1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL 2 3 299TH MEETING 4 5 FULL COUNCIL SESSION 6 7 The Lodge at Gulf State Park Gulf Shores, Alabama 8 9 APRIL 10-11, 2024 10 11 **VOTING MEMBERS** 12 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)...........Alabama 13 Kesley Banks......Texas 14 Susan Boggs.......Alabama 15 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana 16 Dale Diaz......Mississippi 17 J.D. Dugas.....Louisiana 18 19 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)......Texas 20 21 Michael McDermott......Mississippi 22 Anthony Overton......Alabama 23 Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut).....Louisiana 24 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi 25 Andy Strelcheck......NMFS 26 C.J. Sweetman......Florida 27 Ed Walker......Florida 28 Troy Williamson.....Texas 29 30 NON-VOTING MEMBERS 31 Dave Donaldson......GSMFC 32 LTJG Jacob Shinnick......USCG 33 34 STAFF 35 Max Birdsong......Social Scientist 36 Assane Diagne......Economist 37 Matt Freeman......Economist 38 John Froeschke......Deputy Director 39 Lisa Hollensead......Fishery Biologist Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel 40 41 Jessica Matos......Administrative & Accounting Technician 42 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison 43 44 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager 45 Carrie Simmons......Executive Director 46

| 1 | Austin Abrams |
|----------|---------------------------------------|
| 2 | Brett Alger |
| 3 | Scott BannonAL |
| _ | |
| 4 | Elizabeth BoggsOrange Beach, AL |
| 5 | Randy BoggsOrange Beach, AL |
| 6 | Eric BrazerShareholders Alliance |
| 7 | B.J. BurkettPanama City, FL |
| 8 | Rick BurrisMS |
| 9 | Heather BloughNOAA |
| 10 | Ron ChicolaLA |
| 11 | Anthony CollettiLA |
| 12 | Richard CodyNOAA OST |
| 13 | Major Jason DowneyAL |
| 14 | Katie FischerMatlacha, FL |
| 15 | Brad GentnerGentner Consulting |
| 16 | Jim Green |
| 17 | Ken HaddadASA, FL |
| 18 | Jesse Heiser |
| 19 | Scott Hickman |
| 20 | Dylan HubbardFL |
| 21 | Brian Lewis |
| 22 | Lissa LynckerBOEM |
| 23 | Ryan Mallory |
| 24 | Lawrence MarinoLA |
| 25 | Jessica McCawleyFWC, FL |
| 26 | Christina Package-WardNOAA |
| 27 | Alicia Paul |
| 28 | Kelia PaulPanama City, FL |
| 29 | Laura Picariello |
| 30 31 | Clarence Seymour |
| 31 | Jessica Stephen |
| 32 33 | James StevensApalachicola, FL |
| | Mark TryonGulf Breeze, FL |
| 34 | Matt WaliaNOAA OLE |
| 35 | David WalkerAL |
| 36 | John WalterSEFSC |
| 37 38 | Jerry Whisenhunt |
| 39 | Johnny Williams |
| 39 40 | Dale Woodruff |
| 41 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 41 | Bob Zales |
| 43 | oim daibiick |
| 44 | |
| 45 | |
| 10 | |

| | TABLE OF CONTENTS |
|----------|---|
| Table | e of Motions |
| | |
| Call | to Order, Announcements, and Introductions |
| Adopt | cion of Agenda and Approval of Minutes |
| Prese | entations |
| | Brief Update on Recreational Initiative |
| | Opportunities to Advance EEJ in GOM Fisheries |
| | Supporting Agency Update from U.S. Coast Guard |
| | Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM |
| Publi | c Comment |
| Commi | ttoo Poports |
| COIIIII | ttee Reports |
| | Gulf SEDAR Committee Report |
| South | Atlantic Council Liaison Report |
| Comm i | ttee Reports (Continued) |
| COILLII | Shrimp Committee Report |
| | Data Collection Committee Report |
| | Reef Fish Committee Report |
| | Closed Session Report: Announcement of Officer of the Yea |
| | Mackerel Committee Report |
| Suppo | orting Agencies Update |
| Suppe | Alabama Law Enforcement Efforts |
| | NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) |
| | Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission |
| | duri beates marrine risheries commission |
| Discu | assion of Council Planning and Primary Activities |
| Other | Business |
| | Federal Charter Vessel ID Marking Requirements |
| | Discussion of Green Hydrogen Production |
| | Magnuson-Stevens Act Confidentiality Proposed Rulemaking. |
| 7 4 4 01 | ırnment |
| Adjot | |
| Aujot | |

<u>PAGE 133</u>: Motion to request that National Marine Fisheries Service continue with the Texas Federal Closure in the coming year, in conjunction with the State of Texas closure in 2024. <u>The motion carried on page 134</u>.

<u>PAGE 136</u>: Motion that, in Alternative 3, to replace "a non-OLE server" with "the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) or Office of Science and Technology". <u>The motion carried on page 137</u>.

PAGE 138: Motion to request NMFS adopt the following priorities for utilizing the FY24 \$850,000 appropriation for ELB development and implementation: 1. Sufficient funding to ensure the SEFSC server has capacity to receive and store shrimp fishery vessel position data; 2. Develop a statistically robust design for distributing units to a representative portion of the fleet that would be comparable to the last ten years; 3. Cover the cost of providing units and cellular service to those shrimp vessels, pursuant to the Early Adopter Program. The motion carried on page 138.

<u>PAGE 144</u>: Motion that staff send a letter to NMFS requesting a report on the analysis of the 1 percent threshold increments for the red snapper bycatch in the Gulf shrimp fishery. <u>The motion</u> was withdrawn on page 149.

 <u>PAGE 152</u>: Motion to request staff prepare a letter to respond to the request for input on noncompliance of Responsible Fisheries Management Certification in the shrimp industry. <u>The motion carried on page 153.</u>

PAGE 156: Motion to have the IPT explore how to incorporate economic data collection into the amendment. The motion carried on page 156.

PAGE 157: Motion to request that NMFS examine the possibility of randomly sampling economic data from charter-for-hire reporting system participants and report back to the council on the viability of this approach at the next council meeting. The motion carried on page 162.

44 <u>PAGE 163</u>: Motion to request staff bring back a suite of validation options to include the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Charter-

```
for-Hire Data Collection AP. The motion carried on page 167.
```

<u>PAGE 167</u>: Motion that staff develop a document to adjust the annual catch target (ACT) buffer for the federal-water charterfor-hire red snapper sector. The motion carried on page 171.

5 6 7

8

4

1 2 3

> <u>PAGE 171</u>: Motion that staff develop a document to adjust the forhire red snapper season and private recreational red snapper accountability measures. The motion carried on page 181.

9 10 11

12

13

14

<u>PAGE 190</u>: Motion to direct staff to explore the removal of the twenty-fathom closure for shallow-water grouper for the recreational fishery in the months of February and March in the Gulf of Mexico. The motion carried on page 192.

