1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	
3 4	264 TH MEETING
5 6	FULL COUNCIL SESSION
7	Naples Grand Beach Resort Naples, Florida
8 9	JUNE 7-8, 2017
10	
11	VOTING MEMBERS
12	Kevin AnsonAlabama
13	Leann BosargeMississippi
14	Patrick BanksLouisiana
15	Doug BoydTexas
16	Roy CrabtreeNMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
17	Pamela Dana
18	Dale DiazMississippi
19 20	Tom FrazerFlorida
21	Johnny GreeneAlabama Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley)Florida
22	Campo MatensLouisiana
23	Paul Mickle (designee for Jamie Miller)
24	Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas
25	John Sanchez
26	Greg Stunz
27	Ed SwindellLouisiana
28	David WalkerAlabama
29	
30	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
31	Glenn Constant
32	Dave DonaldsonGSMFC
33	Leo Danaher
34	
35	STAFF
36	Steven AtranSenior Fishery Biologist
37	Assane DiagneEconomist
38 39	Matt FreemanEconomist
3 <i>9</i> 40	John FroeschkeFishery Biologist-Statistician Douglas GregoryExecutive Director
41	Morgan KilgourFishery Biologist
42	Ava LasseterAnthropologist
43	Mara Levy
44	Jessica Matos
45	Emily Muehlstein
46	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
47	Carrie SimmonsDeputy Director
48	

1	OTHER PARTICIPANTS	
2	Eric Alexander	
3	Pam AndersonPanama City Beach, FL	ı
4	Anna BeckwithSAFMC	
5	Susan BoggsOrange Beach, AL	J
6	Ryan BradleyMississippi Commercial Fisheries United, Inc.	
7	Eric Brazer	!
8	Shane Cantrell	
9	Mike ColbyClearwater, FL	ı
10	William Copeland	
11	Scott Daggett	
12	Kenneth Daniels	
13	Jason DelacruzFL	ı
14	Traci Floyd	Ĺ
15	Will GeraghtyNaples, FL	ı
16	Sue GerhartNMFS	
17	Bill GouldingNaples, FL	ı
18	Buddy GuindonGalveston, TX	
19	Ken HaddadASA, FL	ı
20	Chad HaggertClearwater Beach, FL	ı
21	Scott HickmanGalveston, TX	
22	Chris Horton	
23	Dylan HubbardFL	1
24	Alison JohnsonOceana	
25	David Johnson	ı
26	Heidi JohnsonFWC, Naples, FL	ı
27	Bill KellyFKCFA	L
28	Garrett KingGalveston TX	
29	David KrebsDestin, FL	1
30	Randy LauserFL	1
31	Kai LorenzenFL	1
32	Edward MacciniFL	
33	Rich MalinowskiNMFS	,
34	Sean MeehanNMFS	
35	Milo MitrovicClearwater, FL	
36	Bart NiquetLynn Haven, FL	
37	Chris NiquetPanama City, FL	
38	Scott PearceFlorida FWC	
39	Bonnie PonwithSEFSC	
40	Valerie Sirch	
41	Bob SpaethMadeira Beach, FL	
42	Russell UnderwoodPanama City, FL	
43	Ed WalkerFL	
44	Shawn Watson	
45	Tom WheatleyPew Charitable Trusts	
46	Sam YoungNaples, FL	ı
47		
48		

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
Table of Contents	3
Table of Motions	4
Call to Order, Announcements, and Introductions	7
doption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes	8
eview of Exempted Fishing Permit Applications	9
resentations	23
Florida Law Enforcement	23
Summary of Anecdotal Data Efforts	
Public Comment	36
Presentation on Coral Reef Conservation Program Report	88
Other Business	93
Lionfish Discussion	93
Ad Hoc Red Snapper IFQ AP Discussion	10
	1.0
ommittee Reports Gulf SEDAR Committee Report	1.0
Reef Fish Committee Report	
Administrative/Budget Committee Report	
Spiny Lobster Committee Report	
Joint Coral/Habitat Protection & Restoration Report	
Data Collection Committee Report	
Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report	
Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report	
Announce Advisory Panel Members	16
	1 7
Supporting Agencies Update	
South Atlantic Council Liaison	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
U.S. Coast Guard	
Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission	1 '7 '
Adjournment	178

TABLE OF MOTIONS

<u>PAGE 115</u>: Motion in 2018 to assess in priority: 1) gray snapper benchmark continued; 2) MRIP calibration updates; 3) king mackerel research tracks; 4) gray triggerfish standard; 5) cobia standard; and 6) red grouper standard. The motion carried on page 120.

<u>PAGE 120</u>: Motion to assess in 2019, in order of priority: 1) scamp research track; 2) vermilion snapper standard; 3) yellowedge grouper standard; 4) tilefish standard; 5) Spanish mackerel standard. The motion carried on page 122.

<u>PAGE 123</u>: Motion for the red grouper assessment in 2018 the terminal year will be 2016. The motion carried on page 125.

<u>PAGE 126</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 6 the preferred alternative. Alternative 6 is for the reef fish stocks listed in Table 1.3.1, reef fish stocks MSST equals 0.5 times BMSY or proxy. The motion carried on page 127.

<u>PAGE 127</u>: Motion to approve Reef Fish Amendment 44, and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. <u>The motion carried on page 129</u>.

<u>PAGE 129</u>: Motion to approve Reef Fish Amendment 47, and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 131.

PAGE 131: Motion to make Option 3 the preferred option. Option 3 is to modify the total number of hooks to be unlimited of which no more than 750 hooks are fished or rigged for fishing. While the option of greater than 1,500 hooks per vessel was not analyzed in Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2010), the regulation to only allow 750 hooks to be fished or rigged for fishing would remain in place. Therefore, there should not be any additional concern for protected species interactions. Law enforcement would only need to check the number of rigged hooks (750) because there would be an unlimited number of unrigged hooks allowed in this option, reducing any burden on law enforcement. The motion carried on page 131.

PAGE 132: Motion to approve the Abbreviated Framework Action to Modify the Number of Unrigged Hooks Carried Onboard Bottom Longline Vessels, and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 133.

<u>PAGE 134</u>: Motion in Action 2 to add a new alternative that would modify the recreational closed season from January 1 to July 31. The motion carried on page 134.

PAGE 134: Motion to move Action 3 to Considered but Rejected. 2.3 Action 3, Modify the Recreational Minimum Size Limit, Alternative 1, no action, do not modify the current recreational minimum size limit of thirty-four inches; Alternative 2, modify the minimum recreational size limit for greater amberjack to thirty inches; Alternative 3, modify the minimum recreational size limit for greater amberjack to thirty-two inches; Alternative 4, modify the minimum recreational size limit for greater amberjack to thirty-six inches. The motion carried on page 135.

<u>PAGE 136</u>: Motion in Section 2.3 to add an alternative for an adaptive management redistribution method based on cyclical redistribution, which depends on fishing participation. <u>The motion carried on page 136</u>.

<u>PAGE 137</u>: Motion to direct staff to write a letter to NMFS to request a determination if an auction of commercial red snapper quota above 4.65 million pounds would require a referendum. The motion carried on page 137.

 <u>PAGE 137</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 2, Option 2b the preferred. Alternative 2 is establish a fishing quota program that provides participants with shares and annual allocation. Option 2b is a Permit Fishing Quota program. <u>The motion carried on page 137</u>.

<u>PAGE 137</u>: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative. <u>The motion carried on page 137</u>.

45 <u>PAGE 137</u>: Motion to move Action 2 to Considered but Rejected. 46 The motion carried on page 137.

48 PAGE 137: Motion in Action 3, Alternative 2, to make Options

```
1 2a, 2b, and 2c the preferred. The motion carried on page 138.
```

2
3 <u>PAGE 139</u>: Motion in Action 3 to move Alternative 2, Options 2d
4 and 2e to Considered but Rejected. <u>The motion failed on page</u>
5 142.

<u>PAGE 142</u>: Motion in Action 6.1 to make Alternative 3, Option 3a the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 142.

<u>PAGE 143</u>: Motion to make the Status Determination Criteria Amendment a priority on the proposed action schedule. <u>The motion carried on page 143</u>.

PAGE 143: Motion to direct staff to begin work on a document to address turtle release gear. The motion carried on page 144.

PAGE 147: Motion to recommend that Spiny Lobster Regulatory Amendment 4 be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 149.

PAGE 149: Motion to direct staff to begin work on a plan amendment to address the bully-net issue and reestablish the protocol procedures with the State of Florida. The motion carried on page 149.

PAGE 150: Motion to move Actions 1 and 2 to Considered but Rejected. The motion failed on page 152.

<u>PAGE 152</u>: Motion in Action 1 to add a new alternative that would exclude octocorals in the EEZ off of Florida from federal management. The motion carried on page 153.

<u>PAGE 156</u>: Motion to direct staff to define criteria to evaluate areas for "evidence of fishing" using VMS and ELB datasets. In areas that have evidence of fishing, to direct staff to include options that allow for a "tiered approach," or specific exemptions, for fishing with bottom tending gear. <u>The motion carried on page 156</u>.

- -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Naples Grand Beach Resort, Naples, Florida, Wednesday morning, June 7, 2017, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND INTRODUCTIONS

 CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE: Welcome to the 264th meeting of the Gulf Council. My name is Leann Bosarge, Chair of the Council. If you have a cell phone, pager, or similar device, we ask that you keep them on silent or vibrating mode during the meeting. Also, in order for all to be able to hear the proceedings, we ask that you please have any private conversations outside.

The Gulf Council is one of eight regional councils established in 1976 by the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, known today as the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The council's purpose is to serve as a deliberative body to advise the Secretary of Commerce on fishery management measures in the federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico. These measures help ensure that fishery resources in the Gulf are sustained, while providing the best overall benefit to the nation.

The council has seventeen voting members, eleven of whom are appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and include individuals from a range of geographical areas in the Gulf of Mexico with experience in various aspects of fisheries.

The membership also includes five state fishery managers from each Gulf state and the Regional Administrator from NOAA's Southeast Fisheries Service, as well as several non-voting members.

 Public input is a vital part of the council's deliberative process, and comments, both oral and written, are accepted and considered by the council throughout the process. Anyone wishing to speak during public comment should sign in at the registration kiosk located at the entrance to the meeting room. We accept only one registration per person. A digital recording is used for the public record. Therefore, for the purpose of voice identification, each person at the table is requested to identify him or herself, starting on my left.

MR. JOHNNY GREENE: Johnny Greene, Alabama.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Kevin Anson, Alabama.

48 MR. DAVID WALKER: David Walker, Alabama.

```
1
 2
               DONALDSON:
                              Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine
    MR.
         DAVE
 3
    Fisheries Commission.
 4
 5
    MR. ED SWINDELL: Ed Swindell, Louisiana.
 6
 7
    MR. PATRICK BANKS: Patrick Banks, Louisiana.
 8
9
    MR. CAMPO MATENS: Camp Matens, Louisiana.
10
    DR. THOMAS FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.
11
12
13
    DR. PAMELA DANA: Pam Dana, Florida.
14
15
    MS. MARTHA GUYAS: Martha Guyas, Florida.
16
17
    MS. ANNA BECKWITH: Anna Beckwith, South Atlantic Council.
18
19
    MR. GLENN CONSTANT: Glenn Constant, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
20
    Service.
21
22
    MS. MARA LEVY: Mara Levy, NOAA Office of General Counsel.
23
24
    DR. ROY CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.
25
26
    MS. SUSAN GERHART: Susan Gerhart, NOAA Fisheries.
27
28
    DR. BONNIE PONWITH: Bonnie Ponwith, NOAA Fisheries.
29
30
    MR. LANCE ROBINSON: Lance Robinson, Texas.
31
32
    DR. GREG STUNZ: Greg Stunz, Texas.
33
34
    MR. DOUGLAS BOYD: Doug Boyd, Texas.
35
36
    DR. PAUL MICKLE: Paul Mickle, Mississippi.
37
38
    MR. DALE DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.
39
40
    LCDR LEO DANAHER: Lieutenant Commander Leo Danaher, U.S. Coast
41
    Guard.
42
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUGLAS GREGORY: Douglas Gregory, council
43
44
    staff.
```

45
46 ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

48 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Our agenda for our council

session can be found under Tab A, Number 3. Are there any additions or revisions to the agenda? Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I would like, at some point, to talk a little bit about lionfish and exempted fishing permit applications and some ideas we have about how to handle that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. So noted. Any other additions or revisions? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as revised. It's so moved by Dr. Dana, and it's seconded by Mr. Greene. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

The minutes from our last meeting are located under Tab A, Number 4. Were there any revisions or edits needed to those minutes? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes as presented. It's so moved by Mr. Banks, and it's seconded by Dr. Stunz. Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Next on our agenda is a Review of Exempted Fishing Permit Applications, if any, and so I will look towards the NMFS realm of the house to see if we have any to review.

REVIEW OF EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT APPLICATIONS

MS. GERHART: Yes, we do. We had one application for an EFP that came in from the State of Louisiana, and I will introduce that. If you have questions, you can ask those to Mr. Banks. This application is to test the use of a data reporting system for private anglers for red snapper.

It would be a two-year program. What they would do is take 25,000 pounds from their state quota that they manage by, as you heard earlier, and convert that to numbers of fish and allow a certain number of anglers, and I believe it's 150 anglers, to catch those fish in federal waters outside of the federal season, but during the state season.

The estimate right now, preliminarily, is about twenty fish per angler, and those anglers would be chosen randomly from a pool that includes those that have the saltwater fishing license as well as the offshore landing permit.

What these people would be required to do is hail-out at least twenty-four hours before they leave on a trip to say that they're going on a trip and declaring where they will be landing and at what time, so that they can be sampled, if desired. When they come back in, they will have to report electronically at the dock, how much they've landed as well as how many anglers were on the boat, so that there is an estimate of effort.

They would be exempt from the bag limit and would just be limited to the number of fish that they have been assigned, their allotment, but they would be still held to the size limit, and so that is the EFP that is under consideration by our office, and, like I said, if you have questions, please direct them to Mr. Banks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am assuming that you're in the very initial review phases of this? All right. Are there any questions about the EFP? Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I had a question about it, and so I was trying to figure out how the reporting works for these anglers and how this -- I think I understood that anglers would only be reporting and hailing-out and all of that if they're doing a federal waters red snapper trip, but they would also be able to fish state waters for red snapper separate from those twenty fish?

I guess my question is are they only reporting on those federal red snapper trips, or are they reporting every time they go into federal waters? For example, if they go offshore to fish amberjack or something like that and then how the state season plays into this as well, and it was kind of confusing to me.

MR. BANKS: Those are good questions. Much like what Dr. Mickle had described in their app, they will have to hail-out through the app or through a call-in, and they will be issued a trip number. During that trip, they are declaring that they are fishing under this EFP, that they will be fishing outside of the regular federal framework, and they will be restricted to doing that.

 It will be a situation -- When we were working with our enforcement agents, they didn't want the confusion of folks working under this experiment as well as then also coming into state waters and harvesting state-water fish, and so, once you declare that trip, that's what you would declare.

If you were in state waters harvesting fish, then you would be in violation of that and not be allowed to participate in the program anymore. That was the way our enforcement agents preferred that we run it, so that there was not any confusion for the enforcement agents.

1 2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: A follow-up, Ms. Guyas?

 ${\tt MS.~GUYAS:}$ I thought it said in there that they could fish the state season, and so I'm confused now.

MR. BANKS: They can fish the state season, but just not on the same day.

MS. GUYAS: Okay, and they would not be reporting those state trips, right, and they would not be reporting any other federal trips that they're making?

MR. BANKS: That is correct.

MS. GUYAS: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: To Martha's point, I guess, it causes a little bit of confusion if the purpose or the intent is to figure out how an angler might distribute their effort over some period of time, because they actually have two options to go fishing, and so, from a science perspective, I guess, if you're trying to evaluate what it is that you're actually trying to evaluate, there is a conflict there, and I don't know how to resolve that.

MR. BANKS: That's a good point as well, and I'm not exactly sure that I know how to resolve it either. One of the things that we feel like this experiment gives us is a chance to learn from the anglers in terms of how they want to distribute their effort.

 We are working with some LSU researchers, from a sociology standpoint, to try to understand that, but that's really a minor part of what we're trying to learn. We're more trying to learn whether we can get better data through this electronic reporting and bring that uncertainty down in our catch estimates, but you bring up a good point that different anglers will be distributing that effort differently, because I can certainly see that I may want to distribute my effort over the course of ten days, and you may want to distribute your effort over the course of one day, and so that's something that we need to address as we look at the stats, I guess.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: A follow-up, Dr. Frazer?

DR. FRAZER: Yes, just a quick follow-up. There's an option

right now, I guess, for you guys simply to modify the request in a way that would say, if you're going to participate in this program, or you elect to participate in the program, then you can only -- Every time you go out, you're going to fish through this permit, essentially, and so you're going to be denied access from fishing the state, those participants. In my view, that's kind of the only way to get out of it.

MR. BANKS: Are you saying the only way to get at it would be to keep them from fishing in the state waters on the same day or for the entire state season?

DR. FRAZER: For the entire state season.

MR. BANKS: That's definitely an issue for us. That's not how we anticipated this program going, and that's not how we want to -- We don't want to restrict these folks in any way in our state waters, other than on the same day. I'm not exactly sure that I follow the rationale of why you would have to restrict that, but I would like to talk to you more about it, to see if we can't rectify that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Just to follow up, if you restricted them though, to where they couldn't fish in the state-water season, whatever that is, will that skew your data in a different direction though, because that may change the way they fish in federal waters. Do you see what I'm saying?

Now you're restricting a certain amount of access, and that may change how they fish and skew your results, which you're trying to look at effort and how, I guess, that's diversified, and then the data collection that goes along with that, so that you can measure that, in other words, measure that effort.

I don't know, but there's a few -- I guess the other option is you would have to hail-in and hail-out and declare all your fishing trips, no matter where you're going or what you're fishing for, while you're in this program, so that you can get a real good picture of it, of that effort, a collection of data effort. Anyway, that's just another idea. I am not a scientist, and so I probably shouldn't weigh in. I had Mr. Boyd over here.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Banks, many private boat anglers land at private docks or at their boat slips. How will you all validate their input when that happens?

MR. BANKS: That's a good question, Doug. As part of accepting

to be part of the program, they would have to allow us to sample them at their -- They would have to accept that we could come to their property and sample them. That's part of the deal, I guess you would say.

MR. BOYD: Okay. That means is then you have to have the location of a dock for each individual that's in this program, and you will have to have a way to contact them to find out where they're going to land, when they hail back in.

MR. BANKS: That's correct. That will be part of the hail-out information. They will be telling us when they're going fishing and when they're expected back and where they're going to, or where they're coming back into.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think I had Mr. Diaz next, and then I will go to Martha.

MR. DIAZ: I have two things. One thing that I'm going to wade into that I am not sure that it's even relevant, but, to Dr. Frazer's point, if you was to not let them fish in state waters, and it's a voluntary program, some people might decline to participate, because they have good access in certain parts of the state to federal waters, where other people that have no access would be eager to participate, and so you might skew it in the direction where people that are in areas that have to travel a long way to get out to deep water to fish might be eager to do it, and other people might not, and I don't know how that affects the conversation, but I figured I would throw that out.

One thing I wanted to ask Patrick is obviously you all will communicate with your law enforcement, and that's very easy, but I can think of at least four other law enforcement agencies that might encounter people fishing out in federal waters when it's closed to everybody else, and so do you all have a plan in place to communicate with the Coast Guard or NOAA Enforcement or Alabama and Mississippi enforcement, where everybody understands what they might encounter on the water, Mr. Banks?

 MR. BANKS: That's another good question, Dale, and I don't know that we have worked those details out, but, in our meetings with our enforcement agents, they also brought up that issue, that they would need to make sure that they coordinated their enforcement activities with the Coast Guard and everybody else, and so I don't know that I could tell you exactly how that will

occur, but I just know that our enforcement agents are already thinking about that, and they're going to be working through that for us, and so it's something that, while I can't say it's completely been addressed, it is certainly part of our process.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Doug brought up the validation, which was one of the things that I was going to ask about, and then, also, I'm just curious. How did you choose the 25,000 pounds and 150 anglers? Tell us about that.

MR. BANKS: That's a good question too, because we went round-and-round about this. I was concerned that 25,000 pounds wouldn't give us really enough data to work with, but one of the things that was critical, in my mind, was that, if we were going to be -- Well, first of all, we wanted to make sure that we did an EFP that did not impact any other state.

We didn't want to take fish out of the buffer or wherever and then end up with the other states or the federal season being impacted, and so we were advised to use some fish from within our self-imposed quota, which, at first, I was not all that happy with. I thought that EFPs were supposed to use extra fish, but I understood the rationale.

Then I said, well, if we're going to use it within our self-imposed quota, if we use very many fish, we're going to impact our own state season, and that's not what we wanted to do either, and so we felt like that was the amount of fish that was so small that it wouldn't impact our state-water season. We wouldn't have to significantly, possibly not at all, reduce our state-water season, but it would still give us enough fish that we could run the experiment for two years, and so that's how the poundage came out.

 In terms of the 150, it was one of those things where it was, well, how many fish can one person use to entice them to actually want to participate, and I wasn't quite sure that, anything less than twenty, that folks would even really get all that excited about helping us with it, and so that's the rationale we used to come up with those numbers.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: A quick follow-up, Martha?

 MS. GUYAS: I forgot one of my other questions that I was going to ask, and I think I know the answer, but I just want to confirm. Can the EFP anglers fish the federal season?

MR. BANKS: Yes, they can.

MS. GUYAS: As an EFP trip or separate?

MR. BANKS: Not as part of the same trip, no. We want this test to be done outside of the federal season and outside of the state-water season.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I have a lot of hands. I am going to go first to Mr. Anson, because he hasn't asked a question yet.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Patrick, what is your, this year or last year, the pounds that you were shooting for for state management?

MR. BANKS: We were managing, last year, to about 1.1 million pounds. This year, it has dropped a little bit, because of the Amendment 28 scenario, and also because, as Joey mentioned in his presentation, we, unfortunately, went over about a thousand pounds, and so we backed that out of our self-imposed quota, and so we're down to about 1.04 million pounds, I think.

MR. ANSON: Certainly I'm all for state management and flexibility of the states and such, but, in trying to see where this could go, potentially, the long-term application, and, if you assume that you have 20,000 individual private recreational anglers, and if you assume they're going to get twenty fish, and you calculate that out with the seven-and-a-half-pound average, and I got some information provided by Joey, you end up with three-million pounds landed under that situation.

 I am, I guess, a little concerned or have questions about the number of fish for this pilot program, particularly if they're able to fish the federal season and such, and that gives them even more fish, or more chances for fish, and trying to match that up with reality and trying to provide as much access to anglers that would want to go fishing, and, again, just the long-term goals of this program.

 MR. BANKS: Kevin, I think you bring up an excellent point that somewhat helps show that the ultimate goal is not twenty fish per person. That is not what we're trying to get to, because, obviously, as you said, the numbers don't work out. We would need a lot more fish to be able to do that, and that's just not the goal, to try to get to an eventual allocation per person. The goal with this is to entice people to help us determine

whether electronic reporting can help decrease the uncertainty around our harvest estimate.

If we were trying to work it out to a certain number of fish per person within our 1.1 million pounds or whatever, we're looking at about five fish per season, and we know that's not acceptable either, and that's not the way we want to go.

Dr. Mickle talked about their electronic reporting and how the PSEs were low, or maybe it was you, but somebody said something around -- I can't remember the number that Dr. Mickle said, but then, when we heard from Texas, and the iSnapper check there had PSEs quite a bit larger than the traditional, I think that shows, to me, or it further validates, to me, that we want to test an electronic reporting system to see if it can work for us.

Can we get as good as what Paul sees or will our electronic reporting be as uncertain as I guess the iSnapper check? Joey showed how well LA Creel works, and it really does. It's a great system, but can we get it even better? If we go to a state-managed system out to 200 nautical miles, will you guys trust that we can manage this resource effectively and be able to shut down quickly to prevent overfishing?

I feel like that, with large error estimates, or large uncertainties, like what was reported about iSnapper, if that is the situation, I am not so sure that I can convince you guys to give us that responsibility, and I'm not so sure that I would feel comfortable giving us that responsibility.

I am just trying to find any way we can to prove that we can manage responsibly and that we can manage to a very tight limit, so that we don't have to impose these huge buffers if we got state management, and that's the goal of this situation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Mr. Boyd, followed by Mr. Greene.

MR. BOYD: Patrick, going back a second to validation, I can see that you could probably validate some percentage of 150 people who are reporting, because they're not going to all be fishing on the same day in your program. What percentage of those trips do you think you can validate with officers at public ramps and at private dock locations?

MR. BANKS: That's a good question, Doug. I am not so sure that I even know at this point. I think that's something we're going

to have to evaluate as part of this test, because another part of the test that's going to be very helpful to us is to know whether we could even administer this on a much larger scale.

If we ramped this up from 150 to all 18,000 ROLP holders, if we don't feel like we can validate enough on the 150, then we may not, administratively, be able to handle it for all 18,000, and so that's part of the test as well, is to test our ability administratively, and so you bring up a valid point, and I'm not so sure that I have an answer yet.

MR. BOYD: That was my next question. That was a great segue. How do you go from 150 people to 15,000 to 20,000 people, because it seems the validation process for that many would just be onerous, and I don't know how you would do that, and, in listening to Bonnie over the last few years, self-reported data needs a lot of validation to make sure that it's accurate and useful, and so I'm not sure what the end game is and where you may be able to go or even not be able to go.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Mr. Greene.

22 23

MR. GREENE: Thank you. To follow up on a comment that Mr. Diaz made about how you're going to work with law enforcement, I think that would be simple enough. You're going to have some type of a letter granting you EFP access, and the individuals can be named and have some type of specific letter with a phone number that, if an enforcement guy boards this guy and he has fish, then he has some type of laminated paper copy of proof with a phone number that they could check in and verify that they are indeed within the parameters of the law.

The other comment I had is that, if you're going to grant these guys twenty fish, it's kind of simple. Rather than having three days, would you be willing to have twenty fish and use them when you want to, and so it's kind of one or the other.

I would encourage you to perhaps consider maybe not allowing these guys to fish in a short federal season and give them the opportunity and let them make that decision. What they do in state waters may be irrelevant, but you kind of give them a carrot here. Either you want to do this or you want to do this, and we'll take up to 150 people, and I think that may resolve some of the conflict, potentially, that Dr. Frazer had raised.

 MR. BANKS: To that point, the only thing I'm concerned about is could we legally restrict the citizen from operating in the federal three-day season? I am not so sure we could. I don't

know. Roy, do you have any idea about that?

DR. CRABTREE: I think, as long as people choose to participate in your EFP, then you could make it a condition of that choice.

MR. BANKS: I would have to look at that, Johnny. It's a good suggestion. Again, some of the things we wanted to make sure that we did was that we gathered this data without impacting the other states, that we gathered this data without making the people who participated have to really sacrifice anything. We wanted to make it easy as possible, and so we'll have to consider that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Lieutenant Commander.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to also kind of echo off of Chairman Greene's point there. Having some kind of administrative guarantee that they're permitted to be partaking in that assessment really kind of irons out any trouble that we might face when we're just trying to verify the catch onboard, and typically we're not doing a lot of boardings solely for fish inside of nine miles.

If a recreational vessel happens to be boarded within nine miles, it's usually for safety, and then they will verify the bag limits onboard, but, if they have any kind of concern as to is it abiding by the state regulations, then they usually just reach out to their agency partners to confirm that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Ms. Bosarge. I do have some concerns on the merits of this, but I don't wish to speak to that. This thing came into the public domain on I think the $24^{\rm th}$, a Friday, and we had a week, a business week, and we here we are today to chew on this.

There was a fishing tournament at which I was a committee member, and snapper were involved, last weekend. We had 400 fishermen for two days, and I tried to talk to as many of the guys that were going offshore as possible. During this week, I tried to talk to as many people that I knew that snapper fished as possible.

The response to my discussions with them were that the Louisiana recreational fishermen do not want this. Daryl Carpenter is the President of the Louisiana Charter Boat Association, and he had surgery yesterday, and he's still in the hospital. Accordingly,

he couldn't come, but I had a long conversation with Daryl, and Daryl asked me to voice his complete opposition to this proposal.

To the extent that Louisiana is opposed to it, I can report to you that, last week, the Louisiana House voted eighty-five to six in opposition to this, directing the department to abandon this program. The Louisiana Senate voted twenty-nine to zero.

It's my understanding that, in tomorrow's commission meeting, there will be a motion to ask this proposal not to go forward, while who knows what happens, but I have every reason to suspect that it will in fact pass, and so all of the people that -- The people that are involved in this in Louisiana don't want any part of this.

It's hard for me, as a lifetime Louisiana citizen, to be in opposition to my own department. It's new territory for me, and it's with reluctance that I am making these statements, but we cannot support -- The people that I know cannot support it, our legislative body cannot support it, and I don't think the commission is going to support this effort. I would ask you to oppose it. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Since we get so few of these EFPs, I just wanted to remind the council that today we're just reviewing it and discussing it. We don't actually vote on it until after public testimony, and so we have it on the agenda to vote up or down on this at 2:15 tomorrow afternoon, just as a reminder.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Emily, did you have something for us?

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: I did, and I'm sorry to interrupt the committee. However, we have received a couple of comments on the EFP, through our general comment form and our gulfcouncil@gulfcouncil.org email, and so Jessica was going to navigate it. If she goes to the amendments under development page and scrolls to the very bottom, there is a general comment form that people have been submitting this one to, because we haven't created a specific EFP comment form.

If you will notice, we have about ten commenters that have submitted comments. Of the ten, I think only one of them was opposed, but it was the Panama City Beach Boatmen's Association. They wrote a letter in opposition, but the comments that we received on the EFP were in support of Louisiana moving forward and the council supporting the vote, and so I just wanted to

make sure that I pointed out that we have had some public comment, and I would encourage you guys, as council members, to go to that general comment form and read that spreadsheet on your own.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Emily. I appreciate that. Any other questions? Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Camp, can you elaborate a little bit on what you know, as far as the opposition to this goes from Louisiana and the constituency there?

MR. MATENS: I'm not sure that I understand the question. Specifically, what do you want to know?

DR. FRAZER: Why are they opposed?

MR. MATENS: They're opposed because they are concerned that this leads to an effort to reduce effort in the Gulf in the private recreational sector for red snapper and having that be extended to other species. The people that are opposed to this fear that this is going to lead to something that they really can't accept.

I have heard talk that the red snapper fishery, the private fishery in the Gulf, is overcapitalized, and I'm not sure what that means, but I think most people would rather see, and I will just pick some numbers out of the air, but a ten-day season for everyone rather than a twenty-day season for half of us.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Camp brings up some good points and some valid concerns, and we have heard that. When we first started talking about EFPs with some of the recreational community, it was back in March, and we heard those very concerns. We brought some ideas of EFPs to a small group at that point, and they made those very concerns.

We have tried hard to make sure that folks know that that's not the route we're going, and I think Camp has said to me before that, well, you may not be going that way, but other people may use the information to go that way, and that may be true, Camp.

I don't know that I can control what other people will use the information for, but I just know that we give a commitment to our anglers that we're not trying to develop an IFQ system or a tag program. We heard loud and clear that tags is not

acceptable, and that's not what we want to do either. Administratively, tags are almost impossible for us to deal with, with 18,000 anglers.

I want to reiterate that again. We have put fact sheets out on our website to tell people what this EFP is meant to do and what it's not meant to do. Unfortunately, we haven't been able to quell the fears of folks who have received misinformation, through the media and through a variety of sources, and we have done our best to dispel that, but, unfortunately, it's just been very, very difficult.

MR. MATENS: To that point, I certainly wouldn't characterize information from the press and everybody else as misinformation. It might be information that people don't like, but I don't think that misinformation is provable.

The tags, a lot of people are against tags. A lot of people are against IFQs, but that's not the issue. The issue is, by any means, whatever means is used to reduce access and effort in the private recreational fishery, it is going to be opposed by many, many people, and apparently a lot of people in Louisiana, including our legislative leaders, and the press, for that matter.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am going to keep my comments short, but I do want to -- This has been a contentious issue that we're talking about. It seems like when we start to talk about red snapper that things get polar, even when we don't want them to be, and I want to commend Louisiana. You're taking a scientific approach to a management problem, and I hope we don't discourage that in any form at any time, and it's tough.

I do want to complain about something else though, since I've got the mic. I think our fishing permit process, our exempted fishing permit process, has some issues in the process itself, and I would like to discuss that, maybe on an agenda item or not, but I don't think the detail is presented in these proposals in the form where we know if it's good science or not, completely separate from the present proposal we're discussing.

Right now, I think it should pass through a very transparent process that allows the public to be educated more. It dodges some of these issues that have come up here today, and knowing that the questions that are trying to be answered by a permit are actually going to be answered, if there's an analysis and a

yes-or-no question that's being addressed, and this is from someone who has gone through the EFP process before, and we spent a lot of time on the proposal, and I don't think many people looked at the proposal to know how much work we had put into it, and that's all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Very good points. I appreciate it. On a broader level. All right. Are there any other questions for the moment on this? Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Just one more question, Patrick. The 14 percent that you're using as your target, does that 14 percent include all recreational fishermen, including for-hire?

MR. BANKS: Yes, it does.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Thank you. At this point, it is -- Yes, sir, Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: There is a lot of consternation about this, and I want to say that I feel compelled to have to say that, we as scientists, we want to test things. We want to perform experiments, and I think we all should take what Paul said about what has gone on about this EFP, and Camp brought up a lot of political decisions that have been made, and also the possibility of our own commission voting on whether to support this EFP or not.

 I think the scientists sitting around the table should take Paul's -- This kind of situation, we realize that, when political pressures affect regulations and laws, that's part of our process, and we all accept that, but, when it tells us what experiments we can run, when it tells us what tests we can do and what data we're allowed to gather, that's a sad day for science, and that's a sad day for management. I just want you guys to realize that that's my feeling on it.

In some ways, it's shameful, and I am very disappointed to see that happen, but, with that said, with all of the uneasiness over this proposal, all of the uneasiness with some of my very good friends around this table, we would ask that we delay this EFP until August.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. So noted, sir. Very well said. That will free up a little more time tomorrow on our agenda, since we're so far behind. Let's see. It's 11:42. We were scheduled at 11:00 to start our presentations for Full Council, and so is Captain Pearce -- Not to put you on the spot, but are you ready?

We are ready for you, sir, whenever you want to proceed.

PRESENTATIONS FLORIDA LAW ENFORCEMENT

CAPTAIN SCOTT PEARCE: I want to thank you all for letting me come out and talk to you today. I wanted to do a presentation on our offshore patrol vessel program for the Gulf of Mexico, our JEA enforcement efforts for this year, and I will keep it kind of short and sweet, because I know you all have got a lot to get to.

The Offshore Patrol Vessel Gulf Sentry, which is located out of St. Petersburg, is commanded by Lieutenant George Wells. This year, as of up to the beginning of May, they have conducted 213 hours of JEA enforcement and forty-six hours of TED enforcement, and they have issued two federal warning and fourteen federal citations, seven state warnings and four state citations, and they wrote seven warnings and four citations that were basically federal violations, but written under state rule.

