all at the last meeting and then put these in priority order based on your priorities and the dates that are due.

I'm not going to walk through the details of that, but I just want you to see where that information is because we will modify this based on your guidance from this meeting. Then the very last page of that is going to be a table that summarizes for the time period we're talking about the amendments and the major milestones.

The process for doing this is we as a staff get together and look at what guidance we've gotten from you at the meeting and make modification to the detail sections, send it down to Jack and Phil and they get with their staff and see where we have resources. We lay out an agreed upon timing to try and meet those various steps.

Then it comes back to us and then we send it out to you. That process usually takes three to four weeks depending on what other critical items we have going on. Then where we are here is basically the black texts are the items that we had – and obviously this is difficult to see on the screen so we sent this around. Everybody has this document. Mike sent it around a few minutes ago.

The black texts indicate what we had before this meeting. The red items, five so far new amendments that you've given us at this meeting; and what we've done is tuck those in sort of on the timeline that we've gotten from the committee actions. Just to recap, Regulatory Amendment 13, we do anticipate taking final action at this meeting, so that will be sent in for formal review next week.

Regulatory Amendment 14, that is down the line, start looking at options in March. Emergency Rule for yellowtail snapper we're finished with. Regulatory Amendment 15, we're scheduled to give final approval here. That will be submitted either before the end of the year or early next year.

We've got Regulatory Amendment 16 on golden tile to look at options in March; 17, MPAs, we looked at some options here. We will be having that Expert Working Group – we're looking at some dates in February, and you will have options from them to look at it in March and then we'll develop further guidance.

Then we've got a new Regulatory Amendment 18 on vermilion and red porgy. You gave us options here. We would be looking at final approval in March. You've got a new generic Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment for-hire

reporting that will go to the Gulf Council for their approval in February. Then we would give final approval in March.

Amendment 22, we are looking at options for June; 27, we anticipate approving for public hearing at this meeting, public hearings in January and then final approval in March. Amendment 29, we're looking at the allocation in the ORCS revisions, discussing this in June after we get the new ORCS numbers from the SSC in May. Then we've got new Snapper Grouper Amendment 30, which is the VMS.

You gave us some guidance here; approve it for public hearing in March. We're looking at public hearings in April or May, final approval in June. Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5, approving for scoping. You will be looking at options in March, approving for public hearing in June. Golden Crab Amendment 6, we'll discuss in March after the AP meeting.

FEP update, that is a 2014 activity. CE- BA 3 now will just have bycatch in it. We need some guidance here, because I am still working through the committee report, but I wasn't exactly clear on the timing for that. If that is to come back to March for final approval or some other date, we need some guidance there.

Coral Amendment 8, we would look at refined options in March, approve for public hearing in June, anticipating final approval in September. Shrimp closure or Shrimp Amendment 9 we're done with. Then we've got a family of mackerel amendments, 19, 20 and the framework that we're working with the Gulf and you will be looking at options in March and then anticipate approval for public hearing in June, final approval in September.

Then we've got a new joint South Atlantic/Gulf Amendment to deal with commercial logbooks, and the timing will have to be determined after the Gulf February meeting. They don't have this on their radar, so we need to work with them and see how they would work on timing on that. Another joint South Atlantic/Gulf – a new South Atlantic/Gulf joint amendment on headboat reporting, this is where we would work with the Gulf as they develop their headboat reporting and put the teeth for enforcement and the provision for extreme weather conditions in our area.

I think that captures all the current items and new. Now we've talked some about how you put this in priority order and it doesn't seem to be very effective to get a list of priorities, because you've given us the dates that you want them. We will do our best to meet that deadline, but obviously the workload has increased with these five new additional amendments.

I'll let Phil mention some potential changes on our economic level of support that will make it more critical that we continue to get the excellent assistance that we have thus far from the economists at the center level.

MR. STEELE: As you can see, it is a very ambitious schedule. As I've discussed with the council any number of times, one of the critical components of completion of our FMPs is our economic analysis.

This is a choke point without which these things just don't get done. Long story short, I just lost one of my economists due to retirement and I'm very likely going to lose another one early in the

year. What this does, of course, it just shifts the load over to your staff, SERO staff and the Science Center staff, so just be aware and take that into consideration in your future actions.