15 16

<u>PAGE 201</u>: Motion to discontinue work on Reef Fish Amendment 61. The motion carried on page 201.

17 18 19

20

21

2223

PAGE 209: Motion that the council recognizes the results of the SEDAR 85 stock assessment and the SSC's recommendations for catch limits for the deepwater grouper complex and requests staff to begin development of a document to modify the deepwater grouper catch limits accordingly. The motion carried on page 209.

2425

26

27

PAGE 216: Motion to include in the development of Amendment 60, a method to equitably reclaim all shares and to distribute the commercial allocation through a public auction to be administered by an independent third party. The motion failed on page 219.

282930

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

Motion to approve the following purpose and need and PAGE 220: list of actions for inclusion in Amendment 60: Purpose: The purpose of this action is to increase access and opportunities to Gulf of Mexico IFQ programs by equitably distributing IFQ shares, and allocation held by NMFS and reclaimed from inactive accounts or accounts not meeting certain eligibility requirements. Need: The need for this action is to address access barriers creating inequities in the Gulf of Mexico IFQ fisheries. Actions: 1. What shares to redistribute (reclaimed, inactive, other); 2. What allocation to redistribute (quota increases, other); Redistribution methods; 4. Eligibility criteria allocation); 5. Appeals process. The motion carried on page 222.

41 42 43

<u>PAGE 226</u>: Motion to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative in Action 1. The motion carried on page 226.

PAGE 226: Motion to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative in Action 2. The motion carried on page 226.

PAGE 227: Motion to add an action to Framework Amendment 14 looking at bag limits. The motion carried on page 227.

_ _ _

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at The Lodge at Gulf State Park in Gulf Shores, Alabama on Wednesday morning, April 10, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.

CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the 299th meeting of the Gulf Council. My name is Kevin Anson, chair of the council. If you have a cell phone, or similar device, we ask that you place it on silent or vibrating mode during the meeting. Also, in order for all to be able to hear the proceedings, we ask that you have any private conversations outside. Please be advised that alcoholic beverages are not permitted in the meeting room.

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 to ensure that fishery resources in the Gulf are sustained, while providing the best overall benefit for 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 the 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. We will welcome public comment from in-person and virtual attendees.

Anyone joining us virtually that wishes to speak during the public comment should register for comment online. Virtual participants that are registered to comment should ensure that they are registered for the webinar under the same name they used to register to speak.

In-person attendees wishing to speak during the public comment should sign-in at the registration kiosk located at the back of the meeting room. We accept only one registration per person. 1 Public comment may end before the published agenda time if all registered in-person and virtual participants have completed their comment.

4

A digital recording is used for the public record, and, therefore, for the purpose of voice identification, I would ask that meeting participants seated at the table identify him or herself, starting on my left.

9

10 MS. SUSAN BOGGS: Susan Boggs, Alabama.

11

12 DR. ANTHONY OVERTON: Anthony Overton, Alabama.

13

14 DR. TOM FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.

15

16 **DR. C.J. SWEETMAN:** C.J. Sweetman, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

18

19 MR. ED WALKER: Ed Walker, Florida.

20

21 MR. BOB GILL: Bob Gill, Florida.

22

23 MS. JESSICA MCCAWLEY: Jessica McCawley, South Atlantic Council.

24

25 LTJG JACOB SHINNICK: Lieutenant Junior Grade Jacob Shinnick, 26 United States Coast Guard.

27

28 MS. MARA LEVY: Mara Levy, NOAA Office of General Counsel.

29

30 MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck, NOAA Fisheries.

31

32 DR. JOHN WALTER: John Walter, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

33

34 MR. TROY WILLIAMSON: Troy Williamson, Texas.

35

36 DR. KESLEY BANKS: Kesley Banks, Texas.

37

38 MR. DAKUS GEESLIN: Dakus Geeslin, Texas Parks and Wildlife 39 Department.

40

41 MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine Fisheries 42 Commission.

43

44 MR. DALE DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.

45

46 MR. MICHAEL MCDERMOTT: Michael McDermott, Mississippi.

GENERAL JOE SPRAGGINS: Joe Spraggins, Mississippi.

M

MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE: Chris Schieble, Louisiana.

MR. BILLY BROUSSARD: Billy Broussard, Louisiana.

VICE CHAIRMAN J.D. DUGAS: J.D. Dugas, Louisiana.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Carrie Simmons, council staff.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, everyone, and I apologize, Lt. Shinnick, for not introducing you earlier in Mackerel, but welcome, and thank you. One other announcement that I would like to provide is thanks to the Alabama Charter Fishing Association for hosting the social last night. It was well-attended, and well-received, and we certainly appreciate it, and so thank you.

That will take us to Agenda Item Number 2, Adoption of the Agenda and Approval of the Minutes, and so Adoption of the Agenda, and are there any changes to the agenda that need to be made? Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so the Federal Register notice had already been submitted, but we did go ahead and distribute to the council, and amend the agenda, to add in the MSA confidentiality proposed rule, and so there will be somebody online to give us that presentation. There's a presentation, and then the actual FRN with the proposed rule posted on the Council's website, and so I just wanted to state that change. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, and I have one change. A request was made for Lt. Shinnick to provide his presentation earlier today, in this morning's session, if possible, and so that was scheduled for tomorrow, the liaison report for the Coast Guard, and if we can possibly move that up into some time in Agenda Item Number III, before we break for lunch, if we're able to.

Any opposition to any of the changes that have been made, or updates? Seeing none, is there any opposition to accepting the agenda as written? All right. Thank you.

That will take us to the Approval of Minutes. Are there any changes needed for the minutes from the last meeting? Seeing none, is there any opposition to accepting the minutes as written?

Seeing no opposition, the minutes are approved, and so that will take us to our presentations. Dr. Simmons, a Brief Update on the Recreational Initiative.

 PRESENTATIONS
BRIEF UPDATE ON RECREATIONAL INITIATIVE

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I'm pleased to let the council know that the steering committee for the recreational initiative met on Thursday, March 21, and we reviewed applicants for the consulting and facilitating position, and we selected the consultant, and that's going to be Andrew Loftus and Willy Goldsmith of the Pelagic Strategies company, and we have a signed contract with them, and we're going to be very busy working with council staff, and Regional Office staff, and Science Center staff, as well as with the consultant, to think about what those meetings are going to shape out to be, bring that information to the steering committee, and then to the council, here in the next couple of meetings. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Dr. Simmons? Seeing none, thank you very much. That will take us to our next item on the agenda, Opportunities to Advance Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) in Gulf of Mexico Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan, Tab A, Number 8(a). Mr. Strelcheck, you're listed on the agenda, but do you have someone here to present?

OPPORTUNITIES TO ADVANCE EQUITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (EEJ) IN GULF OF MEXICO FISHERIES THROUGH THE SOUTHEAST EEJ IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I have a great team of people who have worked on the EEJ plan, and so they'll be presenting, and I will let them introduce themselves, but I just wanted to say thank you for all the council's input upfront, and we have submitted our draft EEJ plan to Headquarters, and we certainly look forward to hearing feedback and input today, as well as showing you how we've addressed your comments.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So, go ahead and introduce yourselves.

