

**Gulf Council Motions Report
June 17–21, 2013
Pensacola, Florida**

Administrative Policy

Motion: To adopt the changes to Policy P., Stock Assessments, of the Administrative Handbook, as noted in Tab H, No. 3 of the briefing material.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Data Collection

Motion: To send the Framework Action for Headboat Electronic Reporting Requirements to the Secretary of Commerce and deem the regulations as necessary and appropriate.

Motion carried by roll call vote.

Dr. Shipp	Yes	Ms. Williams	Yes	Mr. Riley	Absent
Dr. Crabtree	Yes	Mr. Sanchez	Yes	Mr. Pearce	Yes
Mr. Riechers	Yes	Mr. Green	Yes	Dr. Dana	Yes
Mr. Matens	Yes	Mr. Perret	Yes	Mr. Diaz	Yes
Dr. Abele	Yes	Ms. Bademan	Yes	Mr. Boyd	Yes
Mr. Anson	Yes	Mr. Fischer	Yes		

Motion: To postpone discussion of the Scoping Document for Improving Private Recreational Red Snapper Fisheries Data until the October 2013 meeting.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Joint Artificial Reef/Habitat Protection

Motion: That staff develop a letter, sent to the appropriate entities, recognizing the importance of artificial structures as fish habitat; that BOEMRE regulations require they be removed and that we suggest that they be removed without the use of explosives, that the material be retained in existing artificial reef zones and other agreed upon and appropriate locations, and that the monetary savings to the companies be returned to the permit holders based on the current formula that is being used.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Mackerel

Mackerel Amendment 19

Motion: In Action 2, that the preferred alternative be Alternative 1.

Alternative 1: No Action – Do not eliminate any commercial king mackerel permits.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 19 be taken to public hearings.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Amendment 20

Motion: In Action 1, to adopt the IPT language recommendations by removing Option a from Alternatives 2 through 4, and selecting Alternative 1, Option a. as one of the preferred alternatives.

Alternative 1: No Action – Retain the existing commercial hook-and-line trip limits.

Option a. Western Zone at 3,000 pounds.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 2, that the preferred alternative be Alternative 2, Option a.

Alternative 2: Change the fishing season for Gulf group king mackerel season to September 1 – August 31.

Option a: For the Western Zone.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 2, for the Eastern Zone, Northern Subzone, that the preferred alternative be Alternative 3, Option b.

Alternative 3: Change the fishing season for Gulf group king mackerel season to October 1 – September 30.

Option b: For the Eastern Zone Northern Subzone.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 4.1, to adopt the new proposed language as recommended by the South Atlantic Council.

Action 4.1 – Establish Regional Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) for Atlantic Migratory Group King Mackerel.

Alternative 1: No Action - retain one commercial ACL for the Atlantic migratory group king mackerel.

Alternative 2: Establish a separate commercial ACL of Atlantic migratory group king mackerel for North Carolina based on Options a-d below. Monitoring and implementation would be based on Options e-g below.

Option a - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in North Carolina from 2007-08 through 2011-12.

Option b - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in North Carolina from 2002-03 through 2011-2012.

Option c - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times (50% of the proportion of landings in North Carolina 2002-03 through 2011-2012 and 50% of the proportion of landings in North Carolina 2007-08 through 2011-12).

Option d - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in North Carolina from 1997-98 through 2011-12.

Option e - NMFS would monitor landings in both North Carolina and the rest of the states and close the EEZ of each area when the respective ACL is met or expected to be met.

Option f - North Carolina would monitor landings in North Carolina and prohibit landings in North Carolina when the North Carolina ACL is met or projected to be met. NMFS would monitor landings in the rest of the states and close the entire EEZ when the General Atlantic ACL is reached.

Option g - North Carolina would monitor landings in North Carolina and inform NMFS when the North Carolina ACL is met or expected to be met; NMFS would then close the EEZ off North Carolina. NMFS would monitor landings in the rest of the states and close the EEZ off those states when the ACL is reached.

Alternative 3: Establish ACLs for Northern and Southern Zones for Atlantic migratory group king mackerel based on Options a-d below. Monitoring and implementation would be based on Options e-g below. The Northern Zone would include the EEZ off states from North Carolina north to New York. The Southern Zone would include the EEZ off South Carolina, Georgia, and the east coast of Florida. NMFS would monitor landings in both zones and close the EEZ of each zone when the respective ACL is reached.