The Offshore Patrol Vessel C.T. Randall, this vessel has been down for most of the year, due to repairs, but I believe they're back up and running, and so they're trying to make up for lost time, but they had acquired up to thirty-eight hours of JEA enforcement and twelve hours of TED enforcement, as of May, but they have been out for most of the year. They have written two citations, to date, for state citations, and they are based out of Marco Island.

The Offshore Patrol Vessel Guardian, which is commanded by Lieutenant Jason Marlow, is based out of Carrabelle, Florida. To date, they have conducted 150 hours of JEA enforcement, or as of May 1. They've actually got more now, and thirty-hours of TED enforcement, and they have issued thirty warnings for federal violations and forty-one citations for federal violations. They have issued twenty-seven state warnings and sixteen state citations and also seven warnings that were federal violations written under state rule.

The Offshore Patrol Vessel Vigilance, which is commanded by Officer Pete Rockwell out of Destin, Florida, has conducted over 267 hours of JEA enforcement and twenty-four hours of TED enforcement. They have issued five federal warnings and twenty-three federal citations, and they have thirteen state warnings and one state citation.

The Offshore Patrol Vessel 2005 Fincat, which is based out of

Crystal River and commanded by Officer Laird Canfield, has conducted over 308 hours of JEA enforcement patrolling the Gulf of Mexico, twenty-three hours of TED enforcement, and they have issued four federal warnings and twenty-three federal citations. They have issued ten state warnings and three state citations and then also four citations that were federal violations written under state rule.

Our 2006 Fincat, commanded by Officer Matt Cushing, is out of Pensacola, Florida. He has conducted over 207 hours of JEA enforcement and thirteen hours of TED enforcement. He has issued two warnings for federal violations and sixty-two citations for federal violations. He has issued four warnings for state violations and one state citation.

The Offshore Patrol Vessel Interceptor, based out of Key West, and the captain retired this year, but they conducted over 270 hours of JEA enforcement and forty-seven hours of TED enforcement. They issued one federal citation and fifteen state warnings and fifteen state citations and three citations that were federal violations written under state rule.

The combined efforts in the Gulf of Mexico for our offshore patrol vessel fleet accounted for 1,454 hours of enforcement, 203 hours of TED enforcement, fifty-eight inspections, and enforcement actions, whether citations or warnings, and 126 hours of outreach.

Just some case examples, the longline vessel Patriot, and this is the Offshore Patrol Vessel Gulf Sentry, but they found them to be in possession of 110 pieces of king mackerel being used for bait on a longline rig.

The bandit vessel Miss Morgan Starr had 140 pieces of red grouper being used as bait and no longline endorsement, and they were also deploying longline gear deployed inside of twenty fathoms.

The longline vessel Rachelle was found to have 106 pieces of shark, vermilion snapper, and grouper being used as bait. They also had possession of undersized red grouper, and they were charged with interference for dumping fish overboard as the officers approached the vessel.

The online vessel J.U.M.A. was in possession of over 750 hooks. They had 1,300 hooks onboard, and they were also rigged. The hooks were rigged with reef fish for bait.

This is an example of one of the recreational cases that was made. It was an undersized red grouper case. The fish were hidden onboard the vessel, and officers found them. They had over the bag limit of red grouper, undersized red grouper, and they were also not in whole condition. They had eviscerated the grouper, cut the heads off, and filleted some of them. Again, I told you that it was going to be short and sweet, but I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

MR. GREENE: Are there any questions?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Thank you, Captain Pearce. Did your crews intercept any shark finning incidents?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: No, sir. We didn't have any shark finning that I was aware of this year. I would have to go back and check all the stats, but I don't think we had any this year, with the longline vessels or any of the bandit vessels.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Just to follow-up, I've got a little bit of experience with some of your crews in the Key West area, and I speak very highly of them.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you very much, sir. They work really hard.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Captain Pearce, for the presentation. I am curious to know if you keep any records or would have the data structured whereby you could determine if there's been an increase in the number of citations issued this year or last year that might be able to be compared historically, to see if there is an increase in fisheries violations, specifically to recreational.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Yes, sir. We conduct our JEA reports, and so we track everything as we board them, all the citations that are written, and so we would have our annual report tabulations for each year, and so we should be able to go back and effectively look at different activities for each year.

MR. ANSON: Have you not looked at it then to know offhand?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I have not done that as of yet, but, again, I will say that I just newly came into this position, and so there's things that I haven't had a chance to look into yet.

MR. ANSON: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any other questions or comments? Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Thank you for the presentation. Being from the Orange Beach area, I deal with your vessel out of Pensacola on a regular basis, and I just want to commend those guys. They're very professional and quick, and I do appreciate the fact that, when they do get onboard, they allow me to kind of resume my course and heading and kind of continue on, typically.

We may have a trip that's waiting on the dock for us to get back in, and I kind of feel like they are in no way trying to impede me from getting back to the dock to unload to pick up other people, and I do appreciate their willingness to understand that, hey, I'm not in a big hurry and I can just stop and wait right here or can I continue on, because I have pressing issues that I need to tend to, and I do appreciate that.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Captain Pearce, thank you very much, and thank you for waiting patiently, sir. We appreciate that.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: No problem. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Emily, not to put you on the spot here, but, if we skip down the presentations, can we skip to the Summary of Anecdotal Data Efforts and do that one, and then, if time permits, we will work on our Coral Reef Conservation Report? Ava, are you ready over there?

DR. AVA LASSETER: I don't believe I am giving a presentation. I believe it's Emily.

SUMMARY OF ANECDOTAL DATA EFFORTS

 MS. MUEHLSTEIN: You're giving a couple of slides at the end of mine. John, I just want to double-check with you that that's okay, because I know that I was going to -- You were going to lead in, but we'll work around it, and I'm happy to go for it. If we bring up the self-reported angler data presentation, we'll go ahead and do it. Thank you, guys.

If you remember, at the last council meeting, Madam Chair had brought up a discussion about sort of considering ways that the council could collect some sort of self-reported angler data from our fishermen, knowing that those are the folks that are on

the water and seeing things every day and thinking that the council could probably benefit from as much information as we could gather from them.

What I would like to do, just very briefly, is go over a quick report of some of the external and also internal efforts that we have noticed in the region, and, when I say that, the Southeast region, to collect this type of self-reported angler data and utilize that.

We will start with initiatives by other fishery management councils. The first is some of the councils -- I know that the Mid-Atlantic Council and the South Council have both done these fishery performance reports, and what they do is actually draw upon their advisory panels and ask their advisory panels to summarize their perspectives on a variety of species and specific issues, and some of the specific things that they have gathered information on from those groups are fishing behavior, biological trends, environmental issues, and market conditions.

In other words, they actually go out to their advisory panels and ask them directed questions, so that they can get feedback on some of that angler-reported data, and recognizing that those advisory panel members are very involved anglers in the process.

The next thing that is sort of happening in our Southeast region is that the South Atlantic recently hired a full-time position to conduct citizen science, and so it's actually Amber, who used to be their old Outreach Coordinator, and she has switched over, and she is now the full-time Citizen Science Coordinator. I spoke with her about her program, and she pointed out some very important aspects of citizen science that I thought were worth mentioning.

 The first is she said that all citizen science programs are going to be designed to meet specific data gaps, and so, in order words, rather than sort of just collecting general data from our fishermen, you would do something like identify that we have, for example, a data gap on discards for gag grouper, and then you would go out and design a study or a citizen science project that would intentionally target that data gap and try and get information to fill that in.

She also mentioned that citizen science is typically done so that the project is designed collaboratively with both stakeholders and scientists, and so, in other words, they want to make sure that the scientists are involved, so that they know that their end product is something that is usable and that the citizens that are going to be reporting are involved in the program, so that they know what those fishermen are going to be willing to do in order to give information.

They also talked about some sort of certification program or something that will ensure that the data that is reported by those citizens in those citizen science projects is standardized, to the extent that that is possible.

 At this point, the South Atlantic, like I said, has hired that full-time position, and they are coordinating and making their strategic plan for their citizen science, and, right now, they are looking for funding in order to get that program up and rolling.

Next, we work with SEDAR, and they do a couple of things to incorporate self-reported angler data. During their data workshop, there is actually private, for-hire, and commercial fishermen that participate, and their input is critical to understanding the data in fishery trends that are happening during that data workshop.

Next, there are SEDAR observers at the assessment and review workshop, and so those are fishermen that are there to provide insight and ground-truth model results, and so, if the SEDAR panel sees trends or sees something that is kind of strange, they will ask that SEDAR observer if they have any idea what's going on on the water that might be causing some sort of output from a model.

Before I hand it over to Ava, we also are doing some things in the Gulf region already to collect information from our anglers. In a lot of ways, we haven't asked directly for self-reported data. However, in some of the efforts, we collect that information sort of secondarily anyways, and so we do have a data portal, and I think John was going to present on that.

I'm not sure if that will continue to happen at this meeting or the next one, but, very briefly, on that portal, we actually do have a tool that's up and running that collects information on goliath grouper encounters, and so anglers can actually sort of georeference where they've seen a goliath and report that information on our portal.

We are also considering doing that for lionfish, and then have I have coral up there with a question mark, because we've talked about it, but there hasn't been much motion moving forward, and so we do have a mechanism with which we're doing that with very

targeted species in very targeted instances here, and then we also, as you guys know, collect public comment through a number of different mechanisms.

We do have our online comment forms, which are amendment-specific, but, as proven in the last couple of days when I report those comments that we hear that are amendment-specific, there is always usually an area at the bottom that mentions the non-amendment-specific comments, and that's where we heard some things about concerns with the cobia stock and stuff at this meeting. Then we also have that general comment form, where anglers can report data.

We also have oral testimony, both at our hearings and at these council meetings. I think, a lot of times, we do hear from anglers that come up and express their concerns. Finally, we do get a number of emails through that gulfcouncil@gulfcouncil.org email account, and then we also run our council Facebook page, which is very active, and that's a really good sort of repository that we have of anglers sort of reporting what they're seeing and what's going on so far.

With that, I am actually going to hand it over to Ava, because she's got some specific ways that she utilizes our public comment, and I think it will be helpful for her to explain that to us.

DR. LASSETER: Perfect. Thank you. I just wanted to share with you a little bit about a database that I maintain and that uses a specific qualitative data analysis software, and what I do is I compile public comments in this software.

We have the public testimony from council meetings are transcribed, and so I'm able to import the actual transcriptions from the public testimony, like what we'll hear this afternoon, directly into this software. I also have available the written comments, both from the website, that thermometer link, as well as letters that are submitted as well. Now, I do work much more with the public testimony, as that's far easier to import into this.

Once all of these transcriptions and written comments are imported, I code it for content and themes, and so, basically, content would reflect tagging chunks of text, comments, by state of the person speaking, sector, perhaps the topic or the specific amendment that the person is speaking on, and then theme codes develop over time, after I have coded for the content, and I will develop themes that look at maybe a common

perspective or some kind of underlying idea that I start to see a pattern.

2 3 4

This is just a screenshot of what the software interface looks like, and so you can see, at the upper-left corner, there is all of the documents, and I can activate and deactivate them, depending on what I want to look at. The bottom-left, that's my code book that is continually in kind of an iterative process of development, and the center there is where I actually am tagging these segments of text.

 Then, on the right side, it's just an example of some of these - When I retrieve segments of text, it will pull out all of the things that I've asked for and then lays them out for me, and then it also identifies from which document they came from as well.

Again, this is kind of the process of what I do. It's retrieving the segments depending on what I want to look at. If I want to look at say support or opposition to a proposed management action, I can do that, and I can compare the comments by sector or state. Then, as I develop these codes, these thematic codes, further, I start to identify some of these patterns, and that can then inform further questions.

I have used these in the social effects sections, where applicable, in some of the documents, when I reference public testimony, that we heard very often in public testimony such and such, and so I will use these in that Chapter 4 part of the document.

Then I just kind of wanted to make a note, because I hear people talking a lot about anecdotal data, anecdotal data, and I think, in all scientific disciplines, it's really direct observations, anecdotal observations, that are the foundation for building theory and later testing hypotheses, and so I just find that valuable and interesting.

 Really, it's what people first observe and talk about, and, over time, when it starts to become a pattern or repeated observations, somebody then may be interested in examining that more fully, and so there's a real relationship between kind of a deductive and inductive approach, and so that's all I have there, but you're welcome to come talk to me anytime if you would like to see more about this software. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ladies, especially since I put you on the spot. Were there any questions or feedback for Emily or

Ava? Martha.

MS. GUYAS: Just a quick one. Emily, I think on 4, you had talked about maybe starting up a data portal for lionfish, and would the idea here be to streamline it with the other places that are collecting lionfish sighting information, like USGS and REEF, and I think NOAA is doing it as well?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: I am going to defer to John on that one, because he's actually working on that project much more closely than I am.

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: The idea was that -- It's the same thing with goliath grouper. As you know, there is a number of institutions that are collecting this information. We receive a lot of traffic and a lot of interest from people that are on the water, and so the idea is to provide some portal, if you will, where we can collect compatible information and provide it such that we have -- One, that we have as large of a database as we can have, and, two, that we're fairly well integrated in, so we understand the limitations and we can convey that out.

22 23

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Real quick, and I know we're bumping up against lunch. I would like to see, in the future, for us to maybe have the Citizen Science Coordinator from the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council come and give us a presentation, after she has enough time to get established and has a good feel on where she's going, and maybe even have a few results. I don't know what that time is, but if we could try to plan that for the future, I think that might be good for us to do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted. Any other questions or comments? Dr. Stunz

DR. STUNZ: I know we're running up against lunch, but I think the council can really facilitate a role here. My research team are big proponents of citizen science. Does it drive us crazy with fish identification and all of that? Yes, but, at the end of the day, we still get very valuable data that we've used, but I guess the issue, Doug, for you and your group, is that you still need projects that they're feeding into.

I know we have public comment and all of that, and that's very useful, but facilitating projects and working with others that are involving citizen science might be the way to go, to have partnerships, and you're feeding that information into the

process. There is a lot of avenues. I can think of a dozen groups around the Gulf that are doing that sort of thing now. Barotrauma, for example, is one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and it sounds like, really, there is a lot of different avenues we can take here, a lot of different roads we can go down. The one that peaked my interest, that maybe one day we'll be able to pursue, is you talked about a specific project, right, and Emily even mentioned that the citizen science program with the South Atlantic -- They try to identify specific data gaps and then go to their fishermen with those, to get input.

What I thought of, my ultimate goal with this, was to have the project be an individual stock assessment, and like, for example, yesterday, during our conversations around this table, Johnny mentioned that -- When we were talking about amberjack, he said, you know, I fillet fish at the end of the trip, a lot of times, and I've been noticing that I am having roe in these fish in March and April, which is earlier than he is used to seeing it.

I said, hmm. You know me. I'm always thinking. I said, you know, I know a lady that works on amberjack that's a scientist, and I wonder if she would find that information helpful, if she already knows that, or if it's meaningless or whatever. I said, well, it won't take me but about three seconds of my time, and I will just send it along.

So I sent it along, and she emailed me back last night, and she said, no, that actually is very useful information, and she had a follow-up question of, by the way, would you ask the fishermen this for me, and so that is the kind of thing that I'm hoping -- The kind of information that I am hoping that we can make it easier for a broader universe of fishermen to communicate specific information, like specific to that stock assessment, whatever that species is that we're looking at at that point that they think might be helpful.

 We do have fishermen involved in our SEDAR process, but it's a limited number of fishermen, as we go through those workshops and such, and I was trying to kind of broaden it out to a larger universe of fishermen, and I actually brought it up at the CCC meeting that we attended, where all eight councils are together, last month.

There were some fishermen in the Northeast that were pretty interested in it, just due to some of the climate change things

that they're seeing and how some of their species are moving, and it was the commercial fishermen, mainly.

The fishermen are saying that these fish are out there, but they're over here, but it's not showing up in the stock assessments and that there's really a disconnect somewhere, possibly, a perceived disconnect, but they were very excited about the possibility of, if we could ever elevate our anecdotal data, our anecdotal information, directly to those scientists, maybe we could find a way to tweak the process to test our hypothesis of where these fish are or what's happening with these fish and incorporate that eventually, if it pans out.

Anyway, that's where I was hoping to head with it, but I hear some other really good ideas. I liked what Martha and John were talking about with lionfish, and I liked what you were saying too, and so maybe we'll continue to explore this and figure out where we want to go with it. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Just one brief thing. Of course, I really like Dale's idea of seeing where they're going with it and how we could model after that, perhaps, but, in addition to the informal work you're talking about that is real valuable, you know Bonnie and Roy both have problems, through the Cooperative Research Program, for example, that is set up to do that very thing, as well as, to some extent, MARFIN, and so we already have some of those more formal mechanisms in place that the council could partner and do things to broaden the scope there, and so, yes, there's a lot of potential.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

 DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think it's a wonderful idea to bring the coordinator for the citizen science program over for a talk when that really hits the ground and they've got some traction on that. I've been very involved in the development, from the onset. It was a council initiative, in collaboration with some folks from the private sector that are experts in the acquisition and use of citizen science information.

Some of the observations that I have made along that way is that a good program really is a match-maker, and, by that, it's essentially finding a group of fishermen who are willing to collaborate, but finding an end-user for the information, because, if you only have one and you don't have the other, you don't have a project. You have a sack full of data that nobody wants or is committed to using, or you have an unmet need but

nobody to help.

Those two things are really important in conjunction with one another, and so I think it would be a wonderful thing to hear about the evolution of that program and then how long it takes to actually get up and running with some projects.

I also really appreciate Dr. Lasseter's point on the anecdotal information. We anecdotal and often, too often, hear it is a pejorative term, and it is not. It is really the best basis for a testable hypothesis.

We can't use it as a solid data point, because our stock assessments are pretty demanding, in terms of what can be used, but it can be used as that starting point, to recognize that something is changing, and the people who are on the water full-time are always the first people to notice it, and that gives us the ability to, if we're hearing that, to be able to look at the data and to see if the data support these observations and is it localized or is widespread.

The answers to those questions really are the things that keep us from using one data point without substantial follow-on collections, but that it is a crucial step in really exploring change in these very dynamic systems, and so applaud you for this discussion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any other discussion on that topic? Well, then I will let you go to lunch. Sorry. Slight change in agenda, because I guess we probably should -- I was going to have them come back from lunch early, but we will do it now. Dr. Dana, would you come to the front, please, ma'am?

(Whereupon, Dr. Dana was recognized for her service on the council.)

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you very much, Dr. Dana. You can go to lunch now. We are scheduled to come back from lunch at 1:30. That is the actual start time for our public testimony, and so I would prefer that you try and be back in this room by 1:25, so we can all be seated by 1:30. Thanks, guys. We will recess until then.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on June 7, 2017.)

June 7, 2017

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

_ .

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Naples Grand Beach Resort, Naples, Florida, Wednesday afternoon, June 7, 2017, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: On our agenda now, we are scheduled for our public comment session, and so I am going to read our statement, and then we will get started.

Good afternoon. Public input is a vital part of the council's deliberative process. Comments, both oral and written, are accepted and considered by the council throughout the process.

The Sustainable Fisheries Act requires that all statements include a brief description of the background and interest of the person in the subject of the statement. All written information shall include a statement of the source and date of such information.

Oral or written communications provided to the council, its members, or its staff, that relate to matters within the council's purview are public in nature. Please give any written comments to the staff, as well as all written comments will also be posted on the council's website for viewing by council members and the public, and it will be maintained by the council as part of the permanent record.

Knowingly and willfully submitting false information to the council is a violation of federal law. If you plan to speak and haven't already done so, please sign in at the iPad registration station located at the entrance to the meeting room. We do accept only one registration per person.

Each speaker is allowed three minutes for their testimony. Please note the timer lights on the podium, as they will be green for the first two minutes and yellow for the final minute of testimony. At three minutes, the red light will blink, and a buzzer may be enacted. Time allowed to dignitaries providing testimony is extended at the discretion of the Chair. Thank you all for coming today.

As you can see, we do have the list of speakers on the screen, so that you will know what order we're going to call you in, in

case you need to step out for a moment. If for some reason you're not in the room when I get ready to call your name, I will circle around back to you at the end. I will keep a little list of anybody that wasn't in the room when I called you. First on our list today will be Mr. Scott Daggett, followed by Mr. Bob Spaeth.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. SCOTT DAGGETT: Good afternoon. My name is Scott Daggett, and I'm from Madeira Beach. I'm an owner-operator and SOFA member, and, as you can see on the screen, this is what we use offshore. I'm trying to make this as quick as possible. I know I only have three minutes, but the top box I didn't even bother drawing, because it's really not going to affect us. I

t's further offshore, but all those marks you see going down north and south, I believe that's the mounds right there, and I'm not sure of the name. I got kind of confused on that, but they really don't affect us, but what I really want to talk about is Pulley Ridge, and, if she could bring that up, it would be a huge help, because you will see the yellow, I believe, and Pulley Ridge is the first box. This is the existing Pulley Ridge box right now, and the purple is the expanded.

 As you can see, I historically fished there for a lot of years, and what it comes down to is between thirty-five fathoms in the summer, when we're pushed out past thirty-five fathoms, in fifty fathoms, there isn't much there, and, by your 2009 numbers, when we were going to get pushed to fifty fathoms, I used that, but I didn't have time to bring it up though. In spots, just to the north of that, it's only ten miles wide.

What I'm trying to get at is, in the summertime, is we use that area so much, and it's just going to stress the fishery out. We're going to be too many boats in one small spot. The further we're spread apart, the better, and that's pretty much what I've got to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Just for clarification, these are the HAPC coral areas that we're looking at closing?

MR. DAGGETT: Yes, ma'am. I got all the numbers from Morgan.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That's your fishing effort within those?

DR. DAGGETT: Yes, ma'am, that is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So it's heavily fished. Okay.

MR. DAGGETT: Some of those marks go back to 1999 or 1996.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I think we have a question from Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you for coming. What would you like to see, given what's being considered for Pulley Ridge?

MR. DAGGETT: Anything that can keep me fishing inside that box, I am happy with. If it comes down to not anchoring, I can get away with that, because I think a misconception is that we drag our cable up, and, from what I understand, that's flatbed coral there, and, for us, we pull our line to the back of us and straight up. You want to lift it up. If you drag it or pull it out in front of you, where you drag stuff, it's too much of a pain, and you never get your gear back.

I can see the other three boxes offshore, where the black coral is at. I get that. I don't even want to stick my gear there, because I am never getting it back, but, on Pulley Ridge, as long as you keep it behind you and just lift the cable up, I really don't see how you're doing any damage. I have fished there for twenty-something years now, ever since I was a kid.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The way the boxes are drawn right now, you will be anchor? The boxes are tight enough now?

MR. DAGGETT: If it comes down -- I think a lot of us, if it came down to fishing it and not being able to anchor and having to drift it, I would. If I'm allowed to fish there and I couldn't anchor, I would go along with it. As long as I'm allowed to fish anywhere, I'm happy. The more bottom, the better. The bigger they are, the better. You can condense this down to a smaller spot and it leads to overfishing in one area.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate it.

MR. DAGGETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Bob Spaeth, followed by David Johnson.

45 MR. BOB SPAETH: Thank you, council members. Bob Spaeth from 46 the Southern Offshore Fishing Association, Executive Director. 47 A couple of things I want to talk about is our harvest 48 capability. Due to cumulative regulations, the fleet does not - - I am talking about the grouper and tilefish. It does not have the ability to harvest the quota. The reduction of 50 percent of the longline fleet, a three-month turtle closure, and other regulations have contributed to this.

We are now under consideration of closing off part of Pulley Ridge, which sure wouldn't help the capitalization. I think that also that the snapper and the grouper IFQ should be split, because the snapper harvest is not the same as the grouper. We have availability of quota, and we have reasonable lease prices, and we have a lot of participants, and the more participants with the IFQ program, just the number of people that have grouper IFQ and the boats that are the fishery owners.

This year, we're having a slow year. We do not know if it's cyclical or whether the red snapper are taking over the habitat, which is a grave concern of us, because there are so many red snapper out there.

Some of our fishermen, if you question them, will be able to tell you how their catches have changed and what they're catching on that piece of bottom that they caught three to four years ago, and it's amazing how the snapper and the discards that we have, and we would like to -- We're not sure whether that is happening or we have a lionfish issue, and so we don't know what has taken the toll on the stock at this point, and so it's too soon to call Chicken Little and the sky is falling, because we've had cyclical years, where it goes up and down, with all different species.

We would like you to take that into consideration, and also the splitting of the red snapper IFQ to the grouper IFQ, because it's not the same animal. We catch them differently. We catch them slower, and I think that there's a few different things that don't apply to the grouper that apply to the snapper or vice versa. Thank you. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Spaeth, we have a question from Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: When you say split the IFQ, they're already separate IFQs. Are you talking specifically about Amendment 36B?

MR. SPAETH: What we're seeing, sitting here in the audience, Roy, is that it's like when you talk about the IFQ. Everybody seems to think about them as one IFQ, and what we're asking is that -- Because there is a difference, that you look at them,

and whether you split them or not would be up to the council.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate it.

MR. SPAETH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have David Johnson, followed by Randy Lauser.

MR. DAVID JOHNSON: Good afternoon. I'm David Johnson. I'm a captain. I would just like to speak on the Pulley Ridge closure. It's a place that I historically fish and have fished pretty much my entire career. I spent three trips already this year in this area, and it's a healthy bottom. It produces lots of fish.

To reiterate, with the summertime fishing, when the longline fleet is pushed past the thirty-fathom boundary, it's a very narrow area, width-wise, that supports red grouper. A fleet of sixty boats, it's hard for us to operate all year-round when we're all pushing into an area. A lot of the fleet has to shut down for the summertime.

This area that you're proposing to close in Pulley Ridge will actually support a lot of boats. We can pull trips out of there for the summertime, when we're pushed out into that depth. If you close it, it's really going to wreak havoc on our fishery in the summertime, and a lot of money will be lost and a lot of boats tied up for the summer, and that's basically all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question for you, sir, from Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Johnson, for taking the time to come talk to us. I just wanted to ask you about -- It was stated a minute ago that you all are seeing a lot of red snapper, and I just want to ask you a little bit -- If you could talk a little bit about red snapper bycatch and if you all are able to solve that with being able to lease fish or how that works in your business, if you don't mind elaborating a little bit.

MR. JOHNSON: All right. I see a lot of red snapper, a lot more in the past year or two than probably five or six or seven years ago. A lot of areas that I could go through and normally catch gags are now overrun with red snapper. You don't stand a chance of catching a grouper, because there are so many snapper on the bottom and in the area, and so you're catching a lot more,

1 basically.

As far as the lease goes, most boats can carry limited ice, can carry limited fish back to the dock, and so, with the lease price being as high as it is, the money that the boat actually gets, after paying the lease to catch the fish, will barely pay for the cost of your bait, your ice, your fuel.

In the western Gulf, these guys catch them so fast that they can go out and the trip expense is offset by the rapid rate that they can catch the fish. It takes us a lot longer. Our trips are fourteen days. My trips, every trip, is fourteen days. With the higher expenses, we can't afford the higher lease, and you're basically giving up your ice and bait for fish that you can't really make a profit on, because of the lease price.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. I appreciate that input. Thank you again for coming.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Randy Lauser, followed by Edward Maccini.

MR. RANDY LAUSER: Good afternoon, council. My name is Randy Lauser. I'm here on behalf of Southern Offshore Fishing Association, and I'm pretty much here about the Pulley Ridge issue, too. We only have so much bottom. If you guys close Pulley Ridge, you're going to just stack boats on top of boats on top of boats. It's not going to be feasible. It will stress out the area, and I'm sure you guys don't want to stress any more areas out. We've already got enough closures, area closures, and we don't want to go to anything else.

My suggestion maybe would be to help us out and maybe put a thirty-fathom line out there instead of thirty-five, because, right now, we've only got that much of an area.

A thirty-fathom would give us this much area, and it would keep us working through the summer, because, right now, even though Pulley Ridge is still there, you put all those boats out there in that area and they just go on top of each other and on top of each other, and I pretty much tie my boat up the middle of July and August, because it's just a waste of time. If you did close Pulley Ridge, it would just put so much more stress on bottom, which I don't think any of us want that. Pretty much, that's it on Pulley Ridge.

On the IFQ program, I would like to see the fishermen have the IFQ shares instead of letting it go public, and the people who are in it, like grandfather them in and just try to revamp it, to where there is no new people to come in. It would be great to see the fishermen own the fish.

One other thing is, on the extra hooks that we're allowed to carry onboard our vessel, I know it's already in the works, but, if you could keep that and it works, that would be fantastic for us, because the sharks are just eating us alive. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Edward Maccini, followed by Mr. Bart Niquet.

MR. EDWARD MACCINI: Good afternoon. My name is Ed Maccini, a SOFA member, and owner of a longline vessel out of Madeira Beach. I think the first three guys kind of stole my thunder. As far as the Pulley Ridge expansion, we already have a closure for inside of twenty fathoms, to protect the nursery, and that's wonderful. Then thirty-five to twenty fathoms for the turtles. Great. We have the Edges, and we have Steamboat.

I think, if there is any more expansion -- As Randy mentioned, he ties his boat up for the middle of July until the opening in September, and one of the things that the IFQ program was supposed to do was to afford us a twelve-month fishing time. Here's the problem. When we get into June, most of the vessels, the longline vessels, are forty-five feet or less, and so it's advantageous for us to fish the deeper water, and, as of right now, it's a little bit tight.

I agree with Randy that if we could move it to thirty fathoms, and so, essentially, any further closures, I think will result in, for a lot of vessels, a nine-month fishery, because it's just not going to be worthwhile. Someone might say, well, why don't you go for deep water another time of year, and the problem with that is, with the smaller vessels, in the wintertime, the weather is terrible.

We have short days, as far as the sunlight is concerned, and so you're not going to be able to get the same results as the summertime, where you have good weather and longer days, and so any more closures, I think that would really hurt a lot of the smaller vessels.

Randy mentioned the hook issue, and I am totally onboard with that. I think we should have unlimited hooks, of which only 750

can actually be fished.

As far as the IFQ reef permit, I kind of go along with that. I think that you should have a reef permit, and I was talking to someone earlier that mentioned possibly the people who have allocation presently, with no reef permit, would be allowed to continue, but, from this day forward, we'll say, anyone that wants to buy allocation I think should have some skin in the game and have a reef permit with a vessel with the capacity of catching fish.

I think that's pretty much about -- One other thing. If you look at the -- I was looking at some of the tables. With the deepwater landings, if you look at those three months, it's 35 percent of the landings take place at that time, because of the better weather, the longer days. If there is any more closures in that area, you're going to see that go down, because you're going to have less vessels that are going to go out there, because you will just be bumping heads, and it wouldn't be worth it. I guess that's about it. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. MACCINI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Bart Niquet, followed by Shawn Watson.

MR. BART NIQUET: Here we go again. I'm Bart Niquet from Lynn Haven, Florida. I've been fishing for the better part of seventy-five years. My first problem is the council keeps harping on the discard problems and the new recruits in the red snapper fishery. Both problems are being solved by the lease programs. Boat captains and owners can lease small amounts of poundage, in order to retain fish that they would normally throw away, and make a profit on them at the same time.

Using the council's own figures of three-dollars for a lease and five-dollars for the price of the fish, your profit margin is 40 percent, and where in the world else can you get that kind of profit? You can't buy anything that will give you a 40 percent return. The only way it works though is if you use snapper as a bycatch or incidental catch and not a targeted species.

I personally lease allocation to bandit boats, seventeen bandit boats, and eight fish dealers, five in Florida, two in Texas, and one in the Louisiana area. That the money I'm counting on for my next three or four years, which is about all I've got,

and so I don't see why I, after being in the fishery for as long as I have, and having permits as long as I have, that I should be penalized because I didn't keep my permits, and what about the wills and children of captains that had permits and died? Who is going to take care of them?

On another subject, if you're going to close an area to bottom fishing for commercial boats, why not for everybody? An example is Pulley Ridge, the Middle Grounds, Steamboat Lumps, the Flower Gardens, and this list goes on and on. It's not fair or equitable, which was the aim of this program we're on.

The agent from Florida, when he got up here, he said that only 5 percent of the anglers in Florida go offshore to fish. Why then are they given such a high priority of the attention and the allocation? Don't be blackmailed, and don't be jealous. Let's go back and do some business, but Dr. Barbieri said between 350,000 and 450,000 offshore anglers in Florida waters catch snapper.

If each one of them caught two fish and went one time a year and fished six pounds, they have already gone over three-million pounds of fish. Alabama is the same thing. They've got over three-and-a-half-million pounds of fish reported. Somewhere or another, somebody is doing something wrong, and I don't know whether it's my fault or not, but maybe I can't bring it over to you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Niquet. Thank you, sir. Next, we have Shawn Watson, followed by Mr. Chris Niquet.

MR. SHAWN WATSON: Good afternoon, council. My name is Shawn Watson, and I'm a boat owner out of Madeira Beach. I'm a member of Southern Offshore Fishermen's Association. I would also just like to echo some of the things that some of my other friends here have mentioned.

On Pulley Ridge, I think we definitely need to look at other options for that, because these guys need to be able to go down there and harvest those fish when we're in times like this, when the shallow water is closed. Again, putting so much pressure on a small area is just going to really create problems and more hazards for the fishermen.

Also, I want to say that I am in total favor of the loan program that has been mentioned here at the council meeting. I think that's a great idea, as far as getting new entries into the business, just like myself. I am still fairly new into this

industry. I am still learning a lot about it, through these other guys, and that's pretty much what I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Chris Niquet, followed by Mr. Ken Haddad.

MR. CHRIS NIQUET: I'm Chris Niquet from Panama City, Florida. I'm one of those fellows that leases out his allocation. Ever since I got permits, which changed to allocation, I have leased out 100 percent of my allocation to those people who need it for bycatch or to make their operation profitable.

I have heard discussed some modifications to the IFQ program that is supposedly going to solve this problem. If you want to modify this program and restrict how I deal out my poundage, there is going to be about fifty boats that I service with poundage that ain't going to get no poundage, not a pound. I am going to fish them all myself. That's fifty boats that is going to be catching fish, red snapper, and throwing them back dead.

On the next subject, the charter fishing industry, they caught 48 percent of their red snapper quota this year. They had I think it was forty-six days to catch them. This year, you gave an increase, I think, to forty-eight or forty-nine days. Let's do the math, folks. You should have been giving them eighty-five days and see if they can catch 90 percent, because one of the things in Magnuson is maximum sustainable yield. That's what you're going for, and you ain't getting it. You don't give enough days.

About the IFQ system, in short, nobody here has told me the problem that exists in the IFQ system that you're trying to solve. If it's lack of fish to lease, raise the TAC. If you don't have the supply, you can't lease them. You've got more problems in the recreational fishery than you have ever had, and you're harping on the IFQ system, the commercial fishery, to solve them, and it ain't going to happen.

The last thing, and this is in Magnuson, make sure that it's fair and equitable, because, if you reallocate wrong, if you take these fish off the table in the wrong kind of way, we're going to litigate, I promise you. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Ken Haddad, followed by Alison Johnson.