MS. HEATHER BLOUGH: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Andy. I'm Heather Blough, and this is Christina Package-Ward. We're with NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office, and we'll be covering the topic today, with support from our Southeast Fisheries Science Center colleague, Suzanna Blake, who is with us virtually today.

1 2

 You all have received a number of briefings on this effort over the last several years, first on the development and finalization of our national equity and environmental justice strategy, which really provides the framework and support structure for the regional implementation plan that we'll be talking about today, and we also briefed you on the public engagement work that we conducted last summer and fall, throughout the Gulf and the rest of the Southeast region, to get stakeholder feedback and input on ways that we can advance the six national objectives that you see here on this slide in a way that is most responsive, and specific, to our Southeast regional needs.

Then, most recently, Christina and Suzanna briefed you all, at the last meeting in New Orleans, on that very comprehensive list of suggestions that came out of that public engagement work, last summer and fall, and, since then, we've really went through and considered all the suggestions we received, along with subsequent feedback that we received from Gulf Council staff and from our South Atlantic and Caribbean Council partners, as well as staff inside both of our organizations, at the center and the regional office, and we used all of that information to draft our Southeast Equity and Environmental Justice Implementation Plan.

That plan was due to headquarters late last week, and so it's currently under review. It's intended to be a living document that we will review, and update, every five years, and perhaps sooner, as needed. You know, this is the first really comprehensive and coordinated effort we've ever made to try to advance a common set of objectives around this topic, and we are definitely learning as we go, and so we expect this to be a really dynamic and iterative process that continues to improve, both in inputs and outputs, as we gain additional information and the continued involvement and support of you all, our other councils, and the rest of our stakeholders.

We structured today's conversation really to share with you the feedback that we received from Gulf Council staff on that initial list of actions that we were considering carrying forward into the plan, and also to preview with you the refined list of action items that we did incorporate into the draft plan.'

Those were separated into distinct categories. We identified forty-seven items as immediate or near-term, which we intend to accomplish with existing resources during like the first life cycle of the plan, and then the remaining items we binned into a longer-term unfunded list of actions that we believe are important to

achieving the agency's national EEJ objectives, but we don't have the resources to support at this time.

 We understand that there's a lot here to consider, and digest, and so we have organized this content under each of the six objectives, and we're going to walk through them one objective at a time, and then we'll just pause, after each objective, to invite questions about the material, what you're hearing, and also hopefully hear some input from you around topics, or areas, that you're interested in supporting or collaborating with us on in some way, and there is that Tab A-8(b) handout, if you follow along the see the specific details of the action items, and you can follow along there. Are there any questions about the background, or the process, before we jump into the first objective? All right. I'm going to turn it over to Christina to cover research and monitoring.

MS. CHRISTINA PACKAGE-WARD: Our research and monitoring actions aim to improve and expand the social science needed to fully identify and understand our underserved communities and our EEJ-related concerns, needs, and interests. The feedback we received from the Gulf Council staff on this objective was generally supportive. It highlighted relevant council priorities and recommendations from the recently released National Academy of Sciences report, and then it expressed interest in aligning priorities, where appropriate. They also cautioned us to manage expectations and the disappointment that can be created by signaling that we want to increase co-development, and coproduction, of priorities where there are not resources available to fund this work.

In response, we looked for opportunities to align research and monitoring priorities with council priorities, where possible. We used the council's current priorities but note that staff mentioned that they will be updated this year, as well as the National Academy of Sciences report, noting that some areas of overlap on these topics are social vulnerability indicators, diversification, and allocation.

Then we very carefully vetted our funded versus unfunded lists, taking a hard look at whether the items included on each list were realistic, and so our resulting immediate or near-term actions — They are focused, in large part, on conducting research and analysis to identify underserved communities and understand their issues and challenges.

This includes analyzing the barriers to entry in federal fisheries,

expanding demographic data collection, and undertaking interview work to better define and identify underserved communities in the Southeast, examining historical factors and processes, observing crew members, and analyzing this data, and that survey has already been completed in the Gulf, but it will be completed in the South Atlantic also, and then conducting interview work with IFQ participants, and managers, to identify IFQ-related challenges.

Our immediate or near-term actions also include some items partnering to explore and engage on several key topics, such as using specific tools to identify and understand underserved communities, involving underserved communities in participatory research and citizen science, and then examining the effects of allocation decisions and the impacts of seafood imports.

We also identified several longer-term research and monitoring actions needed to effectively improve our service delivery to underserved communities across the region. We intend to prioritize this work additional work, as funding is identified in future years, and these include evaluating equity issues in fisheries, including underserved community challenges, and procedural equity in the fishery decision-making process.

Then analyzing the impacts of services and management decisions, and also examining the expected versus actual impacts of fishery management actions, examining the importance of diversifying operations in fisheries, conducting research to illuminate specific underserved populations and issues, including consumptive or subsistence use of fisheries and women in fisheries. Identifying challenges and lessons learned from disaster events, and I will just pause here for any questions, or discussion, on this item.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a question from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I understand that you're going to identify and understand underserved communities, things like that, but what is being done, once you identify them, and I thought that, by asking this the other day, when we were having a conversation here, and, for instance, when we put out the fishermen tool, and things like that, are we putting them in out in multiple languages, and do we put our applications out in multiple languages, because that is a barrier, and so I appreciate the research, and the identifying, but then how do we engage them?

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Yes, and that's a big part of it, and we definitely have some later items looking at, you know,

communication, and definitely translation is part of that. Sorry. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I have a question, and I'm looking at the draft action items, and, under the long-term actions with the research and monitoring, and it's conduct a situational analysis of marine aquaculture development in the U.S. Caribbean, and I'm curious, and what would be your focus, or how would the analysis score relative to location, the physical location, of those aquaculture sites? I mean, how is that viewed? It could be a positive, on one hand, if it's relative close for employment, and access to employment, but, on the other hand, there's also the aesthetics, and the potential environmental degradation and such, and so is there some sort of metric, or scoring system, that you utilize to kind of flesh that out, or rate a project that might be better, or not better, for those communities?

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: We haven't -- There's a lot of things that we have to work through, and the idea of this project, and it's actually like a joint center-SERO project that we have proposals in for, but it's to really try to do sort of a SWAT analysis, to look at the infrastructure issues they're having, and they are very interested in aquaculture, in their region, and they're also really concerned that people are going to bring it over from the mainland, and not build it from the bottom-up, and, you know, have it community developed, and so it's like kind of focused around that, and working with the community themselves to see what would be the infrastructure needs to support that, what would be realistic for them, considering just the way things work there, and their own cultural needs, and so I don't know, John, if you want to add anything about the Caribbean situational analysis project.

DR. WALTER: Just briefly, and we are doing marine spatial planning for offshore aquaculture siting in the Caribbean, and along with offshore wind siting, and so it's a joint effort to try to identify the right places for things in the blue economy in the Caribbean. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: J.D.

