

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SHRIMP MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Renaissance Battle House Mobile, Alabama

October 24, 2018

VOTING MEMBERS

Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
 Patrick Banks.....Louisiana
 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS
 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
 Robin Riechers.....Texas
 John Sanchez.....Florida

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Susan Boggs.....Alabama
 Doug Boyd.....Texas
 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
 Tom Frazer.....Florida
 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
 Paul Mickle (designee for Joe Spraggins).....Mississippi
 Greg Stunz.....Texas
 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
 Lt Mark Zanowicz.....USCG

STAFF

Assane Diagne.....Economist
 Matt Freeman.....Economist
 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
 Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Luiz Barbieri.....SSC
 Avery Bates.....Organized Seafood Association of Alabama, AL
 Jane Black-Lee.....MS
 Shannon Calay.....SEFSC

1 Bubba Cochran.....Galveston, TX
2 Conner Cochran.....Galveston, TX
3 Richard Cody.....MRIP
4 Michael Drexler.....St. Petersburg, FL
5 Traci Floyd.....MDMR, MS
6 Troy Frady.....AL
7 Chris Garner.....Orange Beach, AL
8 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS
9 Johnny Greene.....Daphne, AL
10 Tim Griner.....SAFMC
11 Chad Hanson.....Pew Charitable Trusts
12 David Krebs.....Destin, FL
13 Rich Malinowski.....NMFS
14 Bart Niquet.....Lynn Haven, FL
15 Clay Porch.....SEFSC
16 David Rainer.....ADCNR
17 Christopher Rhodes.....Biloxi, MS
18 Chris Schieble.....LA
19 Nick Spiliotis.....Houston, TX
20 Tom Steber.....Elberta, AL
21 Jessica Stephen.....NMFS

22
23
24

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Table of Motions.....4
6
7 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....5
8
9 Action Guide and Next Steps.....5
10
11 Draft Options Shrimp Amendment 18: Evaluation of Shrimp Effort
12 Threshold Reduction in the Area Monitored for Juvenile Red
13 Snapper Bycatch.....5
14
15 Adjournment.....16
16
17 - - -
18

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

PAGE 12: Motion in Action 1 to remove Alternative 3. The motion carried on page 14.

PAGE 14: Motion to add an action to do any future changes for shrimp effort reduction threshold through a framework procedure. The motion carried on page 14.

- - -

1 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened at the Renaissance Battle House,
3 Mobile, Alabama, Wednesday morning, October 24, 2018, and was
4 called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

5
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
9

10 **CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE:** I will call the Shrimp Committee to
11 order. To refresh your memory, since we just did committee
12 assignments at this meeting, the Chair is myself, Leann Bosarge,
13 and the Vice Chair is Mr. Patrick Banks. As our members, we
14 have Mr. Kevin Anson, Dr. Crabtree, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Dugas, Mr.
15 Riechers, and Mr. Sanchez.

16
17 Our agenda can be found under Tab D, Number 1. Were there any
18 changes or additions that needed to be made to the agenda? If
19 not, the agenda is approved as presented. The minutes are
20 listed under Tab D, Number 2. Were there any revisions that
21 needed to be made from our minutes from our last meeting? If
22 there is no amendments, then we will assume the minutes are
23 approved as presented.

24
25 The Action Guide and Next Steps, which will lead us through our
26 discussion today, you can find that under Tab D, Number 3, and
27 we have one main item on our agenda today, and that's our draft
28 options of Shrimp Amendment 18, and so, Dr. Kilgour, I will turn
29 it over to you to lead us through that.

30
31 **DRAFT OPTIONS SHRIMP AMENDMENT 18: EVALUATION OF SHRIMP EFFORT**
32 **THRESHOLD REDUCTION IN THE AREA MONITORED FOR JUVENILE RED**
33 **SNAPPER BYCATCH**
34

35 **DR. MORGAN KILGOUR:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Today, I am
36 reviewing Shrimp Amendment 18, which is a draft options paper,
37 and, basically, the committee needs to review the alternatives
38 outlined in the single action, and I have a couple of IPT
39 questions. One is on the alternatives in the first action, and
40 then the second is if the committee would like to consider or
41 add an additional action which would outline a framework for
42 doing what we're doing in this amendment in the future. If you
43 are ready, I can just jump right into the presentation.