MR. KEN HADDAD: Thank you, Madam Chair and council members. First, I want to thank Dr. Dana for her service to the Gulf

fisheries. I want to talk about a few different topics.

 The red snapper ACT for recreational, first, we appreciate your attempts to maximize access and keep us below our ACL. I know it's tenuous on how you do that, and I have some thoughts, and I'm going to give them in questions. I don't know the answers, and I'm not expecting answers, but I am just throwing them out here.

One question would be do the new Standard 1 Guidelines, relative to multiyear determinations of overfishing, give you any ability to use a three-year average before making changes, as you think about this? I don't know, and that may not be relative, but it's worth looking at.

Two, do you have the ability to use underages in the ACL across sectors to help reduce accidental overages by the private recreational? If so, could that be part of the ACT development? Those are my questions relative to that.

Snapper allocation, you had a discussion on that, and we would ask the council to start a snapper allocation amendment that reestablishes a fair allocation. NOAA staff have somewhat clearly articulated that this can be done and that the recent lawsuit was narrowly defined, and we think that you can learn from the suit and provide an accountable new allocation.

Just kind of an observation on the AP, the rec AP. I was there for one day, and I just wanted to share that our first Gulf Angler meeting was identical to the first meeting of the rec AP, and so there is a lot of information that isn't understood and isn't known. We spent considerable time developing questions for NOAA and digging up information to get to even talk about possible management options.

 Even then, it became clear that, without scenario analysis, which is kind of like taking some guesswork out to where you might end up if you take a given alternative, it's very difficult to decide what direction to take, and so I just wanted to share that with you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Alison Johnson, followed by Mr. Will Copeland.

MS. ALISON JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Chairwoman Bosarge and Gulf Council members. I am Alison Johnson, Southeast Campaign Manager with Oceana. Thank you for the opportunity this afternoon to provide public comment. Although Oceana feels that deep-sea coral protection would be better accomplished by using the discretionary provisions in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we do appreciate the extra level of protection that the HAPC provides against oil and gas exploration.

 Regarding Action 1 in the deep-sea coral options paper, we prefer Alternative 2, which would add all deep-sea water octocorals to the fishery management plan, along with all other deep-sea coral species that could be present in the Gulf. We would also like to see a mechanism whereby newly-discovered deep-sea coral could easily be added to the fishery management plan.

Regarding Action 2, we prefer Alternative 2, Option 2, which would establish strict annual catch limits and annual catch targets and overfishing limits for all octocoral species in the Gulf.

Lastly, in all new HAPCs, we would like all bottom-tending gear to be prohibited, including anchoring where deep-sea coral is present. We commend the council, again, for helping and doing this amendment and working with the council as this moves forward, and thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Will Copeland, followed by Mr. Eric Brazer.

MR. WILL COPELAND: Ladies and gentlemen of the Gulf Council, I am William Copeland, a commercial fisherman from New Port Richey, Florida. I am here today supporting Amendment 36B-related proposals, which I believe will improve access to allocation leasing and provide opportunities for fishermen to earn a place in the fishery.

For those of you who don't know me, I grew up in Florida, and I commercial reef fished with my father in the late 1960s through the mid-1970s. My commercial fishing career was partially interrupted when I went to college, and I spent twenty-one years in the Air Force. I'm now a retired Lieutenant Colonel.

Being in the Air Force didn't stop me from commercial fishing. I spent seven years in Florida during my active duty time, and I commercial reef fished during those years. I have been commercially licensed in Florida continuously since 1982. I own two commercial vessels. One I fish inshore, primarily for Spanish mackerel, and I have one reef-permitted vessel that I

fish offshore.

 Again, I am here today in reference to Amendment 36B. First, I agree with an allocation set-aside that I think NOAA Fisheries should establish a reef fish allocation bank to provide better and more consistent access for fishermen to lease allocation. The percentage you want to put in there, I recommend between 10 and 20 percent, but obviously that's not my decision.

The cost to lease this allocation would be paid directly to NOAA, to pay for program operations, and possibly pay for additional data collection for stock assessments. Allocation leased by people from the bank by fishermen could only be used to harvest fish by the vessel and the account that leased the allocation. That would be my proposal. I provided a handout, and there is more details on my recommendations for that bank in there.

I agree with an adaptive share program also, but only if an allocation bank were established. Without the bank, eventually allocation leasing would dry up, and people without shares would no longer be able to fish.

Third, in reference to having to have a reef permit to hold shares in an IFQ account, I agree with the Niquet's that, if you have an account now, that you should be grandfathered and still be able to have those shares to lease out into the future. For anyone entering the IFQ program, I don't think, in the future — I think you should have to have a reef permit.

In summary, I think that we should establish an allocation bank and implement an adaptive share program, and I think that will improve our access to allocation leasing, provide fishermen an opportunity to earn their way into this system and not have to buy their way into the system, as has gone on in years past. This should reduce our bycatch and help reduce discard loss, and I see that I am blinking, and so I will quit.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Copeland. We appreciate you 40 being here.

MR. COPELAND: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Next, we have Mr. Eric Brazer, 45 followed by Ms. Valerie Sirch.

MR. ERIC BRAZER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I am Eric Brazer, Deputy Director of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish

Shareholders Alliance. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I want to hit on five things quickly today.

Number one is the abbreviated framework action to modify the number of unrigged hooks carried on longline vessels. We support Option 3, which would be to modify the number of hooks to be unlimited, while still requiring 750 rigged hooks. You have heard about the problems of losing hooks to sharks and for other reasons, and this is a simple solution. It takes care of that, and it works for the fishermen, and, as you guys heard yesterday, it works for enforcement as well.

Number two, on the federal financing program, Jessica gave a great presentation on this yesterday, and we really can't stress enough that the industry needs this. If the council really is committed to helping young fishermen and replacement entrants, this should be a slam-dunk. It's already proven itself in other regions, and it doesn't take anything from the existing fishermen, and it addresses what we believe to be one of the true barriers to entry, which is access to capital.

Ironically, and we've said this before, when you start injecting instability into a program like this, the ones you're really impacting the most are the young guys who are trying to go out and find money to build that business, and so we urge the council to work with the agency and figure out what we, including the industry, collectively, can do to get this program up and running.

On Amendment 36B, all I'm going to say at this point is that the challenge here, from our perspective, is that the council doesn't have a clear vision for what it's trying to achieve, and we heard this over and over and over again yesterday, and so, until you can come to consensus on this, there is going to continue to be a fundamental disconnect between the ideas that are being brought up and what the true impacts are on the fleet itself.

 With regards to corals, we really appreciate the inclusion of Alternative 4 in Action 3. This acknowledges the significant historical fishing that has taken place in this Pulley Ridge area and the minimal impacts of bottom longline on corals.

This gets us closer to a more informed understanding of historical fishing access and true gear impacts, and we look forward to a broader conversation about how low-impact fishing and coral protections can work together.

Briefly, on reallocation, I've got say something about it. According to the judge, Amendment 28 was fundamentally flawed, and that's her words. That's her language. That's not mine. That action took a lot of time, and it used up a lot of staff resources, and to say that it was controversial is the understatement of the year, and all for what? The courts vacated it, and the federal private angler season kept getting shorter and shorter.

We really want the council to work with us and not against us to find some real solutions that don't penalize the half of the fishery that has an accountable system that prevents these overages. On a positive, but sad note, we want to thank Dr. Pam Dana for her service and her dedication. We are going to miss you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Valerie Sirch, followed by Mr. Kenneth Daniels.

MS. VALERIE SIRCH: Hi. My name is Valerie Sirch, and I am an IFQ shareholder, and I'm really nervous talking to you guys, and so please try to bear with me. I am here today because of the decisions that you are considering making about 36B. I don't pretend to know everything there is to know, but I have been involved with the commercial red snapper fishery since before the IFQ system even started.

I have seen the fishery during the derby days, when there were a lot less red snapper to catch and dockside prices were much lower. Some of you were here then, and you know and remember all of this.

Now the red snapper fishery is much better. After ten years, we started seeing some real progress. We all have business plans that we depend on, and so, when you start talking about restricting this and limiting that and the use-it-or-lose-it, you need to know that you are not just impacting fishermen, but you're impacting business people and families.

You are impacting the fishery by even talking about some of these things. Permit prices are going up as we speak, and some fishermen are just getting really fed up with all of this stuff about the IFQ, and I think that the Amendment 36B is filled with a lot of unintended consequences. I wish you all would stop trying to tear down a system that seems to be working, and I thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Ms. Valerie. Next, we have Mr.

Kenneth Daniels, followed by Mr. Garrett King.

MR. KENNETH DANIELS: I'm Kenneth Daniels. I'm a commercial bottom longline fisherman from Madeira Beach, Florida. I'm a member of SOFA and also a member of the Gulf Shareholders Alliance bycatch reduction. I would like to speak a little bit today about the Pulley Ridge issue.

As I understand the paperwork that came back on it, it said it was some of the most pristine coral seen outside of the Pulley Ridge HAPC area, and that's because we take care of it. We don't want to tear it up.

I would like to speak about the hooks. An unlimited number of hooks, not tied up and ready to go, really does help out, because you guys did a great job of bringing the sharks back. There are plenty of sharks out there, and they eat a lot of hooks.

Then the IFQ system seems to be working pretty good, but it was set up to be a flexible program that worked for the fishermen and the fisheries. Once we start talking about restrictions, you lose your flexibility, and that was one of the big selling points to the fishermen, was the flexibility of it. That's about it today. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Garrett King, followed by Mr. Jason Delacruz.

MR. GARRETT KING: My name is Garrett King, and I'm a commercial fisherman from Galveston, Texas. I'm an owner-operator of a small commercial boat there, mainly fishing snapper. I've been in the fishery since 2003, and I've been an owner-operator since 2013.

Last year, I landed around 75,000 pounds of IFQ-related fish. It was all leased quota. I do not own any quota. My business depends completely on the availability and leasing of quota to survive. I am not in favor of the use-it-or-lose-it or the redistribution of the quota. I feel it will take the leasable allocations off the table and will be detrimental to my business, and there will also, I'm sure, be other unintended consequences.

 I am in favor of a loan program. I would like to grow my business. Just like any other business, you have to invest to grow your business, and it would be a great way for me to be able to get the capital to buy quota from other people and

continue with my operation. To me, this is the only option to safely proceed without any major unintended consequences, mainly putting me out of business. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Mr. Anson.

8 MR. ANSON: Mr. King, thank you for coming all the way from 9 Galveston. I appreciate it. How many pounds of fish do you 10 land in a typical year, IFQ fish as well as non-IFQ fish?

MR. KING: Last year, I landed 76,000 pounds, close to 76,000 pounds, of IFQ fish and about close to 13,000 pounds of other.

MR. ANSON: How much, if I could ask, how much, on average, do you pay for your IFQ fish, and let's just say red snapper, to make it easy, if you were buying multiple species?

19 MR. KING: It's around the three-dollar area.

21 MR. ANSON: If I could also ask how much is dockside price for 22 that?

MR. KING: It's normally somewhere around in the five-dollar range.

27 MR. ANSON: Thank you.

29 MR. KING: Yes.

31 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Jason 32 Delacruz, followed by Mr. Bill Kelly.

MR. JASON DELACRUZ: Good afternoon. Thank you, all, for giving me a chance. Before I forget, I want to thank Pam Dana for doing a truly thankless job. This council process is tiresome, at best, and you stuck it out. You did a good thing, and I really appreciate that.

First, I will hit the hook thing I've been working on. You guys were willing to talk about it in committee, and going to the unlimited is the smartest, best play for us, and I've kind of made it pretty clear that all you're doing is making penalty boxes for me, and, in this case, it's a small hook box that puts us in that position, and so I appreciate you guys moving forward with that.

48 Secondly, I want to talk a little bit about the coral closure.

I really like the idea that everybody has picked up on, is that we can identify these areas and protect these areas, but allow historical access. I do think that's a really critical component, and I hope that that moves forward with all of these closures that we move into, because, if we can't establish that we're actually causing a problem, I just don't see a reason for you to remove us from it.

I mean, one of the challenges in our entire fishery and oceans right now is that we don't understand some of the things that are happening, and, if we don't have a clear delineation of what it is, we're not going to pick the only thing we can control, which is fishing, and say we're going to kick you out, but all the other things that are really causing the problem, we're just going to let those happen, because we can't control them anyway, and so, to me, that seems patently unfair, and giving my guys the opportunity in fishing these areas is critical.

It's the first time I have heard the concept that Randy brought up about let's move that turtle closure to thirty fathoms, and that sounds awesome to me, and I know that's a whole other game that we have to deal with on ESA issues, but I would like to talk about that, and I will work on that in the future, and so I'm looking forward to that.

The IFQ in 36B, you guys -- I appreciate the fact that we're going to start trying to figure out what you guys want to accomplish up here, but you guys need to be really careful. The unintended consequences that can happen here may completely backfire on what you think is going to happen, and so I think that's something that this council, as you guys work through the process, you need to pay close attention to the conversations that we have when we're standing around the table, or we're standing at the bar, and try to understand the things we're saying. It's completely different than everybody thinks.

Also, I really hope this isn't an unintended or a background way to try to work reallocation, because I see these things happening, and reallocation is just -- I mean, there is a reason that we provide this access, and I don't want to see us lose the ability to provide both, and I have always understood, in my heart, that the concept behind our allocations are really more based on where the fundamental usages are.

Us giving access to people for fish is a reason that the numbers are so dissuaded. When you get into my grouper fishery, there is a reason that more of a commercially-landed red grouper is like that, because that's how it works. It made sense.

It was a balance, and it was a naturally-occurring action, and all of these allocations are close to that, and I think everybody forgets that it happened not in a vacuum. It happened in the normal, natural world, and everybody thinks that we can manipulate that now and fix some problems that we just can't fix, and so I really hope that that's not the reason that 36B is moving forward and that we actually try to accomplish something.

Also, and I know I'm just about done, but the fishery finance plan, I have been asking for that, and I've been at this podium no less than probably five times on that specific subject, and, even ten years ago, I was asking about it, and so let's get that moving and get it done, and let's solve our new entrant problem, because capital is the most constraining thing you do, and, in this fundamental group, it's causing that problem. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Bill Kelly, followed by Ms. Pam Anderson.

MR. BILL KELLY: Madam Chair and council members, Bill Kelly, representing the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's Association. I have two issues. One is yellowtail snapper and the other being lionfish. Here we are again, after a number of years of working with both councils, and we have an early closure in the yellowtail snapper fishery in the South Atlantic. It shut down the last week in May instead of the end of July.

Why bring this to the Gulf Council's attention? Because we perceive that we're going to have exactly the same problem next year and the year after that and the year after that. While there is great sentiment and attitude that the South Atlantic Council should correct this, we need help.

We left a million pounds on the recreational side unharvested in the South Atlantic, and we're going to leave a half-a-million pounds unharvested in the Gulf. What we're suggesting and asking for is the Gulf Council's assistance in working with the South Atlantic Council.

Let's combine both the Gulf and South Atlantic stocks. They're one anyway, and manage it under one ACL and let's correct this problem. It's absolutely a shame that we're not making these fish available for harvest and available to America's consumers.

 Number two, lionfish, as you all know, and you approved a profile and a project that we initiated, and we're now working on it in the fourth year. We expect that, with the Gulf and

South Atlantic Council's approval, that we would rapidly get an approval from National Marine Fisheries Service and NOAA, only to be rebuffed last October by the administrative officials in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, under the assumption that we were trying to initiate a new commercial fishery within the Gulf and South Atlantic, specifically a trap fishery, which is not the case.

We have really come up with some novel ideas here. One, we have the combination lobster trap that is already responsible for harvesting well over a million pounds of lionfish as bycatch in the recent history of that fishery, as these lionfish have exploded.

Then we came up with another novel concept. We put an optical camera recognition device on that trap that only opens a trap door when it identifies a lionfish, and so it eliminates bycatch, and then you're really going to like this one. We sit on the bottom, and we bait it, and we let that trap door do its thing, and then we come back a week later and it was full of lionfish, and can you imagine that, and the sanctuary didn't want to go along with that.

Now we've got some major administrative changes that have taken place there, as most of you are aware, and we hope that the new regime there will be much more receptive to this, and I will be meeting with them in Washington, and we have re-filed our application to test in the sanctuary, and then we will go back to Dr. Crabtree and his staff and see if we can get a final approval, but I wanted you to be aware of that and up to speed on things. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for that update, Mr. Kelly. Next, we have Ms. Pam Anderson, followed by Mr. Shane Cantrell.

MS. PAM ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and council members and Dr. Crabtree. I am Pam Anderson of Captain Anderson's Marina and fishing rep on the Bay County Chamber of Commerce in Panama City.

For the MSST document, you are increasing the buffers, and I am not seeing a visual that shows the stock versus the harvest, something like this, and different species reproduce and grow at different rates, and it's seemingly a one-size-fits-all approach to this and not maybe the best path. The suggested buffer of 25 percent for red snapper instead of 9 percent, I would think, is clearly unnecessary.

Vermilion snapper is not overfished or undergoing fishing. Headboats need vermilion snapper to operate days beyond red snapper season. That's just about all we have left to access in northwest Florida, and there are plenty. If anything, we need the ACL higher and just keep the bag limit the same.

Amberjack, charter boats in northwest Florida need amberjack for their spring season. I will refer you to comments sent by Bob Zales for detail, but, with the early closure in March of this year, to look at the faces on the charter boat guys, you would think that BP hit again. It's very important to have access to amberjack in the spring. I have a flash drive in my pocket if anybody wants to see just a random spot that the divers took and they looked up to see all the amberjack above them.

We in Panama City are against any catch share programs, except for one boat operator, according to Bob Zales, President of NACO and PCBA.

I would like to take a minute to look at this chart that I have provided. The purpose of the original chart presented by Representative Steve Southerland's staff was to determine whether or not the stock could increase with a four-fish, sixmonth season, and it did, from fifteen-million fish to twenty-three million fish. They were still small, and average pounds of each harvested had only increased from two pounds to about three-and-a-half pounds, but they were growing.

The purpose of my recent request for updated information was to see what the effect of the stringent regulations and negative economic impacts have had on the stock, assuming there would be very significant increases.

To my surprise, the data seems to show that, in a six-month season, four-fish bag limit, the data points from 2000 to 2006 are a steeper incline. The stock was growing faster than that of the data points from 2007 to 2016.

I believe these questions need to be answered, assuming the information is accurate, and I believe that it probably is, or close, and why aren't we looking at a much more significant increase in the stock? With the stock increases so apparent to all of us, why are the OFLs so low, and, if the fishery impacts are not worsening the stock, but instead it improves, with longer seasons, why are we not considering that as an option, as a necessary change in the FMP?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Anderson, I've got to ask you to wrap it up, please, ma'am.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay. The rest of it, you will see in the paperwork, and I will just give you one quick statement. I said before that we are overfishing the limits sometimes set by SEDAR, the SSC, and the Gulf Council, but we're not overfishing the stock, and that's quite obvious with these charts. I would like for you to see a chart like this for every species that you have to work with. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ma'am. Next, we have Mr. Shane Cantrell, followed by Mr. Tom Wheatley.

MR. SHANE CANTRELL: Thank you, all, for welcoming me to sunny Florida. It's a little different than I've seen in the past, but, first, I want to thank Pam Dana for her years of service and dedication to this council. She has done a phenomenal job of working through these very complex issues, and I would like to also thank Leo Danaher for his time here. We appreciate all of your insight and knowledge into this process, and we look forward to working with the next representative on this council, and other councils as well.

I also am the Co-Chair for the Boundary Expansion Working Group at the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary. As that process goes on and develops in the future, I would like to continue to welcome this council to provide input and be a partner in developing that, as it's been critical thus far.

For Amendment 41, I would like to see the amendment proceed, at this time, with the committee recommendations and the preferreds on the number of species. As John pointed out in committee, he got a lot of response from adding those fish in there.

I personally think that five species is necessary in there, but understand that some of these species are more regional than others, and, looking at it from a different perspective, greater amberjack and gray triggerfish, it's not that long ago that they were open year-round, and we're looking at a closed season on both of them, and so I don't think that's unrealistic for these other species.

However, I want to see this amendment move forward, and that seems to be the best opportunity for that to go forward, and that doesn't prohibit us from continuing that exploration and moving forward in the future.

We want to see the cyclical redistribution continue to be looked at. That's the best viable opportunity without per-vessel catch history, and we want to continue to look at that and see an aggressive reclamation timeline and be able to convene the AP to look at that and have discussions among the industry for the development of that.

For greater amberjack, I would like to see you consider the previous failures of the rebuilding plan as we look at what we're going to do in the future. I believe that, late in the amendment, there was not a lot of -- There was a lot of progress made late in the amendment to start rebuilding, but it was a little bit too late, and so I want to consider a January 1 to July 31 closure, to open those fish up in August, and that provides an ample opportunity and a level playing field for all recreational fishermen to access that fishery and, that late in the year, there is not a lot of other fisheries open.

Snapper will be closed, amberjack will be open. Gray triggerfish, as we just finished that amendment, will also be open, and, if there's any questions that you all have, please feel free.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Tom Wheatley, followed by Mr. Mike Colby.

MR. TOM WHEATLEY: Good afternoon, ma'am. I'm Tom Wheatley, and I'm with the Pew Charitable Trusts. I live, work, and fish out of Tampa, Florida. Thank you to the council and to staff for their hard work thus far on Coral Amendment 9.

As you know, the Gulf of Mexico deep-sea corals do form diverse habitats of reefs and mounds and undersea forests, which are important for many species of fish, including our groupers and snappers. These fragile, slow-growing corals can take decades or longer to recover if at all damaged.

 It's encouraging that the council has provided opportunities for fishermen and scientists and other stakeholders like myself to be involved in this process to this point, and we think that that level of cooperation is really representative in the document that you provided so far.

For instance, as we've heard from some of the fishermen here today, Pulley Ridge is one of the more controversial sites in the document. However, Dr. Kilgour has done a good job of reaching out to affected fishermen to get their input, and, as a result, we think that the action has an appropriate suite of

alternatives that will hopefully lead to a satisfactory outcome. We do have three recommendations for your consideration.

In Action 4, which includes the Many Mounds site, which is off of Florida, we have been speaking with bottom longline fishermen who target deepwater groupers in this site, or close to it, and they are concerned with the eastern boundaries of these sites.

At last year's joint Coral SSC and Shrimp AP meeting, there was discussion of possible modifications to the boundaries of these areas, and that would be good to consider as an additional alternative in the amendment, and it's worth noting that a member of your Coral SSC and also a council staff member will be going on a research cruise to these areas this summer, and we're hopeful that the new research and continued dialogue will get us to an outcome that protects the corals and allows for continued fishing.

In Action 8, we are concerned that no regulations are included for consideration for these sites. These sites are particularly deep, and the VMS and the shrimp ELB data provided indicates that there is no fishing occurring in most of those areas. Now is the time to consider how best to protect these fragile corals from future harm, really before anyone is economically invested in fishing in these sites.

As technology improves, our oceans change, and new markets develop for different fish, it's possible, and even probable, that new fisheries may develop in these deeper waters. It seems like waiting until there is vested economic interest and the corals potentially have sustained damage before acting -- It kind of seems like you're waiting for the horses to have left the barn before you shut the doors, and so we encourage the addition of options that include regulations to the options paper, so that, at a minimum, the appropriate analysis will be completed and the council can fully consider this issue.

Lastly, we are concerned about removing octocorals from the amendment this early in the process. We certainly are empathetic to the concerns of Florida and the marine life collectors.

However, there are sites under HAPC consideration in this document, particularly off of Texas, that have abundant octocorals, and I think, with some creativity, there may be solutions to allow for deep-water octocorals to be protected via this amendment while allowing Florida to retain full management of their marine life collectors, and, as a Floridian, lastly, I

would just like to say thank you to Pam Dana for your service here on the council. We appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Wheatley. Next, we have Mr. Mike Colby, followed by Mr. Russell Underwood.

MR. MIKE COLBY: Good afternoon. I'm Mike Colby, and I'm with the Gulf Seafood Institute and the Clearwater Marine Association. Thank you, council members, and thank you, Dr. Dana, for your time here.

I finished blowing out my heat exchangers on the boat earlier in the week, and that was bad enough, and I thought that this will be easy. I will get in the truck and shoot down the Skyway Bridge on Tuesday and get here. After I almost got blown off the Skyway Bridge, I finally get here, and then I thought I would rather be back in that hole messing around with those cores, but. anyway, I am here.

I always am compelled to give the council some update on our GSI CLS ELB project. We are currently looking at additional funding, which we hope to secure shortly, that are going to put about 200 or 300 more units to hopefully -- It may be a bit of a stretch, but we would like to get those installed by the end of the year and have funding for a third year of the ELB project.

What's interesting in that funding is going to be approximately resources for twenty port location training sessions, and this solves some problems also when the Fisheries Service rolls out the plan for the amendment that was passed here, hoping to get fishermen dialed in, in some way, to using an ELB tablet and understanding what they have to do, regardless of what platform they use. The twenty port location training sessions is not a stretch. Those are in the works, and I am hopefully going to be involved in a bunch of those for Florida.

The other comment I had was, every time I come here and listen to presentations, I always learn something, and I think that's part of the hoped-for outcome of having management council meetings, is that you bring fishermen and people here and you get educated. Today's presentations on the reef survey platforms of the states was very interesting, and it reminded me of some of the challenges that we face in the ELB project.

 Something that resonated with me was, Kevin, your discussion of the Alabama Snapper Check and that you have this capture/recapture platform and you've got an expected number of trips out there, or participants in this, and you garner -- I think the number was 200 reports, with eighty having dockside intercepts for recapture, and I thought, now, that's a pretty good number actually, and I'm sure Alabama would like to see that higher.

Our CLS GSI ELB project is not quite there yet, but, to me, it did indicate the challenge of getting fishermen to do this and getting fishermen to do it. My guess is, unless I didn't hear correctly, that some of that is probably due to people just falling off the radar screen or not feeling comfortable enough with doing certain things, but it did iterate to me the need for training, the need to get fishermen -- I have said this before at other council meetings. You're at the dock, you're icing, you're fueling, they're all freaked out, and you have to incorporate it into your everyday activity. I am hoping, with extra port location trainings, that we can hopefully get over some of those challenges. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Colby. Next, we have Mr. Russell Underwood, followed by Mr. Chad Haggert.

MR. RUSSELL UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I am Russell Underwood from Panama City, Florida. I've been fishing for about forty-five years, ten years of it in the recreational fishery, and, the last thirty-five years, I've been commercial fishing out of Louisiana, out of Belle Pass, Louisiana.

The first thing today is let me say something about the snapper IFQ. I think it's doing very well. I think I said the last meeting that you all need to commend yourselves on what this program has done for the fishery and for the fishermen and for the resource.

I am very thankful to have this fishery program, and I am still actively involved, and, yesterday, listening to the committee meeting, I heard some very disturbing things. I am little bit confused, and I've been coming to these meetings for about thirty-five years, and I think the public and the audience is a little confused about exactly what is going on.

We've got a great IFQ program that's doing good, and we're feeding the American public. The stocks have been raised, but then, yesterday, I heard, in disbelief, that we had a discussion, a long-time discussion, about how we're going to reallocate or how we're going to put our fish that we have worked so hard to rebuild the stock -- We're talking about putting it in an auction.

I am thinking, my God, this council worked so hard, and the fishermen has done their part in building this resource, and now you all are talking about putting it on an auction to give fish to other people that is not even participating in this fishery.

Maybe they are not fishermen. Maybe they might be stockbrokers, and that really offends me, and I think it offends the whole commercial sector, that we thought that we were building up to something to do better for this industry and for the American consumer. It just don't make no sense.

We had a conversation yesterday about getting loans for the new fishermen, and I know I'm getting a little bit old. Captain Buster, he is ninety-one years old, and he's my sea pappy. He's been there a long time, and we talk about maybe putting him out of business or maybe making him get something that he ain't had in a while, and so I just -- You all sent a lot of people a little bit of confusion, and they are scratching their head and saying, my God, I'm a new fisherman and I want to get into this fishery, but now you all are trying to set rules to put me out of the fishery.

One thing I did do in life is I've got two kids. Caroline is thirty-five, and I've got a great son at Berkley. He is fixing to graduate and get his PhD, but one thing I taught these kids was never go out of your way, never go out of your way, to hurt anybody intentionally. You all have got a job to do, but I just heard a lot of things today, and you all should be proud of what you all have done in bringing this fishery back. You all have got lots of other problems besides Amendment 36B.

One gentleman said that yesterday, that we've got other problems to address. The recreational fishery, they need things to work out, and I think about Ms. Pam Dana. She's been here for years and has done a great job, and Ms. Pam, even though she was recreational, she has never gone out of her way to intentionally hurt me, as a commercial fisherman, and that's why I've got a lot of respect for this woman, and so she could be a good example for a lot of new council people, to never go out of your way to hurt somebody else that ain't done nothing wrong, and I thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Chad Haggert, followed by Milo Mitrovic.

MR. CHAD HAGGERT: Good afternoon. I'm Chad Haggert with the Double Eagle Fishing Fleet, partyboats out of Clearwater Beach, Florida. Mine will be short and sweet here today. I apologize

that I missed the committee meeting yesterday, in all the wonderful weather that was there, and I was out fishing yesterday, with thirty hardy souls, and almost a limit of red snapper for sixty feet of water off of Clearwater, Florida, which is almost unheard of until recent days here.

I hear Amendment 41 going forward with three fish, and the guys are asking for five. In the sake to keep it moving, if it needs to be three, that's fine. Amendment 42, I know, has the five species. I am kind of torn between whether I have to have that or not.

Part of me would want it, because, when I go offshore targeting the red snapper, the amberjack and grouper are part of the catch as well, and it would help me reduce throwing those fish back with the discards. I would be able to harvest them, instead of watching them possibly float off.

 The vermilion snapper, from what I have looked at in the information today, it looks like that might have only been overfished for one year and close to overfished another, and I don't know why there is discussion on reducing that.

That's another fish that we catch in the offshore reef complex that, if we're out there and there happens to be a season on them, that would hurt their survival rates, and so, with being able to harvest them, and, if it hasn't gone over their quotas, I don't know what the reasoning would be behind that, and so thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Milo Mitrovic, followed by Susan Boggs.

MR. MILO MITROVIC: Good afternoon. I'm am Milo Mitrovic. I am a private recreational angler out of Clearwater, Florida. I have a huge concern about the three-day red snapper season we had here. The American red snapper three-day season, the Gulf of Mexico is overrun by red snapper, from depths from forty feet out to 200 feet off of Clearwater.

There has been -- I was thinking of another option for the three-day season for American red snapper. NOAA thinks that every boat out there is fishing for red snapper, and I think that's totally false. I think every offshore recreational angler should report their catch and be accountable for it, so NOAA knows what is going on out there in the Gulf out there.

NOAA thinks that every boat out there is fishing the Gulf, and

that's another false, and NOAA needs to get their science straight, so they can get a better data source, and so I was thinking, for the offshore private recreational angler, every private boat that's going offshore should have a VMS, so NOAA knows who is out there fishing in the Gulf and so we can have more days to fish than the three-day season.

I know, myself, I know a hundred private anglers that have boats themselves, and they don't even go fishing for three days. They didn't go, and that's including myself. I didn't go fishing on those three days. I was working, and, everybody else that I knew was out, they didn't go because of work, and, basically, the weather wasn't that cooperative either.

I think we need to do something about this, because I can't even catch fish, because it's only a three-day season, and I want to go out and catch a fish, and I don't mind. I am happy that the stocks are coming back for the red snapper population. I think it's really good the population, how the red snapper are coming back, but I think we need to do something a little bit better than three days, guys, and I can't -- When I'm fishing off of forty feet off of Clearwater, I can't even get to my gag grouper spots, because, every time I drop down a pinfish, or even a whole sardine, I'm catching red snapper, and that's all the way up to Crystal River.

I went up to Crystal River a couple of months ago, just trying it out, and it's all red snapper. From forty out to sixty feet of water, it's all red snapper, and that's my concern today, and I hope that we can make a change and we can all work together. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for coming, sir. Next, we have Ms. Susan Boggs, followed by Dylan Hubbard.

 MS. SUSAN BOGGS: Good afternoon. My name is Susan Boggs from Reel Surprise Charters in Orange Beach, Alabama and Sand Rock Cay Marina, Orange Beach, Alabama. Randy apologized that he couldn't be here today, but, as you all know, it's red snapper season, and he is out fishing.

Amberjacks, I support Action 1, the closed season January through June. With the triggerfish opening in the spring, and snapper season and June and July, I think that the fishermen would prefer to have something to catch in the fall months.

Vermilion snapper, all I can remember is, in 2013, the recreational sector was cut by 50 percent. I would like to not

see any more cuts to the recreational sector. I agree with what Pam said. When snapper season, triggerfish and jacks and all of that is closed, that's all that's remaining out there to be caught.

I want to touch on something that most of you all, I know, are very aware of, and that was the Orange Beach red snapper protest that took place this past Sunday. It was not a success. Eighteen boats showed up to that protest, and I stood at the specially-called council meeting in the City of Orange Beach, and I said to the council, just as we come and say to this council, not one recreational fisherman has come to this podium and offered a solution, and I would really like to see, and I commend this council for the recreational AP. I know it's a slow process, but look at Amendment 41 and 42. We're making progress. It's moving forward, and I thank this council for that.

I encourage the recreational fishermen -- My message to you is I brought that message to Orange Beach two weeks ago and said show up at these meetings and help us work through this process. It's important, and it's taxing, and it takes time, but the fishermen do it, and we have seen successes in this fishery. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Dylan Hubbard, followed by David Krebs.

MR. DYLAN HUBBARD: Hello, council. I'm Captain Dylan Hubbard from Hubbard's Marina. Hubbard's Marina has been operating fishing vessels off the coast of the Tampa Bay area for nearly ninety years. We are family owned and operated, and we have six federally-permitted vessels, two being large partyboats and four being private charter vessels, two of which are multi-passenger vessels.

The first thing was the options paper for the Framework Action to Require Possession of Descending Devices or Venting Tools Onboard Vessels Possession Reef Fish. We support Action 1, suggesting Alternative 3a, in conjunction with Alternative 4, to increase the survival of released fish, thereby minimizing the mortality of bycatch when barotrauma is present.

The development of an outreach program would be a great addition to the requirement of having a venting tool onboard, because many anglers will need to learn how to vent fish properly. Finally, we strongly encourage you to consider removing the possibility of making a descending device required, because it's

not realistic to be used offshore.

We would have to hire a special mate just to man that descending device and designate a special area of the vessel to do so, and it just wouldn't be realistic to use on a partyboat or a headboat, in a situation where we're catching small, undersized fish or fish that are out of season. It would take a great amount of time, and, in my opinion, become more of a shark feeder and result in more dead discards, due to shark predation, especially in the summertime.

Then, also, Amendment 41, the revised draft of Allocation-Based Management for Federally-Permitted Charter Vessels, Chapter 2.1, Action 1, we propose Alternative 1, no action, with an added Option a that would make a logbook reporting mandatory, like it is for the headboat industry. After a set amount of time, like three, five, or seven years, we could reevaluate, and there would be historical catch data to work from when instituting the initial IFQ distribution.