Option a - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in that zone from 2007-08 through 2011-12.

Option b - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in that zone from 2002-03 through 2011-2012.

Option c - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average (50% of the proportion of landings from that zone 2002-03 through 2011-2012 and 50% of the proportion of landings from that zone 2007-08 through 2011-12).

Option d - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in that zone from 1997-98 through 2011-12.

Alternative 4: Allow for transfer of quota between regions. North Carolina and Florida would be designated as the coordinating states for any transfer request, in consultation with other states.

Process for Transfer under Alternative 2

Florida, in consultation with Georgia, South Carolina, and the Mid-Atlantic states, may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the General Atlantic ACL to the North Carolina ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for Florida, after consultation with all other states. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of quota to be transferred.

North Carolina may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the North Carolina ACL to the General Atlantic ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for North Carolina. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of quota to be transferred.

Process for Transfer under Alternative 3

Florida, in consultation with Georgia and South Carolina, may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the Southern Zone ACL to the Northern Zone ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for Florida, after consultation with Georgia and South Carolina. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of ACL to be transferred.

North Carolina, in consultation with all Mid-Atlantic states, may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the Northern Zone ACL to the Southern Zone ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for North Carolina, after consultation with the Mid-Atlantic states. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of ACL to be transferred.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 4.2, to adopt the new proposed language as recommended by the South Atlantic Council.

Action 4.2 – Establish Regional Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) for Atlantic Migratory Group Spanish Mackerel.

Alternative 1: No Action - retain one commercial ACL for the Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel

Alternative 2: Establish a separate commercial ACL of Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel for North Carolina based on Options a-d below. Monitoring and implementation would be based on Options e-g below.

Option a - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in North Carolina from 2007-08 through 2011-12.

Option b - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in North Carolina from 2002-03 through 2011-2012.

Option c - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times (50% of the proportion of landings in North Carolina 2002-03 through 2011-2012 and 50% of the proportion of landings in North Carolina 2007-08 through 2011-12).

Option d - The North Carolina ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in North Carolina from 1997-98 through 2011-12.

Option e - NMFS would monitor landings in both North Carolina and the rest of the states and close the EEZ of each area when the respective ACL is met or expected to be met.

Option f - North Carolina would monitor landings in North Carolina and prohibit landings in North Carolina when the North Carolina ACL is met or projected to be met. NMFS would monitor landings in the rest of the states and close the entire EEZ when the General Atlantic ACL is reached.

Option g - North Carolina would monitor landings in North Carolina and inform NMFS when the North Carolina ACL is met or expected to be met; NMFS would then close the EEZ off North Carolina. NMFS would monitor landings in the rest of the states and close the EEZ off those states when the ACL is reached.

Alternative 3: Establish ACLs for Northern and Southern Zones for Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel based on Options a-d below. Monitoring and implementation would be based on Options e-g below. The Northern Zone would include the EEZ off states from North Carolina north to New York. The Southern Zone would include the EEZ off South Carolina, Georgia, and the east coast of Florida. NMFS would monitor landings in both zones and close the EEZ of each zone when the respective ACL is reached.

Option a - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in that zone from 2007-08 through 2011-12.

Option b - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in that zone from 2002-03 through 2011-2012.

Option c - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average (50% of the proportion of landings from that zone 2002-03 through 2011-2012 and 50% of the proportion of landings from that zone 2007-08 through 2011-12).

Option d - Each zone ACL would be the Atlantic migratory group ACL times the average of the proportion of landings in that zone from 1997-98 through 2011-12.

Alternative 4: Allow for transfer of quota between regions. North Carolina and Florida would be designated as the coordinating states for any transfer request, in consultation with other states.

Process for Transfer under Alternative 2

Florida, in consultation with Georgia, South Carolina, and the Mid-Atlantic states, may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the General Atlantic ACL to the North Carolina ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for Florida, after consultation with all other states. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of quota to be transferred.

North Carolina may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the North Carolina ACL to the General Atlantic ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for North Carolina. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of quota to be transferred.

Process for Transfer under Alternative 3

Florida, in consultation with Georgia and South Carolina, may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the Southern Zone ACL to the Northern Zone ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for Florida, after consultation with Georgia and South Carolina. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of ACL to be transferred.