 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm looking at slide 4, or page 4, on the right side, the near-term funded actuals, all the way down to the bottom, where it has the bullet of impacts of seafood imports, and can you give us some explanation of what does that mean, impacts of seafood imports, and my question goes back to our shrimp issues that we're having.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Yes, and I think definitely shrimp is an example of that, and there is a project going on looking at shrimp impacts.

MS. BLOUGH: We heard, throughout all the subregions, that market competition of imports is really a huge barrier for them, in terms of profitability and ability to survive, and shrimp was a big one, probably the people we heard the most from, but it did really span all the fisheries, and so we are looking at using, or collaborating, with the National Seafood Strategy folks, to look at ways to get at that, by working across the federal government. You know, there's so little what we can do, NOAA Fisheries, to address that, but it's like we can develop those partnerships and come at some of these issues more holistically. The shrimp pilot is one of those.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions at this time? I'm not seeing any, and you can continue. Thank you.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Our policies and plans actions aim to address various institutional complexity and access barriers that were identified during our stakeholder engagement work. Feedback we received from Gulf Council staff on this topic questioned the purpose, or objective, of several of the activities that we were considering, including some terminology that was unclear.

They encouraged us to try to present the activities at more consistent scales, as some were very generalized, and others were fishery-specific, and they also encouraged us to identify more meaningful metrics, in some cases, and use language that more clearly distinguishes our role and authorities, and they noted their preference for more informal best practices, versus policy directives that were proposed to address certain barriers.

In response, we substantially refined, and revised, the list of items we were considering under this objective, and we clarified terminology, in some cases, and so our resulting immediate, or near-term, actions focused on ensuring equitable access to offshore aquaculture opportunities and to climate-related benefits and services, working with our observer program to determine if any changes would be appropriate to address some of the suggestions we heard there and to develop an informational handout on the program that can be shared.

Establishing best practices for how we develop and deploy fisher surveys and collaborating with you, and others, to address equity issues in the shrimp and IFQ fisheries, along with any

unintentional procedural barriers to engagement. Then working with our General Counsel and Headquarters to develop policy guidance addressing the use of various forms of financial assistance to support our underserved community engagement objectives.

We also identified two longer-term actions we believe are important to ensure the equitable distribution of our mission-related opportunities and services in the Southeast. We intend to prioritize this additional work, as funding is identified in future years, and these are focused on simplifying our fishery permit application process, and renewal processes, and developing a policy framework to support more routine and consistent efforts to gather, consider, include, and apply local and traditional ecological knowledge in our data collection, science, and management processes, and I will pause here for any questions, and

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

discussion, on this item.

 MS. BOGGS: Can you give me an example of, on page 6, the bottom-left, develop best practices, versus policy directives? Help me understand what that might mean or look like.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: I think that was actually related to the fisher survey guidance that we wanted to develop. We had an action there related to developing a policy directive for how we conduct fisher surveys, like how they're developed, are they translated, are they simplified, you know, do we want to -- How can we best streamline them and be consistent across-the-board and address them, and we did hear a lot of comments, from communities, about the way that they're receiving them, you know, and so they're coming with threats, like you have to complete this, or you won't get your permit, and, you know, they're just looking for more information on why we need the data, how the data are going to be used, how it will be protected, and so I think the comment was there, just about we can do the same thing with best practices, without developing additional policy directives, which can seem more formal.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just a comment, and, obviously, we're talking about policies and plans here, but this is, to me, where we're seeing the synergies with the work the council is already doing, right, and so we're building our EEJ plan around work that's already happening, or is in motion, and the other thing that I just wanted to note, and I really want to thank Bob Gill.

1 2

He reached out, a while ago, about the Fisheries Finance Program, and trying to get more information about that, and, although that's not the policy guidance, we're actually talking to them now about opportunities to come to council meetings, going forward, as a way to, obviously, interact with fishermen, as well as potentially other mechanisms for them to meet with industry members. I just wanted to note that this doesn't have to be new stuff, right, and it can be stuff that we're already doing, and we're just building the EEJ plan around those activities.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions at this time? I am not seeing any, and if you can continue. Thank you.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Our benefits actions focus on leveling the playing field with respect to the opportunities and services we provide, so that all stakeholders have equal access. The feedback that we received from Gulf Council staff on this objective emphasized the importance of social and economic data collection and analysis needed to characterize benefits and beneficiaries, and they pointed to the National Academy of Sciences recommendations on that topic and noted that our social vulnerability indicators work is a research priority for the councils.

Staff also cautioned us to manage expectations regarding our ability to increase stakeholder access to grants and benefits, as competitive funding is limited, to carefully consider our ability to address stakeholder requests for national-level policy changes, and support with federal fishery disaster assistance, given our limited roles and responsibilities in those areas. These comments were very helpful to us in developing a shorter, more refined, and meaningful list of actions to advance this objective.

Our resulting immediate and near-term actions include tracking the percentage of opportunities that accrue to underserved communities, where we're able to do so, so that we can get an understanding of what that looks like. The types of opportunities we're thinking about in this context would include things like contracts and grants, experimental fishing and research permits, educational training, and internship opportunities.

We included several items focused on reducing barriers to accessing grants, careers and mission-related jobs, and the capital needed to successfully compete for fishery and aquaculture opportunities and maintain profitability. We want to promote the consideration of underserved community needs and federal fishery disaster

assistance allocations, in collaboration with Headquarters, states, territories, and other partners.

Other items would have us collaborate at all levels of government to explore and pursue opportunities for preserving or creating new infrastructure and working waterfronts, and this is a critical need in all three regions, and there are a number of opportunities that we could explore and take advantage of, if we allocate time to do so, and we've included a couple of items that try to address requests to use our authorities to help communities mitigate the threats they're facing from large-scale infrastructure and energy projects related to natural resource injuries.

We also identified just a couple of longer-term actions that we believe are needed to effectively support this objective, but would require additional resources, and these include advancing and improving science and management in the U.S. Caribbean, collaborating with underserved communities, the aquaculture industry, and the fishing industry, to develop, or support, high school technical courses and other vocational training and technical assistance programs in fishing and marine aquaculture, with a focus on underserved community members. I will just pause here for any questions, and discussion, on this item.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any questions? I am not seeing any, if you can continue.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Our outreach and engagement actions are focused largely on further diversifying our community platforms and tools, and so, really, in response to some of the barriers that were identified during our public engagement effort, and so that we're not unintentionally impeding underserved community participation in the work that we do, and the council is particularly skilled in this area.

They had a lot of comments, and good suggestions, for us on the actions that we were considering here. They highlighted the popularity of the stakeholder conference calls that we used to organize, on occasion, to discuss topic-specific issues, like red snapper, and they suggested that we consider incorporating more of those types of things, along with podcasts and more use of radio to help get at some of the identified technological and literacy barriers.