44
45 We're at modifying the shrimp effort threshold, and so shrimp
46 effort is capped in the 10 to 21 Statistical Zones and in ten to
47 thirty fathoms of water. It needs to be, right now, 67 percent
48 below the baseline years of 2001 to 2003, in that area, and that

1 threshold was put in place in Amendment 14, because the bycatch
2 of red snapper was thought to be a primary factor affecting the
3 recovery of red snapper, and it indicated a need for a reduction
4 in juvenile red snapper bycatch.

5
6 Again, the initial reduction was based on the average effort in
7 the baseline years of 2001 to 2003, and effort needed to be
8 reduced by 74 percent initially, and that was reduced to 67
9 percent in 2011, and the amendment stated that effort should be
10 reduced by 60 percent, and so another reduction, by 2032, and so
11 this reduction in the effort threshold means that shrimp effort
12 can increase, and so it's really fun to talk about.

13
14 The reason why the 60 percent in 2032 was out there was because
15 that's when red snapper was projected to be rebuilt, and so just
16 a little bit of information. This is the table that's available
17 in Shrimp Amendment 18, and it outlines the percent reduction
18 from the baseline for all of the years, and I want to highlight,
19 in 2011, there was some -- It was outlined in the amendment that
20 it should be reduced to 67 percent, and so the shrimp fishery
21 has been well within their threshold since the inception of this
22 cap, but the red snapper status has changed, and so it's no
23 longer overfished, nor undergoing overfishing, though it is
24 still in a rebuilding plan. The effect of the shrimp fishery on
25 mortality for red snapper is also less than previously thought.

26
27 The shrimp fishery has never exceeded its effort, and it's still
28 contracting, and one thing to consider is that, while red
29 snapper catches have increased with rebuilding, the shrimp
30 fishery has not seen any gains in this rebuilding.

31
32 The purpose of this action is to reduce the red snapper bycatch
33 reduction target in the federal Gulf shrimp fishery, in response
34 to the latest Gulf red snapper stock assessment, and the need
35 for this action is to promote economic stability in the federal
36 Gulf shrimp fishery, by reducing effort constraints and to
37 equitably distribute the benefits from rebuilding, while
38 continuing to protect the Gulf red snapper stock.

39
40 This is, like I said earlier, one action, which would allow for
41 effort to increase. Alternative 1 is no action. Right now,
42 it's unclear to staff, and we're still working with figuring out
43 if that reduction to 60 percent would be automatic by 2032, and
44 so that's something I am still working on. Alternative 2 would
45 set a static shrimp effort reduction goal for shrimp effort, and
46 so the three that are outlined are 63 percent, which is pretty
47 much halfway between 67 percent and 60 percent, which was
48 outlined in Amendment 14, 60 percent, or 56 percent.

1
2 If you recall, at the August council meeting, an analysis by the
3 Science Center was presented that showed that there was very
4 negligible differences in the ABCs projected for red snapper,
5 based on the 56 percent and 60 percent.

6
7 Alternative 3 would set a timeline for incremental changes to
8 the shrimp effort reduction goal, and the table is available on
9 the next page. Option a would change that effort reduction,
10 that threshold, to every two years, and so the total percent
11 change would be 7 percent over the course of the next fourteen
12 years, and so there would be a 1 percent change every two years.

13
14 Sub-Option b would reduce it to 56 percent, should the council
15 decide to do that, and so that would be an 11 percent change, or
16 1.6 percent every two years, and Option b would have a change
17 every five years, and so, instead of going straight from 67
18 percent to 60 percent, or 56 percent, as a static change, every
19 five years, there would be a 1.75 percent reduction. Sub-Option
20 b would reduce that to 56 percent below the cap right now, and
21 that would be 2.75 percent every five years.

22
23 This is information to consider, and the full report is
24 available in Appendix A, but this is the SEDAR base on the
25 current 67 percent reduction and if we reduced it to 60 percent
26 or 56 percent, and those would be the red snapper ABCs.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Diaz.

29
30 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Morgan, I just wanted
31 to make sure that I'm thinking about this right. These
32 reductions we're looking at here is based on the fact that if,
33 starting today, every year from this point forward through this
34 table, we would actually come down to that 60 percent level, to
35 actually get to these numbers, but, if I'm thinking about this
36 right, past history has shown that the shrimp fishery has not
37 come down to the levels that's been set in the past, and so my
38 calculations are at about 4 percent less effort than the target
39 from 2008 to 2017, and that would include 2011 actually having a
40 negative number.