North Carolina, in consultation with all Mid-Atlantic states, may request approval from the Regional Administrator to transfer part of the Northern Zone ACL to the Southern Zone ACL. Requests for transfer must be made by letter signed by the principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility and expertise, or his/her previously named designee, for North Carolina, after consultation with the Mid-Atlantic states. The letter must certify that all pertinent state requirements have been met and identify the amount of ACL to be transferred.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To accept the IPT recommended changes for Action 6, Alternative 3.

Alternative 3: The ACL for each jurisdictional area would be determined as follows:

- The Gulf migratory group cobia ACL ABC (based on the ABC as determined by the SSC) would be divided into a Gulf jurisdictional Zone ACL and an east coast of Florida East Coast ACL (FL/GA border to Council jurisdictional boundary) based on the options below.
 - Option a:** Use 2002-2012 (10 years) landings to establish the percentage split for the Gulf ABC.
 - Option b:** Use 2008-2012 (5 years) landings to establish the percentage split for the Gulf ABC.
 - Option c:** Use Boyles law: 50% of landings from 2002-2012 + 50% of landings from 2008-2012 to establish the percentage split for the Gulf ABC.
 - South Atlantic Council Preferred Option d: Use 1998-2012 (15 years) landings to establish the percentage split for the Gulf ABC. (SA Mackerel AP Preferred)
 - Option e:** Based on yellowtail: 50% of average landings from 1993-2008 + 50% of average landings from 2006-2008 to establish the percentage split for the Gulf ABC.
 - Option f:** Based on mutton: 50% of average landings from 1990-2008 + 50% of average landings from 2006-2008 to establish the percentage split for the Gulf ABC.
- The South Atlantic jurisdictional area ACL would be equal the ACL ABC for the Atlantic migratory group cobia (based on the ABC as determined by the SSC) plus the portion of the Gulf migratory group ACL for the east coast of Florida.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 6, that the preferred alternative be Alternative 3, Option d.

Alternative 3: The ACL for each jurisdictional area would be determined as follows:

- The Gulf migratory group cobia ACL ABC (based on the ABC as determined by the SSC) would be divided into a Gulf jurisdictional Zone ACL and an east coast of Florida East Coast ACL (FL/GA border to Council jurisdictional boundary) based on the options below.

Option d: Use 1998-2012 (15 years) landings to establish the percentage split for the Gulf ABC. (SA Mackerel AP Preferred)

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That Amendment 20 be taken to public hearings.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That public hearings for Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendments 19 and 20 be held in the following locations:

Corpus Christi, TX
Galveston area, TX
Grand Isle, LA
D'Iberville, MS
Mobile, AL
Panama City, FL
Tampa/St. Petersburg, FL
Key West, FL

Motion carried with no opposition.

Reef Fish

Motion: To request that the SSC provide a scenario of ABC values for 2013-2015 using the 20.4% SPR (F_{MAX}) for red snapper as soon as possible.

Motion carried with no opposition.

SEDAR 31 – 2013 Red Snapper Quotas

Motion: That the Red Snapper ACL be set at 11 mp for 2013.

Substitute motion: In Action 1, to add a new Alternative 6.

Alternative 6. To set the 2013 quotas based on a total ABC that allows a constant yield rebuilding at the same rate as the ABC during 2013-2015. The buffer for the commercial sector we be 0%. The buffer for the recreational sector would be 20%.

ABC 11.9 mp
Total Quota $6.069 - 4.665 = 10.734$ mp
Commercial 51% of 11.9 mp = 6.069 mp
Recreational 49% of 11.9 mp = 5.831 mp
$$\begin{array}{r} \text{x } .80 \\ \hline 4.648 \text{ mp} \end{array}$$

Substitute motion withdrawn.

Substitute motion: To recommend that the red snapper ACL for 2013 be set at 6.069 mp for the harvesting sector and at 4.665 for the recreational sector based on a 5% buffer for the harvesting sector and a 15% buffer for the recreational sector.

ABC 11.9 mp
Commercial 51% of 11.9 mp = 6.069 mp
$$\begin{array}{r} \text{x } .95 \\ \hline 5.766 \text{ mp} \end{array}$$

Recreational 49% of 11.9 mp = 5.831 mp
$$\begin{array}{r} \text{x } .85 \\ \hline 4.956 \text{ mp} \end{array}$$

Total quota 10.722 mp

Substitute motion failed.

Second substitute motion: That the Red Snapper ACL be set at 11.5 mp for 2013.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To request that staff develop a framework action to set the TAC for 2013 and to schedule an additional Council meeting to take final action in July 2013.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To maintain the current 2013 quota for the recreational sector at 4.145 mp and increase the commercial quota to 5.610 mp.

