Tab B, No. 5a

Summary for the Joint Meeting of the Ad Hoc Reef Fish Headboat

and Ad Hoc Red Snapper Charter Advisory Panels

New Orleans, Louisiana

January 9-10, 2017

Council, Staff, NMFS, and Facilitator
Patrick Banks
Doug Boyd
Roy Crabtree
Myron Fischer
Johnny Green
Camp Matens
John Sanchez
Ed Swindell
Assane Diagne
Matt Freeman
Sue Gerhart
Karen Hoak
Emily Muehlstein
Carrie Simmons
Betty Staugler
Jessica Stephen

Headboat Panel Attendance
Frank (Skipper) Thierry*
Pam Anderson
Randy Boggs
Clifton Cox
Jim Green*
Chad Haggert
Mark Hubbard
Kelly Owens
Charlie Paprocki
Eric Schmidt
Tom Steber*

Charter Boat Panel Attendance
Gary Bryant
Shane Cantrell
Daryl Carpenter
Mike Eller
Troy Frady
Charles Guilford
Gary Jarvis
Mark Kelley
Mike Nugent
Rene Rice
Scott Robson
Sonny Schindler
Ed Walker

Attendance - Others
Jeff Barger
Bill Butler
Dylan Butler
Katie Chapiesky
Richard Fischer
Betty Harder
Pamela Jarvis
Robert Jones
Jason Klosterman
Sharon McBreen
Randy Pausina
Elizabeth Silleck
Bill Staff
Ben Weber
Daniel Willard
Scott Hickman
Ken Anderson

* Denotes a member serving on both Advisory Panels.

The Ad Hoc Reef Fish Headboat and Ad Hoc Red Snapper Charter Advisory Panels (APs) convened a joint meeting at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, January 9, 2017. Betty Staugler, from Florida Sea Grant, and Council staff Emily Muehlstein facilitated the meeting. The facilitators provided an agenda, overview presentation, and a question guide (see Appendix at the end of this Summary) to direct the discussion and work towards a consensus. The following summary generally follows the meeting discussion chronologically; however, as the APs returned to some portions of the question guide for further discussion, these comments have been grouped together to facilitate review of the APs' consensus statements.

Overview of the For-Hire Sector and Summary of Current Reef Fish Amendments 41 and 42

Council staff and NMFS presented a brief overview of the for-hire sector, focusing on the geographic distribution of permits, red snapper landings distribution both between charter and headboat as well as regionally, and distribution of passenger capacity. After reviewing the Purpose of the joint meeting, which is to provide an opportunity to build consensus between the charter and headboat components of the recreational sector and recommend to the Council management approaches suitable to the specificities and needs of both components, the facilitators invited AP members to contribute to the rationale for the meeting. Members voiced that the rationale included arriving at recommendations to the Council on whether to move forward with a single or separate amendments for the for-hire sub-sectors, how to address latent permits, and address the issue of landings history for the for-hire sector. Then, staff presented an overview of information on the for-hire permits, species considered, and potential timeline status for Reef Fish Amendments 41 and 42.

Decisions on For-Hire Management Programs

Staff gave a two-part presentation related to decisions for for-hire management programs. The first part focused on type of management, timing and number of for-hire programs, and species to include. AP members then discussed each of those topics, as noted below. The second part focused on division of for-hire quota, adjustments to individual allocations, participation, and other decisions. Following that part of the presentation, AP members again discussed each of those topics as noted below.

Preferred Management Approach for the For-Hire Fleet

The AP members discussed traditional management and allocation based management with regards to benefits and drawbacks of each. AP members pointed out benefits of traditional management include the following: can be applied across the for-hire sector through seasonal closures as well as bag and size limits; involves simple management. It was noted that a drawback to traditional management is that it can lead to derby fishing. AP members listed benefits of allocation based management include the following: offers opportunities for year-round fishing; reduces pressure on fish in a certain period of time. Some AP members spoke against inter-sector trade as a potential design element of allocation based management. An AP member also raised the concern that if the poundage to be allocated is too low, then operators would not be able to sustain their operations and remain in the industry.

Consensus statement: The APs are willing to consider and will try to design an allocation based system.

Preferred Avenue with Separate Amendments or Single Amendment

The AP members discussed whether they should recommend to the Council pursuing separate amendments or a single amendment for management of the for-hire sector. It was noted that the Council's decision on electronic reporting for the for-hire sector at the January meeting might affect the ease of managing headboats and charter vessels together. One member stated that a single amendment would be less chaotic for both the Council and the communities affected but that having separate amendments would address the needs and specificities of both the headboats and charter boats. AP members pointed out that headboats already have a landings history and that merging into a single amendment could be seen as penalizing them.