41
42 What you're saying is it actually should have been changed to 67
43 percent in 2011, and that would actually be higher than that,
44 and so am I thinking about that right, that this table is
45 considering that that 60 percent is where we would be at every
46 year, but, in reality, that's not where we've been?

47
48 **DR. KILGOUR:** The first column in this table assumes that it

1 would be at 67 percent every year, and so that's the base, and
2 then the second column would be if we were at 60 percent. When
3 they put those numbers in, they assumed that you hit that, but
4 you're right that the shrimp fishery has not hit that. They
5 have always been well above their effort threshold, and so
6 within a percent a couple of years, but they have not hit that
7 effort threshold, and so there has not been a need to close the
8 fishery or anything. They have done what they are supposed to
9 do.

10

11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Riechers.

12

13 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** A couple of comments on this. When we say
14 well above, it's gotten fairly close a couple of times through
15 the years, 67.1 and 67.4, and we were supposed to be at 67, and
16 so they've come close to being above the threshold that they
17 needed to reach.

18

19 That's here nor there, except, when we talk about where we're
20 trying to get to, that may become important. The other part is
21 there has been a benefit that has occurred, because we've
22 already reduced the threshold at one point in time, so that we
23 were able to basically create some relief, in case there was
24 some expansion in the fishery, and there hasn't been a lot of
25 expansion, but there also -- When you say they are reducing
26 still, I am not certain that the numbers bear that out in our
27 overall reduction here, as we look at it.

28

29 Now, we believe, for other reasons, that there may still be some
30 consolidation going on and other things, but, in the time series
31 we're looking at, at this point, it's actually fairly static in
32 the last several five or six years, with the exception of a
33 little bump in one year of that time period, and so let's just
34 make sure we're looking at the same numbers and looking at them
35 in the same way.

36

37 What I want to know though is there were -- In the discussion in
38 the document, there seems to be some unanswered questions as to
39 whether or not it automatically goes to 60 at the end of the
40 period if we do nothing, but our goal here was to actually do
41 something to create an interim time period where we think we can
42 adjust that and not go into closures, but still make sure we're
43 on track to create the rebuilding that we want to create by
44 2032, as that was part of the Amendment 14 and 27 at the time,
45 but there seems to be some unanswered questions regarding how
46 that's going to -- What we have to do. We have to do an
47 amendment, and is that correct?

48

1 **DR. ROY CRABTREE:** Yes. It won't automatically happen at any
2 point. You have to do an amendment.
3
4 **MR. RIECHERS:** So we definitely have to do an amendment, and the
5 earliest the amendment can take place -- Obviously, Kevin and I
6 were having a conversation earlier about this, and the earliest
7 the amendment can take place is for us to pass it in 2019, so
8 that it takes effect in 2020. Given where we were last year,
9 what risk do we believe we have, and how is the Center going to
10 handle that, as we look at next year's effort, or do you think
11 there is any risk? Let me put it that way.
12
13 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Crabtree.
14
15 **DR. CRABTREE:** When you say risk, you mean what are the chances
16 that we exceed the effort limit?
17
18 **MR. RIECHERS:** Well, I'm not asking you to project that, and so
19 I guess what happens if we get this and -- We're trying to make
20 sure that we don't have rolling closures.
21
22 **DR. CRABTREE:** Right.
23
24 **MR. RIECHERS:** So what I am trying to do is figure out -- Is
25 there an interim action here we take, so that we do that in some
26 way quicker, or is there this step-down action that allows us to
27 think about it over the whole long-term period, is what I'm
28 trying to get at.
29
30 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think your best course of action is to move
31 this amendment through as quick as you can and go ahead and
32 reduce the threshold to 60 percent. I don't know if there's an
33 interim action of any sort that we could take or would need to
34 take if we were to get into a situation next year where we were
35 over the threshold and approval of this amendment had already
36 happened and we were in the rulemaking somewhere, but we would
37 deal with that when we get there, but I don't know how to
38 anticipate that, and so I think your best course is just to move
39 this through as expeditiously as you can. It seems pretty
40 straightforward, to me.
41
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and, if we were able to finalize this
43 amendment in 2019, I would think, once it went into rulemaking
44 and became effective, then it would be in effect for 2019 and
45 not 2020, right?
46
47 **DR. CRABTREE:** If we were able to vote this up -- I don't know
48 when the schedule is, but when is the earliest we would vote

1 this up, do you think?