If Alternative 2 is pursued, against our recommendation, we would highly recommend to the council that they utilize the headboat historical data. For example, if you were to institute the allocation-based management for federally-permitted charter vessels, you could look at the headboat historical catch data geographics, and some of the arguments we heard in the council was where is the red snapper being caught and they don't catch it on the western coast of Florida, and, well, we catch a lot of it. As you've heard many times, we can't get away from them.

There is plenty of amberjack, and there is plenty of gray triggerfish around our area too, and there is a ton of grouper, and so looking at that headboat historical catch data would give you a good starting point when you're looking at the initial IFQ distribution for Amendment 41, if you were to go that route, which we would strongly advise against.

Also, draft Amendment 42, Federal Reef Fish Headboat Management, we didn't really discuss it during this meeting, but I would like to see Amendment 41 and Amendment 42 move together, not only in the timeline, but also in the species managed.

If you're going to manage certain species in Amendment 41, we feel they should be managed in Amendment 42 as well, which would make it easier for the public, because the public takes these trips. This isn't for us.

I know what's in season. I have to know what's in season. It's

my job, but the public needs to know how to book a trip, and, right now, we have four different red snapper seasons, and I spend a lot of my time at work explaining how the regulation works and why it's this way and trying to explain different seasons.

If you had Amendment 41 and Amendment 42 pass, and you have this allocation-based management system and some species are included in one and some species are included in another -- I've got charter boats and headboats. I would have to spend an hour on the phone telling a client what they can and can't keep, based on which boat they take, and it would really, really complicate an already complex system, and I would strongly recommend moving those together, not only in the timeline, but also as far as what species are being managed.

Also, lastly, the final action on Amendment 47, Chapter 2.1, Action 1, we suggest Alternative 1, no action. A proxy is not needed, as this is a healthy stock and not being overfished. Chapter 2.2, Action 2, we suggest, again, Alternative 1, no action. The ACL for vermilion snapper should remain at 3.42 million pounds, as we currently have a very healthy fishery, a very robust fishery, with large fish.

If the ACL is adjusted down around the bordered catch, the catch landings are already being recorded at, and it happens to be hit once or twice, we don't want to see the vermilion have the overfished designation and all the problems that we face with red snapper, amberjack, and gray triggerfish as well. Thank you for your time, council.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I think we have a question for you from Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Dylan, thank you for your testimony. I have a question on barotrauma and venting devices. I am assuming, from your testimony, that you have venting devices on your boats, and I am assuming that you have trained your crew on how to use them.

 MR. HUBBARD: To be honest, council, I thought that I was still supposed to have them on my boat, and so they have never left the boat. We have used venting tools for a long, long time, and well before they were ever mandatory, and we continue to use venting devices, and I often do seminars, probably three to four times a month, not only to promote my business, but also to raise awareness about our fishery, and every seminar I give includes how to vent a fish, how to properly vent a fish, where

to vent that fish, and when you need to vent a fish.

Obviously, as the council knows, anywhere from seventy to ninety foot and beyond, depending on the water temperature, barotrauma is present, and proper venting of a fish will totally make that fish a healthy discard.

In my opinion, when you use proper tools, like a de-hooker, not using needle-nose pliers and not bringing that fish on the deck and letting him sit on the deck, but a properly-vented fish that is de-hooked quickly and properly is going to go home healthy 99.9 percent of the time, and a descending device is extra required material that's going to sit on the roof next to the black spare tire for the turtle devices. In my opinion, a venting tool is all that needs to be required, and it would result in plenty of healthy discards.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. David Krebs, followed by Mr. Ed Walker.

 MR. DAVID KREBS: Good afternoon, council. I'm David Krebs, owner of Ariel Seafoods in Destin, Florida and Sebastian, Florida. I'm an IFQ shareholder and sat in your IFQ advisory panel to develop the program back in 2004. A lot of the discussions that are being held today, if you'll go back and review some of the AP discussion in 2004, you will find 100 percent of the things you're talking about. We addressed it in 2004, and, unfortunately, it wasn't adopted by the council in 2007, as we moved forward.

I find it frustrating that I look at the makeup of the Reef Fish Committee, and what I have for commercial representation on that committee that's actually commercial, because what do I have for commercial on this council? Mr. Walker, Ms. Dana, and Johnny Greene, and, yet, I haven't heard any of them say there's a problem with the red snapper IFQ program that needs to be addressed.

For some reason, everything that I hear comes from the recreational component of this council that we need to do something about the most successful program that has ever come

out of this council, and it's frustrating, because, during that whole time, the recreational participation on this council has not come up with one idea to advance recreational red snapper management.

So, now, thank God, we've got Congress involved, and we've actually got something on the table that says, hey, maybe if we get the states to give up their state seasons, we could come up with twenty-one days. Weekends are twenty-seven days, twelve weekends and three special days.

That is a start. For five years, where has that come from from this council? For five years, all we've talked about is how do we interfere, interrupt, and destabilize the best system that we have ever had, the IFQ? It was vetted over fourteen years. We spent three or four years just arguing about allocation in the AP process, and yet we want to destabilize it.

When you tell people they can't lease their fish anymore -- A man dies that fished for me for twenty-five years, and I still have the ability to lease his fish. Guess what? That keeps my fish house in business. If you take that away from me, you affect the community of Destin, Florida, because, eventually, my fish house goes away. Maybe that's the intent of the recreational industry. I hope not.

Dr. Dana, thank you so much for all that you have done for us. You have been impartial, you have been fair, and I don't understand why you're not still here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Krebs, we have a question from Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, David. Thank you for coming off of work to come here and be with us and give testimony. I have a couple of questions here. The loan program, can you maybe give us your thoughts on this loan program?

MR. KREBS: David, that does go back to my talking about what happened in the AP development. We recognized, back then, that there needed to be a federal loan program for new participation, because it was going to change over time, and you have a successful business model that, yes, the more successful it gets, the more expensive it gets, but why couldn't there be a loan program for new participation?

The frustration always was that we were told to consolidate our fleet to reduce our footprint. We did that, and now the

argument that's coming into play to destabilize the fishery is we need new entrants. No, we need replacement entrants. We need somebody that can buy somebody out and replace them without disrupting the whole system, and that's my frustration as a fish house in Destin.

If my fishermen, as they get older, are forced to sell their fish, that's going to go someone who has the money. The only people that have money are big corporations, and so you're going to find other people in different areas, and it moves all the fish away from a community, and so we need a loan program, and whether that's community based or federal based, but it makes perfect sense. That way, a guy can get in.

I mean, if you get a 2 percent loan and you're getting a good return on your fish, it makes nothing but commonsense, and so I certainly hope -- We talked about it ten years ago, and I hope we will talk about it more in the future, and actually do more than talk about it, but look at that as a solution to new participation. Thank you for the question.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Ed Walker, followed by Captain Bill Goulding.

MR. ED WALKER: Thank you very much. My name is Ed Walker, and I am a recreational fisherman, a charter boat fisherman, and a commercial fisherman, among other things, and I am here to speak today on Amendment 41, the multispecies part of that, actually. Where I live here in west Florida, the Clearwater area, grouper, to me, is the most important species, red grouper and gag grouper, particularly.

 This area where I live is the biological center of abundance for both of those species, and I personally would like to see groupers removed or set as not preferred, which I understand that your committee did already, from the multispecies in Amendment 41. I still support Amendment 41, but I think the grouper should be pulled out, and I will tell you why.

Red grouper and grouper are not overfished or undergoing overfishing. We're allowed to fish for red grouper all year recreationally and on a charter boat, and so we're good with that. It's not broke, and don't fix it.

I do a lot of gag fishing in my charter business and recreationally, and we have a six-month season for those. It's

actually grown in the last couple of years, and we like that path, and it's the same principle. To me, the gag is not broken, and let's not fix it, and so keep the groupers out, but go with the other species.

I am on the charter boat AP that kind of drafted what used to be called the cyclical redistribution plan, which I still like. It spreads the fish out, and then, over a long period of time, they're supposed to kind of work their way to where they need to be, which is a great plan, but, since the groupers are not regionally-distributed across the whole Gulf, and there is very few in Texas, and most of them are over here, I think we should just skip those years of all that redistribution and pull the groupers out and move forward with Amendment 41 with the three current species. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Captain Bill Goulding, followed by Mr. Scott Hickman.

MR. BILL GOULDING: Hi. My name is Bill Goulding, and I'm a local boy. I work here out of Naples, and I run a diving, spearfishing, and charter business. I am not on the commercial level, like most of these guys. Basically, I run four or less on my charter boat, and, if you know these waters, within nine miles, the visibility is going to be iffy, at best. Once you're beyond that, it tends to get better. At twenty to thirty miles, the visibility actually can be as much as sixty and seventy feet.

With the moratorium on the reef and pelagic licenses that was enacted in 2003, it was supposed to be a three-year moratorium. At the end of those three years, it was extended indefinitely, I believe was the term, with the caveat that, at least every ten years, this should be reviewed. To my knowledge, this has not been reviewed. I sent several letters to the council, and I never have got a response.

Also, in the original moratorium, Alternative B7 stated that charters with four or less harvesters would have a moderate adverse biological impact and should be exempt. This was not included and incorporated into it, and so, at this point, I'm still not allowed to go beyond nine miles.

I guess what I'm asking is this will this be considered whenever this new study is done on the moratorium. Spearfishing in southwest Florida requires visibility. If you know these waters, you need to be at least fifteen to thirty miles offshore.

All the new reef deployments that we just put in here, we put in thirty reef deployments, of which I was a part of. I did a lot of the diving, pre and post-survey dives, for the Paradise Reef Project.

Every one of those is in federal waters, and so I have people calling me and saying, hey, Bill, I would like to go spearfishing on your boat and let's go to the reefs, and you know I was restoring the reef, and I was in the movie and all of that stuff, and I say that I can't take you there, and they go, what do you mean, and I say that I can't go beyond nine miles at this point, unless I want to buy a license.

Now, when these licenses came about, I'm not sure of the exact fee, but it was a minimal charge. In 2006, when I looked at them, they were going for about \$4,000. Currently, a captain, a friend of mine, just sold his license that he wasn't using for \$20,000.

Fishing, diving, there's like four dive boats here in Naples, and that's it. They all have four or less licenses, and so our impact is going to be minimal, I would say, at best, or at worst, and, basically, spearfishing charters -- We're kind of like water taxis. We take divers out, and they exit the boat and dive. If they each hold their own licenses, why do I need one?

On the Florida Wildlife site, it says, under dive charters, scuba divers engaged in lobstering or fishing must have an individual saltwater fishing license if the vessel that they are on does not have the necessary vessel licenses, and why does this apply in state waters and not federal waters, especially since FWC enforces in both areas?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Captain Bill, I will have to ask you to wrap it up, please, sir.

MR. GOULDING: Okay. Spearing and diving require visibility. It's a safety issue. Fishing does not require the same thing. Our business is minimal compared to fishing charters, and our clients require specialized training and equipment and comprise probably 2 percent of the fishing population.

If we run two or three trips a week, it's a lot. All I'm asking is that I would like to know when we expect to see if anything has been done on this, and, if I can be involved, I would be happy to. Thank you.

1 2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Scott Hickman, followed by Mr. Buddy Guindon.

MR. SCOTT HICKMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the Gulf Council. Madam Chairman and council members, thank you for having us here this afternoon. First off, I would like to thank Dr. Pam Dana for the amazing job she has done on the Gulf Council, and Lieutenant Commander Danaher as well. He has also served with me on the Flower Garden Banks, and he's a great guy, and we're going to miss him. I just met his replacement, another Texan, and we look forward to having him participate in this process.

First off, there's been a lot of discussions on cobia. I have been a long-time big fan of catching cobia. I've been in the fishery for thirty years as a charter boat captain, and recently as an IFQ participant, and I have kept records on cobia. I used to catch about 200 keepers a summer, and I continue to watch that number dwindle, dwindle. Last year, I think I was in the low sixties. I've kept real good records on that, and we've got an issue with cobia.

I think a one-fish bag limit for cobia would be warranted. I know the APs that I've sat on has sent that to you all before, and it's never really been discussed, and we would like to see that looked at a little closer.

Sitting through this meeting this week has been kind of a shocker, being in Galveston and having so many friends that are recreational fishermen. They're so unhappy and so angry to see all the time spent attacking the only system that works in the Gulf right now, which I'm a new participant in, which is the IFQ system, instead of focusing on recreational issues.

Now, I applaud Patrick Banks' state on what they tried to do with this EFP, which I guess it's not going to move forward now. It's a great idea, and they're trying something. Some people may like it, and some may not, but they're wanting to try something.

 This council needs to think outside the box and start trying stuff. Our state directors that are working on this thing by shutting their state waters down to do this federal plan and giving these guys weekends, do it. Let's do something. Let's work with the Secretary of Commerce. He's got an idea. Shut your waters down, and let's do something for these recreational fishermen.

HAPCs to protect our deepwater corals, I want the agency to redefine what's really nationally significant coral areas. No anchoring in HAPCs, period. Shrink the no-activity zones for oil and gas and the fishing industry, due to better drilling technology and better fishing navigational and sonar technologies.

I support the preferred alternative motions in Amendment 41 made in the committee yesterday. As far as barotrauma release devices, I am currently involved in Cooperative Research Project on sampling fish on platforms. We're doing some acoustic tagging of fish, tag and recapture studies.

You release these fish. You put GoPro cameras on these release devices, and you do it, every time without a cage, a shark or a bottlenose dolphin is eventually going to eat that fish. They are weak. The only way the descending device is really going to make an impact is if you move off the site and you put them in a cage and you put them down and let them sit for fifteen minutes. Then you open the cat-trap door up, once the fish has totally come back and got its strength back and it can swim back to the site.

We have seen, over and over and over again, that, yes, they go down. Yes, they release, but, the majority of the time, it's like putting a Twinkie down. The predators wait, and they kind of look at it. The release device lets them go, and they start to swim off, and, nine times out of ten, something is going to eat them, and that's what we're finding on the science side of it. I would have never believed it until I saw it, and so thank you, all, for your time, and try to enjoy this weather and the rest of your time in Florida. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we have a question for you from Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Scott. You are relatively new in the IFQ program. You've been it in a few years now, but I guess if you could give some of the benefits you've seen in it and then maybe how the loan program may help new people in the program.

MR. HICKMAN: I will take the loan program first, because I actually sat on the AP when we talked and developed that, and I think that the council sent it up to the Secretary of Commerce, and I don't know why it didn't get funded or passed.

It would sure help my kids' college account, because I have

spent a lot of money buying into the system. It's a great system. Doug's motion about me having to buy back 40 percent of the fish that I've already bought is very disconcerting to me and my family. It would be a huge financial hardship for us.

I don't have to throw back dead fish in the water anymore. It's a conservation-based system, and it works. It's super high-level accountability, with logbooks and observers on my boat, and safety gear, and on and on and on, but I can fish when I want. I can fish when the weather is good. I can fish when the price is high, when the fish house needs them, and it's a great system. It works on very different level.

You can go back to arguing about how the initial allocation was done, and that's way in the past, and there is no effect on me. I bought into it. A loan program would help folks like I heard about one from of our local guys from Galveston, Garrett King. He fishes eighty-something-thousand pounds a year and makes a living off of just leasing fish.

If you start meddling with this thing, you take that guy off the water. The guy that has those fish, that's an older guy, you're going to force him back on the water, and you're going to hurt young fishermen, and you're going to hurt young families. I disagree with that. A loan program would help, and I think it would give the ability for some of those people that want out of the fishery to buy in, and I think that's the better way to attack this thing.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

DR. DANA: I do. Thank you. Captain Hickman, has your fleet had the opportunity to think about the amberjack season preferred, like what months to have closed or open?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana, did you have a question?

MR. HICKMAN: I appreciate you bringing that up, because I should have mentioned that, and I'm sure Mike Jennings is probably blowing up my texts somewhere right now. Yes, we discussed it at length.

 As most of the folks here know, we don't have good weather in Texas in the winter and spring. Right now, we start to get our good weather, in June, and so we're not even getting to access this fishery. We've got a very healthy amberjack fishery in the western Gulf. The science shows that. We would prefer an August 1 opener. We would like it to go three months, if we

could, and we support a thirty-six-inch minimum. We want to see those fish spawn before we take them out of the fishery.

If we can't get three months out of it, with a one-fish bag limit, we would support a trip limit on charter boats and headboats. We would support a trip limit, to be able to get three months out of it. That would help the Destin Fishing Rodeo in October. They need that fish in October. Our Galveston fleet needs a trophy fish in August and September, when our tourists are still there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have one more question for you.

DR. STUNZ: Scott, thanks. A quick question. I was just interested in the comment you said about all the fish dying released from the Seaqualizer devices, and certainly I would agree with you that mortality can be an issue, especially in certain regions and certain places, but just I think a broad statement that all those fish are dying probably isn't the case.

You know, there is many investigators, throughout the Gulf, that are seeing a lot of survivorship coming from these devices, and so we too, and many others, put the GoPros, but, at the same time, predators aren't in every spot, and there is still a lot of utility in that, and I don't think putting them in a cage, while that's clearly probably the best, is not practical for everyday anglers and charter captains that are out there.

MR. HICKMAN: I could probably explain that a little better, Dr. Stunz. If you're just doing a few, just to do the Seaqualizer, just a few fish, but, if you're on a headboat or a charter boat, where you're catching multiple numbers of fish, and that vessel is -- We know charter boats do highgrade. Everybody wants to go home with a big fish.

The more you're putting up and down, you are drawing those predators in, where I think, from the scientific studies you're probably seeing, where you're just doing a few per site, if you're doing fifty or a hundred or 150 fish, in a short period of time, you're more apt to draw the predators in during that scenario.

I think you're right that there's going to be more predators at different areas, but, overall, just from what I have seen in doing some of these scientific projects, as you're doing a lot of fish, or even on charter boats, where you're catching a lot of fish, up and down and up and down and up and down, you're going to eventually draw them. It's like chumming, but you're

chumming with fish that are weak, and so that's just my own -- As a professional fisherman that spends a hundred days on the water every year, that's my opinion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Buddy Guindon is going to be next, followed by Will Geraghty.

 MR. BUDDY GUINDON: I wasn't going to here, but, now that Roy is out of the room, and Ken brought it up, and it was the explanation that I heard yesterday explained by Roy about the lawsuit, and I heard it explained that all the court found was a failure to explain how Amendment 28 was fair and equitable.

The suggestion was that, if the council had only done a better job explaining what it did, the court would have upheld Amendment 28. This is dead wrong. What the court found was a fundamental flaw. The court found that Amendment 28 rewarded the recreational sector for an inefficient management plan that resulted in anglers catching too many fish, and it penalized the commercial sector having an efficient management plan that quaranteed compliance with its catch limits.

This is what the court said. Amendment 28 places the commercial sector in a permanent disadvantage by failing to take into account the IFQ program and its impact on reallocation, and the court could not deem such a scenario fair and equitable. The court made emphasis on "permanent", the damage to the commercial fishery.

The bottom line is that it's unfair to take away from a sector that has an accountable system that prevents overages and gives those fish to a sector that lacks an accountable system and routinely exceeds its catch limit. If all the court found was a failure to explain something, it could have remanded Amendment 28 and asked National Marine Fisheries to provide the missing explanation. Instead, the court vacated Amendment 28, because it's flawed, its flaw is fundamental, and it could not be corrected.

I just want to make that clear, because I don't think the explanation that Dr. Crabtree gave was clear, and I think that, before you move forward and continue to take money out of the pockets of hard-working fishermen, we should think carefully about this, because, in Magnuson, Section 303(a)(14), to the

extent that rebuilding plans or other conservation and management measures, which reduce the overall harvest in a fishery are necessary, allocate taking into consideration the economic impact of harvest restrictions or recovery benefits on the fishery participants in each sector. Any harvest restrictions or recovery benefits fairly and equitably among the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors in the fishery.

I would like to say that we have a lot of things to do. Let's move on and do them. Let's not think about a rent resource or an auction. If you want to do that, do it at a national level. There is fisheries all around this country that are operated the same ways ours are, and so, if you want to do something, go to the federal government and get that law changed and quit picking on snapper fishermen because they did a good job and they're making some money and our fishery is just booming and better than it has ever been in most of our lifespans.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Guindon, I have to ask you to wrap it up, please, sir.

MR. GUINDON: I will wrap it up, ma'am, but I do have to mention that Pam Dana has been a fabulous addition to this council, and I appreciate your service. You have been fair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question for you.

MR. GUINDON: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Buddy. It's kind of a two-part question, or just two questions. The first one is about the abundance of snapper and what you're seeing off the coast of Texas and Galveston, and then I know that, not long ago, they had you on Fox News 8, and I think some things came up earlier about there was some misinformation in Louisiana, and then someone said there was not, and so maybe you could speak to that, since you were actually in that, and maybe what you know.

MR. GUINDON: Okay. As far as the abundance of fish off of Texas, I have been fishing for thirty-nine years of my life, right off the coast of Galveston, and, this year, I was shocked and amazed and happy to see an abundance of fish that were ten to twenty-five pounds in fifty feet of water, fifty to thirty-six.

The bank off of Galveston runs about fifty miles long. It runs all the way down into Louisiana, and they call it Sabine Bank

down there, but there was an abundance of these big, breeder fish in there, that I have never seen in my life. Once in a while, you catch one or two, but I am talking about maybe 2,000 that were taken off of there between April and the end of the three-day recreational season.

To me, that says that, if your breed stock is that prevalent in that depth of water, we're doing something right, and we need to be careful not to screw that up.

As far as the Fox News channel bashing of successful businesses in the Gulf of Mexico, that was perpetrated by Congressman Garret Graves. He used folks that have been locked up, are felons, for fisheries violations to say that he got cheated out of initial allocation and everything bad that you could say about a system that has rebuilt a fishery and has made successful businesses.

I think that anytime a congressman gets involved in fisheries management, it can be a really bad thing, because their knowledge is given to them by a staffer. They don't have institutional knowledge in fisheries. They get it from a staffer, who has been briefed by whomever that congressman feels is an expert.

When those things were done and they put our incomes on the TV and talked poorly of our management system, while lying about us not paying anything from the use of the resource, and everybody tries to avoid the fact that we pay 3 percent, and that's more money than -- You know, I tell that to people that are in business around me, that I pay 3 percent of my gross to the federal government to manage the fishery, and they go, what?

In most businesses, that would crush their business to pay 3 percent. Oil companies don't pay 3 percent royalty on their leases in the Gulf of Mexico when they drill a well, after that production. It's less than 1 percent, and so that's all. Anything else?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Buddy, for coming. Those were really thoughtful comments that you provided, but I am just curious. I am not familiar with that part of the Gulf of Mexico, but you mentioned that bank that you were talking about the brood stock, and it was in fifty feet of water, and is that --

MR. GUINDON: On one end, it's fifty feet, and, on the other

end, it's thirty-six feet.

MR. ANSON: How many miles offshore is that from Texas or Louisiana?

MR. GUINDON: About twenty-seven.

MR. ANSON: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. GUINDON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we may have one more question for you.

MR. BOYD: Sorry, Buddy, to bring you back up here, and I should have asked this to Mr. Krebs as well, but you both talk about a successful management program and your business, and this management program has helped you guys build a business, and can you explain to us a little bit about what kind of business does this program support for you? I mean, how many people do you employ or how many boats does your allocation go to that then employs people? I just want to try to get an idea of what kind of business type of impact this program has.

MR. GUINDON: For me, personally, I have five fishing vessels that I own that use a portion of my quota. They each employ five people, or sometimes six, if we have greenhorns on the boat, because we need an extra guy.

I have a fish house that employs, most of the time, twenty-five people. We service about seven other commercial fishing operations, one of which is here today, Garrett King, and we procure allocation around the Gulf of Mexico to make sure that they can stay viable as a business, and you heard how much fish he caught.

 I also, when someone calls me on the phone and says I need this or someone has landed at the dock in Florida and they're under on their allocation, we do our best to make sure that they're taken care of. We have started a quota bank in the Shareholders Alliance that is addressing that problem, and that just feeds right into Chris Niquet, who came here trying to save his business and his father and his brother, that have fished all their lives.

This need for allocation leases is huge now, that we have built a program that's successful, and it's brought in people, replacement people, new entrants, whatever you want to call them, but without the ability to buy a boat and have the time and the allocation to fish and pay for that and then go after owning their own quota.

Garrett is thirty-something, or maybe he's early forties, but he has twenty years now with a paid-for boat to build allocation, or build shares, that then he can retire with. That was the one thing missing in the commercial fishery when I got in it, was, when you retired, what did you have? You had a ragged-out boat and a ragged-out body, and so you better have saved your money, or you're going to live really poorly.

Now we have the ability to not only have a great retirement, if we choose, but to build a family business. I have four sons that are in my business, and they have all joined in because of the IFQ system. Without the IFQ system, I would have never let my kids become fishermen and fish house operators. They would have finished college and went on to do something else, because it's a tough business.

Now, it's a very successful business, and I hope that this council considers what they do and the impacts that it will cause down the chain, and not to me, but to the people that are new in this fishery and to my family. Thank you. Thank you for the question, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Sam Young, followed by Mr. Ryan Bradley. I am so sorry. Next, we have Will Geraghty. Then we will have Mr. Sam Young.

MR. WILL GERAGHTY: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and council. I'm Captain Will Geraghty from Naples, Florida, charter/for-hire, and I appreciate you guys coming and holding your council meeting down here in Naples, and I hope you have enjoyed the weather. It's been awesome.

More importantly, I appreciate the opportunity to come before the council and speak on a few items today. It is my understanding that the Louisiana EFP has been kind of shelved or pulled off the table for now, but my initial instinct is to commend the council for the vibrant dialogue and even considering the item, as the need for innovative data collection methods and models is quite important, especially to the true recreational sector, given the pushback of the three-day snapper season.

I really feel bad for those guys. Imagine if the season started on Tuesday. These guys wouldn't even be able to leave port. I

think that they need to be held accountable though, and, without accountability, there can't be sustainability, and so I would urge the council to consider looking at different models and innovative tools to collect data, specifically speaking to the true recreational sector.

My second item would be myself and fellow colleagues here in the southwest Florida charter/for-hire fleet are kind of struggling with the August opener for amberjack. The fear would be that the potential for less fishing days or no fish when that species becomes a viable target for us here in southwest Florida. We typically start fishing, or encountering those fish on a consistent basis, late December, January, February, and March, and an August 1 opener might leave us with a whole lot less fishing days, or no days to fish for the species whatsoever.

The third item would be the motion to pull grouper out of Amendment 41. I have been fed some real compelling arguments as to why the groupers need to be backed out of Amendment 41, and part of my fleet agrees with that, and there is several that would like to see it remain a five-species moving forward.

 What I would like to hear from the council would be more dialogue on how pulling the groupers out of 41 would affect the amendment or not affect the amendment moving forward, and, again, I appreciate the opportunity to come and speak to you, and, reverting a little bit back to the EFP and the three-day snapper season, from a personal note, it's a little discouraging for me to see an extreme lack of disengagement by the true recreational sector, given that they only got three days to fish. This room should be packed with people demanding a little bit better access or more days to fish. Thank you once again.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Sam Young, followed by Ryan Bradley.

MR. SAM YOUNG: Good afternoon, council. Thank you for being here in Naples. It's not often we get the chance down in our neck of the words to enjoy your company, and so welcome, and thank you. My name is Captain Sam Young, and I'm here on behalf of the Marco Sportfishing Club. I am Director of Fisheries for the club, with 800 members.

First and foremost, when I sent out the e-blast to the membership, with the agenda attached, I got my phone ringing off the hook, and emails were going off left and right, and they were saying to me that I have read some of these amendments, and I don't understand what they're talking about, and so all these

recreational fishermen don't speak in scientific language, and so, for lack of a better phrase, could you dumb it down a little bit, or at least give us a preface as to what this really means to the stakeholders, be it recreational, for-hire, or commercial, kind of a synopsis upfront of what all that stuff behind it, with algorithms and what have you, means to them at the end of the day, so they can get a good idea of, okay, this is what Amendment 44 means to me, and now I can go and make a decision of whether I want to go and listen and participate.

That was the big push-back on my folks. They needed a reason to be here, and, when they read through the documents, they said, if this is how it's going to be spoken to, I don't get it, I don't understand it, and it will be a waste of my time, and so I didn't want to leave that impression with them, and so I said, if you do anything, just come and listen to one of them, or at least participate in this forum, where there was questions and answers, or where you will hear from people that know what they're talking about and you will learn something.

I have been to a lot of meetings in Stuart, for the South Atlantic and the Gulf Council, and I always have learned a great deal when I go to those, and so I appreciate that opportunity.

Having said, that, that was my main point, to just consider the recreational fishermen, who is not scientific, and give us something that we can understand upfront, before we try to read through the document. That would go a long way to getting more attendance.

Secondly, I am always curious, because I was a member of the MREP. I participated and graduated from the MREP program, and that was a great education, and I am always nonplussed when I see this barotrauma come up, time and again, and what we learned at MREP was that the Seaqualizer was clearly, through the data that NOAA has done, is the absolutely best release methodology to be used, and so I don't know why it keeps coming up.

I have two on my boat, and our club, when we sponsor a grouper tournament, each charter captain, or each captain that's in the tournament, is required to have a Seaqualizer onboard, and so it's kind of a no-brainer to me.

 As far as the red snapper goes, I know it's Roy Crabtree's favorite topic, but, in any event, there has been -- All the data points that I saw at MREP were really Tampa and north, and, right out here, and, on Monday, I did a charter believe it or not, in that weather, and we limited out on red snapper in 132

feet, big ones, and so they're here, and I would like to see the council consider redeploying some of the long-standing test sites or evaluation sites and relocate them down to this neck of the woods, so you get an idea of what we really have down here for red snapper populations.

There is a lot of red snapper out here, and so I think that's been discounted, and so, again, I think it's been underestimated, when you look at the total population, from the top of the state to the bottom of the State of Florida.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Young, I am going to have to ask you to wrap it up, please, sir.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. I was going to speak about amberjack, but I think enough has been said, or comments have been made, and I am done.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Don't leave, because I think we have a couple of questions for you. Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Captain. My question for you was, on the red snapper that you're seeing an abundance of, is that in state waters, or is that out past nine miles?

MR. YOUNG: We have to run -- That run was seventy-two miles west.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Then Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I would like to hear what you have to say about amberjack.

MR. YOUNG: Again, I am not sure of where all the data points are coming from. Again, I look back to what I learned at MREP, and most of the test sites and data points were coming from the northern Gulf and central Gulf and not down here in the southern Gulf, and our demographic is very different than all of those others, and we have an abundance of amberjack.

I am also a spear fisherman, and so I dive these various wreck sites, and you can't -- The numbers are stunningly high, and big fish, wherever you go. Wherever you dive, they're there. You can't fish a wreck without getting hooked up to an amberjack on a yellowtail or a mangrove snapper, or a barracuda will get it first, but the amberjack are incredibly prolific here, and in great numbers, and so everyone that I have talked to at our club is nonplussed by the fact that -- Why did they shut it off

already?

Then the last comment that I would make is that our club is very strongly in support of doing something with the goliath grouper, because this area, right where we live here, is the mecca for goliath grouper, and they are a nuisance fish, and people are starting to take it into their own hands, I am told.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha and then Dr. Crabtree.

MS. GUYAS: Thanks for being here, Sam. So, to follow up on John's question about amberjack, we're considering potentially tweaking the recreational closed season, and some of the options would include potentially opening in the spring and then running it until the quota is gone, or waiting to open until August, and what do you think people in your club and folks down here would like to see, in terms of when amberjack would open? When would it need to be open for you all?

MR. YOUNG: We can catch them pretty much year-long around here. As I said, they're at every wreck site or every big ledge that I fish or dive or -- My other compatriots have found the same thing. You can't fish a place without getting into amberjack, and so I'm not sure why we -- I wouldn't mind -- I think the limit now is two per person in federal waters, or is it one? Is it one? I don't know why that couldn't go on year-round, based on the numbers that we see of amberjack, but, if you want an answer to would spring be better, yes, probably spring.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: This will be quick. If we got far enough along to having to consider ways to stretch a season, it would helpful if there is some talk amongst your group as to lowering, maybe, a bag limit or maybe even a vessel limit or something. Again, if it comes down to looking at a premature closure or perhaps extending this somehow, and that would be helpful for me to hear.

 MR. YOUNG: I think there's a number of things that you could look at, in terms of bag limits and whatnot, if you've got a group, whether you're recreational or on a charter. They would like to keep one fish that they can bring up and take home. That's what they pay for to do, and we bring up them up and they say, what, you have to throw that back? Sadly, I have to say, yes, it's got to go back, and so, in any event, bag limits, I think, we need to consider, for a number of different species maybe.

1 2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir, and we appreciate the amberjack feedback, because we are going to take final action on that at our next meeting, more than likely.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Next, we have Mr. Ryan Bradley.

MR. RYAN BRADLEY: Thank you, council, for allowing me to be the last one to speak today. I appreciate it. I know you all are ready to get out of here, and so don't ask too many questions. No, you can.

My name is Ryan Bradley, and I'm the Director of the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United, Incorporated. I am also a fifth-generation commercial fisherman, and I'm here today to talk about the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Management Plan and the current individual fishing quota programs.

Currently, Mississippi has the least amount of individuals or entities with reef fish permits or individual fishing quotas. Further, essentially, Mississippi has landed zero pounds of commercial red snapper in recent years. This is a big problem for us in Mississippi. We're missing out on a lot of economic opportunities.

To rectify this problem, we have initiated some grassroots efforts to pursue opportunities to create a permit/quota bank to assist underserved communities, such as those fishermen in Mississippi, to gain access to the fishery, if they agree to predefined sustainable fishing practices. If we could get some further input from some of you all on that, maybe that could help us out some.

Further, we applaud the council's steps to consider cyclical redistribution in the commercial IFQ fishery yesterday. Currently, all of the organization's constituency favors cyclical redistribution, because this management method gives new entrants a viable avenue towards IFQ share ownership for those fishermen who are landing the fish.

However, after speaking with the current shareholders, there are some unintended consequences that may arise. Therefore, to be effective, cyclical redistribution must be coupled with a quota set-aside for new entrants to access. Magnuson-Stevens allows for this. This can be done in a couple of ways.

 An initial allocation bank operated by NMFS for new entrants to access is one way. A state-water commercial season is another way. If you say that is not possible, Mississippi had a state-water red snapper season in 2011 and 2012. Fishermen were able to harvest a 200-pound daily bag limit. These are avenues for these fishermen to get historical landings.

This set-aside and quota could be deducted from any potential increase in the TAC, as to not take away from the current shareholders. The current generation of fishermen must be able to utilize landing history, much in the same way the initial shareholders received their percentage of shares. My question to the council and to the initial IFQ shareholders is this. If initial shareholders had the opportunity to utilize historic landings to obtain shares, should new entrants not have that same opportunity?

Currently, new entrants are already having to pay a hefty price to access the fishing privileges that the initial shareholders never had to pay. Under the current system, the initial shareholders retained their shares indefinitely, regardless of participation. This is a real problem and not just a perceived one.