They expressed a desire to help support our interest in increasing outreach and engagement of our female stakeholders, and Emily had some really great ideas around that topic, and so we're hoping

that we'll be able to support those in some way, moving forward, and they highlighted challenges with -- Information collection challenges with some of the actions that we were looking at that would have us tailor outreach products to other underserved community members, and those were really related to considerations about the lack of demographic data that we have on our constituents, and also the related PII limitations and restrictions, with how we're using that information.

They emphasized the importance of incorporating retention criteria into our performance metrics, and also supported the need that was identified for additional plain-language training, and then, finally, they raised some important questions about our ability to control critical messaging, if we were to rely on non-agency-affiliated community NGOs to share information and translate some of the information that we want to get out to communities.

These comments also were really helpful to us in both prioritizing the list of actions that we decided to carry forward as well as fine-tuning and supplementing some of our performance metrics and modifying the text of some of the actions that we carried forward, just to address the challenges that they had identified.

Our immediate, or near-term, list of actions now includes organizing a facilitated workshop with our regional Sea Grant staff to try to start the process of institutionalizing more formal communication pathways with our underserved community, constituents throughout the region, and we would like to develop guidance, and options, for more consistently meeting translation needs, using the resources that we already have on-hand, and we've made some great strides in this area since your last meeting. Headquarters, at the national level, the leadership, has established two contracts that are loaded for FY24 that the regions have been called to use for these needs.

 We've also started to look at greater use of the non-official services, like Google translate, to address some of the other needs that we have, as appropriate, and so that action is really around formalizing a process for using those types of services, and others.

We want to develop tailored, topic-specific outreach strategies to communicate about prospective and current regulatory changes, the grants and opportunities that are available to communities, the status, and schedule, of fishery disaster declarations and assistance, and also, as we mentioned earlier, the why, and the how, behind the fishery-survey-related research that we are

conducting. We also have an action in there that would improve our ability to meet our plain language mandates and directives, and we want to look at working with our regional collaboration teams, and other NOAA partners, to see if we could possibly find a way to establish some virtual meeting hubs within underserved communities, to help increase access to those virtual meeting opportunities for people who are struggling to do that.

Our other longer-term actions would have us pursue funding to increase our ability to meet identified translation needs, by more formally allocating resources to that purpose and including that in our annual budgeting and planning processes. Then identify, or create, one or more multilingual stakeholder liaisons, both at SERO and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Really, the goal here is to provide more of a one-stop shop support to constituents who are calling in with a range of questions, so they're not getting handed off constantly, and to be able to do that in multiple languages.

We would like to continue, or expand, on the work that we began through the Sea Grant workshop this year to establish really a formalized community liaison network, throughout the region, to help us meet our outreach and engagement objectives in like the most strategic and cost-effective way, and then that final action is additional strategies to facilitate more frequent meaningful outreach and interaction with female stakeholders, including maybe supporting some of the items that the councils would like to accomplish there.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a question from Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: So, have two -- Well, a question, and then maybe a comment, and, with the outreach and engagement, do you have ways to measure your success with engaging the people, once you start this process?

 MS. PACKAGE-WARD: So, we have incorporated some performance metrics in the table, and I'm not sure that they're all perfect. We're still working on those too, and they're going through a review, but I know part of the metrics that we're including for those is the feedback of the communities themselves, right, like how they think that we're doing on that topic, and we would be interested if you have other ideas around that, and it wouldn't be too late to work those in.

MS. BOGGS: I will certainly take a look at it.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Okay.

MS. BOGGS: The other comment that I wanted to make, because your last comment about the female stakeholders -- I get a lot of magazines, being a marina owner, and I see more and more women fishing organizations, and it's becoming something that is very popular among women, and, if you do the research, you also see the women are particularly the ones that bring their children fishing, and that's important too, to get them engaged as well.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions? If you can continue.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Okay, and our inclusive governance objective, and these actions are really the ones that touch the work that you do most directly, and we also received a number of comments, and suggestions, from staff on these actions. They expressed interest in working with us to increase participation in public meetings and input processes, and they also noted opportunities to take advantage of existing, or maybe modified, council products to support that work, like the videos on the fishery management process, the navigating the council process brochure, and the Fisher Feedback tool that we talked about earlier this morning, to meet both these and other inclusive governance objectives that we have here.

They noted agreement with one of the actions that we were considering that would have us engage communities earlier in our Endangered Species Act decision-making processes, and they highlighted information challenges, and needs, related to several of the actions that we're aiming to further diversify representation on council committees and advisory bodies.

Recommended alternative approaches, or suggestions, include, for example, making use of existing council committees, and advisory panels, versus standing up new ones to support the implementation strategy, as a more cost-effective way to do that, and then they also noted the need to really clearly articulate, and distinguish, our roles, and authorities, related to several of the items addressing council appointments and the Marine Resources Education Program, and, finally, they identified some funding, and other feasibility issues, related to some of the suggestions that would have impacted logistics, council meeting logistics.

 All of these also were helpful to us in helping to refine, and prioritize, the items that we carried forward under this objective, and our final list of items has us working with the councils to increase underserved community participation in public meetings

and input processes, and on council and other advisory bodies, including those internal to the work that we're doing within the region, and this would include exploring options to help ensure that all stakeholders feel secure to voice their perspective, and also work, on our end, to amplify messaging that's coming out of Headquarters about the status and schedule and process for council nominations and appointments, to help people better understand what that looks like and what that pathway would be.

We've included an action that encourages the council to consider the use of committees, and advisory panels, to advise on EEJ issues related to the work that they're doing, and also to support some of our regional EEJ goals and objectives, and we would like to work with the councils to develop, or increase, distribution of some materials to help meet some of the educational barriers identified under this objective, and also with the Marine Resources Education Program steering committee, to look at underserved community participation and opportunities there.

 We've incorporated an action that would have us work with --Continue working with the council's SSCs, and APs, to identify collaborative research priorities and pair that with work on our end, to look at how we can maybe better use competitive grants, exempted fishing permits, and other mechanisms to help better enable fishers to contribute to and participate in that work that is able to be funded, and, finally, that last item is about -- We did carry forward the item to earlier engage communities in ESA decision-making, prior to making listing decisions and developing recovery plans and critical habitat designations and those other types of things that affect them. We're looking to do that through informational meetings, public hearings, and those types of mechanisms.

Then the longer-term actions we've included here would have us explore opportunities to leverage the support of community liaisons to gather and report input from communities that are in rural areas, and other areas, or types of communities that have more limited capabilities to participate in decision processes, and we're thinking this work might could be an offshoot of the NOAA Sea Grant work that we start this year.

We would like to develop new targeted competitive grants, and pilot projects, if we can secure additional funds for that work, to help support greater participation in regional research and monitoring activities, and then that list item would have us increase funding to the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils to support some of the identified translation needs, in the form of real-time

professional translation, where it makes sense to do so, of meetings, dubbing of council meeting recordings, or other approaches, as identified.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I do like the idea, on page 12, about information sharing about council appointment opportunities and the process, and I think that's something that's not consistent across the states, and it seems like, when we get to that process, and I've had conversations of how do I do this, or how do I do that, and so I think, if there's any way to have any type of consistency of, you know, how you get the applicant applications out, the opportunity to apply, and how to apply, and just kind of -- As it says here, a process that people clearly understand what they need to do and how they need to do it.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: Thank you for that, and we've actually been talking with Headquarters Office of Sustainable Fisheries, that's kind of in charge of that, and they're already developing — They're also doing their own plan, EEJ plan, and they're trying to incorporate some of this in and developing more consistent messaging and websites around that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions at this time? I'm not seeing any, and you can proceed.