MR. CUPKA: Are there any questions or comments for Gregg at this point? I think it is very important, too, if you do chair a committee that you pay attention to this and follow it and make sure that everyone is on the same track as where we are heading with this. Like I say, I think one of the things we need to do is probably have a motion to approve the operations plan; is that correct?

MR. WAUGH: I would think it would be to approve this timeline; just approve that draft timeline as your goal and we will strive to meet that as best we can and continue to give you the quality product that we try to at every time.

MR. CUPKA: This was part of the Operations Plan; so if we approve the operations plan, we'll be approving this at the same time?

MR. WAUGH: No, this will become a part of the Operations Plan. It will replace that table on the back.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we approve the draft FMP framework timeline for the upcoming year.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we have motion; is there a second; second by Charlie. Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none; then **that motion is approved.** Okay, was that all you need on that, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: I think so, because what this will do is then we'll go through and revise the whole document. I think look for that coming out within about a month from now and that will have the details. Just to reiterate, too, any of you that are on committees or committee chairs, you can look at those specific details. We always indicate which staff person is responsible for that particular committee, so contact them one on one to answer any specific questions.

MR. CUPKA: Okay that will bring us down to other business and there were two items of other business. One was the visioning exercise, and I envision getting together with Bob next week to look at who we would put on that committee that is going to be looking at trying to flesh out some recommendations to bring back to us in March in regards to how we might want to move ahead on this as well as hopefully some preliminary cost estimates on what it would take to do some of that.

Like I say, I will get together with Bob next week and then we'll be in touch with a couple of you and we will decide what council members and what staff members we want to put on that and contact Bonnie's shop and Roy's shop to see who they might want to involve in that exercise. Are there any other comments on that at this time?

Seeing none; then we are fixing to get a little bit behind schedule. I don't know how long this other one will take, but I know Roy wanted to have some discussion on ACLs and meeting ACLs and how close we want to get to ACLs. I'll turn it over to Roy and ask him to lead us through this and make some remarks on what he's looking for out of this.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we quite often are having situations where we – and the most recent one was gag; we closed the fishery. After the reports came in, we were at something close to 94 percent of the quota was caught. We had a lot of requests to reopen and catch the remaining quota. We did reopen for seven days.

As you all recall, the weather was terrible, but even so there were fish caught and we ended up based on the numbers I have now at 98 percent of the quota caught. We are getting ready to reopen some other fisheries. We are going to reopen red snapper and gray triggerfish on Wednesday next week for seven days. Gray triggerfish is another one that is just below 94 percent of the quota being caught.

We don't really have any criteria or anything for how close do we want to try and get to these quotas. Obviously, we are not going to be able to get to 99.9 percent of the quotas caught. The closer you try to get to the quota, the greater the likelihood that you are going to go over. I wanted to get some kind of thinking from the council and make sure we're sort of all on the same page.

I'm basically thinking if you get to 95 percent or closer on a quota, that is probably as good as you can do and you ought not to reopen at that point, but some of it depends on the magnitude of the quota. The real issue is the catch rate. Golden tile has a fairly large quota, 400, 500,000 pounds, but it is a longline fishery and they can catch it up real fast. Some discussion would be helpful to me and see if we can kind of all get on the same page as to how close do you want to get, what is your risk tolerance for overshooting these quotas? The closer we try to come, the greater likelihood we're going to overshoot the quotas.

MR. JOLLEY: Roy, I like that; I think 95 percent is a good number. If you get to 95 percent and stay below, I don't think we can ask for any better than that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, we may want a different number for fisheries that are on rebuilding that we would have a payback on versus a fishery that is not being rebuilt that we do not have a payback on. I don't know that we necessarily need the same number for those two different fisheries.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I think 95 percent is close enough in this. Basically we are put into these situations because of the guidelines that were originally developed. If the guidelines were developed – we don't have ACTs because of the way the guidelines were developed. The guidelines would have been able to transfer quota so you could had a bigger ACL it would have been over – well, whatever it was over, I can't tell you right now my mind is not – but, anyway, you remember the discussions we've had.

I think the agency is going back and looking at some of this and looking at some of the guidelines as far as being able to try and transfer quota between years. If we get to that point, I think we could put ACTs in and then we could have even a bigger way to deal with this situation, a better way.