Last, I would like to give a quick summary on a fishing report and what we're seeing in Mississippi. The red snapper biomass south of Mississippi waters is essentially untapped. We are also seeing good numbers of large cobia year-round. I know there's a lot of talk about these fish migrate annually. However, we're not seeing that. We're seeing big fish hanging around the same spots all year-long.

We're also seeing more red grouper coming our way, which is historically unheard of. We never would see a red grouper. They're starting to show up around our area. We're also seeing mangrove snapper move in closer than we ever have before. I mean, they're catching mangrove snapper off the beach, pretty much, and one species we're not seeing a whole lot of is amberjack. We have seen a pretty sharp decline in the amberjack biomass around our area, south of the Mississippi.

Lastly, our inshore shrimp season opened today. I talked to a few fishermen, and there's pretty good reports of modest catches. However, the number of vessels participating in the opening day is at an all-time low, and I bring this up, Dr. Crabtree, because I wonder how much lower can our active shrimp industry vessels go, especially if you implement another TED rule that's going to put fishermen out of business. With that,

I don't have much more to say. I have a little something that I would like to mention about the loan program.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Bradley, I am sorry. We've got a question from Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I would like to hear what he's got to say about the loan program, and so I would ask you a question, because it was brought up by several other people, and I would just like to see if you all are similar to other folks or not.

MR. BRADLEY: For the loan program, if you want to make people richer, implement a loan program. I talked with our fishermen about it, and money is not the problem. We've got money to invest in this fishery. It's largely not profitable, is why they're not trying to get in it right now. If some minor modifications were made, plenty of capital would flow into the fishery.

A loan program, in my opinion, would drive up share prices, and it would drive up the cost to fish, and it would impact the markets and the restaurants. I don't think the lack of capital is the reason why people aren't lining up to buy these shares. That's my opinion.

I am trying to think. Over the loan program, we favor a setaside in quota for new entrants to access or state seasons for new entrants to earn their way into the fishery, much like you hear a lot of these guys say that they earned this. Well, I will tell you what. Let our guys go out and get a little allocation and let them fish and let them earn their way into the fishery.

A loan program, you're going to put people into slavery. You're going to put them into a position where they may not be able to pay that loan back, and people are going to get heavily invested in it, and ten years may go by, and they can't pay their notes and they're going to lose everything, and they might have not should have been in that in the first place if they had to get a loan, and that's all I have on the loan program.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate it.

MR. BRADLEY: All right. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. That wraps up public testimony for the day, and we are ahead of schedule. Aren't you all so excited that I may work you a little later? We have just a

couple of agenda items that we did not make it to before public testimony, and so I hate to tell you this, but let's take a quick bathroom break, and then we're going to come back and do a little more work, and so I'll see you back in about fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

PRESENTATION ON CORAL REEF CONSERVATION PROGRAM REPORT

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The first thing that we're going to continue on with, under our schedule today that we were not able to complete before lunch, is our Coral Reef Conservation Program Report, and I believe John is ready to give us that.

DR. FROESCHKE: I am ready. I just wanted to give the council a brief update. As you may or may not be aware, we have received support for the Coral Reef Conservation Program since -- This is our sixth year, and so we've had a number of ongoing efforts relating to coral and improving data and things like that, and so I'm just going to give you an update on some of the things that we've done. We're currently finishing up a three-year grant cycle.

This current cycle, we sort of had three themes, which I have highlighted in the blue boxes, and some of this -- The first one was this information about coral ecosystems, and we've developed the portal, the gulfcouncil.org website. If you haven't had a chance to look at that, I encourage you do that.

We have tried to provide a source for coral spatial data, habitat-related information, to provide to our stakeholders and interested users, in what we hope to be a useful format, and we've developed other products and things as well.

A second objective of this is enhancing stakeholder engagement. It's kind of a catchall term, but we've tried to do is provide some content about the importance of corals from the management and fishery perspectives and other things related to tropical habitats in what we've called learning modules, and I have a slide about those.

We have developed a few different ones, and we're still in development, and the idea was an eye-catching kind of useful format that someone would be engaged enough to click through and learn about something relevant to what we do at the council.

Then this third tier, this coral management, what we're doing

here is intended to complement the activities in Coral Amendment 9 and just to provide a different way to look at the pros and cons of different ways to identify critical habitat or HAPCs, and so we have some things, and that's really what we're working on now, and so this is just a quick screenshot of the portal page, and the different thumbnails down there are just some of the applications.

We have the Coral HAPC Viewer and lobster viewers and some of the learning modules down there on the left, and so, if you ever have a chance to scroll through those and give us feedback, we would love to hear it.

This is just a summary of one of the coral reef learning modules. It's a web-based thing, and it tends to have text on one side and pictures and interactive graphics and things, and so try to make them user-friendly and short. Someone could look through them in two or three minutes and hopefully learn something.

A second theme is we have a couple of mapping applications. We have called them "enhancing stakeholder engagement". Those are the buzzwords in the grant. This top one, you may have seen it before, but it's an interactive web map viewer to complement some of the decision-making in the coral amendment.

As you all have narrowed down the areas you wanted to focus on, we have tried to provide those in such a way that interested people could download the data or kind of look at the areas on their own terms and gather some of that information, and so there is tabs in the data and some other things in there.

This bottom one here is the spiny lobster closed areas. As you remember, in Spiny Lobster Amendment 11, we introduced sixty closed areas, I think, and they're small, in the Keys. People tend not to know where they are, because they are not marked and things, and so we developed a mapping application, where people could kind of go look through there, and they can look at the coordinates and things and see where they might fish relative to those, and it's really just something simple to provide some information to people if they're interested.

 In terms of feedback, just a quick graphic here. This map on the top right just shows you the blue areas, and the darker blue shows you where people visit our website from. What you can see is that we have a fairly broad reach, and so people well outside of the Gulf come and visit our site for various reasons, and so we do make an impact. We always think of ourselves as Gulffocused, but we do have an impact throughout the nation, and so it's always good to remember that.

In terms of the evaluation of the corals and the HAPCs, again, I am interested in -- We're doing some modeling things to try to complement the analyses in the document, and, really, this is to facilitate understanding of what is being done and to provide some supplementary information about this.

Just a bit of history here. If you recall, the coral HAPC process began as part of a workshop that was sponsored through our previous coral grant, and so, again, this started at the 2013 CRCP workshop, in which we convened a group of experts, and they provided feedback on a number of areas that they thought might be suitable for some additional management, and so it set of this sort of cascade of checkmarks of meetings and gathering experts and things like that, and this square on the bottom screen here is the management strategy evaluation, and that's what I mentioned here, and I will describe it more just briefly.

If you're not familiar with the term, "management strategy evaluation" can be used sort of however you like, but, in this context, we're using a modeling approach to evaluate closed areas and different ways that you might select areas for spacebased management, depending on your priorities and your objectives.

Again, it's not to usurp what's being done at the council, but it does provide a way where you specify your objectives and you specify things that are meaningful and you can see what the result might be.

The way these models work, and I won't get too far into the weeds. If you're interested, I'm happy to talk more about it, but we're just sort of learning this, but it's a spatial-based approach in which you have some data and you develop it on a grid, and the data that we primarily are considering at this point is the fishing, the ELB and the reef fish data, and we know where people fish, and the objective is try to minimally disrupt these activities while providing some additional protections.

We know where the coral habitat is, and the management decisions are just how much area you might want to conserve or specify for some additional protection, and then this level of fragmentation, and what that means is that you could have, in terms of management areas, you could have one really big area or you could have many small areas, and so, as you increase the

level of fragmentation, it would be a smaller area, and so there might be various reasons you might want to do either of those, and this provides a method to explore that option.

Just in terms of the inputs, as you are all aware, we have, in terms of the fisheries, we have the reef fish VMS data, and we have the ELB, shrimp ELB, and this is broad-brush and not any specific user or anything like that. We aggregate it in these green grids, and there is a graphic on the right, where the areas in red are areas of a lot more intense effort. The areas in green are much less effort, and so the idea, from this perspective, is putting closed areas in the green area would be less disruptive.

Depending on how you wanted to optimize this, if you wanted to weight one fleet more than another or not weight it at all or something, this provides a way to examine the sensitivity of your inputs to the outputs, and the outputs would be theoretical areas that you could designate as HAPC or something else.

The other input to this are these maps of habitat suitability. I know you've all had different conversations about models and observations and things, and, in this case, we have used some modeled inputs of potential habitat suitability, using sort of this standard methodology, and we have put these in here at a ten-by-ten grid size, and what you end up with is you get layers, GIS layers, if you will, and you can stack these on as inputs into the model.

 I don't really have any results, if you will. We are still working on this. We're learning as we go, but hopefully, in the next couple of months, we'll have some ideas and things and we can provide some more context in this, but this is what we're working on now. Again, if you have more questions, we're happy to talk to you about it.

One other feature of this portal that we've talked some about is the idea of self-reported angler data, and we do have one of our learning modules that we developed was on goliath grouper and talking about the biology and ecological benefits and perhaps consequences of these animals and their recovery.

We have some maps, and we worked with FWC, where you can look at their scientific information regarding the distribution of goliath grouper, and we also developed a tool which anglers could report an observation or an interaction or something, which we can store that in the database and provide to whoever would want it, and so the idea that we can work with FWC and

other agencies that are collecting these data to make sure we have a compatible database.

This screen on the right is just sort of the form, if you will, and it just lives in a web-based map, and so you could either go to the site, and it's on our portal, and just click a spot and populate most of the information, and you can provide as much or as little as you wanted, and then it just lives in a database that we have.

We have had it only a few months. We haven't marketed it much, but it's something that we're interested in developing. It's a very scalable concept. It's lightweight, but it would be easy to add or subtract fields, data, species, whatever you have in mind.

This next slide is a similar approach. As I think we mentioned earlier, we are developing a lionfish learning module, and we intend to make this available, as far as reporting and things, as well, and so we hope to have that up and going in the next month or two.

The next steps are the grant cycle ends on September 30, and we have been told that we've preliminarily been selected for additional funding in continuing years, and so we intend to continue developing the portal and the products that go there. We're going to finish these learning modules and some of these management strategy evaluation tools in this one. Then we have some new stuff that we can hopefully tell you more about once we get word on the final funding in 2017. I will take any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. That was very interesting. Did we have any questions or discussion from the group? Yes, Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: John, are any of the self-reported data -- Are those data reported by anglers or divers or whatever, for the lionfish and the goliath -- Are those data available for review via an interactive map, once the location is identified, or are you kind of keeping those close to the vest?

DR. FROESCHKE: We haven't got a lot of traffic, because we haven't marketed it. I don't have them up there now. If that was something that we wanted, I can definitely do that. There is no technical limitations on doing that. The good thing about the platform that I've developed these in is that it's -- You can do what you want, and so, if that's something that you think

would be of use, we can certainly do it.

MR. GREENE: Thank you. Is there further questions? Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I just want to make a comment. I did go to the site and use it to help me when I was going through the coral document, that Coral Amendment 9 that Morgan has been working on, and, anyway, I am impressed with the amount of work.

I know this is a tremendous amount of work, and so please tell your staff, Brian, and I think Claire might be helping with this, and thank you, John, for all of your hard work. I think continuing to put some effort into this is a good thing, and so your hard work and good work doesn't go unnoticed. Thank you, sir.

DR. FROESCHKE: Thanks for the feedback.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and I can see where we can scale it to use it for a lot of different purposes, and so I am pretty interested in it. Thank you. Any other feedback from the group on this? Thank you, sir.

We do have a little bit of time left, and we probably have some decent things to tackle still tomorrow, and so we're going to keep plugging along, guys. I think we've got at least one item under Other Business. Let's see if we can knock that out first. We'll get the low-hanging fruit, and, if we have time, we may jump back into that SEDAR Report. We'll get into the SEDAR Report and see if we can't hammer out what we need to figure out there with those assessments, and so, Dr. Crabtree, you had an item under Other Business regarding lionfish and EFPs.

OTHER BUSINESS LIONFISH DISCUSSION

 DR. CRABTREE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Our office currently has four requests in hand for either letters of authorization or exempted fishing permits to test the effectiveness of new trap designs for lionfish removals, and none of them is complete enough yet that we're going to review them at this meeting, but you did hear Bill Kelly speak some about one of the projects that he's working on. Some of the work is specific to the Gulf of Mexico, and some of it would occur in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic regions.

We previously have issued a letter of authorization for work that's being done by the National Ocean Service off of

Pensacola, and they have been working to test the effectiveness of a FAD, fishing attracting device, based non-containment curtain trap, they call it, and we're currently reviewing a request to review that authorization.

We have also issued and renewed an exempted fishing permit for work that's being done by other researchers off of North Carolina, and they're looking at testing the effectiveness of Maine lobster traps in harvesting lionfish on artificial reefs and hard-bottom areas and to assess the regional market conditions for the species.

Last year, you reviewed and recommended that we approve the proposal that Bill Kelly spoke of, and this is from the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's Association, for an exempted fishing permit that would expand some of what they're doing using modified spiny lobster and black sea bass traps, and we're still working with Bill on that project. Other applications we have at hand would also test modified spiny lobster trap designs, the NOS FAD-based design, and some kind of modification combination of the two.

Now, the Fisheries Service and the region strongly supports efforts to come up with gear that could be used to develop commercial-scale fisheries for lionfish. I don't think lionfish are ever going away, but, I think if we can develop a commercial fishery for them, we can potentially keep the populations at lower levels.

I also think, if we can increase fishing opportunities for fishermen and they can make money off of fishing for lionfish and we can provide seafood, that's all a good thing, but these applications that we have are proposing to deploy a fairly substantial number of lionfish traps, and I think we need to be careful about evaluating the impacts of that research.

We need to look at bycatch of other species in that, and we need to look at the impact of these traps on protected resources, like corals and right whales and those kinds of things, and so, because there are a lot of commonalities in the objectives and the activities that all of these applications are proposing, we are currently looking at a way that we might be able to help organize the work under a programmatic exempted fishing permit and the associated environmental review documents, so that the various applicants can do their work to support a broad scientific survey on them, and I wanted to get your thoughts to that approach and input on any concerns you might have or things you might like to see as we do this kind of work.

Then the other thing is we have a blanket ban on fish traps in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and most of these types of traps that are being developed meet the definition of fish traps. It's a very broad definition.

What we're envisioning, ultimately, is coming up with something similar to the bycatch reduction device protocol, the BRD protocol that we have, where fishermen can test a bycatch reduction device, and, if it meets the criteria laid out in the protocol, it gets certified as a useable BRD and they can install it in shrimp trawls and use it to reduce bycatch.

I would like to get to some type of lionfish trap protocol, where fishermen can do the work on a type of trap and then, if it meets the criteria we set, in terms of minimal levels of bycatch and those kinds of things, it would then be exempted from the fish trap prohibitions in the Gulf and South Atlantic, but I think there are going to be questions about, even if we can come up with some types of traps that work, how many of these do we really want to put out and those types of things?

I wanted to lay out these thoughts to you at this meeting, and I'm going to do the same thing next week with the South Atlantic Council, because, if we did get to setting up some sort of protocol and exemption from the fish trap review, we would probably have to do some type of amendment to our management plans to do that, but it does seem, to me, that we need to think about some strategy of how we want to go about it.

I don't really want to end up with fifty exempted fishing permits for a whole lot of disconnected and unrelated projects, and I do think, to get to a real commercial fishery that is focusing on lionfish, they need to be operating under the regular rules of the road and not under exempted fishing permits, because, for the market to develop, it's going to need to have some consistency in the regulations, and so I would be interested in hearing your thoughts about these kinds of things.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thanks for bringing this up, Roy, to the council. Alabama has received a request from an entity, and they said they have submitted an EFP request to you, and I believe to Florida, but we are concerned. We have similar concerns as you relative to effects or impacts to protected resources, debris effects.

 I mean, some of these things are very light. They don't have any markings, at least the ones that were proposed to us. They just kind of put something down on the bottom and mark it with a GPS. Then, a day or two later, they come back and what happens if a storm comes, if they're not able to come out and a storm comes?

They were talking about potentially, on the South Atlantic too, including the Gulf, 20,000 of these diver-deployed traps and retrieved traps, and I certainly believe there is potential for our market in our area and the Pensacola area and Orange Beach. There is quite a few spear fishermen that go after them, and some have even bought some state licenses to go out and conduct that activity that have never been commercial fishermen.

There is potential there, and there is a need, and so I agree that there probably needs to be some sort of overarching structure or something that we can get to that will not only help federal waters, but potentially it could be used for state applications, too.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: How big are these fish?

MR. ANSON: They can get up to twenty-plus inches, but, generally, they're about a foot now, but they can get bigger.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you. It's an interesting proposition, creating a commercial fishery for an invasive species. I am sitting here thinking, well, if you want to incorporate them into the management plan, how do you do that?

 DR. CRABTREE: Well, I don't think it's appropriate to incorporate them into the management plan, because the Magnuson Act is designed to protect and conserve resources, and what I want to see happen with lionfish is I want to overfish them as bad as we can, and it seems to me that's something we have learned how to do over the years, and so I don't think we want to have a conservation plan from lionfish, but what we do need to do is make sure that the gears being used are consistent with our fishing regulations and that they're not having undue impacts on the resources we are trying to protect and conserve.

To some extent, if we can reduce the lionfish populations, I think that's good for the resources we're protecting, but it's

just we need to balance the benefits of reducing lionfish populations with the potential downside of some of the habitat impacts and other types of impacts that having the traps out there might create.

DR. FRAZER: I agree with all of that. We obviously want to get rid of them as soon as we can. The issue is sometimes you think about these unintended consequences. When you create a fishery and some type of a financial dependence, then you don't know necessarily where that's going to go, and so I just would be real careful there.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I appreciate that. It's just I'm not sure where -- I think the only way to generate the levels of effort that would be needed to make a big difference in their population would be if people can profit from them, because I don't see where the government funding sources are going to be sufficient to support that effort without some sort of market driving it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

22 23

MS. GUYAS: Thanks. The commercial fishery is happening now, in state waters in Florida, and federal. There are people that are spearfishing for them, and that's what they do. That is their income. There is also some that people are taking as bycatch in lobster traps, and, like what Kevin said, we're getting these requests as well, and it seems like it makes sense to coordinate and really look at them from a holistic viewpoint and make sure that when we're -- I guess come up with some kind of standards when we're looking at these, making sure we're not impacting habitat and all of that and that we have acceptable levels of bycatch, or no bycatch or whatever, but I think what you have outlined seems to sound okay.

DR. CRABTREE: Martha is right on that the market is happening. I am told they're getting six-dollars a pound for these in the Keys, and so --

DR. FRAZER: It's fifteen in New York.

42 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer, and then Mr. Anson.

DR. FRAZER: What are you seeing in the Caribbean? They have a similar problem, and are there people trying to do fish traps there for them?

DR. CRABTREE: They do. The Caribbean is a little different,

because fish traps aren't prohibited in the Caribbean. That's one of their gears that they use, and so, from a regulatory perspective, it's somewhat different down there, but they have the same problems. They have a growing and abundant lionfish population. They are harvesting them, and they're getting them, but I plan to -- The next Caribbean Council meeting will be in August, and we're going to have this same conversation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: One more follow-up and then Mr. Anson.

DR. FRAZER: Because they're not -- They're a legal gear in the Caribbean, and there's a lot to learn from the people that have different gear designs, and I am just thinking if there is an opportunity, perhaps, to put on some type of a workshop or something to kind of gather all the information. You've got five-million people trying to build traps, and we can learn from one another.

DR. CRABTREE: We can certainly look into doing that, and I'm not sure that the traps that they're using for fish traps down there are all that effective at getting lionfish. There is a lot of spear fishery for it down there. The trouble with the spear fishery though is you are limited in the depths you can go to, and lionfish occur well beyond the limits of divers to effectively harvest them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Roy, what were you envisioning? I mean, Martha said that the state -- I suggested that we ought to probably cooperate, but do you want to develop a document within the council process or do you want to do it independent through your office and just come back to the council when you get everything finalized?

DR. CRABTREE: Like I said, we're looking at some type of programmatic exempted fishing permit, and, to do that, we would have to do a NEPA document of some sort, and so that could become the basis for it, and we could certainly keep the council in the loop on it as we develop it. We're really just in the formative stages of trying to figure out how we would do this and what we might do, but we'll certainly keep you involved in the process as we figure this out.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Just from an informational purpose, from a western Gulf perspective, at least further in the western Gulf, they're

certainly there, but we don't see them anywhere near like what you see in Florida.

The Flower Gardens, a natural coral reef there, certainly has their fair share of them, and they seem, for whatever reason, to like the natural bottom just a slight bit better, but they're available, and you see a pair or so, and so I don't know that — In our region, the fishery probably wouldn't be realistic, and I hope that stays to be the case.

Each year, we tend to think this is going to be the year of the lionfish and we're going to see that explosion, but, since 2011 when we first saw them, we never have seen them really get a foothold, and so maybe that's sort of part of their range. I don't know, but we don't see a whole lot of them, fortunately.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. This may be somewhat off the subject, but I was diving -- I lived in Africa for a number of years, and, thirty years ago, lionfish were everywhere in east Africa. They covey up to anything, any little anomaly on the bottom. If it's something like a rock that you can pick it up, you can pick it up and they will just stay right there and move around with you.

My wife and I also dive in the Caribbean, and not in U.S. waters, and they've got some pretty cool programs. One of the places that we dive, if you're interested, you go in the water with a local authorized person with a sling, and you have to prove that you can shoot three coconuts floating in the coral without damaging the coral. If you do, you get a license all week, and you can kill all the lionfish you want, and they take them. I'm sure they eat them. They take them.

I think the point of that is that other people have found creative ways to deal with this, and I agree completely with Roy. These things are far beyond the limits of sport diving. Maybe not for Jason Delacruz, but, again, the point I wanted to make is these darned things are not afraid of anything.

I have no idea what eats them. I have never seen another fish take one in east Africa, but, at any regard, that's enough. I don't want to get on a sidetrack, but we're not the only people facing this. It's going to take creative measures to do anything, if it's possible. I mean, you guys are biologists. If this even possible? These things are at 2,000 feet.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Well, we see these things a good bit off the northern Gulf coast, up in Alabama, and these fish will get on artificial structures. When you pull up on a spot, it looks more like a fuzz on the bottom, as opposed to a tradition spot with fish up in the water.

If the lionfish are removed off the spot, within a couple of weeks, you can go back to that spot, and there will be fish back up in the water, and so there is a huge impact that these lionfish are having, and it may be part of the reason that you see some of these fish spreading out or some of these fish — Finding red snapper ranging into different areas, and there may be a whole host of reasons, and who knows what the answer is.

Roy, I am going to support what you're trying to do, and I would be glad to help you, but my question is going to be for Mr. Constant down at the end of the table. You and I have talked about lionfish in the past. Do you guys have anything on you all's radar screen? Is there anything that you can offer help or advice or warnings or anything you can offer us?

MR. CONSTANT: Certainly we do have them on our radar, and I think the same kind of discussions have taken place in the Department of Interior with not only lionfish, but Asian carp and other species, where eradication is not a realistic option into the future.

I think one thing that we've done, I think through the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and the Invasive Species Program, is modified or had the national invasive species plan, and I don't recall the exact title, but there is a task force that has developed a lionfish plan, and so we propose that that be, part of it at least, funded with some of this Gulf restoration money, and I think the commission actually voted to support that.

The other thing is I think we've had discussions about a little bit longer-term forecast in the prospect of developing things like commercial fisheries or to manage invasive species, and, while I guess, Roy, it would be an interesting question to kind of dig into, if it evolves to the point where it's a viable control, and not an eradication, and there is a dependency in the commercial sense in the fishery, whether or not long-term that's a sustainable measure, in trying to avoid -- Without a fisheries management plan.

 If you don't manage the availability of lionfish, will it eventually be that the fishermen run out of fish or that the market dries up?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I don't know. I mean, if I could exterminate them entirely right now, I would, but I don't know how to do that, and so I don't know what, fifty to a hundred years from now, people's view of lionfish will become, but I think, right now, to the extent that we can -- If we can do it with avoiding habitat impacts and all the other downsides, I would say fish them down as far as we can fish them down.

MR. CONSTANT: I agree, and so, to your point, I think we're interested in evaluating what the sweet spot is, and I think this plan that the commission has supported is maybe a viable way to get to partner, at least, in the effort to kind of advance this idea of either exempted fisheries and market development.

MR. GREENE: Thank you.

AD HOC RED SNAPPER IFQ AP DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Was there any other comments that anybody wanted to make? Okay. Good discussion. I did have one thing for Other Business, and we'll go through it real quick. It was kind of based on a lot of the feedback that I heard in public comment, and I am wondering if the council would be interested in creating an ad hoc AP that is specific to the IFQ program and try and garner some feedback from people that, number one, that are involved in it every day, that operate in it, so that we can have a good handle on what some of these unintended consequences are.

We could have some people on there that are new entrants and not the people that got original shares, original shares in the distribution. We want some of those too, but, in other words, have a good range of people on there and then have some people that maybe are commercial fishermen that want to become the next generation IFO holder.

 I feel like we -- Even myself, and obviously I don't operate in the IFQ, but I am from the commercial fishery, and I threw out an idea that I thought, okay, surely this one would be an easy one, to get rid of the middle man, and we punched holes in it around the table enough that I was not interested in it. Then, when I walked to the back of the room on our next break, they were like, oh, yeah, and you didn't think about this and this.

I said, oh, gosh, that would be terrible.

I really think that we need to get that feedback. I think that I am getting some of it from all three of those different angles, as I walk around the room during breaks, but I think we probably need that in a more formal sense, to make sure that we're getting all the information that we need that can help feed into some of this decision-making.

I was asking Doug, and he said that when that first five-year review came out that we did form a -- Right before it, maybe, or maybe it was involved in the review, but, anyway, we did form an ad hoc red snapper IFQ to give some feedback on that, for that review process, but we are looking now at both red snapper and grouper tilefish, and I think we probably need to make sure, especially based on some of the comments that we had during public testimony, that we're going to get good coverage from both of those groups.

It overlaps in some ways, but it sounds like some of that grouper tilefish is a little bit concentrated, as far as your specialty and your area that you fish out of, and so I think it's going to probably be important that we get good representation there from both of those IFQ systems, but is that something that the council would be interested in doing, in forming an ad hoc, to make sure that we get some good input as we move forward with that amendment, or no? That is my question to you all. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I will start. Based on some of the things we heard, from the grouper folks in particular, I kind of feel like maybe this is a question that would be better to answer after we have the grouper five-year review, because what I heard basically was grouper is a whole other animal, well grouper and tilefish, really, than red snapper, and, if they want completely different things or there are completely different issues in that IFQ program, maybe we would want to consider that and pursue a separate path, but it's difficult for me to say how to handle that now without kind of seeing the review. I kind of wanted the big-picture of what's happening.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: That's kind of what I heard from Bob Spaeth, was they're two different species and maybe they have two different areas, too.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

1 2

MR. ANSON: I don't necessarily have a problem with forming an AP or something to give some feedback. I think maybe though, if we gave it our best attempt to identify options or, as we're going through this document right now, is that we ought to try to get more specific, if we feel it's necessary, more specific items in the document that we could then give to them and say here is what the council is generally thinking, rather than them kind of coming up with things, in case they don't come up with things that the council is interested in getting feedback on, and so I think we need to make sure that that document is pretty all-encompassing of those ideas or concepts that we're thinking of implementing for them to review and comment on.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think you and I are the same page there, because what I was thinking, from a timeframe, is, well, if the council decided this was a good idea, we could start to try and advertise for it.

We would do that preliminary review in August, and then we would have that secondary review in October, which means this group really probably wouldn't even meet and give us feedback until next year, and I guess that's why I was throwing it out now, because I figured, by that point, we're probably going to need some feedback, but that was my idea.

I just didn't know if anybody else was interested. I just felt like it gets so complicated so fast, and I would really want some input from people on the ground. Like Kevin said, as we get farther along and we're starting to hone in on some things and make sure that we are aware of all the consequences and okay with that, and we may be okay with the consequences, and that's fine, but I just want to make sure that we're aware of all of them. Yes, sir, Mr. Walker.

 MR. WALKER: Maybe I could get a chance to speak to some of the industry tonight and we can come back to Full Council and discuss it tomorrow, whether they would like to see them separated or see this. I had actually mentioned to Kevin one time that I would like to see the AP get back together and discuss this, the original red snapper AP, but a lot of those folks were around from the very beginning, and some of them were not. Some of them were small shareholders too during that, and some were large.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is anybody kind of all-out opposed to it, because I don't want to go down that path if there is anybody really opposed to it. Okay.

1 2

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We would need a motion to do something like this, because our normal procedure for dealing with ad hoc APs is to review them in January and determine if we still need to keep them and determine if any of them need to be advertised.

Then we would advertise them, along with the other APs that are being advertised at that time, but there is nothing to stop us from doing it at a different time, like now. I mean, it's doable, but I don't want to go through all of that unless there's a motion of the council that really tells us to do that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Right.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The idea of having separate ad hoc APs for each fishery versus having one -- I think, if we do one, if we try to combine, I would like to revisit the idea of categories, so that we know this person is a reef fish IFQ holder and this person is a grouper IFQ holder and this person has both, and, if you want other categories, like fish house operators or somebody that just leases stuff, instead of owning it, then we can try to pepper it with a more representative listing of stakeholders in those specific groups.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That's a good idea. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Doug kind of took most of what I wanted to say, and that is for us to try to get as diverse of a group as possible, representing all of those different areas that we talked about, and I guess that we could access most of those, at least, through the IFQ program, as far as those that are shareholders and those that acquire leased or have allocation and that type of stuff.

We can at least use that as a pool, to make sure that we contact those directly when the announcement goes out, and that, somehow or another, we put the feelers out, through outreach, for those that may not have leased, that are on the fence of thinking about getting in, actually new entrants into the fishery, to make sure we get at least a couple of those and get their perspective.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was just curious. I am looking at the population on the ad hoc red snapper IFQ, and I wonder how many of these people are in both fisheries. I mean,

Billy Archer and Jim Clements and Delacruz and Mike Eller and Buddy Guindon, and I wonder if maybe we could utilize this AP to do the same thing that you want to do.

3 4 5

6 7

8

9

10

2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, it could be possible, but I'm not -- I mean, I would have to look at it, but it sounds like, from what Mr. Anson was saying, that we would want to make sure -- I agree with you, Kevin, that we make sure that we have a good crosssection of people that maybe were initial shareholders, that are maybe newer shareholders, that are people that are leasing only, so that we get all perspectives.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

I agree. For expediency, Camp, I thought about, well, maybe we could just do a separate grouper-tilefish and leave that old red snapper one, but I said, if we want to make sure we really have the broad perspective, as we're honing in on this document that we're trying to incorporate, we may want to re-advertise and do that.

18 19 20

MR. MATENS: To that point, you may be right.

21 22

23

24

25

26

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Let's just think about it between now and Full Council. It was something that I wanted to throw out there, and you all can kind of chew on two ad hocs or one ad hoc, however you think is the best way to line it up, but I just thought I would throw -- It dawned on me during public testimony that that might be a good thing to form.

27 28 29

30

31

32

33

All right. It looks like it's now five o'clock. Surely that's probably what we were -- Well, we were scheduled until 5:30, but I'm not going to work you until 5:30 today, but I think we had a great day. Tomorrow morning, we do not start until 8:30, you will be excited to hear, and so we will recess until tomorrow morning at 8:30. Thanks, guys.

34 35 36

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on June 7, 2017.)

37 38

39 40

June 8, 2017

41 42

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

43 44

45 46

47

48

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Naples Grand Beach Resort, Naples, Florida, Thursday morning, June 8, 2017, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: This morning, we actually are going to lead off with the Gulf SEDAR Committee Report, if that is okay with the council. We will rearrange that schedule a little bit, just because we do have a little bit of business there that we want to take care of, and I think Mr. Rindone is available if we need him. He hasn't called in yet, but, if it looks like we need him, we can get him to call in for us, and so that's what we'll lead off with.

COMMITTEE REPORTS GULF SEDAR COMMITTEE REPORT

SEDAR Steering Committee Review, staff reviewed the proceedings from the May 5, 2017 SEDAR Steering Committee webinar. The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, FWC, notified the Steering Committee that the SEDAR 48 assessment of southeastern U.S. black grouper would not continue, due to issues with species identification and other issues, which would be outlined in a later report from the FWC.

The Steering Committee supported the recommendation of the Marine Recreational Information Program, MRIP, Transition Team to delay recalibration work until 2018, when more data will be available.

The proposed research track assessment method has suffered a setback, largely due to scheduling and deadlines for deliverables to SEDAR cooperators. At this time, stock assessments scheduled to be research track assessments are being relabeled as benchmark assessments until the research track method is clarified. Lastly, the scamp research track project will be delayed until 2019.

SEDAR Schedule, staff reviewed the SEDAR schedule with the committee. Gray triggerfish is set to be assessed in the first half of 2018. Staff recommended that the council request a terminal year of 2016 for the data going into the stock assessment, which would add three years of additional data, plus new sex-specific growth curves and an updated larval index.

 Due to the shuffling of workloads at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, as a result of the delayed work on the MRIP recalibration, the Gulf Council has been left with an available assessment slot for late 2018. Staff recommended consideration of cobia or red grouper.

 Council members noted a considerable amount of input received from stakeholders concerned about the health of the Gulf cobia stock. Further, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council is going to assess cobia in 2018 also.

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council will also be considering removing Atlantic cobia from the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP and turning management over to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, since approximately 85 percent or more of the Atlantic cobia landings come from state waters.

However, it was noted, after the council filled the 2018 assessment slot with cobia, that the same analyst is responsible for both gray triggerfish and cobia, which could create a staff availability issue and prevent both of those species from being assessed in the same year. Alternatively, fishermen have reported difficulty in finding red grouper for the last couple of years.

I am going to pause here, before I read that motion, because, as you remember in the committee, we made some motions to change the SEDAR schedule around, based on the information that we had received that we had an open slot, and we tried to look at our priorities, and we moved some things around. I think Dr. Ponwith has a little bit more information for us, before we get everything finalized, that she would like to give us an update on what the staff can handle and how that looks.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just as a preface, when we look at any schedule, we have to look at the schedule relative to the full list of SEDAR clients, because essentially our stock assessment scientists work with all of them, and so that's the South Atlantic, the Gulf, the Caribbean, and the HMS species, coastal species.

Then the other thing that we need to do is consult with three sort of specialty groups, essentially the biological sample people, the life history people who do the otolith reading and the fecundity, the data analysts, and the assessment analysts.

Essentially, what I was able to do is do some consulting yesterday, based on the input that you got, and what we see as a feasible schedule for 2018, with the number of hands we have available, is to do an assessment on red grouper in 2018 and to also add the gray triggerfish. In speaking with a select number of folks and consulting, it sounds like gray triggerfish has a much higher-intensity need right now, and so, essentially, put gray triggerfish on in 2018, but do that late in the year.

2 3

The reason for that is the analyst who does gray triggerfish is in the middle of gray snapper right now, and he essentially can't be leading two of these at once. That is more than we can handle. Then, when the calibration information comes in, to begin those MRIP lites also late in the year.