2
3 **DR. KILGOUR:** That depends on the council. If we had a public
4 hearing draft in January, we could do a final draft in April,
5 and I guess that would be the soonest we could vote that up.

6
7 **DR. CRABTREE:** So it potentially is implemented in the fall, if
8 things move quickly, and I don't recall, off the top of my head,
9 when we normally get the effort.

10
11 **DR. KILGOUR:** We get it in October, usually, which is why it's
12 in this document, and so we'll have the 2018 numbers next
13 October.

14
15 **DR. CRABTREE:** It seems to me, if we got the numbers in October,
16 then it would trigger a closure, I guess, and I would have to
17 look back at how all of that works, but there would be a time,
18 and it would trigger the closure, probably in 2020 sometime
19 anyway, and so it seems to me that we do have time to get this
20 in place, should that situation arise, but we need to move. We
21 don't have a lot of time to waste.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Diaz.

24
25 **MR. DIAZ:** I think it's important that we move on and go ahead
26 and act on it, because there is some science that we have now
27 that we didn't have when this document was originally
28 implemented, and the target was to get it down to 60 percent,
29 but National Marine Fisheries Service and the Southeast
30 Fisheries Science Center did some evaluation on this whole
31 process, and this is just reading from the discussion from that.

32
33 The analysis concluded that red snapper mortality due to
34 discards and closed recreational seasons is much higher than was
35 thought at the time that the shrimp effort reduction threshold
36 was put in place, and the natural mortality values in previous
37 assessments assumed for zero and age-one fish has changed. The
38 natural mortality of juvenile red snapper is higher, and it says
39 the Southeast Fisheries Science Center analysis was based on
40 reduction in the threshold being applied to Gulf-wide rather
41 than specifically to the area monitored for juvenile red snapper
42 bycatch. The results projected negligible changes to the ABC
43 for 60 percent and 56 percent reductions below the baseline.

44
45 That is information that was not available when this document
46 was first done, and I think, being as we have this new
47 information, we should try to move quickly on this and make sure
48 that we don't get the shrimp industry in a place where they

1 could potentially be penalized for some small overrun, should it
2 occur. Thank you, ma'am.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Riechers.

5

6 **MR. RIECHERS:** Dale, I am in agreement with you. The only
7 question I have is maybe how that movement occurs and whether we
8 should be thinking about a step-down movement, so that, as we
9 check in periodically on the rebuilding schedule for red snapper
10 and how shrimp effort plays into that, whether or not we use
11 Alternative 3, and one of the alternatives in Alternative 3, or
12 whether we use an alternative in Alternative 2 and go directly
13 there.

14

15 I mean, that's the only question that I am trying to struggle
16 with, thinking that really we know more, even though this was
17 done outside of the process when this was put in place, and it
18 was done within the context of the rebuilding schedule for red
19 snapper, and I am trying to think about those two in concert and
20 how we get those assessments over the course of between 2018 and
21 2032. In reality, I am kind of, myself, struggling between
22 Alternative 3b or a and Alternative 2b and how you get there and
23 whether or not you have that check-in periodically with the
24 assessment.

25

26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, I think that another thing that's in
27 our scope of work is that staff mentioned that, if we have to
28 address this again in the future, and I guess that could be
29 either up or down, that they would like to possibly look at
30 putting in a procedure so this could be a framework, and so, if
31 you just go -- In other words, if we have to adjust it in the
32 future, if we went with the 60 percent right now and just go
33 straight to it, if we had to adjust it in the future, when we
34 get some new stock assessment, we would have a framework
35 procedure that would make it much more streamlined. Dr.
36 Crabtree.

37

38 **DR. CRABTREE:** Yes, and I agree with that, Leann, and so, if
39 something fundamental in our understanding of the fishery and
40 the impact of shrimp trawl bycatch were to change, we could come
41 in and do a framework and make an adjustment, and so I don't see
42 much to be gained by this step-down in Alternative 3, and my
43 inclination would be to go ahead and remove that alternative
44 from the document, in the interest of moving this as
45 expeditiously as we can, and then that leaves us with several
46 alternatives on what exactly the threshold should be, and we
47 just come back and make that decision, I guess, when we are at a
48 point to choose preferreds, but I don't -- Alternative 3 just

1 seems needlessly complicated to me, and I don't really think it
2 gains us much.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Is that a motion or not a motion?