 MS. PACKAGE-WARD: We're in the homestretch. This is our last objective here, and the actions that we're considering here are really designed to provide us the internal support structure to get this work done, and so we did receive less feedback on these, because they're more inward focused, but staff did reiterate support for plain language training here, and they also highlighted the National Academy of Sciences recommendation to develop investment strategies for increasing social science capacity and leadership within the agency, and they cautioned us to manage expectations about our ability to implement several of the suggestions that we were considering here, given limitations. We took that advice to heart when considering how to prioritize what we carried over, and also how to bin what we were including in the funded versus unfunded categories.

Our resulting immediate or near-term, items would have us integrate the items that we've included in the plan as immediate or near-term into our organizational priorities, through strategic planning processes, to help us track those and make sure we get them done, and then also to pursue a funding strategy to address

the longer-term items that we hope to pursue in future years.

We want to either continue using the existing EEJ teams that we've already established, and we have, right now, the Council Coordinating Committee EEJ reps participating on those, and we feel like it's been working really well, and we'll set up some sort of new teams to help support implementation of some of these items.

We want to work with Headquarters to provide both national and regionally-centric EEJ training to our staff in the regions, and also to the councils, to talk about the national and regional objectives in the implementation plan, and we would like to continue to build partnerships and support scholarship, internship, and mentorship programs, really to provide underserved communities increased access to careers within our organizations, and then we also want to continue to organize and participate in interagency workshops, and other discussions, to help us leverage resources and the help that we need to address some of the more pressing and complex cross-jurisdictional challenges that were identified in the plan.

The longer-term actions we've identified here are to increase our organizational capacity for this work, by hiring EEJ coordinators at both the Regional Office and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, bringing on more full-time anthropologists, or other non-economic social scientists to support work in this area, and also hiring some additional biologists to support our work in the Caribbean, which has been kind of chronically underfunded.

We would like to do more routine plain language training to all of our staff within the organizations, and also some specialized training for grants, agents, port agents, and other people who interact with underserved and other communities really more directly, and then we would also like to identify folks within our organizations who can provide more technical assistance with grants and other funding opportunities that are sometimes challenging for folks to navigate. Any questions about this objective?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any questions? I am not seeing any.

MS. BLOUGH: As we noted early in this presentation, the draft plan is currently undergoing review at Headquarters, and it's tentatively scheduled for a June rollout, and so we'll take into account the additional input that you provided today, when it comes back to address Headquarters' review comments later this month,

and then, once it's finalized, it will be reviewed, and updated, on a five-year schedule, and we look forward to your continued involvement and feedback in this work, and I'm really appreciative of your considerations and comments.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: For all the really thoughtful comments, and I know it took time to go through that, but we got a lot of good stuff from the council staff, and also from Max's -- First from Natasha's, and then Max's, participation on our team. It's been great.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for the update, and the presentation. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to say that I think you guys did a great job. This was a really heavy lift, and I appreciate the extra time after the January council meeting, for us to really kind of digest this, and think about it, and the meetings we had afterward to go through those comments, and I think we have a really improved product that I feel a lot more comfortable putting out there, and I really appreciate that process, and I think it was very well done, and that's how I would like to do a lot more things. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I just appreciate what you're working on, and I would like to offer up that, in Mississippi, if there's anything — We have a large Asian community, that we could definitely use a lot of help with, and, if there's anything we can do for you there, please don't hesitate to call us and let us know, and we will be glad to offer up any information we can, and try to work out anything we can, because a lot of the things you talked about here today, you know, being able to communicate with them, and also being able to help serve that community, is a huge thing, and we would appreciate your help on that. Thank you very much.

MS. BLOUGH: Thank you very much. That's great to hear.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions? I just have one question, that is more for Dr. Simmons, maybe, and Mr. Strelcheck, and I have not discussed this with you prior, but, you know, Andy, you mentioned that you were going to try to integrate as much of the ongoing work, or maybe tweak a little bit, of the things, the processes and such, that you have internally, to try to meet some of these objectives, but I'm just wondering, and has there been any discussion relative to including, in any of the documents that

we develop, where there are instances where these EEJ objectives, or processes, would be utilized to help formulate any of the -- Again, the documents that we oversee and approve, and is there going to be a section that's added to kind of highlight any special, or extra, work that might be related to EEJ outreach, or EEJ activities, that are used to develop the document?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think that's a great question. I think we have some opportunity to build that into our documents, and we would have to figure out the best place for that, but, maybe at the social effects and the communities analysis that's done, but we would have to think about that some more.

I guess, as far as the interaction, or, you know, the synergy that we have going on here, and I think especially for the research and monitoring priorities, and many of the things that were identified in this were also identified in the council's research and monitoring priorities, and we're going to be updating those in the next four years, and bringing that back to the SSC and council, and I think there was a lot of overlap there, in those efforts, and refinement, I think, with this as well, to help get better data to inform our amendments and try to identify what projects could help further that effort as well, and so I think we are drilling down a little bit more to that, but we still have a lot of resource limitations.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: A couple of thoughts, and I agree, right, and I think there is an opportunity to insert this into amendments, and council actions, and, ideally, right, some of the data and research and information that we're gathering will naturally help inform a lot of our actions, going forward, or better inform them maybe, but, you know, my comment earlier -- I talked to my team about this just being a cultural shift for the agency, right, and so this is inherently then going to be part of our culture, and kind of business as usual going forward, and this is integrated as part of our work.

With that said, you know, we've tried to be very thoughtful with regard to what we think we can do in the short-term with the resources we have, versus those longer-term efforts, and, in order to really make substantial progress on this, we need resources, and, you know, we need the extra bandwidth, and that's certainly our goal that we'll be striving toward, but I think what we'll have to do, in the short-term, is take this implementation plan, once it's finalized, and be very thoughtful, and measured, in terms

of what actions we take on, how we coordinate with Carrie and the council, what do we believe we have the capacity for in the short, medium, and long-term.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Walter, did you have your hand up?

DR. WALTER: I did, and I really want to thank the team who put this together, and Christina and Heather for presenting this on behalf of the team, under the pretty advanced timeframe of getting all of this together and putting it before us, and it was really great work, and I think, in terms of what we're going to do, in terms of evaluating the science that we bring to the table, and our social science I think is going to inform a lot of the social science actions, and activities, that we do, as well as things that we might do with regard to engagement with the communities, in terms of trying to bring that science and make it available to people to understand, and so we're going to incorporate that.