Consensus statement: Move forward with two amendments, and neither will move forward without the other. Both go to referendum at the same time. If one referendum fails, then they both stop.

Timeframe for Implementation

AP members next discussed the timeframe for implementing the amendments. Some AP members expressed a desire for implementation as soon as possible. Other members noted that taking time to work out all the details, such as latent permits and development of landing history, would be more equitable for everyone; however, it was addressed that some individuals needing to build a catch history may attempt to pad their landings numbers going forward. One member stated that the cyclical redistribution presented by NMFS staff seemed like a viable option and could be put into place sooner. After some discussion, most AP members did not show interest in prolonging implementation by the time period necessary to gather landings history for the charter vessels. While AP members were split between moving forward with landings proxies and using cyclical redistribution, with a potential implementation date of 2019, and moving forward with gathering one year of data with electronic logbooks (ELBs) to remove latent permits and using cyclical redistribution, with a potential implementation date of 2020, members were able to reach a consensus statement.

Consensus statement: The charter and headboat programs are implemented at the same time.

Species Included in the Management Approach

The AP members then discussed prioritizing five species (red snapper, greater amberjack, triggerfish, gag, and red grouper) and their recommendation for how many of those species should be included. One member noted that if ELBs were to be used for the for-hire sector, then it would be preferable for all five species to be included in the management approach. Another member expressed that fish allocated to the for-hire sector is caught by the public, and so developing a fishery management plan that included five species would improve the fishery for the public.

The APs prioritized the five species (from highest priority to lowest priority) as follows:

1) Red snapper
2) Greater amberjack
3) Triggerfish
4) Gag
5) Red grouper

When asked how they would perceive a management program that included fewer than five species, AP members responded that they already considered five species to be a compromise.

> **Consensus statement: We want all five species included in the management program.**

Quota Apportionment between the Charter and Headboat Components

The AP members discussed how to apportion quota between the charter vessels and headboats, should the Council decide to proceed with two separate amendments.

Consensus statement: The landings histories for the Beaufort survey vessels should be brought into the program(s). For vessels with high passenger capacity that were or were not previously included in the survey, the survey vessels will set aside allocation with future cyclical redistribution for those vessels that are operational. For those additional vessels that would be added to the program, a portion of what would have been allocated for charter vessels will be transferred to the headboat vessels.

Conducting Initial Individual Apportionments

The AP members discussed how to conduct initial individual apportionments. Since not all vessels in the for-hire sector have an established catch history, they discussed the potential role of cyclical redistribution, based on a presentation by NMFS staff, as a way of not having to rely solely on trading in order for shares to go to vessels that are actively fishing.

Consensus statement: That headboats be those vessels that are included in the Beaufort study, those that have established catch histories.

The APs also request that the Council reconvene the APs following the January Council meeting at the earliest convenience. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. on January 10.

Appendix – Question Guide

1. **What is the preferred management approach for the for-hire fleet?**
   - What are the benefits of traditional management?
   - What are the deal breakers for traditional management?
   - What are the benefits of allocation based management?
   - What are the deal breakers for using allocation based management?
   - Consensus statement:

2. **Would a separate amendment or a single amendment be the preferred avenue?**
   - What are the benefits of separate programs?
   - What are the deal breakers for using separate programs?
   - What are the benefits of a single program?
   - What are the deal breakers for using a single program?
   - Consensus statement:

3. **What is the timeframe for implementation?**
   - What are the benefits of waiting for electronic reporting?
   - What are the deal breakers of waiting for electronic reporting?
   - Wat are the benefits of moving forward without electronic reporting?
   - What are the deal breakers of moving forward without electronic reporting?
   - Consensus statement:

4. **What species should be included in the management approach?**
   - Priority order of species to include:
   - Number of species that must be included to move forward:
   - Consensus statement:

5. **How should quotas be apportioned between the charter and headboat components?**
   - Why should we use the headboat landings histories?
   - Why shouldn't we use the headboat landings histories?
   - Why should we use proxies?
   - Why shouldn't we use proxies?
   - Which proxies would be most appropriate to use?
   - What are the deal breakers?
   - Consensus statement:

6. **How should initial individual apportionments be conducted?**
   - Why should we use the headboat landings histories?
   - Why shouldn't we use the headboat landings histories?
   - Why should we use proxies?
   - Why shouldn't we use proxies?
   - Which proxies would be most appropriate to use?

- What are the deal breakers?
- Consensus statement:

7. **Should adjustments to individual allocations be considered following the initial apportionments?**
    - How often should these be adjusted?

8. **Should the management program(s) be mandatory or provide opt-out opportunity?**

9. **Should the management program(s) be phased-in or implemented at once?**