DR. CRABTREE: We do have ACTs in some fisheries in the southeast and usually with those you can do a lot more towards trying to hit it, because you've got a buffer between the ACL and

the ACT. But I certainly am sensitive to a lot of people's feeling that we've got too many buffers and it is in some cases overly conservative.

I'll take your guidance that generally 95 percent or so is good enough. I'll also take your guidance from the last meeting, and that means 94.6 percent rounds up to 95, and in those cases that we're not likely going to reopen the fishery and we'll go from that. Just while I've got you here, I think most of you are probably aware that blue runner is going to close on Monday. As I said, snapper and triggerfish will reopen on the twelfth; then on the nineteenth of December snapper and triggerfish will close back down, and in addition snowy grouper – this is commercial – snowy grouper and wahoo are also going to close on December 19.

I think we need to be prepared that because most of our fishing years start on January 1, as we get into November/December every year, we're going to have a lot of closures taking place, just one after the other as these quotas are caught up. But you'll probably see some Fishery Bulletins go out later this afternoon with some of these closure dates on them.

MR. MAHOOD: Just to point out, inadvertently Snapper Grouper Amendment 28 was left off this table, and I want to make sure it's okay as part of the motion that would be included; just a technical glitch.

MR. CUPKA: Is that okay with the maker and the seconded?

DR. DUVAL: Yes sir.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, very good. All right, with that we are going to adjourn Executive Finance.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 o'clock a.m., December 6, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
January 1, 2013

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2012-2013 Committees

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION

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

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

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

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Tom Swatzel, Chair
John Jolley, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

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

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

- ✓ David Cupka, Chair
 - ✓ Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
 - ✓ Michelle Duval
 - ✓ Jessica McCawley- **MARTIN BANEMAN**
 - ✓ Charlie Phillips
- Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

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

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

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

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

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

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

PERSONNEL

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

PROTECTED RESOURCES

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

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: John Carmichael

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2012 - 2013 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jessica McCawley
Director,
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.,
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847 (f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

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

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

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

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

Deputy Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Staff Economist

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

SEDAR Admin/Outreach

Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

JIM KELLEY
MONICA SMET-BRUNELLO
PHIL STEELE
BONNIE POWWETH
DOUG BOYD
SCOTT SANDORF
JACK MCGOVERN
JASON WALKER
RED MUNDEN
TRES FATE
OTHA EASLEY

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:
 Executive Finance Committee
 December 6, 2012
 Wilmington, NC

<u>NAME & ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP</u>
LCDR W.S. Gibson	305 415 6793	William.S.gibson@uscg.mil	
Yvonne Fox	910-620-5847	YvonneFox@gmail.com	
Rushy Johnson	386-239-0948	DSF2009@AOL.com	32120-9351
Melissa Collier	919-881-2909	mcollier@edf.org	
David Tucker	252-528-3474	bluesocean@centurylink.net	
Jack Cox	252-728-9528		
Geetha Mahini		gmahini@edf.org	28411
Leola Dunning	305-393-0934		
Stephanie Gaggli	252-728-2089		567 Bayview Drive Hampden Island NC 28531

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

SAFMC December 2012 Council Meeting:
Executive Finance Committee
December 6, 2012
Wilmington, NC

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

EMAIL
ADDRESS

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

Ehpatc Gaskill 852-788-2085

567 Bayview B1
Fornham Island NC 28537

Larriee Thompson 321-794-6866 larriee.thompson@alcom.mims.fl 32754

Brian Gorski CCA Florida Bayorski@ccaflorida.org

CHRIS ACCREDITE 252-269-2517 Treefish701@hotmail.com

Harold Podes 850-325-1285 apodes@pertrusts.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

Generated

Dec 11, 2012 06:47 AM PST

General Information

Webinar Name SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)	Webinar ID 327187682
Actual Start Date/Time Dec 06, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Actual Duration (minutes) 460
Clicked Registration Link 68	Opened Invitation 35
Total Attended 32	

Session Details

plowden,david	dplowden@ec.rr.com
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Dec 06, 2012 09:17 AM EST
City	wil
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:18 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 03:40 PM EST	114.25

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 43

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Byrd,Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Nov 30, 2012 11:19 AM EST
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	460.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

c,m **mec181@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 10:23 AM EST

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 10:24 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	382.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 46

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Johnson,Robert **jlfishing@bellsouth.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 08:23 AM EST

City St Augustine

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	460.53

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 38

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Mehta,Nikhil nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 03:38 PM EST