Motion ruled out of order.

Motion: In Action 1, to remove Alternative 3.

Alternative 3: Set the 2013 quotas based on the ABC of 13.5 mp ww and applying buffers derived from ACL control rule established in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment. The sector quotas would be based on the 51%:49% commercial and recreational allocation. The buffer for the commercial sector would be 0%; the buffer for the recreational sector would be 20%. The total quota is equal to the sum of the sector quotas.

	0%	20%
Total quota	Commercial quota	Recreational quota
12.177 mp	6.885 mp	5.292 mp

Motion carried with one opposition.

Motion: In Action 1, to remove Alternative 2.

Alternative 2: Set the 2013 quotas for red snapper based on the acceptable biological catch (ABC) of 13.5 mp ww. The sector quotas would be based on the 51%:49% commercial and recreational allocation. The total quota is equal to the sum of the sector quotas.

Total quota	Commercial quota	Recreational quota
13.5 mp	6.885 mp	6.615 mp

Motion carried with one opposition.

Motion: To add a new alternative to set the total quota at 10 mp with the 51%/49% commercial/recreational allocation (commercial – 5.1 mp, recreational – 4.9 mp).

Motion carried 7 to 5.

Motion: To request that staff include options that would deal with a continuous season and a weekends only season.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Amendment 28 – Red Snapper Allocation

Motion: In Action 1, Alternative 2, to add a new Option d.

Option d. Allocate 50% of the red snapper ACL to the commercial sector and 50% to the recreational sector.

Motion withdrawn.

Motion: To request that staff revise Amendment 28 including the Appendix B scenarios, but with the ACL for 2013 set at 11mp, and include the SSC ABC recommendations for 2014 and 2015.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Amendment 39 – Regional Management of Red Snapper

Motion: In Action 3, that Alternative 5 not be made a preferred alternative at this time.

Preferred Alternative 5: Apportion the recreational red snapper quota among the Gulf states based on 50% of the average of historical landings from 1986-2011 and 50% of the average of historical landings from 2006-2011, excluding landings from 2010, and rounding the resulting proportions to whole numbers. The resulting allocation is: Alabama 30%, Florida 38%, Louisiana 14%, Mississippi 3%, and Texas 15%.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 3, to remove the last sentence in Alternative 5 (“The resulting allocation is: Alabama 30%, Florida 38%, Louisiana 14%, Mississippi 3%, and Texas 15%”).

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 4, that Alternative 6 not be a preferred alternative.

Preferred Alternative 6: Allow individual regions to establish closed areas within the EEZ adjacent to their region that applies only to vessels registered within their region.

Motion failed 8 to 6.

Motion: In Action 4, to add a new preferred alternative to allow individual regions to establish sub-allocations for the private and for-hire (charter and headboat) sectors.

Motion carried 12 to 1.

Motion: In Action 6, to add a new alternative for a phase-in option.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 7, that the preferred alternative be Alternative 3.

Alternative 3: If a state opts out of delegation, the NMFS default regulations would apply for recreational harvest of red snapper in the EEZ off such state.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 7, that there be a second preferred alternative, Alternative 2, Option a.

Alternative 2: During the suspension of delegation, the recreational harvest of red snapper in the EEZ off such state would be:

Option a. Restricted to the NMFS default regulations.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That Amendment 39 be sent out to public hearings.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To hold public hearings for Amendment 39 in the following locations:

Baton Rouge, LA
Galveston area, TX
Corpus Christi, TX
D'Iberville, MS
Mobile, AL
Panama City, FL
Tampa/St. Petersburg, FL

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To form an Ad Hoc Red Snapper IFQ Advisory Panel for the purpose of addressing changes in the program, and to review applications at the August 2013 meeting.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To direct Council staff to prepare a white paper to review the regulations to allow federally permitted for-hire vessels that also have a federal commercial Gulf reef fish permit to fish under their commercial permit up to the same number of passengers as the vessel is authorized to carry under the vessel's USCG authorization.

Motion carried 8 to 6.

Motion: To request that staff put Action to Define For-Hire Fishing Under Contractual Services on a future Council meeting agenda for discussion.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To take Amendment 28 to public hearings.

Motion failed 7 to 1.

Motion to table.

Motion to table withdrawn.

Shrimp

Motion: To approve the Shrimp ELB Abbreviated Framework and that our preferred option be Option 3.