5
6 **DR. CRABTREE:** I would be happy to make that as a motion, and I
7 move to remove Action 1, Alternative 3, to remove it from the
8 document.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. We have a motion going on the
11 board, and we have a second from Mr. Diaz. Is there discussion
12 on the motion? Mr. Anson.

13
14 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Just to go back to the conversation that was
15 had relative to 2019 and the timing of when we get the shrimp
16 numbers, or the shrimp effort numbers, and what action might
17 need to be taken if they are exceeded, the shrimp effort is
18 exceeded, in 2018 and the timing of this document, Dr. Crabtree.
19 If you got them in the fall, and it said it exceeded, and this
20 was going on behind the scenes --

21
22 **DR. CRABTREE:** I am going to ask Mara to -- We have never had it
23 triggered, and so we've never done it, but I know there is a
24 procedure laid out, and so, Mara, maybe you can tell us how that
25 would work.

26
27 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Well, it's in the regulations, and so the
28 regulations read -- It's a very long paragraph, but the end of
29 it says, if the RA determines that a closure is necessary and
30 the closure falls within the scope of the potential closures
31 evaluated in the Gulf Shrimp FMP and good cause exists to waive
32 notice and comment, NMFS will implement the closure by
33 publication of a final rule in the Federal Register. If such
34 good cause is not justified, NMFS will implement the closure via
35 appropriate notice and comment and rulemaking. NMFS intends
36 that any closure implemented consistent with this paragraph will
37 begin on the same date and time as the Texas closure, unless
38 circumstances dictate otherwise.

39
40 There is a process of the RA's determination of the need for
41 such closure and its geographical scope and duration will be
42 based on an annual assessment by the Southeast Fisheries Science
43 Center of the shrimp effort and associated shrimp trawl bycatch
44 mortality on red snapper in the ten to thirty-fathom area of
45 Statistical Zones 10 to 21 compared to the 67 percent target
46 reduction. I don't know. It basically says what the procedure
47 is, and I guess it tries to line it up with the Texas closure,
48 but I don't know how that would work, in practice, like when you

1 would get the information.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Crabtree.

4

5 **DR. CRABTREE:** Mara, if we got the numbers in October of 2019
6 and they showed we were over the threshold, the closure wouldn't
7 happen though until May 15, which is when the Texas closure goes
8 in place?

9

10 **MS. LEVY:** The rule says the Southeast Fisheries Science Center
11 assessment will be provided to the RA on or about March 1 of
12 each year, and so it anticipates that you get it in March, I
13 think, so that you can line it up with the Texas closure if you
14 need to.

15

16 **DR. CRABTREE:** Okay, but the closure wouldn't occur until the
17 Texas closure happens?

18

19 **MS. LEVY:** Unless circumstances dictate otherwise.

20

21 **DR. CRABTREE:** Right. Okay.

22

23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Anson.

24

25 **MR. ANSON:** Based on that last comment, and that's kind of what
26 I heard, is that there is some flexibility, it sounds like, that
27 the RA has in going forward with the closure or not, and maybe
28 some of this analysis that went into this document would kind of
29 give pause for the RA to possibly implement a closure, based on
30 the recommendation or the analysis that was conducted in looking
31 at the 60 percent and the 56 percent effort reduction.

32

33 **MS. LEVY:** Yes, and I think, if you have an amendment that you
34 voted up and submitted and then also -- I mean, it has to go
35 through the sixty-day comment period and then the approval, but,
36 even if the final rule follows that -- Like, once it's approved,
37 I think we could say, look, this is an approved thing, and we're
38 still in the rulemaking, and so we're not just going to jump at
39 the 67 percent when we know we're going to implement a lower
40 threshold.

41

42 **DR. CRABTREE:** I can assure you that the RA will take that into
43 account before making a determination.

44

45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Any further discussion on the
46 motion? **The motion is, in Action 1, to remove Alternative 3,**
47 **and Alternative 3 is pretty wordy, and it's listed there on the**
48 **board. Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the**