City St.Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Dec 06, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 11:48 AM EST	163
---------------------------	---------------------------	-----

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Lamberte,Tony tony.lamberte@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 10:24 AM EST

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Dec 06, 2012 10:24 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	381.88
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

merritt,rita **miridon@ec.rr.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 10:00 AM EST

City wrightsville beach

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 10:01 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	405.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 63

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Davis,Greg **gcdavismarine@gmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 12:05 PM EST

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 12:08 PM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	277.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

mershon,wayne **kenyonseafood@sc.rr.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 02:44 PM EST

City murrells inlet

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 02:44 PM EST	Dec 06, 2012 02:53 PM EST	9

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

phillips,todd **tphillips@oceanconservancy.org**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 12:02 PM EST

City austin

State TX

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 12:02 PM EST	Dec 06, 2012 02:10 PM EST	128.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Bresnen,Anthony anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 04:05 PM EST

City Tallahassee

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 01:16 PM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	209.22

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

travis,michael mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 15, 2012 02:58 PM EST

City clearwater

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 02:27 PM EST	Dec 06, 2012 02:45 PM EST	17.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Michie, Kate kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:15 AM EST

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:15 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 03:59 PM EST	403.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Neer, Julie julie.neer@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 06:59 AM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 03:48 PM EST	403.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Ballenger, Joseph ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:44 AM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:44 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	421.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Player, David playerd@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 11:11 AM EST

City Myrtle Beach

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 11:12 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	333.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Mitchell,Warren **warren.mitchell@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 02:46 PM EST

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 02:46 PM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	119.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Eich,Anne Marie **annemarie.eich@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 08:58 AM EST

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:35 PM EST	449.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

DeVictor,Rick rick.devictor@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:44 AM EST

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:45 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:24 PM EST	398.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

pugliese,roger roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 08:01 AM EST

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:07 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 12:43 PM EST	173.9

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 52

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

holiman,s **stephen.holiman@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:15 AM EST

City st pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Dec 06, 2012 09:18 AM EST Dec 06, 2012 03:30 PM EST 372.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Laks,Ira **captaindrifter@bellsouth.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:53 AM EST

City Jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Dec 06, 2012 09:53 AM EST Dec 06, 2012 01:26 PM EST 205.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Clemens,Anik anik.clemens@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 03:48 PM EST

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:44 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 03:55 PM EST	370.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Teehan,William ptsquid@nettally.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 02:30 PM EST

City Tallahassee

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 02:30 PM EST	Dec 06, 2012 02:52 PM EST	22.15

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Heil,Dave **dheil331@gmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 01, 2012 09:51 AM EST

City Winter Park

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:05 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 11:57 AM EST	155.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

woodward,chris **chris.woodward@bonniercorp.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:57 AM EST

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:58 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 11:37 AM EST	99.15

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

mccaffity,william saltydogmk1979@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:47 AM EST

City havelock

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 11:02 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 12:00 PM EST	57.42

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 45

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Gore,Karla karlagore@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 11:59 AM EST

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 11:59 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 04:46 PM EST	287.4

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

sedberry,george **george.sedberry@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 08:08 AM EST

City savannah

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Dec 06, 2012 09:10 AM EST Dec 06, 2012 04:12 PM EST 337.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Helies, Frank **fchelies@verizon.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Dec 06, 2012 09:17 AM EST

City Tampa

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Dec 06, 2012 09:17 AM EST Dec 06, 2012 04:45 PM EST 447.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Dukes,Amy **dukesa@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 30, 2012 04:55 PM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 10:04 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 11:58 AM EST	113.7

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Tsao,Fan **fan.tsao@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Nov 21, 2012 02:21 PM EST

City Silver Spring

State MD

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Dec 06, 2012 09:08 AM EST	Dec 06, 2012 03:49 PM EST	401.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Reeder, Bernie **berniereeder@gmail.com**

Attended No

Registration Date Nov 28, 2012 11:41 AM EST

City Southport

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Lloyd, Vic **vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Dec 02, 2012 09:26 AM EST

City Atlantic Beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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

Reichert,Marcel reichertm@dnr.sc.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Nov 27, 2012 04:34 PM EST

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

FARMER,NICK nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Nov 14, 2012 03:39 PM EST

City ST PETERSBURG

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

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