Again, as Andy said, it's sort of a cultural change for us, and a wakeup call for the lens by which we conduct our work, and I think that's probably the main thing that we can do, absent then hopefully getting further resources to do this, and we'll do what we're currently doing through this lens that I think will be a big advancement. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Any other questions, or comments, related to this topic? I am not seeing any, and I will echo those same comments. Thank you for all your work, and there's a lot of heavy lift going on here, and I certainly appreciate all your efforts, and so thank you.

 That will take us to -- I had requested to modify the agenda to include a liaison report from the Coast Guard, and Lt. Shinnick, if you ready to do that, we'll go ahead and insert that here.

U.S. COAST GUARD

LTJG SHINNICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, everyone. I'm Lieutenant Junior Grade Jacob Shinnick, and I'm the Living Marine Resource Officer out of Sector Mobile, and I'll be giving a brief presentation on the 8th District enforcement update for living marine resources.

This slide shows the 8th District area of responsibility, and, as you can see, it covers a large portion of the United States. It covers some of the major rivers of the U.S., and it also covers a significant portion of the Gulf of Mexico.

Exclusive Economic Zone enforcement, this slide covers Fiscal Year 2021 to 2024, and it covers the interdictions and red snapper seizures in the EEZ in regard to foreign fishing vessels, and, as you can see from this slide, looking at Fiscal Year 2021, there were seventy-eight interdictions, and about 14,640 pounds of red snapper seized, in comparison to Fiscal Year 2023, where there was fifty-three interdictions, and about 5,895 pounds of red snapper

seized.

Overall, this data seems to show a trend downward in EEJ interdictions, but there are some comments to note of this data. Like other military services, the United States Coast Guard is experiencing personnel shortages, which have limited cutter patrol hours, and it does not necessarily mean that there are fewer lanchas within our EEZ. Additionally, assessing illegal red snapper catch is difficult, depending on when the cutter boards the lanchas, depending on where they are in the fishing process, whether they have either just started fishing or have completed their catches, and it can cause variation in seizure sizes. Cutter patrols are effective in routinely recovering miles of illegal longline on each patrol.

Looking ahead to the remainder of 2024, with the goals of increasing cooperation with Mexico, and performing joint operations, and targeting enforcement operations, and so, in response to the personnel shortages, that goal would be to have more tactical operations with cutter patrols, and basing them on sound intelligence, to ensure that patrols are as effective and efficient as possible, in regard to the LMR mission.

Domestic fisheries enforcement, this slide touches on Fiscal Year 2023 and 2024, and, as you can see, in Fiscal Year 2024, so far, we have 310 boardings. Since we're about halfway through the fiscal year, it looks like we'll be on course to meet past year boarding metrics. Some of the most common violations we see are turtle excluder devices, or TEDs, and bycatch reduction devices, and, again, looking ahead to 2024, or the remainder thereof, we would like to increase our maritime domain awareness, and, again, targeted enforcement operations, and then continue to develop partnerships with NOAA and state law enforcement agencies.

We recently had a joint boarding with NOAA on a shrimper off the Coast of Mississippi, which had zip-tied the covers over the TED, which this modification would have prevented larger turtles from being able to escape the nets, and this boarding resulted in a significant violation, and it wouldn't have been possible without

working with our partners, and so with goals of increasing operations with them, to make sure that we're as effective as possible.

Marine protected resources, we haven't seen too many requests for assistance for interactions, with 2023 showing two and 2024 showing four, but some of the most common interactions we do see are entangled sea turtle and whale sightings, and, just looking ahead to 2024, with a goal to conduct outreach to local communities and to continue to respond to and coordinate with additional resources for marine protected resources sightings and responses. With that, that concludes my presentation. Thank you to the council for its flexibility and for the opportunity to present today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Any questions? Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks for the presentation, and the update, and I just have a quick question. On that last slide, where you said you have those most common interactions on whale sightings, do you guys just keep a log of all the times that you see whales, and do you have them by species?

LTJG SHINNICK: I believe that is just referencing from the community reaching out to the Coast Guard, and I know our cutter operations are always seeing dolphins and whales, and those marine protected resources, but I don't believe they keep a log on those specific species interactions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions? I am not seeing any. Thanks again, Lt. Shinnick. We appreciate it. Okay, and so that will take us then to the Update from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) on Wind Energy Development in the Gulf of Mexico, Tab A, Number 9. Ms. Lyncker, are you on the line?

MS. LISSA LYNCKER: Good morning. I am here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Good morning, and we can hear you.

UPDATE FROM THE BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT (BOEM) ON WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

MS. LYNCKER: All right. I do have a slide deck. Good morning. My name is Lissa Lyncker, and I had the pleasure of presenting to the council in January, and so thank you for having us again. Today, I plan to cover BOEM updates since January, and we've had a couple of big ones. I will cover our recent announcement on the second wind proposed sale in the Gulf. At the end, if we have

time, I can touch on the most recent oil and gas announcement for the Gulf as well.

We're in a current formal comment period for our proposed sale notice, and I will get into those details. Again, our communication, and collaboration, is ongoing, and we look for the newest information, and comments, at all times, but, especially while we're in these comment periods, we definitely want to hear back from our partners, and our stakeholders, and from the community, and to make sure we're making the best-informed decisions.

This is a timeline for the federal leasing process, starting on the left, the request for information, all the way to the auction. As you can see here that little red drop, this is where we are in the process, nearing a proposed auction time, and we are in that public comment period.

On March 20, BOEM announced that we're proposing a second offshore wind auction in the Gulf. The proposed sale notice was published in the Federal Register, and that's the docket number, and so, as we collect formal comments, we encourage people to go to federalregister.gov and use that docket number.

Our proposed sale notice describes the four lease areas, and I will get into those, the proposed conditions and stipulations, and much of this is consistent with the last lease, but we do have some enhancements in reporting, and engagement, that I will go into. Bidding credits, those are the same, and I will cover those. We did change the auction format a little, and so we are holding different roundtables, and seminars, to help the potential bidders understand that those new instructions, et cetera.

We are seeking specific feedback, and so we have about thirteen questions inside of this proposed sale notice, and I will get into what those topics are, and then, of course, a sixty-day comment period, which ends on May 20.

 These are the four proposed lease areas that would be held in a second sale. Two of them are new. The ones to the left are in Wind Energy Area I, and those were included in the first Gulf of Mexico sale, and then there's the two ones in the right. All of them are approximately 100,000 acres, based on the latest industry input for economically viable acreage required, and so two are new, and two are the same, and it also shows the proximity to the other lease area that was sold in the last auction.

The takeaway is that it's almost 400,000 acres, and BOEM is proposing these four lease areas off the coast of Texas and Louisiana. That has the potential for providing electricity for up to a million homes, and providing, you know, hundreds of jobs, and so wind energy has the potential to -- It's well-positioned in the Gulf of Mexico, with the infrastructure that we have, the workforce, the business, and expertise, and so this would just continue to build on what we started last year with our lease sale.

BOEM's objective with this proposing a second sale, and I will get into, at the end, proposing potentially a third sale, is to provide a predictable schedule to allow developers to effectively plan an investment strategy.