1 motion? One in opposition. The motion carries with one in
2 opposition. Mr. Diaz.
3
4 **MR. DIAZ:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I sent a motion to the
5 staff, if they can put that on the board, please. Morgan, I am
6 trying to accomplish one of your last bullets that you had about
7 a framework procedure. **I want to make a motion to add an action**
8 **to do any future changes for shrimp effort reduction through a**
9 **framework procedure.**
10
11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so we have a motion on the
12 board. Do we have a second for the motion? It's seconded by
13 Dr. Crabtree.
14
15 **DR. CRABTREE:** To clarify, what this means is that we would add
16 an action to create a framework procedure to allow us to do
17 that.
18
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Do you want to put "threshold" in there
20 somewhere, so that they know that this is specific to that
21 threshold? We can ask Morgan. I don't know if she needs that
22 or not.
23
24 **DR. KILGOUR:** Well, I know what the intent is, but if you wanted
25 to do "shrimp effort reduction threshold through a framework",
26 that would be fine too, if you just wanted to keep it consistent
27 with the language in the document.
28
29 **MR. DIAZ:** Okay, and I'm fine with that.
30
31 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Our seconder is okay with that? Okay. All
32 right, and so we have a motion on the board. Is there
33 discussion on the motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition**
34 **to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.**
35
36 Dr. Kilgour, were you finished with your presentation, or did we
37 catch you in the middle of it?
38
39 **DR. KILGOUR:** Well, I think I got everything that I needed. I'm
40 not sure if I finished my presentation or not. The last slide,
41 you guys already covered. Would the council like to add an
42 action that would develop a framework procedure to reduce the
43 effort threshold? Are there any other effort reductions that
44 the council would like to consider outside of those outlined in
45 Alternative 2 and 3? Are the range of alternatives appropriate?
46 I think I got what I needed, with the exception of that second
47 bullet.
48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Diaz.
2
3 **MR. DIAZ:** Just my opinion, based on the information in the
4 document and the tables that you have, I think the range of
5 alternatives are reasonable.
6
7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Boyd.
8
9 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not on the
10 committee, but I do have a question, though. We know that
11 shrimp trawls are not selective, and this is focused on red
12 snapper. Has there been any analysis on the other species that
13 we manage and the effect that this is going to have on those
14 other species, like triggerfish or gray snapper or red drum or
15 any of the others?
16
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, I will look to the NMFS side of the
18 house on the analysis, but we have observers that go out on the
19 boat.
20
21 **DR. CRABTREE:** Well, I mean, the assessments for those species
22 all deal with shrimp trawl bycatch, and so I don't know how you
23 could analyze this, unless you did a hypothetical of what if
24 they did go over and then there was a closure and what impact
25 would that have on things, but it would seem to be to be subject
26 to so many what-ifs that it would be hard to know if it means
27 anything.
28
29 If history is our guide, it's unlikely they are going to ever
30 exceed the threshold anyway, and so there wouldn't have been a
31 closure, and so moving the threshold gives us some comfort, and
32 it maybe brings some stability to the industry, but, unless
33 there's a change in their effort, it won't have any impact on
34 bycatch, and so I'm not sure how you could really do an analysis
35 of the impact of this specific measure on those other species.
36
37 I mean you could, Doug, look at what if shrimp effort goes up
38 and how would that affect gray triggerfish and how would that
39 affect some other species, and I think that's all you could
40 really do.
41
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Any further discussion? Morgan,
43 did you -- Were you going to take us through the document, or is
44 it just that presentation? I mean, I'm fine with the
45 presentation. Okay. The plan is to bring a public hearing
46 draft back for us in January?
47
48 **DR. KILGOUR:** If that's what the committee desires, that's what

1 will happen, or I could bring you another draft options with the
2 new action that you just added in January and allow the Shrimp
3 AP to weigh-in on this while it's in the options stage, or they
4 can weigh-in on it when it's in the public hearing draft stage.
5 They generally meet in late February or early March, and it
6 depends on when I can get the stock assessments for the shrimp.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Well, we definitely want the Shrimp AP
9 to weigh-in, for sure, at their next meeting, and they always
10 have a meeting before the Texas closure, and so that should be
11 coming up in the first quarter of next year. All right. We'll
12 leave it up to you as to which draft you bring us next time.
13 Mr. Diaz.

14
15 **MR. DIAZ:** If we're trying to move this to get out there where
16 we have a final document in October, I think a public hearing
17 draft in January would be preferable. That's my opinion.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Dr. Kilgour, you will take that
20 input from the committee, but I know we have a prioritization
21 spreadsheet, and you all have a lot on your plate. We would
22 appreciate a public hearing draft, and we'll let you hash it out
23 and see if you're able to accomplish that for us in January.
24 Thank you. All right. Next on our agenda is Other Business.
25 Was there any other business to come before the committee?
26 Seeing none, that concludes the Shrimp Management Committee.

27
28 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 24, 2018.)

29
30 - - -
31