What that will cost is dropping vermilion. We can't do vermilion and red grouper in the same year without several years of advanced work, because those are very data rich and lots of otoliths that need to be cut and red and inter-calibrated with the other labs that are participating. What the schedule would look like then is red grouper, gray triggerfish, the MRIP lites, and with Florida conducting the hogfish assessment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Bonnie, on cobia, the South Atlantic is doing a cobia benchmark, and I guess that's going to be done out of Beaufort. Why couldn't that assessment just be expanded to include the Gulf as well, because I know we have a stock ID workshop, and it's not outside the realm of possibility that they would decide that it's all one stock to begin with and they would have to be tied together, and it does seem they are interrelated, because any change in the boundary is going to affect both stocks, and I would personally like to see Gulf and Atlantic cobia assessed in a similar manner with the same model, the same set of assumptions and all that.

DR. PONWITH: We can absolutely do cobia instead of gray triggerfish, and everything you said makes perfectly good sense. The catch is for the data people. If you have one assessment team do one full cobia assessment and basically capture all of the data, from Texas all the way around to the Mid-Atlantic, there really isn't that much of a change in how you set the model up, but it has a profound impact on the amount of data and data contributors that our data team has to work with.

Right now, they are the bottleneck on that, and so I agree with you. I think that's advisable. If we do the stock ID workshop and determine that cobia is extremely distinct in the Gulf of Mexico, there still may be rationale for setting the model up the exact same way, but a less strong push to do it all in one massive assessment, but, if the results of that stock ID comes back and says this is one homogeneous stock, then we are going to want to have the Gulf of Mexico data in there.

DR. CRABTREE: This is what I am struggling with, because I

don't believe that it will be acceptable to this council to delay gray triggerfish. I think that's going to have to happen. What are we going do though if we then get to the South Atlantic cobia assessment and they do decide it's one stock? Does that assessment then get hugely delayed? I think that's going to create problems on the east coast with it, and so I am trying to find some way that we can get gray triggerfish, but still get cobia done.

DR. PONWITH: I can talk to our data people, to find out -- The story on cobia is our age readers do not read most of the cobia tissues. That is done by other groups, and so we would have to find out sort of where we are on cobia and the availability of those partners who read the cobia, to make sure that those structures are caught up, and I can find out from our data people what the implications are and look at extreme measures, relying on the states to do the data preparation for the assessment or something like that.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, because I think where we are is it's going to be unacceptable for this council to delay gray triggerfish, and I'm pretty sure that next week it's going to be unacceptable for the South Atlantic Council to delay cobia, because both of them have become huge issues that are creating great problems for us, and so it would be really good if we could figure out some way to reconcile that.

 DR. PONWITH: The other thing is I would have to talk to the South Atlantic analyst who leads on cobia. In a situation where if we do it as one uniform stock, is that one lead analyst, who just ingests all the data exactly the same and runs -- If you're sitting on a mountain of data this big or sitting on a mountain of data that big, the model would run the same, but, if there are idiosyncrasies in the way the model needs to be run, we may be in a situation where we need two analysts.

The challenge there is the analyst who is doing gray snapper right now, and the data part of that has hit its peak intensity, and the analysis part of that is just really getting underway, and that person will be busy doing that assessment really now for the coming months, and, when the assessment is done, technically, it's really not done for the analyst, because we have to wrap up the report and we have to present to the SSC, present to the review committee and present to the SSC, and then essentially run projections for the council to be able to set ACLs from the ABCs, and so there's a lot of follow-up work that has to be done.

 That's the thing that keeps you from having that same person be in the middle of a second assessment, because it's pretty laborious, and so our challenge, again, is the gray snapper analyst is the person who is responsible for gray triggerfish and is the person who is responsible for cobia, and so it's a pretty giant traffic jam.

I can talk to our analysts and find out, if the stock ID says they're separate, then we can agree to use the same methodology on cobia in both regions, but they don't necessarily need to be done at exactly the same time. If stock ID says this is one homogenous stock, then the next question is do you have one lead analyst for that or does it require two and what are our alternatives, because right now, that's kind of the jam that I'm in. I mean, it's a jam.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I am going to recap and make sure that my notes are right, Bonnie. Gray snapper is ongoing at the beginning of 2018, and it's actually ongoing now, because it started in 2017, and it's going to finish up somewhere around spring of 2018.

Now, that person would be the lead analyst for a gray trigger and/or a cobia assessment that would be done, and so that's kind of a little bit of the bottleneck there, that they can't be in two places at once. They can't do trigger and cobia. Then the issue with the vermilion -- Our other option, if we didn't do cobia, was to do red grouper and bump it up on the schedule, but the issue there is that the lead analyst that does red grouper is also the lead analyst that does vermilion, and is that correct?

DR. PONWITH: There is no problem doing red grouper. We can do red grouper in 2018.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Can you do red grouper and vermilion snapper in 2018?

DR. PONWITH: No, and the problem with red grouper and vermilion is, number one, we won't be able to get all of those otoliths read in time to get started. Number two, that just makes the data preparation worse. Our data people -- That overloads the data people who are doing all the data prep for the assessment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Dr. Ponwith, I just find it troubling that it's a matter of availability of analysts in your shop. Do you have

vacancies there, and don't you have other folks that could competently take the lead on some of these? These surveys and such are very important to so many constituent groups, and, to have it all sitting on you guys and you don't have the proper bulk of folks to handle them, it's troubling.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, I agree, Dr. Dana. It is troubling. We did have an analyst who left exactly at the end of the year, which was just a handful of weeks before the freeze. Essentially, there was a freeze on hiring federal employees that lasted through into the spring, and that freeze was ultimately lifted, which creates the ability to make hiring decisions and initiate the hiring process, but, anytime you have a freeze, you create - The freeze stops you from hiring, but it doesn't stop people from leaving.

Essentially, you create this giant backlog of actions that then you have to work your way through the backlog of accumulated hiring actions, and so it creates a traffic jam in workforce management.

In addition, there are -- This spring, there were a lot of budget uncertainties, with the continuing resolution. Would the continuing resolution come back at FY16 levels or was it going to come in lower? All of those decisions are very important in making decisions that you know are going to be sustainable, in terms of how you backfill those positions.

We have a vacancy in our assessment team for the Gulf of Mexico, and, also, in that same timeframe, we had a very senior data person on our data team retire, and, again, that has a similar effect on the data preparation side, and so the retirements can happen quickly. The finding suitable talent to replace someone who is senior and tried and true -- It's asymmetrical. It takes longer to fill those positions than it takes them to be emptied.

 I share your concern. In terms of building a bench to be able to cross-train people would be a way to prevent a situation where you had one lead analyst who was an expert on a stock, and that certainly is ideal.

What that takes is building this cadre of people who have been through a stock assessment, trained up on how the process works within a council arena, and then, once they have gotten one or two assessments under their belt, then actually have them serve as an assist on other ones, so that, in the event that we do end up in a situation like this, there is more than one person with competence.

It takes time to get to that point. They have to -- When I fill that vacancy, I have to have them conduct an assessment in sort of journeyman status for one year and then bring them on as a lead. Only after they have been a lead are they in a situation where can start the cross-training.

MR. GREENE: To that point, Dr. Dana?

DR. DANA: Thank you, Mr. Greene. Given this situation, and given that, and I mean I appreciate the time it takes in order to advertise for positions and refill with competent folks into your offices, especially scientists. That is a whole different ballgame, and getting the people that are competent and can carry on some pretty complex investigation, and I wonder if -- I mean, gray triggerfish has to go forward. I mean, we should have been doing that a long time ago, and so that needs to move forward and not be delayed any longer.

On the cobia though, given that we're hearing so much public comment about that in the Gulf, I wonder if the states -- Our Gulf states have a pretty good understanding of the fishery, and they have some talented researchers, and I wonder if they can come up with some idea to get some of their researchers to work, and I don't know, but to work together to help fill that void, given that your office cannot handle it right now.

DR. PONWITH: We can certainly -- We are certainly going to have to rely on our partners on the age analysis, because my understanding is that the data holdings of those tissues reside largely with our partners, and the competence to process those really relies in some of our partners, and so we're going to have to rely on our partners pretty heavily to work those tissues up.

I will have to go back and discuss with the team what options exist for dealing with cobia, because Dr. Crabtree makes a really valid point. I mean, if the stock ID comes back and says this is a homogenous stock, then it really does become crucial to set that model up to do one massive assessment. I will have to talk with the team to find out whether that's a one analyst with several assists or a multiple-analysts approach.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Bonnie, a little -- I need some clarification, I guess, on the issue relative to red grouper and vermilion snapper. In one sense, it's not an

analyst problem, I think is what I heard you say. It's more of a data problem, and so you talked about the partners and such, and so I just want to get clarification.

Is it a data problem, from the perspective of processing otoliths, or is it a data problem with respect to processing otoliths and your capacity with staff, seeing that you had the retirement of that key person? Is it both or is it just the one?

I guess I don't know the timing of what these events are, and, like you said, retirements can happen fairly quickly, but these items are discussed at the Steering Committee level, as far as coming up with a list, and, at least in the short term, barring any unforeseen events, in the short term, the species -- There shouldn't be much doubt or concern about doing triggerfish this late in the process and still having it on the list placed in 2018.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, you've made it abundantly clear that gray triggerfish is a priority, and we are prepared to deal with gray triggerfish. The issue with vermilion is multiple challenges. Number one, there are a lot of otoliths for vermilion and for red grouper. To be able to do both of those this year, in addition to the other otolith preparations that we're working on, to be on track, is just not feasible.

The other thing is that, if we have gray triggerfish on the agenda and red grouper on the agenda, having vermilion on two overtaxes the data preparation for this, and so that's twofold. Then the third complication is that the people who are working on red snapper are the people who would be working on vermilion, and so it creates a jam there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Dr. Ponwith, I was kind of wondering, or maybe Dr. Crabtree, and we hear a lot about the analysis and some of the resources, and I've heard this before, but what would be the best path to attain more funding to help give the Science Center more resources?

DR. CRABTREE: The overall funding level for the agency is set by Congress. Now, there are allocation decisions made within the agency, but, overall, to increase funding, and I can tell you that every region has similar problems and feels they need more funding, that's in the hands of Congress.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory and then Mr. Greene.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I think a large part of this confusion is that, as of a month or so ago, we thought most of the 2017 and the beginning of 2018 was going to be taken up with the MRIP calibrations, and so, back in last October, we only had scheduled gray triggerfish and red grouper, according to the SEDAR Steering Committee Report, but, when we came to the council in January of this year, the council substituted vermilion snapper for red grouper, and it was supposed to be a vermilion snapper update.

The only thing we were expecting in 2018, as of our January meeting, was finishing gray snapper, doing the MRIP calibrations at the beginning of the year, the scamp research track, the king mackerel research track that's joint with Mexico, the gray triggerfish standard assessment, and the vermilion update.

At our Steering Committee meeting webinar, two or three weeks ago, or I guess a month ago now, we learned that the MRIP calibrations would not start until the end of 2018, and so that left some space for us to do some other assessments in the beginning of 2018, and so staff starting piling it on.

We had vermilion on there, because of the council's decision in January, and red grouper was already on the radar for a SEDAR, because of the meeting we had in October, but staff pushed cobia to be priority, because of anecdotal data they had heard from the fishery, and then I, being on the SEDAR Committee myself, had the same logic that Roy had.

If there's going to be a cobia assessment on the South Atlantic side and a stock ID, it makes sense for us to do one. At that time, we did not know about the conflict demands on the analyst, and so we brought this to the council at this meeting and pushed cobia in the beginning, and now we're just learning about the analyst conflicts.

There has been confusion, and it's not because -- It's because the situation has changed. We were given an opportunity to do more assessments, and we tried to slip more in there, and so, really, I guess the -- I don't know if Dr. Ponwith was thinking of vermilion as an update or a standard, and I don't know if that makes a difference in whether vermilion can be done or red grouper in 2018.

The red grouper was originally scheduled by this council for 2019, but we were calling it operational track at that time, as

opposed to a research track, and so that would probably have been a standard. I hope that clarifies a little bit of why we have this confusion right now.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Greene, I hope you can bring us to a head here.

MR. GREENE: I am going to bring us somewhere. I don't know how well it's going to work, but I'm going to throw it up there and see how it sticks, with the intention of showing where our council is with the intent of priority and understanding Dr. Crabtree's point about cobia.

I am going to make a motion here in just a second, but I have one question that I would like to get answered by I guess Dr. Crabtree. If the cobia is assessed in Beaufort, is that -- That is a different Science Center than Miami or -- You said something specifically to Beaufort, and I'm not sure that I understood what you meant.

DR. CRABTREE: It's all under the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, but many of the South Atlantic assessments are done by analysts at the Beaufort Lab, and the Gulf assessments are done by analysts, by and large, at the Miami Lab, but that breaks down with coastal migratory pelagics, because the Miami Lab has normally done the mackerel assessments, and I am not really -- I don't even know who did the last cobia assessment. I don't know if that was Beaufort or Miami. I am not sure, but you have two large assessment groups that do the assessments for these two councils, and that is one in Miami and one in Beaufort.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Procedurally, if Mr. Greene is going to make a motion that's going to adjust a SEDAR schedule, procedurally, I am going to go back to my committee report first, and I'm going to make the motion. I am going to read the motion that was made in committee to change the schedule, and then, if someone wants to make a motion, they can make a substitute to what we did in committee. Just a heads-up that that's where we're going here.

 The committee recommends, and I so move, to assess gray triggerfish and cobia in 2018 as standard track assessments, with a terminal year of 2016. The motion carried with no opposition. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I would like to make a substitute motion, and I will try to characterize from the SEDAR schedule handout, in orders of priority from one through six. Essentially, the

handout that you guys have that has the list of fish that are going to be assessed in 2018, I am just going to number them one through six with the stock accordingly, and so I'm not sure how the -- I am trying to kind of make sure that I get the motion correct as we go, and we may have to go back and modify the motion, to get it correct as to my intent, and so bear with me here, ladies. I am sorry, and I will try to go at your speed here on this.

For the year of 2018, I would like to see, in the number one spot, and so number one would be gray snapper benchmark continued, number two would be the MRIP calibration updates, number three will be king mackerel research track, number four will be gray triggerfish standard, number five will be cobia, and number six will be red grouper, and that would be a standard for cobia and red grouper. If I get a second, I will give you my rationale.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The motion has been seconded by Martha.

MR. GREENE: My rationale for this is, while I am extremely understanding and sympathetic to everything that Bonnie said, and, Dr. Ponwith, I heard everything you said, and I understand most of it.

From the side of it as to what we set up as a priority and what you can do, it is, in my book, kind of two different things, and so, without the intent of this council showing what our scientific research needs truly are and trying to be sympathetic to the problems that you have, I think it takes away from how important these six assessments truly are.

If we don't pass some similar motion to this, saying this is our absolute we've got to have this done needs, and it comes back that you can't accomplish that because you don't have the tools in your toolbox to do that, then I think something is truly lost.

The cobia deal that Dr. Crabtree laid out is a huge deal, probably a lot larger than what most of us in this council understand, because we typically stick to our business in the Gulf, and we don't have a ton of joint management plans, like the South Atlantic does. I think about everything they do that they have to deal with one council in the Gulf or to the north, and so they typically have to deal with this stuff all the time.

The cobia deal in the Atlantic is a huge, huge deal. I think that's something that we certainly need to put in there and move

forward with it. If there are provisions that a research lab in Beaufort can assist by doing this, I think then maybe we need to reach out to other avenues to help the Science Center in Miami get what it needs to do that.

I think it also sends an important message to our constituents that, yes, we hear you, and, yes, we want to do everything we can to help you, and we have put it in a motion, and we have sent it up the ladder, and we will do our best, knowing that Bonnie is going to do everything in her power to meet our demands and try to legitimately do what we want to do.

With that being said, I think this is the only path forward for us to take. I know that Bonnie may come back and say, look, I've talked to everybody, and it's just simply not going to happen, but that doesn't change the fact that this is our priority list and we need to move forward with that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any further discussion? Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Johnny has captured my sentiments exactly.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: I actually agree with you that I think it's crucial that in these discussions that we don't lose your sense of priority. Your sense of priority is crucial, because it helps us to understand where we are sufficient and where we are insufficient, and it helps us to understand where we've had to use baling wire and chewing gum to try and get something done or failed to get something done that you set as a priority.

We don't want to lose that sense of priority, and so I think that's important for the administrative record. It gives us something to aim at, and, as long as it's understood that we will do everything in our power to honor that, but, in a case where we can't, we will have to make a correction to that and get back to you with what the actual can-do list is and then make that part of the record as well, and I think that's the best way to tackle this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to share a few things. In Mississippi, when we do stock assessments, and we have these same conversations in our agency with our commissioners, and it's pretty much the same exact process.

We have a list of sixteen stock assessments that we would like to do next year, and we prioritize those, and we line up what we funds we have, and we work down the list. Now, this motion is not demanding that the Science Center do these six next year. They're going to work in this priority, and it spills over into the next year, and I am understanding that correct?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and the spillover -- This is the priority list, yes. In other words, if Bonnie has an issue with cobia, if something cannot be worked out there, then we have made it clear that next in line for us would be red grouper for 2018.

Now, as far as spilling over into the next year, because 2019 is a long way away, if she comes back and tells us that cobia just can't be done, then we would probably revisit the 2019 schedule and see how we want to realign things, or if we want to realign things there, but, yes, generally speaking, yes, that's the deal.

DR. MICKLE: An example of that is the gray snapper spilling into next year, correct, and holding up this problem, and so, with my experience, in my agency, which is a much smaller scale and everything, when we get backed up and our commissioners are screaming that they need to have things put in a faster realm, we start outsourcing.

We start sending stock assessments to other places, and that adds variety, and it brings in a diversity of analysts and everything, and it doesn't slow down the process. It's just good business to outsource when you're overwhelmed, and I will leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. This question is actually for Paul. When you outsource, who do you outsource to or with?

DR. MICKLE: I think we would all be surprised, because I have already looked, and there is a lot of analysts in our country, just our country, and there is private -- There is companies, private organizations, that do this.

I think my predecessor actually brought this up in Galveston two years ago, and I'm not quite sure how the conversations went, and, surprisingly, it was about gray triggerfish, outsourcing gray triggerfish. Again, I wasn't here for the subsequent

conservations behind that, but I don't know what happened when we did discuss that, this council did, of outsourcing, but a very quick look would reveal a lot of different groups that do stock assessments.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Two things. First, to answer that, is we just don't have the funds to pay for somebody to do a stock assessment. That's something that we have discussed in SEDAR for a number of years, going back to when Mr. Boyd was the Chair of the council on SEDAR. He made that plea.

 Two, this schedule is supposed to be fixed and agreed upon, negotiated between the council and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, but what has happened is things are fluid. Things change, and so the schedule is never as it was intended to be.

We're supposed to get five assessments a year, but I don't remember getting five assessments a year, for one reason or the other, and so, yes, we can treat this as a priority list now, but we still try to nail things down as soon as we can, but, again, we were disrupted this time because of the change in the scheduling of the MRIP calibrations.

It gave us an opportunity to do some assessments that we had scheduled for 2019 in 2018, and we pushed that, and that's why we're where we are today. Yes, we will take this forward, and, if the council would like, we can come back and discuss 2019 and 2020 in August, before the September SEDAR meeting. Then we can come back in October and give you the results of the discussions in the SEDAR Committee, and the SEDAR Committee meetings are broadcast by webinar, and so anybody can listen in.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion on this motion? Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: We have the motion on the board for 2018, and I'm going to bring a motion, after this one passes, for 2019, understanding where we're at on this, and so I will try to explain, because we did drop vermilion snapper out of this, and I will pick that up in 2019, and I will have a question or two before I make that motion as well, and so just because I know some of you are kind of wondering where I'm going to go with this, and I'm just trying to throw it out there and lay it on the table, just so everybody understands where I'm at.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Just for clarification, Johnny, in your motion, your substitute motion, would it read better if it said in 2018 "to assess in priority", because, right now, it just says that all of them will be assessed.

MR. GREENE: Yes, ma'am, and I think that was my intent, was that the numbers would signify our intent of priority, and so, yes, I think that would flow a lot better.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha, as seconder, are you okay with that addition? Okay. All right. Any further discussion on this motion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye; all opposed same sign. The motion carries.

The next thing in our committee report is a motion that speaks to our 2019 assessment schedule, and so I'm going to read that, and, if we want to leave it as is, that's fine. If not, we will need a substitute.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to assess red grouper as the number one priority in 2019 as a standard track assessment with a terminal year of 2018. The motion carries with no opposition. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I am going to make a substitute motion in just a second, but my question is that, sometime back, I was the council representative, and I went to a SEDAR meeting, and I believe it was yellowedge grouper and tilefish that were being done at the same time. Dr. Ponwith, does that sound right, or Mr. Gregory, is that right?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Yes, and that was in 2011. I was the chair of the review workshop, and that's the one I think you attended.

MR. GREENE: Okay. Because you were the chair of that, were they -- In 2019, it fills up two spots. Is that how it was done in 2011? Do you remember, Mr. Gregory?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: No, I don't.

 MR. GREENE: Okay. Where I'm hung right now is I was trying to see if yellowedge grouper and tilefish were going to be kind of done at the same, and, right now, in 2019, they take up two spots, but I'm sure they'll be done by the same analyst, I would assume, being that they're so closely related, but I don't know

the answer to that.

With that, I am going to attempt to move on. Now, understanding that if something does not get done in 2018 that it will get bumped to 2019, and probably take the lead as the number-one priority, I think is where we're all trying to go.

If, for some reason, the motion we just approved, if we don't get to number six, which was red grouper, if it doesn't get done, then it will be the number-one priority for 2019. I think that was the intention that we as a council were trying to make or that I was trying to kind of lead to.

With that, in 2019, I will make a substitute motion to assess -- In 2019, to assess, in order of priority, number one will be scamp, and I think that would be listed as RT, which will be research track; number two will be vermilion snapper, as a standard; number three will be yellowedge grouper standard; number four will be tilefish standard; and number five will be the Spanish mackerel standard. Madam Chair, I believe that is my motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. To assess, in 2019, in order of priority, 1) scamp research track, 2) vermilion snapper standard; 3) yellowedge grouper standard, 4) tilefish standard, and 5) Spanish mackerel standard. Do we have a second for this motion? It's seconded by Dr. Frazer.

We have this motion on the board. Now, 2019 is still a proposed type of deal, and so obviously, the motion we passed right before this, there is still a question mark next to which one of those last two are going to get assessed, cobia or red grouper, but hopefully -- This is June, and so, hopefully in August, we should have the firmed up, and, once we know that, we can revisit the 2019 proposed schedule and see which one of those we need to try and fold in somewhere, and so this would just be our proposed for now, knowing that, at the next meeting, we'll have to revisit it. Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The first part of the motion is for red grouper in 2019, with a terminal year of 2018, and so, just so you know, it can be done that way, but what it requires is that you wait until quite late in the year, because it takes that amount of time for the terminal year data to become final.

You can start the assessment right away, in the beginning of the year, with a terminal year two years before, but, if you want

the 2018 data to be used in a 2019 assessment, it can't start any earlier than probably the late summer, so that the 2018 data have a chance to go final.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thanks for that, Dr. Ponwith, and, at this point, it's somewhat of a moot point, because we've moved it to the 2018 schedule, red grouper, and so that motion above it was reorganizing the 2019 priority schedule, and so our substitute changes the way that we're reorganizing the 2019 priority schedule, but thank you for that info. It may still be relevant at some point in the future. Dr. Simmons.

DR. CARRIE SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think you guys did discuss this in committee, but I just thought that I would bring it up again, because Ryan is texting me. He is telling me the tilefish, which was primarily golden tile, was pretty much a data-poor assessment, and we don't know that there is a whole lot of new information.

I think there is some information on blueline tilefish in the South Atlantic, but I don't know how much of that can be carried over to the Gulf, regarding this assessment, and so, again, just we might not end up with a whole lot, regarding a standard assessment for tilefish, but we can get more information for you for the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That sounds perfect, and, since we're probably going to have to revisit our 2019 schedule again, if you can just bring that, so we'll have all the relevant information in front of us, that will help us make some decisions. Any further discussion on this motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Let's get back to our committee report. Staff noted that, if final landings data are not available in time for an assessment, that preliminary landings data could be used until final data are available.

Other shuffling of assessment priorities was discussed. However, staff encouraged the committee to hold off on reorganizing 2019 and forward assessment priorities until after the October 2017 Steering Committee meeting.

 The committee ran out of time to discuss the stock assessment prioritization worksheet, Tab I, Number 5(b), and the NOAA Stock Assessment Improvement Plan, Tab I, Number 6(a), and the council's subsequent letter, Tab I, Number 6(b). Therefore, we will quickly pick that up.

Our agenda includes the Stock Assessment Prioritization Worksheet and the NOAA Stock Assessment Improvement Plan. Mr. Gregory, I believe you were slated to tell us a little bit about that on our original committee report. Give us just a second to pull that up, and then we will get started.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It's on the council agenda. The letter is before you, and it's been reviewed by the SSC and our Chair, and, as we said yesterday, sometimes we don't bring letters like to the Full Council, and, rather than read the letter, I assume people have had a chance to read it. If there is any editorial changes that people want to make, we would welcome that. Otherwise, we will forward the letter as is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The letter is in reference to NOAA's Stock Assessment Improvement Plan that they presented us a document with, and we're giving them some feedback on how that plan reads and what it may mean to us and where we may see room for improvement. Did anybody have any revisions or edits to that letter? Are you okay with it as presented? I am seeing some nodding of heads around the table. All right, Mr. Gregory, I believe that that letter is appropriate.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That will conclude my report. Is there any other related business to come before the SEDAR? Mr. Greene.

 MR. GREENE: I can't let it go. Okay. Back to the red grouper. We need to establish a terminal year for that assessment. I'm going to make a motion that, for the red grouper assessment in 2018, the terminal year would be 2016.

That's my motion, and I have some more information that I will provide as rationale that may change that to 2017, but I kind of want to see where we go with this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. The motion is, for the red grouper assessment in 2018, the terminal year will be 2016. Do we have a second for discussion? It's seconded by John. Mr. Greene, do you want to give us some discussion?

MR. GREENE: I think the terminal year would be correct for 2018. Now, if that assessment is to start late in 2018, after say September, then I don't know why we couldn't use 2017, but I don't know how it's going to fall, but, looking at the list of priorities, I would assume it's going to be late into the year

when it starts, and I think we could use 2017, but I kind of wanted to get the council's input before I changed it to 2017, because, when you just read the motion, it says, in 2018, the terminal year will be 2016, but, if it started late in the year, say September, then we could potentially use 2017 and get the best data.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I would agree, and, if that would help expedite not having to wait for the 2017 data to be fully vetted, and we can gain some time, perhaps, with the utilization of 2016, then clearly that would be the path to take, but, if that's not going to be the case, then we probably need to hear from the Science Center and see if that is the case.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Bonnie, I know that puts you on the spot a little bit. Do you know, based on the priorities we listed for 2018, and we had red grouper as last on that list, do you think it's possible to use 2017, or should we specify 2016?

DR. PONWITH: With the list that you have for 2018, the probabilities of getting to red grouper in 2018 are very, very slim. As the sixth stock assessment on that list, the probabilities of being able to do that assessment in 2018 are low, and, again, that just comes from the number of assessments that our data people can accommodate.

If you have a desire to have the terminal year be 2017, that assessment could not be begun until the waning months of 2018 in the first place, which it lands then at the same time as we would conceivably be doing the MRIP lites, and it would spill into 2019.

 I would have to look to see -- It doesn't relieve the pressure on the data people, which is where the pressure is right now, being able to get those data pulled together and conditioned for use in the assessment.

 That really does put the pressure on the data people as well as the otolith people at that point, and I would have to go back and talk with staff, but my instinct right now is that that's one more assessment than we're going to be able to pull off in 2018.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

48 MR. SANCHEZ: Simply put, but foregoing 2017 and using a

terminal year of 2016, so that data could be gathered, we don't gain anything, is your instinct.

DR. PONWITH: If you put the terminal year as 2016, all things being equal, it enables -- In the general case, it enables the stock assessment to be begun in the beginning of the year, as opposed to very, very late in the year, but, in this case, I think red grouper, whether you start early in the year or late in the year, is one more assessment than we're going to be able to do, and so it almost renders the terminal year as moot.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion on this motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

Any other SEDAR-related business? Okay. One report down. Let's everybody have a quick break before we start Reef Fish, because I know you don't like to leave the table once we do that, and so we'll take a quick, ten-minute break.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

22 23

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene, I will turn it over to you.

REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is the Reef Fish Committee Report from June 5 and 6, 2017. The agenda was adopted, with the addition of several items under Other Business. The minutes of the April 4, 2017 committee meeting were approved with several corrections noted by committee members.

Final Action, Amendment 44, Minimum Stock Size Threshold for Reef Fish Stocks, staff reviewed the alternatives in the amendment and the public comments received. A committee member noted that the stock status information in Table 2.1.1 was not based on the most recent assessment for red snapper and greater amberjack.

 Using the most recent assessments, the stock biomass relative to BMSY was corrected as follows. Red snapper SSB current/SSB 26 percent SPR was 54 percent in the 2014 update assessment. This means that red snapper would no longer be classified as overfished under an MSST of 50 percent of BMSY.

Greater amberjack SSB current/SSB 30 percent SPR was 29 percent in the 2017 SEDAR 33 update assessment. This means that greater

amberjack would continue to be classified as overfished under all MSST alternatives.

2 3 4

A Committee member made a motion to change the preferred alternative from Alternative 3 to Alternative 6, which would change the MSST to 50 percent of BMSY. He felt that this would give the council the greatest flexibility to end a stock decline before the constraints of a rebuilding plan are imposed. Bonnie Ponwith noted that her colleagues recommended Alternative 5, MSST equals 75 percent of BMSY, but felt that Alternative 2 or Preferred Alternative 3 were also acceptable.

Council staff explained that, at 50 percent of BMSY, stocks were considered in danger of collapse. However, committee members noted that preventing overfishing would continue to drive management. If overfishing can be prevented, the stock should remain above this threshold.

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 6 the preferred alternative. Alternative 6 is for the reef fish stocks listed in Table 1.3.1, reef fish stocks MSST equals 50 percent BMSY, or proxy.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: I just do want to reiterate a concern that setting - Based on the analyses that we've done, setting the MSST at this level does actually require overfishing to -- Overfishing is what would drive it to this point, and so it creates some concern, having that as your threshold.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I mean I think we generally assume that stocks become overfished because of overfishing, and, if the overfishing is chronic and allowed to go on for many years, then stocks can be driven down to low levels.

 That is what happened with red snapper and a number of our stocks. They underwent overfishing for twenty years or more, many decades ago, but, with the laws we have now and the vigilance of this council, that situation is very different, and it's difficult for me, for these stocks, which are assessed with some regularity, it's difficult for me to envision a situation where chronic overfishing would be allowed to go on for that extended amount of time, and so I understand Bonnie's comments, but I think, given the way the statute is set up now, the risk

is fairly minimal, and so this seems acceptable to me.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Atran.

MR. STEVEN ATRAN: I just wanted to remind folks of the seven stocks that this motion covers. This includes hogfish, and you just, in the last amendment, Amendment 43, had adopted 75 percent of BMSY as the MSST for hogfish, and so, if you go with this, that would modify hogfish along with the other six stocks covered by this amendment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion on the motion? All those in favor, signify by saying aye; all those opposed same sign. The motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Staff explained that MSST levels are not included in the Code of Federal Regulations. Therefore, there was no codified text to accompany the amendment.

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to approve Reef Fish Amendment 44 and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion, and this is final action, and so this will be a roll call vote. Mr. Gregory, I will let you call the names.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.

36 DR. STUNZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Swindell.

44 MR. SWINDELL: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd.

48 MR. BOYD: Yes.

```
1
 2
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.
 3
 4
    MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
 5
 6
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Dana.
 7
8
    DR. DANA: Yes.
9
10
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Greene.
11
12
    MR. GREENE: Yes.
13
14
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.
15
16
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
17
18
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.
19
20
    MR. WALKER: Yes.
21
22
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Diaz.
23
    MR. DIAZ: Yes.
24
25
26
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.
27
28
    MR. BANKS: Yes.
29
30
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.
31
32
    MS. GUYAS: Yes.
33
34
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Robinson.
35
36
    MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
37
38
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Mickle.
39
40
    DR. MICKLE: Yes.
41
42
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.
43
    MR. MATENS: Yes.
44
45
46
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.
```

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It passes unanimously.

 MR. GREENE: Final Action, Amendment 47, Vermilion Snapper MSY Proxy and ACL, staff reviewed the actions and alternatives in the amendment and public comments received, noting that the ACL was dependent upon the combination of preferred alternatives in the two actions.

The SSC had approved alternate OFL and ABC yield streams in the event the council selected the new Alternative 3 in Action 1, proxy equals F26 percent SPR, but they continued recommend that 30 percent SPR be the MSY proxy. There were no motions to change either of the preferred alternatives. 1, Preferred Alternative 2 the proxy for vermilion snapper MSY is the yield when fishing at F30 percent SPR. Action 2, Preferred Alternative 3, the ACL for vermilion snapper for the years 2017 through 2021 will be the constant catch average of the five-year ACLs when fishing at 75 percent of the MSY proxy yield selected in Action 1. With the selected preferred alternatives, the vermilion snapper ACL would be 3.11 million pounds whole weight.

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to approve Reef Fish Amendment 47 and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a committee motion. Again, this is going to be final action, and so this will be a roll call vote as well.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.

42 MR. BANKS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.

46 MR. WALKER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Mickle.

```
1
 2
    DR. MICKLE: Yes.
 3
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd. Mr. Diaz.
 4
 5
 6
    MR. DIAZ: Yes.
 7
 8
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Greene.
9
10
    MR. GREENE: Yes.
11
12
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Crabtree.
13
14
    MS. GERHART: Yes.
15
16
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Robinson.
17
18
    MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
19
20
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.
21
22
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
23
24
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.
25
26
    MR. MATENS: Yes.
27
28
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.
29
30
    DR. STUNZ: Yes.
31
32
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.
33
34
    MS. GUYAS: Yes.
35
36
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Anson.
37
38
    MR. ANSON: Yes.
39
40
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.
41
42
    MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
43
44
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Dana.
45
46
    DR. DANA: Yes.
```

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The motion passes unanimously, sixteen to zero with one absence.

MR. GREENE: Final Action, Abbreviated Framework Action to Modify the Number of Unrigged Hooks Carried Onboard Bottom Longline Vessels, staff provided an overview, including the purpose and need of the abbreviated framework action to modify the number of unrigged hooks carried onboard bottom longline vessels.

Staff indicated the council could take final action at this meeting, if warranted. Ms. Gerhart summarized recent reef fish observer data on bottom longline reef fish trips that indicated, since the implementation of Amendment 31 in 2010, average hook loss per trip had increased. Thus, the 250 extra unrigged hooks onboard is not sufficient.

The committee discussed the comments provided by law enforcement officers that indicated counting the number of unrigged hooks onboard could be burdensome if increased, but allowing an unlimited number onboard would be ideal. The regulation of 750 hooks fished or rigged for fishing would not be changed through this action.