Option 3. NMFS and industry would share the cost of the ELB program. A logical division of costs would be for NMFS to cover the software development, data storage, effort estimation analysis, and archival activities, and for the fishing industry to cover the costs of installing and maintaining the units and the cost of data transmission from the units to a NOAA server. This division of costs is the same as for the Gulf reef fish vessel monitoring system (VMS) program. The VMS program has covered the initial costs to purchase the new ELB units for each of the shrimp permit holders in the Gulf. Vessel owners would only pay the installation, maintenance, and transmission costs. It is also possible, similar to Option 2, industry or the Council could arrange funding from other sources.

Motion carried with one opposition.

Motion: If outside funding becomes available, such as oil spill restoration money from BP administered by a third-party, the LGL contract could be continued for multiple years to allow a smoother transition between the two programs. During this time, selected vessels could be assigned to participate in either the LGL program or the NMFS program, at the discretion of the SRD. The nature, amount, and duration of such funding has not been determined at this time.

If outside funding becomes available at some point and covers the cost of the entire program, cost sharing of the ELB program may not be needed. If such funding is less than the total cost of the program, the industry portion would be covered or reduced with that funding.

The intent in implementing this program is to provide flexibility to the SRD in the transition from the existing program and devices to a new program utilizing new technology and cost sharing with industry.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: To submit the Framework Action to Fund Electronic Logbook Program for the Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico to the Secretary of Commerce and deem the regulations as necessary and appropriate.

Motion carried by roll call vote.

Mr. Sanchez	Yes	Mr. Riley	Absent	Mr. Pearce	Yes
Dr. Shipp	Yes	Mr. Boyd	Yes	Mr. Diaz	Yes
Mr. Fischer	Yes	Mr. Riechers	Absent	Mr. Anson	Yes
Dr. Dana	Yes	Dr. Crabtree	Yes	Ms. Bademan	Yes
Mr. Matens	Yes	Mr. Greene	Yes	Mr. Perret	Yes
Dr. Abele	Yes	Ms. Williams	Yes		

Motion: To convene a joint meeting of the Ad Hoc Artificial Substrate Advisory Panel and the Shrimp Advisory Panel as soon as possible.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That the charge be as follows:

To meet and discuss with the Ad Hoc Artificial Reef Substrate Advisory Panel issues, impacts, and concerns associated with artificial reef siting criteria.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Sustainable Fisheries/Ecosystem

Motion: That the Council recommend to add to the list of reauthorization priorities the need for a sustainable certification that would authorize NMFS to provide the U.S. industry with a sustainable certification program and certification mark, which would provide the industry with the ability to promote and sell its seafood products, in both domestic and export markets, as sustainable based upon the requirements of the Act.

Motion carried with no opposition.

AP/SSC Appointments

Lori Schmitz-Janowski was appointed to the Ad Hoc Artificial Substrate AP. Other appointments are as follows:

AP Selection List Effective 6/17/13

Last Name	First Name	State	Class
-----------	------------	-------	-------

Coral Advisory Panel

Caignet	Carrie	FL	R
Moe	Martin	FL	S
Ruzicka	Rob	FL	FWRI
Sapp	Portia	FL	FDAG
Sammarco	Paul	LA	S
Schmahl	George	TX	NOAA
Talbott	John	TX	O

SEDAR Workshop Advisory Panel

Boggs	Randy	AL	CB
Bryant	Bob	FL	O
Christman	Mary	FL	MCC Stat. Consulting
Fisher	Mark	TX	TPWD
Friess	Claudia	TX	EN
Murie	Debra	FL	UF
Nelson	Russ	FL	CCA
Richardson	Bill	MS	MSDMR
Sauls	Beverly	FL	FFWCC
Stewart	Russell	FL	R

SSC Selection List
Effective 6/17/13

Last Name	First Name	State	Affiliation
-----------	------------	-------	-------------

Special Coral SSC

Brooke	Sandra	FL	FSU
Cuba	Thomas	FL	Delta S. Inc.
Jaap	Walter	FL	USF
Lang	Judith	VA	Retired
Ruzicka	Rob	FL	FFWRI
Sammarco, Ph.D.	Paul	LA	LUMCON
Schmahl	George	TX	FFG NMS

Special Coastal Migratory Pelagics (Mackerel) SSC

Adriance	Jason	LA	LDWF
Porche	G. Erick	MS	MDMR
Recks	Melissa	FL	FWC