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to make Option 3 the preferred option. Option 3 is modify the total number of hooks to be unlimited, of which no more than 750 hooks are fished or rigged for fishing. While the option of greater than 1,500 hooks per vessel was not analyzed in Amendment 31, the regulation to only allow 750 hooks to be fished or rigged for fishing would remain in place. Therefore, there should not be any additional concern for protected species interactions. Law enforcement would only need to check the number of rigged hooks, 750, because there would be an unlimited number of unrigged hooks allowed in this option, reducing any burden on law enforcement.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: The committee then voted to recommend approval and submission of the Abbreviated Framework Action and codified text.

```
1 2
```

4 5

6 7

8

9

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to approve the Abbreviated Framework Action to Modify the Number of Unrigged Hooks Carried onboard Bottom Longline Vessels and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, and deem the codified text as necessary appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

10 11

12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. We have a motion on the board, 13 and, again, this final action, and so this will be a roll call vote.

15

16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Dr. Dana.

17

18 DR. DANA: Yes.

19

20 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Ms. Guyas.

21

22 MS. GUYAS: Yes.

23

24 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Matens.

2526

26 MR. MATENS: Yes.

27

28 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Diaz.

29

30 MR. DIAZ: Yes.

31

32 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Swindell.

33

34 MR. SWINDELL: Yes.

35

36 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Banks.

37

38 MR. BANKS: Yes.

39

40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Robinson.

41

42 MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

43

44 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Mickle.

45

46 DR. MICKLE: Yes.

47

48 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Dr. Frazer.

```
1
 2
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
 3
 4
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.
 5
 6
    DR. STUNZ: Yes.
 7
 8
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.
 9
10
    MR. WALKER: Yes.
11
12
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Crabtree.
13
14
    DR. CRABTREE: Yes.
15
16
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:
                                Mr. Anson.
17
18
    MR. ANSON: Yes.
19
20
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.
2.1
22
    MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
2.3
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd. Absent. Mr. Greene.
24
25
26
    MR. GREENE: Yes.
27
28
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.
29
30
    CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:
                      Yes.
31
32
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The motion passes sixteen to zero.
33
                 Draft Framework Action to Modify the ACT for Red
34
35
    Snapper Federal For-Hire and Private Angler Components, staff
36
    reviewed options for modifying the ACT buffers for the red
37
    snapper recreational components.
38
39
    The current options represent a permanent, as opposed to a
40
    fluid, change in the current 20 percent buffer, based on the
41
    landings from the 2017 fishing year.
42
43
    Committee members were pleased with the purpose and need.
44
    However, they expressed concern with the inherent lack
45
    flexibility, acknowledging that using only two years of data
```

under the current sector separation management program presented

several quantitative challenges.

46

47

48

A committee member expressed concern that the options presented were within the scope of error estimation for the landings data. Another committee member noted that, while data collection programs are improving, catch rates are still quite variable, with weather being an unpredictable, yet influential, factor. An approach which considers using a moving average was discussed and was requested to be added. Staff will work to incorporate an alternative which explores a moving average, as discussed by the committee.

Draft Framework Action for Greater Amberjack ACL and Management Measures, the committee reviewed the draft framework action that considers changes to greater amberjack management measures. The committee reviewed the alternatives in Action 2 that would modify the fixed recreational closed season. The committee discussed that opening the greater amberjack recreational season later in the year would allow stability in the season and access to a prized species during the fall.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to add a new alternative under Action 2 that would modify the recreational closed season from January 1 to July 31.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Next, the committee reviewed Action 3 that has alternatives to change the minimum size limit. Staff stated that the recreational minimum size limit was increased to thirty-four inches in 2016, but this change was not included in the most recent stock assessment.

The committee determined that it is premature to consider further modification to the minimum size limit until the effect of the most recent minimum size increase is known.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to move Action 3 to Considered but Rejected. 2.3 Action 3, Modify the Recreational Minimum Size Limit, Alternative 1, no action, do not modify the current recreational minimum size limit of thirty-four inches; Alternative 2, modify the minimum recreational size limit for greater amberjack to thirty inches; Alternative 3, modify the minimum recreational size limit for greater amberjack to thirty-two inches; Alternative 4, modify the minimum recreational size limit for greater amberjack to thirty-six inches.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Report of the Ad Hoc Red Snapper Private Angler AP, the committee reviewed the summary report from the May 8 and 9 Ad Hoc Private Recreational Red Snapper Advisory Panel meeting. The advisory panel was asked to provide recommendations to improve access to red snapper in federal waters for private recreational anglers.

However, after reviewing the meeting materials and presentations, the advisory panel decided that additional background information was necessary prior to recommending changes in management. The committee supported this request and directed staff to reconvene this advisory panel and provide them with the requested background information sometime this fall.

Discussion of Red Snapper Allocation Issues, Mara Levy reviewed the recent court decision that vacated the Amendment 28 reallocation of red snapper. She noted that National Marine Fisheries Service has just published a rule reinstating the original allocation.

The lawsuit addressed four issues. Number one was statutory violations, number two was biological issues, number three was economic and social issues; and number four was compliance with National Standard 4.

The court found in favor of National Marine Fisheries Service on the first three issues. With respect to National Standard 4, the court stated that it was reasonable to pursue a new allocation, but Amendment 28 put the commercial sector at a disadvantage, because its landings were constrained by the IFQ system during years used to determine the allocation.

The decision did not imply that reallocation could not be reconsidered or that historical landings could not be used. However, all factors affected by reallocation decisions, including stock assessments, should be considered.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

 MS. LEVY: Just to make one slight correction. It has the four issues. Statutory violations, they were all allegations of statutory violations, and so what I meant by that was one was a strict that you couldn't do this under 407(d)(2) type of argument. It wasn't related to the analysis of the biological

or social impacts, and that's just to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Ms. Levy.

4 5

MR. GREENE: Options Paper, Amendment 36B, Commercial Reef Fish IFQ Modifications, staff gave a presentation on the Fishery Finance Program. Council staff then reviewed the draft options paper and requested that the committee discuss the IFQ programs' goals and objectives.

The committee discussed some potential goals the amendment may address. These include reducing bycatch from the expanding red snapper population, requiring shareholders to more actively participate in fishing, assisting the next generation's entrance to the IFQ program, and extracting resource rent through auctions or royalties. Committee members noted that caution was needed in pursuing these potential actions, as unintended consequences may undermine the IFQ programs' performance. After discussing the potential action for a quota redistribution and set-aside, the committee passed the following motion.

By a voice vote of eleven to four, the committee recommends, and I so move, that in Section 2.3, to add an alternative for an adaptive management redistribution method based on cyclical redistribution, which depends on fishing participation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Committee members inquired about the referendum requirements pertaining to redistributing quota by auction. Ms. Levy reviewed the language in the Magnuson-Stevens Act pertaining to auctions. The committee then passed the following motion.

By a voice vote with no opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to write a letter to National Marine Fisheries Service to request a determination if an auction of commercial red snapper quota above 4.65 million pounds would require a referendum.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Revised Draft Amendment 41, Allocation-Based

1 Management for Federally-Permitted Charter Vessels, staff gave a presentation of three new actions contained within revised Draft 3 Amendment 41.

4 5

6 7

2

The council requested these actions at the April meeting, which address the following: species for inclusion: allocation of annual catch limit; adaptive management or cyclical redistribution. The committee then made the following motions.

8 9 10

11

12

13

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, make Alternative 2, Option 2b the preferred. Alternative 2 is establish a fishing quota program that provides participants with shares and annual allocation. Option 2b is a Permit Fishing Quota, or PFQ, program.

14 15

16 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. 17 we have any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any 18 opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion 19 carries.

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. GREENE: Without opposition, the committee recommends and I so move, in Action 2, to make Alternative 1 the preferred Alternative 1 is no action, do not establish a alternative. voluntary red snapper management program for charter vessels. The red snapper management program applies to all vessels with a valid or renewable Gulf charter/headboat permit for reef fish.

27 28 29

30

31

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

32 33 34

35

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to move Action 2, Program Participation, to Considered but Rejected.

36 37 38

39

40

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

41 42

43 MR. GREENE: The committee then discussed the range of species 44 for inclusion in the management program. The committee made the 45 following motion.

46

47 Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 3, Alternative 2, to make Options 2a, 2b, and 2c the 48

preferred. Alternative 2 is include the following species in the management program. Option 2a is red grouper, Option 2b is greater amberjack, Option 2c is gray triggerfish.

1 2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? I will read the motion. In Action 3, Alternative 2, to make Options 2a, 2b, and 2c the preferred. Alternative 2 is include the following species in the management program, and Option 2a is red snapper, Option 2b is greater amberjack, and Option 2c is gray triggerfish, and so those would be the three preferreds. Is there discussion on that motion?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I just want to confirm that the intent is that the Option 2d and 2e stay in the document for analysis.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I was going to make a motion after this motion to pull them out, but whatever you think is the cleanest way to do that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Let's go ahead and vote this motion up or down, and then, if you want to remove the other two, we'll have a separate motion. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I just have a little bit of pause. I am trying to think through this. I mean, basically, we pulled those groupers out because they're primarily in the Florida area. We distribute a lot of grouper out in the Gulf, where people don't catch a lot of them, and, while gray triggerfish is not exactly the same, and I believe most of them are caught in the northern Gulf, and we're still going to distribute a lot of gray triggerfish to a lot of areas that there are probably not a lot of them harvested.

With that rationale, I am just trying to figure out what to do with gray triggerfish. I am not ready to make a motion at this point, but, at a future meeting, I might. Anyway, that's something that I am thinking through as we talk about this, and I would be interested to know if other folks feel the same way. Thank you, ma'am.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Diaz. Is there further discussion on the motion? Okay. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye; all those opposed same sign. The motion carries. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I will make a motion here that, in Action 3, move Alternatives 2d and 2e to Considered but Rejected.

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion that's coming up The motion is being made by Ms. Guyas, and it's on the board. The motion reads: In Action 3, been seconded by Mr. Sanchez. Alternative 2d and 2e to Considered but Rejected. Alternative 2 is to include the following species in management program. Option 2d is gag and Option 2e is red It would remove those two species from the document, Is there discussion on the motion? from consideration. Dana.

13 14 15

16

17

18

DR. DANA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I would like to ask Martha what the rationale would be to take them entirely out versus having the council staff continue to look at the impacts of -- Well, just the rationale. I'm not saying that I'm opposed to it, but I just want to know the rationale.

19 20 21

22

2324

25

26

MS. GUYAS: We heard a little bit about this last night, and we also have -- There are several comments in the online comments about this from a lot of Florida captains, particularly from down here in this area. Gag and red grouper are pretty much the bread-and-butter for southwest Florida, the Tampa Bay area, and a lot of those guys feel like they have a pretty good system right now.

272829

30

31

32

33

3435

Red grouper is open year-round, and gag is open seven months of the year now. They feel like they have the opportunities they need and don't mess with a good thing, I think was kind of how Ed Walker described it last night, but the people that are catching these species, primarily, don't seem to be onboard with this at this point, and so that would be my rationale. I think it will also probably make this document a lot less cumbersome for staff, when they're doing analysis, too.

36 37 38

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

39 40

41

42

43

MR. SANCHEZ: I guess, to add some rationale, that we mentioned already in committee, they're not overfished, as opposed to the other species in the preferred, and, for that reason, and the regional reason, that this is a localized thing to this fishing community, I would clearly support this.

44 45 46

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

47 48

DR. CRABTREE: I guess I'm okay with this, but we need to think

about the implications for Amendment 42, because, if the rationale is they're not overfished and the regional nature of it, then it seems to me that that applies to Amendment 42 as well, and I guess we'll come back to that at the next meeting, but, if we decide to exclude them here and then not in 42, we're going to need to have some sort of reason as to why we're treating them differently.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Dr. Crabtree, to that point, I do think -- Me and Mr. Sanchez talked about this this morning, and there is a catch history for the boats that are in Amendment 42, and so they could be distributed to folks that have a catch history, where, in this document, for the most part, we don't have catch histories for these boats, and they will have to be distributed by some mechanism to be picked out, and they'll probably distribute it all over the Gulf of Mexico, and so I don't know if that helps with your rationale, but that's what me and Mr. Sanchez had discussed this morning, and I think Mr. Sanchez is right on that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Is there further discussion? Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I guess I have an ignorant question, because I don't know that I've run into this, but, if we send it to Considered but Rejected, does that mean that we can't go back and pull it back into the document later down the road?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy or Mr. Gregory?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It would be difficult, particularly near the end of the document preparation, because we won't have the analyses, and it would slow the document down at that point.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

 MR. ANSON: I am just trying to think of three years or four years or five years down the road, if we go to this PFQ and the flexibility, I guess, of new entrants in acquiring a permit and making sure that permit kind of fits their region of availability of fish.

As you expand more species, you get different combinations of those fish attached with that permit, and so I guess, on that hand, I would probably look to reducing it, just to reduce the complexity, but I just don't know if that creates -- There will

be markets, I guess, or pools. The Florida permits will stay, I guess, in Florida, at that point, for the most part, because the other part of the Gulf that catches more red snapper will just look for those permits, and so it could affect prices or availability and that type of thing, in order for a person to get what they need, I guess, for their particular business.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That's an interesting comment, Mr. Anson. I am not thinking about it so much as to this motion, but just in general as something that we may want to think about later in the document. I mean, I know we have a permit that covers a lot of different species, but we may want to think about, logistically, how to line that up if we think it may cause a problem later, because this is different, where it might be attached to the permit rather than an individual, and so we'll just think about that in the future. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I guess, on that note, I feel like keeping them in would make sure that those permits stay in Florida. If they're not in, then potentially you could pick up a reef fish permit and you wouldn't necessarily have -- It's going to depend on the individual permit and what you get, and I don't know. It is going to be something that we're going to need to consider for all of the species, I think, and it's going to get complicated.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I was just throwing it out there just for discussion purposes at this point. It just kind of popped into my head as, again, trying to envision what the permits would look like, or the availability, and, again, new entrants and how the system is set up now. You can sell the permits, and, right now, you can just buy a permit and go from Florida to Texas, and vice versa, and that it might not quite work out that way in the future, if we go down either three or five or what have you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I still don't understand -- It's not compelling to me why gag grouper and red grouper need to be pulled completely out of the document. I mean, I understand taking the three, the red snapper, the gray triggerfish, and I forget what the last one is there, but keeping those three species as the focal point, the preferred alternative. However, I don't know why you would need to completely take out gag and red grouper, because, down the road, you may want to bring it back up, you guys, years from now. I just don't know. I haven't heard compelling arguments as to why

they need to disappear.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I agree with Pam to just have a preferred with three species, and I don't see the harm in leaving it in here. There may be some more public comment that comes in that changes the view, and who knows, but I don't see the harm of just leaving them in the document for more discussion.

11 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I agree also with both Pam and David. I would like to see them left in the document.

16 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Any other further discussion on this 17 motion? I think we better raise our hands on this one. All those in favor, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I have seven.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Nine. The motion fails seven to nine.

MR. GREENE: The committee discussed the benefits and drawbacks of a set cycle and a progressive cycle for use in adaptive management. The Committee made the following motion.

With a voice vote of two opposed, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 6.1 to make Alternative 3, Option 3a the preferred alternative. Alternative 3 is the cycles for adaptive management will occur in an increasing progressive range, starting at X year and incrementing by one year until Y years. Thereafter, cycles will be Y years in length. Option 3a is one year incrementing by one year till reaching three years (cycle 1 equals one year, cycle 2 equals two years, cycle 3 plus equals three years).

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries.

MR. GREENE: The committee requested decision tools, similar to that for red snapper, be developed for gray triggerfish, greater amberjack, gag, and red grouper. For enforcement purposes, the committee inquired if real-time data would be available for use

with adaptive management. Dr. Stephen responded that this would be possible for this type of program. The committee also requested referendum requirements be presented at the August meeting.

Draft Amendment 42, Federal Reef Fish Headboat Management, staff noted that the committee previously reviewed the management actions in Amendment 42. Because the allocation of resources to the for-hire components is addressed in both Amendments 41 and 42, staff inquired about removing it from one of the amendments.

 The committee discussed the allocation issue and requested that Ms. Levy provide guidance on the potential implications of removing resource allocation considerations from one of the amendments. Committee members requested that staff bring back referendum eligibility criteria to the committee in August.

Status Determination Criteria Amendment, Mara Levy noted that Amendment 43 had not defined OY for hogfish, and the council was out of compliance for most of its stocks with the requirement that stocks have status determination criteria. Staff recently resumed work on a status determination criteria amendment that would define MSY proxy, MFMT, MSST, and OY for all reef fish stocks and red drum, but this amendment has not been a high priority.

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to make the Status Determination Criteria Amendment a priority on the proposed action schedule.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Turtle Release Gear, Sue Gerhart noted that two new gear types have been approved by the Science Center for use in handling and releasing incidentally-caught sea turtles when fishing for reef fish. These are a collapsible net and a new type of de-hooking device.

Before they can be used by fishermen, they need to be added to the list of approved sea turtle release gear. The South Atlantic Council has a process for adding new gear to the list. However, the Gulf Council has no such process. She suggested that the council develop a process, so that these gear types and future gears can be added to the Gulf list of approved gears.

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to

direct staff to begin work on a document to address turtle release gear.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Louisiana Recreational Reef Fish Management Plan, Patrick Banks noted that the council had recently agreed to begin developing a state management plan for Louisiana for red snapper.

To assist in this development, Louisiana Department of Fish and Wildlife had begun working on a draft plan, which he presented to the committee and was distributed to the council. Committee members felt that this was a good contribution to the development process. However, it was noted that the allocation to Louisiana would have to be done in combination with the allocations to the other states.

Seeing nothing on that, before I read that last sentence that I really want to read, I just want to point out that, during conversations yesterday, Dr. Crabtree had brought up an EFP about lionfish, and we had a good conversation about it, and Mr. Constant had also weighed in on that as well, and so I think -- I don't know if this is the appropriate committee for that discussion to continue, but I would like to have some more lionfish discussion in the appropriate committee, wherever we see fit, for the next council meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted. Is there any opposition from the council to add that to our next council agenda? All right. I see a shaking of heads that there is not a problem with that. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Johnny, what do have in mind? I'm just curious. We've got a pretty big lionfish program in our state, and I'm just trying to think how we might be able to help.

 MR. GREENE: I think that, just my observation of listening to the conversation that went around between Dr. Crabtree and the proposal from the EFP and the Florida Keys guys and some of their stuff, and then Mr. Constant's comments yesterday, it seems like there is a lot of programs going around, and I think everybody is kind of working around each other, and I am hoping to use our time to kind of maybe let Glenn come in and do a presentation about what they're doing and see what Florida is doing and kind of make sure that everybody is kind of working

towards the common goal.

I think everybody is going around the mountain, but I just want to make sure that, when we meet, that we all hit at the same place and people aren't doing work all over the place. It just seems like some guys are doing work that other people didn't know about, and I just hope to kind of throw it all on the table, so everybody could see what was being done.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Are you asking for a discussion of the different EFPs related to lionfish, or are you asking for the states to give a presentation on what they're doing with regard to lionfish, much like we did with data collection, or do you want scientists? I mean, there's a lot of work that's been done, and a lot of science that's being started on that, and it quickly gets outside the range of our grasp, I think.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I will be glad to let Johnny answer, but I think it sounds like it may be as simple as probably a presentation from Mr. Constant, because that's definitely something that I don't think most of us are familiar with, maybe what's going on in that agency, and then maybe a brief presentation from the other two entities that seem to be pretty deep into this already, which would be Martha's side of the table over there somewhere, the Florida folks, and maybe we can get Luiz back up there again right before lunch.

Then we will have maybe Dr. Crabtree or NMFS do a brief summary of what they've got in the works, because they said that they were looking at some things, but it was very preliminary, as to how they were going to try and do something from a 30,000-foot view. Then, from there, maybe we'll have some discussion that will germinate and see what we can come up with. Johnny, does that sound okay to you? Mr. Constant.

 MR. CONSTANT: Along those lines, I contacted our invasive species coordinator to kind of consolidate and give a summary about where we are right now, with respect to the things that I think, Doug, are pertinent to discussion here, certainly there is a lot of lionfish work going on.

We certainly are interested in the idea that we're going to maybe have an opportunity to maybe support or to contribute to the development of new traps or eradication programs, and so whatever you think is relevant to the discussion in the pertinent committee, I would be glad to package that, and I know

we work with the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, and they administer some of our invasive species money, and so we can coordinate with them too and kind of package that up in a presentation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Lieutenant Commander.

 LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am just offering another resource on that lionfish topic, and the Flower Garden Banks has hosted several events out at the sanctuary, and they have done some community involvement of diverse natures, and it may just be another resource to discuss some of your options, if you're trying to figure out what to do on that topic.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and, you know, if any of the other states around the table have things that they're doing with lionfish -- I am certainly not trying to leave you out. As we get into that agenda item at the next meeting, feel free to chime in and give us a little quick update on maybe what you have in the works. I'm just trying to keep you from making a huge presentation if it wasn't something that you were really deep into yet.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Given the discussion yesterday, this could be quite a lengthy presentation, and so it will affect our agenda.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So we'll start at 7:30 is what you're saying?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: If you wish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We will figure it out. Hopefully, we'll be able to bring it and put it on the August agenda. If we absolutely have to, we may have to bump it to October, but we will get it to you as soon as we can.

MR. GREENE: Madam Chairman, this concludes my report.

ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. If there is nothing else, that will wrap up our Reef Fish business, I think in record time, and so next on our agenda is our Administrative/Budget Report, and that is going to be me, and so let me get ready here.

The Administrative/Budget Committee Report, the committee adopted the agenda and minutes of the April 2017 Administrative/Budget Committee meeting as written.

Agenda Item IV, Approval of Final 2017 Budget Funding, the committee was unable to review the final 2017 council budget, because we have not been provided our total 2017 funding level by National Marine Fisheries Service, due to delays in passing the federal budget. The council needs to approve our final 2017 budget once we obtain the actual funding level from NMFS. Therefore, we will bring the final 2017 budget to the council in August for approval.

 Agenda Item V, Review of H.R. 200 and H.R. 2023 Potential Impacts, Tab G, Number 5, House Resolutions 200 and 2023 have been introduced into committee and a number of the sections are directly pertinent to the Gulf of Mexico.

NOAA General Counsel has advised the councils they could no longer indicate to Congress preferences for particular sections of a bill unless specifically requested to do so by Congress, but, rather, in providing general input, we should only comment on the potential impacts of proposed legislation.

Staff reviewed summaries of potential impacts of each section of the bills that were not discussed in April, including a number of sections directly related to the Gulf of Mexico. The committee provided suggested revisions to a few of the sections. These potential impact analyses will be used as the basis for providing written or verbal testimony on these bills if requested by either the Council Coordinating Committee or Congress.

No motions were made in committee, and there was no other business to come before the committee. This concludes our committee report. Was there any other business that was related to the Administrative/Budget Committee Report? All right. That will take us to D on our agenda, which is our Spiny Lobster Committee Report, and Ms. Guyas.

SPINY LOBSTER COMMITTEE REPORT

MS. GUYAS: Staff presented the final draft of Regulatory Amendment 4 and provided a summary of public comments. The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend that Spiny Lobster Regulatory Amendment 4 be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

```
1
 2
    CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion on the
 3
    board, and this, again, is final action, and so it will be a
 4
    roll call vote.
 5
 6
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.
 7
8
    MR. MATENS: Yes.
9
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Greene.
10
11
12
    MR. GREENE: Yes.
13
14
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Diaz.
15
16
    MR. DIAZ: Yes.
17
18
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.
19
20
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
21
22
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Robinson.
23
24
    MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
25
26
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Swindell.
27
28
    MR. SWINDELL: Yes.
29
30
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Mickle.
31
32
    DR. MICKLE: Yes.
33
34
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.
35
36
    MS. GUYAS: Yes.
37
38
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.
39
40
    DR. STUNZ: Yes.
41
42
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.
43
```

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

MR. WALKER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.

1 2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Crabtree.

8 DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Dana.

12 DR. DANA: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.

16 MR. BANKS: Yes.

18 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Anson.

20 MR. ANSON: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.

24 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The motion passes seventeen to zero.

MS. GUYAS: The committee was also updated on the issue of the State of Florida bully-netting regulations. NOAA GC informed the committee that though there is a protocol to allow the State of Florida to recommend federal regulations, the procedure to implement the protocol no longer exists. The council could address just the bully-netting issue with a framework amendment, or could address both issues in a full plan amendment.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to begin work on a plan amendment to address the bully-net issue and reestablish the protocol procedures with the State of Florida.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition** 44 **to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.**

MS. GUYAS: That concludes my report.

48 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ma'am. Was there anything else to

come before the Spiny Lobster Committee before we move on to the Coral and Habitat Protection Committee? All right. Next on the agenda is our committee report for our Joint Coral/Habitat Protection & Restoration Committee, which is quite a mouthful. Mr. Diaz, I will turn it over to you.

JOINT CORAL/HABITAT PROTECTION & RESTORATION COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. DIAZ: The Joint Coral/Habitat Protection & Restoration Committee met on June 5. Review Options Paper for Coral Amendment 9, staff presented the committee with the Draft Options Paper for Coral Amendment 9.

There are nine actions in the document. The committee made several recommendations regarding the introduction and purpose and need, including clarifying the quadrants in Table 1.1.1, modifying the purpose and need to state "appropriate protections for corals in the Gulf of Mexico", and clarifying some language.

Action 1 addresses incorporating octocorals in the FMU. The committee discussed clarifying Alternative 1. Florida currently manages octocoral harvest in the EEZ adjacent to Florida. Staff also presented the committee with Action 2 and some issues which the IPT asked for clarification. The committees discussed the current issues with adding octocorals to the FMU and made the following motion. The committee recommends, and I so move, to move Action 1 and 2 to Considered but Rejected. Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there discussion on the motion? Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess I am going to speak in opposition to the motion and revisit it, if possible, and the reason that I want to do that is really reflecting on that particular action and also listening to some of the public testimony yesterday and talking to staff.

I think I would really like to see the Table 2.1.1 to be clarified, I guess, on those Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, that those alternatives apply only to the corals in that table, and then give some time for the public to weigh in a little bit down the road a little bit on this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So these are the corals, the octocorals, that are being managed in federal waters by the State of Florida? This would incorporate them back into the fishery unit and then essentially, I guess, we would take over management from Florida. Is what this would do?

1 2

DR. FRAZER: I think what we would do is add another alternative as well in this, an Alternative 5, and I guess we could direct staff to develop that alternative that exempts Florida. It allows them to manage the octocorals the way that they do currently.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: What we did in the South Atlantic with this is we include octocorals in the management unit, but only off of Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, and not off of Florida, and then we set the ACL for octocorals in those three states at zero, and so I guess we could do something like that, where Florida is not in the FMU, because they have a state management program that we have determined is sufficient. Then, off of the remaining Gulf states, it's in the FMU, and the ACL is zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I guess, if we vote this motion down and those two actions stay in the document, I would strongly advocate for that kind of approach that excludes Florida from -- It excludes, I guess, octocorals in the EEZ off of Florida from council management. Otherwise, we're going to have some issues, I think, but I will defer to other folks about how they want to handle the rest of the Gulf.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I just want to say that, based on the discussion around the table right now, I am in favor of voting this motion down and proceeding with some of the methods that being discussed by Dr. Frazer and Dr. Crabtree. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: What Roy described is exactly my intent.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So it's not our intent to start trying to draw boxes around these octocorals, and I will just put it on the record, because, in the literature in the document, these are not reef-building corals. These are more kind of off to themselves type of corals, sparse and here and there, and they are on muddy bottom and not -- A lot of times, they're on muddy bottom, and so I don't want to get into a situation where we're drawing pea-sized boxes in the Gulf of Mexico.

1 2

This is just to put them in there so we can kind of have, essentially, no take on them and no harvest in the rest of the Gulf of Mexico, where we're not aware that there is any harvest, but we're kind of safeguarding it. That's what we're aiming for here?

DR. FRAZER: Affirmative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Because the one group that wants these added back in, that gave public comment on it, keeps changing their stance, and so, as long as we're not going to mess with Florida and we think they're doing a good job, and we're not going to step in and actually start trying to regulate the harvest in the EEZ off of Florida, then I guess I'm okay with it, hesitantly so. I will probably not vote. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: That means, procedurally, if we're okay with what Tom is suggesting, that we would then vote this motion down.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, Dr. Frazer. We have a motion on the board to move Action 1 and 2 to Considered but Rejected. All those in favor of this motion, signify by raising your hand; all those opposed to the motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen. Am I missing anyone?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I abstained.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: So the motion fails zero to sixteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Based on that, I guess, in Action 1, I would make a motion to add a new Alternative 5 that would exclude octocorals in the EEZ off of Florida from federal management.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Before we get a second, I have a question for Mara. Mara, does it make any difference, from your perspective, whether we word the alternative like that, where we exclude off of Florida from federal management, rather than have something where options are to have that management off of Texas or Louisiana or Mississippi or Alabama or Florida and then not pick Florida? I guess I am just making sure that we're not getting into a situation where we're trying to delegate, and I don't know if that changes any of our rules, the way we do things.

MS. LEVY: Well, maybe the IPT can sort of figure out what the best way to structure the alternative is, either an alternative with options for what states you want to include, the EEZ off of what states, or how it should be appropriately worded, to make sure we're giving you the options and addressing Martha's concern.

6 7 8

9

10

11

1

2 3

4

5

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. That sounds great. All right. have a motion on the board. Do we have a second for the motion? It's seconded by Dr. Frazer. Any discussion on the motion? I think we've had some pretty good discussion. Guyas.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

The IPT, feel free to fix this however it needs to MS. GUYAS: be done, but I guess my intention, at least the way this is structured now, is that the committee could choose one of the management alternatives, like 2 or 3 or 4, and then choose this in addition to that, to basically exclude Florida from whatever option is chosen, but however is the best way to structure this, I am good with that, but this is my intent here.

20 21 22

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted. Mr. Banks.

23 24

MR. BANKS: I am sorry that I'm confused, but is it a delegation or is it not, or we're going to wait for the IPT to tell us that?

26 27 28

25

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

29 30

DR. CRABTREE: No, because we wouldn't put it in the fishery management plan off of Florida.

31 32 33

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any other discussion? All right. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye; all those opposed same sign. The motion carried.

35 36 37

38 39

40

34

Staff proceeded to review Actions 3 through 8, which MR. DIAZ: all address creating new HAPCs in the various regions of the There were some minor edits to wording that were suggested and will be included in future documents, as will clarification on deep-water coral definitions.

41 42 43

44

45

46 47

Staff will include discussion on the differences between the ELB data and the VMS data in the figure legends and will also adjust the color scheme to better reflect effort. It was also requested that information on how many fishermen are permitted with bottom tending gear and VMS in the eastern Gulf to help

48 inform discussion on eastern Gulf areas. Staff highlighted the two areas that were identified as contentious and how the options for the alternatives reflected a tiered approach for these areas. The committee discussed adding an exemption or tiered approach for all areas that have fishing documented, but no motion was made.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I would like to make a motion to that effect, to direct staff to define criteria to evaluate areas for "evidence of fishing", using VMS and ELB datasets. In areas that have evidence of fishing, direct staff to include options that allow for a tiered approach or specific exemptions for fishing without bottom-tending gear.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I think we have the motion on the board. Direct staff to define criteria to evaluate areas for "evidence of fishing", using VMS and ELB datasets. In areas that have evidence of fishing, direct staff to include options that allow for a tiered approach or specific exemptions for fishing without bottom-tending gear. Do we have a second for the motion? Seconded by Mr. Diaz. Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Banks.

 MR. BANKS: Just a quick question for John. Are you thinking, in certain areas where we have pings from VMS or ELB, in the tiered approach maybe -- This is just a possibility, but, if there's a certain amount of pings, it's in Tier 1, and then, if there's a certain amount of pings above that, it's a Tier 2, to try to determine how much fishing is going on in there, and is that the type of tiered approach you're talking about?

 MR. SANCHEZ: That would be one way, but, in addition to that, one ping, two pings, ten pings, and let's vet that out. Is it fishing or is transit or is this or is it that, and try to get to the bottom of that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Patrick, I will elaborate a little bit. The other part of this tiered approach that that is speaking to — If you will remember, we did that white paper for the Flower Garden Banks, and so you may have a box, but, inside that, you have different levels of activity that get progressively more stringent as you get closer to the coral, and so that is essentially leaving it open for staff to look at how much fishing is there, and, based on what type of fishing is there, can we put some sort of tiered approach in, to allow these fishermen to not be in violation, if they're in that area, or

would it be better to just simply put an exemption in for a certain type of gear, to allow them to continue that historical fishing there, and that's what that's doing. Any other discussion? Yes, Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I was just going to mention that, before we had VMS, paper logbooks were grids, and I don't know if they wanted to take consideration of using some of that information as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, that's a good point, and we'll look at how far back, because the VMS, I guess, would go back to 2007 or so? I think the ELB data goes all the way back to like 2001, maybe, somewhere in that neighborhood, or 2003, and so, yes, that's something that we can ask staff to take a look at and see if it helps them any to really identify what's going on in those areas that they have questions about. Okay. Any further discussion on the motion? Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Banks asked my question, and so I pass. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Dr. Kilgour.

DR. MORGAN KILGOUR: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just for my own clarification, when I am looking at this tiered approach, or specific exemptions, I was kind of thinking you would want something similar to what we did for the Flower Garden Banks regulations, and just to tell you, off the cuff, that I did the analysis for a lot of these areas, and most of this is bandit rig gear.

I would probably be including those types of exemptions and not necessarily specific areas within these areas, based on the data that we have, and would that be acceptable to the council for me to do that type of -- Or would you like some type of area within these area-type tiers, which would be a lot more cumbersome, but easily done.

 I just want to make sure that I'm clear on what the intent is here, because, when I looked at the data in the -- There is information in the discussion, and most of these areas that light up as yellow with VMS information were from bandit rigs, and so I would put in, like similar to what I did with the alternatives in Pulley Ridge and Viosca Knoll, a specific exemption for those areas, unless there were multiple gear types that were used. If that's acceptable to the council, then I am very clear in moving forward. If you want a tiered approach, with areas within areas, I can absolutely do that and go back to

the finer-scale data as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, it's acceptable to me for the exemptions. If you find an area where you just can't make it work and you need another option, there is the tiered approach, but, no, I think the exemptions are fine. Is there anybody else that wants to weigh in on that? Okay. We have a motion on the board. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carried.

MR. DIAZ: Staff presented Action 9, which would address prohibiting dredging in existing HAPCs with fishing regulations. The committee requested clarification on the different mechanisms for protecting corals.

Staff highlighted that the deep-sea coral provision for the MSA was intended for councils that do not have formal Coral FMPs and that the deep-sea coral provision will only prohibit fishing. Coral EFH automatically requires a consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service for any extractive purpose, and the establishment of coral HAPCs would highlight specific areas of concern within coral EFH.

The committees discussed that there should be a prohibition on all anchoring in these areas. Staff will investigate how other councils prohibit anchoring and if the anchoring is fishing vessel specific, and they will report back to the council with the information.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz, if you don't mind, I have a comment here, before we leave the coral amendment. Morgan, I made a comment during the committee that I really feel like the committee and the council should decide what we are going to use as a depth for deep-sea coral, especially considering that may set a precedent in the future, and there is a deep-sea coral designation out there, that if things were not managed under a coral FMP, they can be given a deep-sea designation, which prohibits fishing.

I think that that's a sticky situation for us, to redefine what depth range is considered deep-sea, just blanket, without a decision point on it, and so, if you need a motion to add an action in there, where we actually determine deep-sea coral is either fifty meters, as the Coral SSC and AP recommended, or the NOAA definition, which I think is around 150 meters, or something like that. Do you need a motion in order to incorporate an action item on something like this?

DR. KILGOUR: I can -- What I will do is I will go into the NOAA Deep-Sea Coral Program and find out what their definition is, and I can include that in the definition box in the introduction, on what they are qualifying as deep-sea corals.

If the council wants to have a different definition, then that can be a topic of discussion, but I would like to highlight that the deep-sea coral provision within Magnuson -- That still has to be implemented by the council, and so, unless you were to go through with an amendment to implement the deep-sea coral provision and do deep-sea coral areas instead of this coral HAPC document, I think you're okay.

If you want a formal definition, I probably need a motion, but, if you would like me to just report back to you what the Deep-Sea Coral Program uses as their definition, I would be happy to do that as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I think that would be good, but, in reading the document earlier, there was two different buoy gear definitions, and one of them didn't quite go to the bottom and there was different criteria, and this is just another area where I felt like there was fifty meter versus 150 meter, and we need to kind of make a decision.

I think, if you can just check into that and report back to us, then we will make a decision going from there, because I think it is rather confusing to the public, because, before being involved in this process, I would have never guessed, in a million years, that deep-sea coral would have been defined as fifty meters, in anybody's opinion, but it's one of those things I feel like we need to flesh out.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Does that give you enough direction, Morgan? Okay. Sounds good. Mr. Diaz

MR. DIAZ: Other Business, staff provided a brief update on the status of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary and the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Expansions. The council will likely be presented with updates to both expansions in 2018. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Is there any other business related to Coral before we leave that report? All right. Next on our agenda is our Data Collection Committee Report, and so, Dr. Stunz, are you ready? I will turn it over to you.

1 2

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. STUNZ: I am ready, Madam Chair, and thank you. The Data Collection Committee met on June 7, 2017. First were Presentations on Procedures to Estimate Recreational Landings. Representatives from the five Gulf states gave presentations on their state-specific efforts to improve their recreational data collection programs, Tab F, Numbers 4(a) through 4(e).

The respective programs aim to improve the precision and accuracy of reef fish catch and effort estimates that may not be adequately characterized by existing programs. Many of the states are working closely with MRIP to ensure the programs produce accurate estimates and can be calibrated with other programs that collect recreational fisheries data.

Next was the Discussion of MRIP Strategic Plan. The council has been requested to review and comment on the MRIP Strategic Plan, Tab F, Number 5(b). Staff has prepared a draft letter, Tab F, Number 5(a), identifying specific concerns and highlighting areas of improvement in the strategic plan.

Ms. Levy provided clarification that the 2006 reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act does not require in-season monitoring for species that have exceeded their annual catch limit, or ACL, in the most recent fishing year, or rather that requirement is part of the accountability measures developed by the council. Staff will clarify the letter and submit to MRIP on behalf of the council.

In Other Business, the committee requested an update on the implementation status for the recently completed For-Hire Electronic Reporting Amendment at the August 2017 council meeting. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Anything else related to Data Collection? Seeing none, we will move right down the agenda, and I think that will bring us to Mr. Walker with the Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report.

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. We will be in Tab E, the Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report for June 5, 2017. Florida Sea Grant Presentation on Barotrauma, Tab E, Number 4, Captain Betty Staugler from Florida Sea Grant presented a review of two surveys on angler knowledge and attitudes toward venting

and descending devices.

 One survey was conducted by Florida Sea Grant in 2014 via email. The other survey was a University of Florida Fisheries & Aquatic Sciences survey completed for the council in 2015 and 2016. Both surveys found that anglers are generally familiar with barotrauma signs, with more anglers familiar with venting tools than descender devices.

 The greatest impact affecting the use of mitigation measures was predicted to be from social norms. A requirement to possess venting tools or descender devices is likely to emphasize the social norm. Most anglers receive educational information via fishing magazines, TV shows, websites, and YouTube videos.

Options paper for framework action to require possession of descending devices or venting tools on board vessels possessing reef fish, and that's Tab E, Number 5, staff reviewed an options paper for possible actions to recommend or require venting tools or descending devices on vessels fishing for reef fish.

Committee members strongly supported an outreach program, regardless of whether devices were recommended or required. One member suggested that, given the social pressure to use such tools, a regulation may not be necessary. It was pointed out that activities under the RESTORE Program could include distribution of devices, but only if they are not required by regulation.

If required by regulation, RESTORE funds could not be used to distribute devices, but could be used to establish an outreach program. One committee member suggested requiring a placard be onboard providing instructions on how to use the devices, similar to the placard required for sea turtle release required on commercial vessels.

Some committee members questioned if the SEDAR stock assessments could account for the use of devices if they were not required. Dr. Bonnie Ponwith responded that there were many factors involved, and it would be a judgement call on how much to credit the use of the devices.

Staff suggested that if the council chooses to recommend rather than require venting tools or descender devices, a framework action may not be needed. Staff is awaiting guidance from the council on how to proceed.

Options Paper, Carryover of Unharvested Quota, and this is Tab

E, Number 6. Staff reviewed an options paper to modify the council's ABC Control Rule by incorporating a provision to allow for the carryover of the uncaught portion of the ACL into the following fishing year, given the conditions outlined in the options paper.

Committee members asked about the amount of foregone yield that might be carried over for a given species. Staff explained, through the actions presented, how the council could determine which species would be eligible for a carryover and how to adjust the amount of foregone yield that could be carried over to the next fishing year.

One large issue, which has been extensively discussed by the IPT, is how to handle species that are managed under IFQ programs. Staff asked for clarification on how the council might like to handle IFQ species and whether the committee agreed with the current direction of the document. NOAA General Counsel advised the council to justify the percentages presented in alternatives in Actions 3 and 4, likely using the tables provided in the document. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Walker. We did make it through your entire agenda. All right. I thought that we had one item left under your agenda, but we did make it through. Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One of things that -- We hurried through the carryover, because of the time factor, but one of the things that I think was left without adequate discussion was do we want to proceed with the document to implement a regulation on barotrauma or do we want to give staff guidance that we should come back with a draft policy and facilitate an education and outreach program on this with other entities, particularly with the Sea Grant programs and the Gulf States Commission?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, council. Any feedback? Essentially, if we only want to go the policy route, then staff doesn't really need to develop this document further.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Whereas, if we're wanting to implement a regulation, then we need to direct staff to continue work on the document. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I will try to start some discussion. I think we need to try to reduce dead discards the most effective way we can, and I really don't know what that is at this point. I think Dr. Crabtree had mentioned something about the fact that, if we were to start this regulation and it's law, then grant money can't be used to help provide these devices to people that need them, and so I would hate to not be able to use grant money to provide devices to people.

I really don't know what the best way for us to go right now is to be most effective at reducing discards. Maybe around the table, we can have some discussion and form some opinions, but I don't know what path would get us the most results at this point. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I am kind of with you, Dale. There have been other attempts, by various groups, to get descending devices out to folks for free, and they were fairly successful, at least in getting out the devices, and there's been mixed results on how effectively or how widely they are being used, but I certainly wouldn't want, if there is some more money coming down to offer it again, if we develop a policy that would prevent that, because I think that could be the best path, rather than just doing the policy.

I think the council should develop a little bit of outreach, through video or something, that could be accessed through the council's website, certainly trying to stay engaged, as much as possible, with those groups that have already been actively involved in trying to get out descending devices and interlink each other, I guess, or try to work as effectively as possible to keep the message out, particularly when it comes times for opportunities when free devices are available.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have a list here. I have Martha next.

 MS. GUYAS: I kind of wonder. I have some of the same concerns as you all, and I wonder if we put the amendment kind of on hold, at least for the time being, and I think we need to do outreach.

 There is no doubt about that, and I think the Sea Grant presentation illustrated that pretty well, that there is a lot of people that really just aren't aware or don't understand, and we can couple with the RESTORE efforts and what Gulf States and the other states may be doing, but maybe we put this on hold for

now, the regulatory part.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Then I had Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I think my inclination is that education and outreach, for now, is the best approach, particularly in light of the implications of this towards the use of restoration money and things, and so I would probably agree with Martha, or I think Martha said it, the idea of putting the amendment on hold for now and embarking more on an outreach-oriented approach.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Well, I am probably speaking in the minority here. I mean, I am certainly not opposed at all to outreach and education. In fact, I'm a huge proponent of that. You know that I don't have a nice motion prepared, and I'm fine waiting until the next meeting or something, but I sure would like to see this move forward in a more formal way, because it takes a while.

I mean, we all know with the RESTORE money, and I certainly would not want to cut out any type of program that would facilitate this process, but there's a lot of good work that goes into the RESTORE proposals, and a lot of them don't get funded, and so, for us to make decisions that may or may not happen is probably not the best way, and I think, even if it was, there are some ways we can work around that.

 Just so I'm on the record, and, probably in the next meeting or so, I would probably come back with some motions, or I would like to see this move forward in a more formal way, just because I see the value of these in the fisheries, and I want to make one more comment, Madam Chair, if it's okay, while I have the microphone.

There was some public comment yesterday about perceptions of mortality and eating the discarded fish, of dolphins and other things, and that's certainly true. That happens, and there's no doubt about it, but, overall, I think, of all the groups doing this work, they're seeing much more value than the offsetting predation that occurs on these fish, and so I guess I'm fine for now in proceeding in that way, but I would hope, in the very near future, that we would take this up in a more formal amendment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, Dr. Stunz, I think I'm in your camp. I think I would like to see this amendment move forward as well.

I mean, I hear the comments about the RESTORE Act funds, but that oil spill was in 2010, and this is seven years later, and we're still waiting on certain funds to come through the channels, and so I don't know about waiting on funds for a ten to fifty-dollar device.

We make them pay more than that to have lifejackets on the boat, and we don't. That's you over here on this side of the table, but, anyway, the other thing that I think about are some of the new regulations that we have with amberjack. We increased that size limit, and we're going to have more discards there. Anything that we can do, especially for these species that we have issues with -- We have issues with amberjack, and we're going to have no season recreationally on triggerfish next year. You're going to have a lot of -- This year, I guess it is. Excuse me. We're in 2017, and so we're going to have some discards, some increase in discards there.

I think it's something that we probably should continue to pursue. It was also something that came from the recreational community in the outside group that got together.

That was one of the things that we heard several times from them that they were in favor of, and that is one piece, obviously, of a solution that the recreational community has brought to us, and it's something we keep asking them for, or come to us with solutions, and so, I think if we kind of put this on the back burner, that would send the wrong signal to them, but that's just my opinion on it. Next, I had Mr. Walker and then Mr. Gregory and then Mr. Anson.

 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was just going to mention, in the commercial industry, we were using venting tools even before they were required, at one time, and after they were required, and there's a lot of times that fish doesn't actually need to be vented, but there are times that they do need to be vented, and we have always practiced that. Almost everyone I know in the commercial industry has tried to use commonsense.

When you see a fish that looks like he needs to be vented, then you need to vent that fish, and so I think the education and outreach would be of value too, but, like in the commercial industry, we're also using the venting tools and, the descender device, I don't think that would probably benefit us much, but a venting tool does.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I had Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I was just going to elaborate. When we made our outreach committee a technical committee, we also expanded it, and we tried to get a representative from each of the Gulf Sea Grant programs, in addition to each of the state communications people that work in the state agencies.

I think one person dropped off, and so we'll try to replace that, and so that gives us access to all of the Sea Grant programs in the Gulf, and then they, in conjunction with the commission, have started meeting at the spring and fall meeting of the state commission to coordinate among themselves, and so that's an opportunity where they can work together on that too, and so we would simply be facilitating that, in addition to doing a video and putting stuff on our website, but we certainly won't be out doing workshops ourselves. We will be encouraging other people to do that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I had Mr. Anson and then Mr. Boyd.

MR. ANSON: Going back to what Greg talked about, that you're going to hold off on any motions, I appreciate that, and I am with you. I guess my question, and I'm not too familiar with the RESTORE process and their funding cycles, and so I'm looking down at Glenn, and he's got his hand up.

That would be my question, is that we have passed many years since the oil spill, and we'll continue on many years, as far as funding cycles, and so I don't want to give the indication, at least where I'm at, to just keep waiting and waiting and waiting for a proposal to be funded, but I certainly don't want, if there is something that's in the works now to be reviewed for the next approval cycle, that, if there is a proposal out there to continue giving descending devices out free to the public, I don't want a motion started here for someone that's in the decision-making process to see that the council is going to be developing some regulatory framework and so we're going to not fund this project, whereas they might have if there was no pending action.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Mr. Constant?

MR. CONSTANT: Yes, and so a couple of points of information. I think it is a pretty complex maze of funding through all the different pots of resources available from Gulf restoration, but, in this case, I think the NRDA pot of money has some very specific funding for injury for these resources.

In the latest notice of intent for public input about what kinds of restoration they would like to see with fish and water-column invertebrates, this idea of reducing bycatch and descender devices as a means of restoration has come to the top of priority, and so I think there's a really good, strong interest in funding these kinds of things. There are projects proposing descender device distribution, in the way of mortality reduction, in the hopper.

It's currently going through a prioritization process right now, which will probably be completed in the next month or so, and so it is a little different than the kind of broad discussions about all of this available restoration money that we've had in the past. That said, the expectations about when that money would be available, just kind of for your information, I think would be sometime in 2018, mid to late 2018, in the current cycle.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: One question. When you say that money is available, you mentioned some research, and so is this money to research descending devices or is this money to actually say, no, we're going to pay to put descending devices on licensed angler vessels?

MR. CONSTANT: It could be either. I think the proposals that are in right now are actually for the distribution of devices to reduce bycatch, and so it's actual restoration effort that would leave fish in the water as a restoration means.

There could also be proposals to research, because it was put out for public input, and so there could be many different proposals, but I can tell you that the prioritization has been to actually implement restoration, which would be the distribution of those devices.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Dr. Stunz?

DR. STUNZ: Yes, to that point, Glenn, and maybe you can give some clarification, and, Roy, please correct me if I'm wrong, because I don't know if you were 100 percent certain about would funding like prevent -- Since this gear, but it's kind of one of those things that I don't know if that was the intent of the RFP or whatever, and would that technically prevent distribution of these devices if we did something like that, or you may not know the answer, but we may be talking about something that's not issue, is what I am trying to get at.

MR. CONSTANT: There are exclusion criteria that come with the

prioritization, and, so, when they filter through these projects, one of the things that excludes proposals from being considered is whether or not it's required under federal law, and so, if you acted in a way that made it mandatory, it would take that particular project off the table for funding.

DR. STUNZ: That would apply in this case then is what you're saying.

MR. CONSTANT: Right.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Once it's written into the Federal Code as a regulation, it would apply, but yet, if we had it ready with our list of approved devices, and you finally bless it on your end and there is money for it, and you start handing them out, and then we send that amendment up to NOAA to say, all right, we want to complement that and now it's required to.

MR. CONSTANT: I don't think there is anything that prevents that scenario from unfolding. That said, it is in a prioritization queue, and so there may be some consideration for that, if that was the intent.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: You just mentioned a set of approved devices, and we haven't really discussed that in detail, and it's a slippery slope, whether we list what's approved or just leave it up to the anglers to determine what they're going to do, which causes enforcement a little problem, but, if we start trying to list what's approved, we're going to get ourselves into a TED situation, where these devices have to be tested and proved effective before they can be approved, and we'll be amending this document each time somebody develops a new tool, and so that -- If we're going to do the regulation viewpoint, that really has to have a lot of thought put into it, how we're going to approach that part.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

 DR. STUNZ: To that point, Madam Chair, and, Doug, you're exactly right, and that's one reason I favor moving this a little bit forward sooner, because it is going to take a lot of discussion. David Walker just brought up some great points as well that would have to be built into that, in terms of do you have to use it every time or not and all of that, or just onboard.

As we well know, this process is never characterized as fast, and so it's going to take some time, and that's why I would be in favor of starting this sooner than later, and we can always hold off if the funding climate issues develop or whatever.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Doug Boyd has been waiting patiently, and so I'm going to let him go.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The discussion that we have just had is what I wanted to bring up. I am in favor of moving forward. I think there are a lot of moving parts in this, and I think there's definitions in this.

We know devices work, and we need to understand how the commercial, the recreational, the for-hire industry uses the devices and what's appropriate for them to have on their boats, and I think we ought to move forward and discuss it. It doesn't mean that we have to make anything mandatory, and it doesn't mean that we even have to finalize it, but I think we ought to have those discussions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a couple of things. One was one of the headboat guys made a good point. If we require descending devices, you've got some poor soul on the deck running around descending the heck out of a bunch of fish, but, more importantly, I did some quick numbers, and my assumptions may be way off, but, at a fifty-dollar device, we're looking at about \$25 million here worth of stuff, and I think there's going to be a lot of interest in the vendor community to make sure they're on that list, and I think that -- I am almost of a mind not to worry about making these things free to the public, but my mind could be changed, but I think that's a dangerous thing to do. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Where do we want to leave staff on this? Do we want to tell them to bring it back to us again in August with more analysis or do we want to tell them to just hold tight for a little bit? We're going to need a motion and vote it up or down if I'm not even going to get any nodding of heads around the table. Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I would ask that you not specify that we bring it back in August. We have a lot of other things going on with red snapper, and this is not going to be a high-priority item. We can continue working on it as a regulation, or we can shift gears and develop a policy that's more easily

developed, but please don't tie us down to bringing this to you at every meeting or anything like that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for keeping me straight. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I was just going to say that -- I mean, as much as I would like to see this go forward, I don't have a pressing concern that couldn't be taken up and we pass the motion or do something at the next meeting or in the fairly near future to get this rolling, but, for right now, I think we're kind of -- At least from my mind, I am feeling okay.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am going to ask this in a different way. Is everybody okay with staff bringing this back at some point in the future with further analysis to look at both the regulatory side and what may or may not be approved and start getting into that discussion? Are you okay with that or not? I need some nodding of heads, at least. I am getting thumbs-up and yes. All right. So there's not a time certain, but it will stay in movement and getting some traction at some point. All right. Thank you, guys.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It was just pointed out to me that one thing in this committee that we didn't cover is the SSC comments, and this is Tab B, Number 14, and that had vermilion and status determination criteria comments, but also a review of the draft underharvest carryover options.

In these comments, we have a few SSC member questions and suggestions, but, overall, in the last paragraph, it says, recognizing that the carryover amendment is in the early stages of development, the SSC requested to review future document updates, especially in light of the simulations the committee requested above.

The SSC thought that review of these simulations would allow the committee to better evaluate the different outcomes and tradeoffs of the various options in this amendment. We will definitely be taking this back to the SSC, probably at their September meeting, and then back to the council here in October.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I did have that as a note here to myself, that staff needed some guidance on how to proceed with that carryover document, and so is that enough guidance to staff, that the SSC needs to evaluate some scenarios? Mr. Atran, was the -- Was that Mr. Rindone's document?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It's Ryan's.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and he's not here today. Dr. Simmons, are you comfortable with where you're headed on that document?

DR. SIMMONS: Yes, and thank you, Madam Chair. I think we do need to put the moving average information in there and then put it back before the SSC again at their September meeting, when it's in-person and not a webinar, and so that would be our plan right now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. As long as you're clear and everybody is okay with that on the agenda for the SSC, I don't see anybody really opposed to it around the table, and so we should be good there. Is that all of our guidance that we needed under that committee report? I think it is.

I hesitate to ask you all this, because I work you through lunch every meeting on the last day, but here's what we have left, guys. We need to announce our advisory panel members, and we do not have a vote on an exempted fishing permit. We have already gone through that. We have our Supporting Agencies Updates and then I think we have already cleared everything out of Other Business, and so do you all want to work through lunch? You do not have to work through lunch. I am seeing some yes. Okay. All right. It is only 11:30, and so maybe you won't starve to death before we get there. Next, it's going to be our Announcement of Advisory Panel members, and I am going to let Mr. Gregory do that for us.

ANNOUNCE ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We have reappointed the Coastal Migratory Pelagics and the Red Drum Advisory Panels this year for a three-year term. For the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Advisory Panel, there is sixteen members. They are: Roy Cravey, Judson Curtis, Gary Jarvis, Chris Jenkins, David Krebs, Tom Marvel, Jeffrey Matthews, George Niles, Michael Nugent, Kelty Readenour, William Stein III, Fred Tewell, Ed Walker, Lance Walker, James Michael Whitfield, and Robert Woithe. That is the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Advisory Panel.

 For the Red Drum Advisory Panel, there are fourteen members, and it's: Francis Donaldson, Benjamin Graham, John Green, Joseph Hendon, Robert Leaf, Jeffrey Miller, Burt E. Moritz, Lance Nacio, Ben Raines, Erman Rawlings, Sonny Schindler, Derek Shoobridge, Dustin Trochesset, and Troy Williamson. That completes the list of members.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. That completes that agenda item, which will bring us to our Supporting Agencies Update, and I will start with our South Atlantic representative, Ms. Anna Beckwith. Did you have anything that you wanted to update us on?

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATE

SOUTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL LIAISON

for-hire

concentrating our efforts on discussion around our snapper

grouper for-hire limited permit, and we will not be continuing discussion, at this time, on our CMP permit or our dolphin wahoo

We're still in the very early stages

For red snapper, we are working on an amendment for red snapper right now. We're basing our focus primarily on best fishing

terms of products from our visioning process, we are working on

amendments for recreational and commercial changes that would

come directly from the visioning process that we had over the

yellowtail and dolphin amendments until we get some revised MRIP

practices, and we're waiting on some resolution to an ABC.

numbers, and so that's really all we're working on.

wanted to update us on, but do you have anything, sir?

You will see, under the briefing

Finally, we suspended work on the

That sounds good. I will move over to Mr.

entry.

We

limited

6

7

8

9

10 MS. 11 materials, our last meeting report from our March meeting, if anybody would like to look through that, but just a couple of 12 13 points that might interest you.

BECKWITH:

last couple of years,

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:

Constant.

are

permit.

discussion.

I did.

working on a

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

2.1 22

23 24

25 26

27 28

29 30

31 32

33 34 35

36 37

38

39 40

41 42

43 44

45

46

47

48 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:

please, sir?

MR. CONSTANT:

Sure, I can do that.

170

Thanks.

Thank you. I appreciate it. All right,

Thank you, sir. We appreciate that.

I don't know if there was anything else that you

MR. CONSTANT: No, ma'am, but just unless there's other questions, but my best wishes to departing members.

have one -- If you will keep us posted as you move forward with

the descending devices proposals, will you just keep us updated,

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Lieutenant Commander, you're next on the list.

U.S. COAST GUARD

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. We've got just one slide to kind of capture some highlights here. I will try and keep this -- I will stick to the highlight reel. For the first bullet, we had a unique case back on April 2. This case, in particular, commenced in Corpus Christi, after the Corpus Christi Police Department observed a rendezvous between a lancha and a vehicle on the beach.

When the lancha departed the beach, Coast Guard forces against south Texas commenced a lengthy pursuit. The reason I bring this case up is we're always seeing the lancha threat change, and this is one of those unique cases where, during the pursuit, the lancha entered the surf zone, and that pretty much curtailed our ability to use warning shots and disabling fire, mainly because of the safety of the people on the beach.

As you can see in the P2, the second picture down, the watercraft was maneuvering quite close to the shoreline, and you can actually see people on the beach up there near their vehicles, and so the result was the craft actually made it all the way to Mexican territorial seas.

It just became difficult to issue those warning shots and disabling fire, for safety purposes, but the fact that they were not fishing and their aggressive behavior, along with the observations from our aircraft, just further confirms links or ties with other illicit trafficking.

On the second bullet, Coast Guard forces in Texas have coordinated a large-scale surge operation to enforce the Texas shrimp closure. We boarded more than a dozen shrimpers that were on the edge of the state line in Louisiana waters, and there were no significant violations. Air Station Corpus Christi also flew several missions with NOAA OLE agents onboard, and they did not observe any activity of shrimpers in the Texas corridor.

The third bullet, the Coast Guard Cutter Vigilant is in the Gulf throughout June, and they're conducting a focus on highly migratory species vessels and patrolling the maritime boundary line. Coupled with fixed-wing aircraft from the Aviation Training Center in Mobile, Vigilant has already boarded several HMS vessels and discovered violations of tuna carcass status. One vessel also received a termination, due to multiple safety

violations.

On the positive side, all of the vessels that were in the gear restricted area that Vigilant was patrolling, all of those vessels had appropriate licenses and permitted gear onboard.

The last bullet was from last week, and that is -- I missed one, didn't I? May 15, Station Freeport and CBP, that was kind of a last-minute addition that I added, and I apologize for not mentioning that in my order of events here, but Station Freeport has done a tremendous job working with partner agencies to identify a lot of poaching that's going on with red snapper, and that particular case, on May 15, the owner of the vessel admitted to catching twelve red snapper in federal waters, but they had this unique secret compartment that was underneath the seat for the center console.

The owner of the vessel demonstrated how he activates the latch for the hidden compartment. He basically had a switch inside his electronics panel that he would flip, and then his trim tab was used to open the compartment door, and so, once we knew the compartment was there, we basically said that you're going to have to open the compartment and show us what's in it, and that's when they identified the red snapper and asked him where he caught them, and he admitted to fishing in federal waters. I think he got a \$2,000 fine leveraged from TP&W against him, and they seized the catch.

 The last bullet there, June 1, was the Lancha Working Group. That was last week in New Orleans. We had the privilege to host several members from NOAA Region Southeast General Counsel and also from NOAA's Office of Law Enforcement at Headquarters were in attendance, and, in addition to that, from our Coast Guard side of the house, we had personnel from Coast Guard Headquarters, Atlantic Area, and the deployable specialized forces. It was all trying to address the forward thinking on where we're going with the lancha threat and what to do with the trends and analysis that we're still currently seeing.

There was one more lancha interdiction last night. Unfortunately, we did not get them before they had retrieved their gear, and so they had already caught over a hundred red snapper, and, of course, you know that gets returned to the sea, because we don't have any place to keep it. Madam Chair, pending any questions or further discussion, that concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. That was very interesting. We do

have a question from Mr. Matens.

1 2 3

MR. MATENS: Leo, I have noticed this in a bunch of presentations that you've made. In P1, that lancha there, and I guess they call them pangas in the west, just before the guy with his hand on the tiller, there's a little vertical box thing, and what is that?

 LCDR DANAHER: That's just really like kind of a console. All the lanchas that we see traditionally have tiller-driven engines, but they have that sort of center post there, just in front of the operator, and it's usually where they might have some kind of VHF radio or any of their kind of communications gear, because they do communicate with one another when they're out there.

Some of the questions have been whether or not the Mexican government is enforcing AIS equipment onboard the vessel, and, to this date, I can report that, of all the lanchas we have seized, we have never found an AIS onboard.

MR. MATENS: You mean they communicate over VHF radio with each other, where you can listen?

LCDR DANAHER: Sometimes we have found VHF radio, and, other times, we have found CB radios, and so they're trying to avoid detection by using other types of frequencies and gear, and that's just one of the methods they use to evade us.

MR. MATENS: Thank you.

DR. DANA: What's an AIS?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: You can answer, but it's required for vessels outside of three miles now, and, essentially, like you all worry about VMS and people knowing where you're fishing, you put an AIS on that boat, and everybody in the world can see it. It tracks your location.

There's an app on our phone, and we can see where our boats are at all times. If you want to know where to go to catch the shrimp, pull your AIS up, and you can see where all the boats are going back and forth and back and forth. It's wonderful.

DR. DANA: What does it stand for though?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I think it's automatic identification system. Is that right?

LCDR DANAHER: That sounds right to me. I get into acronym soup sometimes, but the AIS systems -- That is more traditional with just the general commercial traffic out there, and it's apparently something that the Mexican government has been looking into, but we haven't -- In our communication with NOAA and with the State Department, we have not yet observed any kind of AIS equipment onboard seized lanchas.

Now, that doesn't rule out the possibility that they could be dumping it before they get to the interdiction point, but any kind of bracket system or some kind of evidence that would show that the AIS was on there prior to us making the interdiction, we haven't seen anything like that either.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: There is an organization called Global Fishing Watch, and they have tapped into AIS and other tracking mechanisms, and you can go to their websites and look at the distribution of fishing vessels throughout the world, and other people are using it to monitor marine reserves and if there is illegal fishing going on.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It became a Coast Guard requirement for commercial vessels over a certain length, and I don't remember what the length is.

LCDR DANAHER: Sixty-five.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sixty-five and operating outside of three miles. If your boat is over sixty-five feet, you have to have this on and operating, so everybody can see where you are. It was a safety thing. It was mainly big ships and crew boats and supply boats and stuff that had them before that, and, for safety purposes, the Coast Guard lumped some fishing vessels in there, too. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Lieutenant Commander Danaher, just a couple of questions. You mentioned the analysis on the lancha poaching, and that is pretty much a set task for folks in the Coast Guard, is to estimate the pounds each year. I know you've been doing it, and you provided a presentation a few meetings ago, but that's going to be a consistent thing until the poaching threat is eliminated, or nearly eliminated, correct?

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, sir. The lancha economic impact assessment,

or analysis, is something that my counterparts up at the Atlantic Area are trying to conduct every single year. They were unable to compute the data for 2015, based on discrepancies with one of their variables for where Coast Guard vessels were located, and so that's part of their computation, is to download essentially the track history for all the Coast Guard patrol boats in that maritime boundary line corridor.

They're hoping for better data this year to do the 2016 assessment, and they are also looking to coordinate a little bit more with NOAA for peer review and such, but the intent is to continue to do the assessment annually.

MR. ANSON: One other question. Setting the Mexican poaching incidents aside, how much in the Gulf of Mexico do you all — How many incidents or cases do you make each year, roughly, for other crossings and harvesting and deployment of gear inside the EEZ?

LCDR DANAHER: Sir, the only data that I really have is for the Mexican lanchas. We have not observed any other foreign nations, but we are also limited in our endurance capability, and so, with the fast-response cutters that are larger, 154 feet, they will be coming online, two of them, this summer.

They will have the reach to give us a better assessment on the edge of the EEZ, in some of the high-seas pockets, because we do patrol those periodically, especially with fixed-wing aircraft, but we're not going out there every single day, and the data that we're receiving for those regions doesn't reflect any kind of illegal activity.

MR. ANSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I am just curious. In past presentations, we've seen how many boats they have caught and disposed of and estimated the catches derived from those boats, and do you have any sense of the magnitude of this, in terms of here are the ones that we caught, but perhaps this much of it is going on that we don't catch, because of obvious reasons.

 LCDR DANAHER: Yes, sir. That point was actually made at the lancha working group last week, and that is one of the items that the impact assessment is trying to capture. Offhand, I don't -- I can get back to you on the exact numbers, but it was certainly one of those conservative estimates of we're probably

only catching maybe 20 or 30 percent of what's actually going on out there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Just to follow up on that, when we went to the CCC meeting in May, where all eight councils are together, there was actually interest from councils in Alaska about these lanchas, because the pictures that were shown showed that they had a sizeable amount of red snapper on them, and red snapper sometimes ends up in our political realm and maybe has effects on other councils, from that aspect, and so they were kind of interested in, hey, are you trying to get a handle on how many of those fish are being landed illegally and incorporating that into your data streams and your assessments and such, and so just if you maybe could pass that along to our future council representative and let him know that we will still be interested in seeing how that can be incorporated one day.

LCDR DANAHER: Certainly, Madam Chair. One other point to mention is -- I just wanted to kind of bring the topics back to the domestic fisheries side and segue a little bit off of what Mr. Anson was asking about for domestic cases, but we are seeing a very substantial compliance rate when we do the fishery boardings for domestic fisheries, which is a good thing.

Sadly though, on that 6 or 7 percent where we are seeing violations being committed, it falls in line with that center bullet there from May 15. It's these egregious cases, where people are deliberately out there trying to circumvent the law and the authorities, and so, while most of the Gulf -- Most of the fishermen that are out there, at least from what our boarding numbers reflect, is that people are doing a good job at playing by the rules, but, unfortunately, we are still discovering some negligence and deliberate violations.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

 MR. SANCHEZ: One last thing. I, for one, would be very interested in seeing like a summary, when you get it, of the June 1 lancha working group meeting. Maybe we can see that at some point.

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, sir. I would be happy to. We're still working on all of the notes and the report from that event, but I would say that it was very successful, and it was the first time in recent years that we had significant NOAA presence there, which was extremely helpful in scoping the strategy and direction.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Very interesting update, and I just want to say, again, thank you so much for being around this table with us. We have thoroughly enjoyed it. We wish you the best of luck in your new position with the Coast Guard, but we hope to see you again, and definitely in January in New Orleans, if not before, sir.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would say that you're building a pretty good army of Coast Guard members that are now more knowledgeable on the marine affairs, because I am only transferring internally, and I will have more impact on the operations that are going on in the field, and so, as we bring on additional expertise, it's just getting to be a larger fire team of those of us that are trying to help you out there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. It's much appreciated. All right. Next, I am going to go over to Mr. Dave Donaldson, to see if he has an update from Gulf States for us.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MR. DONALDSON: Madam Chair, thank you. I do not. Being the last person, I don't really have anything to share, but I just want to reiterate my appreciation for Dr. Dana and the Lieutenant Commander, and I wish them well in their future endeavors.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I will echo that. Dr. Dana, you will be missed. I will never forget my first vote on the council. It was 30B, and they called on me first, of all things. It was final action, a roll call vote, and I had to decide yes or no, and you have never held that against me, I have to say.

You continued to work with me, because I am pretty sure that your and my votes cancelled each other out on that one, and so thank you for being open-minded and always being there when I had a question, as I tried to learn, and still am trying to learn, and I very much appreciate it, and I have enjoyed working with you, and come back and see us any time.

DR. DANA: I may have held it against you. Well, as I said the other day at the reception, and thanks to the Charter Fishermen's Association and Reef Fish Alliance for hosting that very nice reception on Tuesday.

As I said then, I won't miss the process much. However, I -- Actually, I won't miss the process at all, but I will miss the individuals on this council. It's been a privilege and an honor

to get to know all of you and serve with you, and this council, and I don't care what side of the fence you sit on, this council has absolutely fine folks sitting on it, and it's been a privilege.

I thank Dr. Crabtree for supporting me for two appointments. I know you stood up to put me on here, and I appreciate it, and I thank Nick Wiley and Jessica McCawley and my friend, Martha Guyas, for their years of support as well, and so that's about it. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Dr. Dana. I think that's everything on our agenda. Let me double-check my checkmarks here. Yes, I believe that is it. It's not too, too late. It's almost noon. Thank you, everybody. I know we worked some pretty long days this time. I started you early and worked you late a couple of times, and we worked through lunch today, and I appreciate all your efforts, and we will see you again in August. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 8, 2017.)

_ _ _