The PSN, the proposed sale notice, is asking a number of questions, and some of them are specific to the lease areas, such as the size, the number, the orientation of the specific lease areas, but, in these -- You know, looking at the bidding credits for the developers, but what I want to focus on is the questions that are focused, that are targeted, on enhancing our engagement efforts, looking at benefits to underserved communities, looking at how we currently outreach to tribal nations, and other ocean users, other agencies, and are there ways we can do this better, and so they lay out, and we lay out, in the proposed sale notice, and I'm saying my leasing team, but we lay out, in this proposed sale notice, a number of questions that we are looking for meaningful comments on, and can we do better at reaching out to our partners? Can we do better bringing people to the table earlier? We're also looking to enhance our approach.

A couple of new things here, and the number of lease areas per bidder has changed, and so we're looking for comments on that. The model, in other parts of the nation, has states buying electricity, and there's a limit of one per customer, but, in the Gulf of Mexico, where it may be more beneficial, you know, based on economy of scale, and one bidder may need multiple leases in an area to make it work, where we currently don't have a process for it to move onshore into the grid, and I think I will get into that, but any questions on the layouts, et cetera, and all of these are laid out -- It's really important, and we're looking for information, and new information we may have not seen yet, or if there's concerns that we haven't considered.

Looking at the lease-specific terms, conditions, and stipulations, these are consistent with what was used in the past, and so some of these site characterizations, the requirement for reporting, national security and military operations, standard operating

conditions, all of that. I would say what's new here is reporting and enhancement of engagement, and so progress reports are required to be submitted every six months, and they must include communication plans for fisheries, tribes, and agencies, federal and state.

Then we're also requiring that, if there's multiple lessees in a region, that they talk to each other as well. When looking at the project labor agreements, it's not required in the Gulf of Mexico, like it's required in other regions, but the lessee must make every reasonable effort to enter into one, if that works for them, and this was consistent with the last sale.

Then supply chain statement of goals, and the lessee must submit a statement describing the plans, including engagement with domestic suppliers, for contributing to the creation of a robust, resilient, U.S.-based offshore wind supply chain.

Another thing to note here is the bidding credit calculations — The way that it's being calculated as changed. Historically, last time, it was based on the cash bid only, and so the percentages were a little higher, and now it's being based — Those bidding credits are being based off of the total winning bid, and so it's a larger proportion, and so the percentages, for the bidding credit, have gone down, but nothing has changed, and it's just way it was calculated, and so, if you have any questions on that, and I am also learning about it, but our econ division said, to us, the way that it was calculated last time was on a partial, and now it's on a whole, and that's why those numbers look slightly different.

Another thing that we wanted to point out that's an edit, or relatively new, in addition to this, is that we are allowing leases to propose green hydrogen production, and so it is something that we have authority for, and we did have language in the last lease sale, and lease instruments, and, when our solicitors reviewed, they said it was not as clear, and so we went back and made it very clear, and we do have the authority to permit and allow this, and this is -- You know, hydrogen is one type of offtake that is considered -- This energy production is considered possible now.

 Looking at our upcoming meetings, we are making sure we make ourselves available to help everyone understand what's in the proposed sale notice and what the next steps are. Today, earlier this morning, we had a wind auction seminar, and an industry roundtable combined meeting, to help industry understand how to qualify and move through the bidding process, as well as ask any

questions on the proposed sale notice.

It's important to note that we will have our fifth intergovernmental taskforce coming up on April 18, and so please do go to our website and register for that. Then we have focus group meetings planned as well, later in the month. We have a fisheries, and we have an environmental non-governmental organization meeting, two separate meetings, so we can target specific topics of interest.

All of these are to help everybody understand where we are in the process, really to make sure, you know, we have an opportunity to listen, and then the comment period closes on May 20.

What happens next? We have a number of meetings, that we look forward to hearing input, and hearing back on the number of questions we have posed in our sale notice, and then we're going to take time to review that information, and so the next steps are hypothetical. There's been no decisions made. We're proposing a sale, but there's still no decision, but we would then take the information that was provided and review the current lease areas and decide on final lease areas, final lease stipulations and terms, and those would be published in the final sale notice.

That would have to happen approximately thirty days before a lease auction, and, again, our lease auction would have to happen within the IRA coverage, and it would have to happen sixty days before December 23, if we were going to have IRA coverage for these leases, and so, with that being said, that leaves us at about the end of the fiscal year, and so about the end of September, or early October, for a lease auction, and potentially about end of July, or early August, for our final sale notice, when that would come out, and so that's the timing on that.

Just to expand a little bit, BOEM in general is looking at four sales this year. We'll do the central Atlantic approximately midsummer, one in the Gulf of Mexico, approximately early fall, as I mentioned, and then potentially two others, Oregon and Gulf of Maine, later in the fall.

The week of April 22, we have BOEM regional and departmental leadership attending the International Partnering Forum, and so we will have our full team coming down to the International Partnering Forum on Offshore Wind, and the Secretary of Interior, Secretary Haaland, will be there making some announcements, likely including some of these details that I just shared with you.

Looking forward, we are looking, and planning, for a GOMW-3, and so we do have our GOMW-2 on the table, but we are looking ahead, and it takes time to, you know, continue this outreach and engagement, and conduct data refreshes, and we're doing that now, and working with NOAA's National Center for Coastal Ocean Sciences, NCOS, and so a huge thank you to them and their team and their expertise.

We're also looking at transition planning, beginning now and working with the Department of Energy and NCOS, to better understand the most deconflicted corridors for transmission, and then we have ongoing hurricane research. We've funded a number of studies with NREL to get the latest wind speeds across the Gulf and understand the latest hurricane technologies.

BOEM's goal is, again, to provide a predictable schedule to allow developers to -- We're not sure if industry is going to -- You know, if it's going to be similar to the last sale or not, and, you know, we've kept in contact over the last year, but what we've heard is predictability helps in planning, and so we can do that, and we will continue to ensure the appropriate engagement with tribes and fisheries and other agencies, including this council.

The last thing that I -- Then I'll take all the questions, and I'm sure you all have lots of questions on all of that, and the last thing that I would just mention is for oil and gas. On March 29, BOEM announced the notice of availability of the area identification for the Gulf of Mexico, and the area ID is not a decision to lease. It's not a prejudgment, and it determines which areas are identified in the call for information that will receive further consideration and analyses for oil and gas sales.

In December of last year, the department announced our national OCS leasing program, and there were three in the Gulf of Mexico. The first proposed sale, under that program, is tentatively scheduled for 2025, and so we are -- A decision to lease must be preceded by several steps, including completion of environmental analyses, including NEPA consultations under environmental and other statutes, and so there will be lots of opportunity for input on that as well, but that's just the heads-up that we have wind and oil and gas moving forward together, and that is -- That's all I have right now, and I will take any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: My first question is one of your slides for hydrogen - It's called a minor edit, and it's talking about edits were made

to lease instrument and PSN to allow lessees to propose green hydrogen production as an energy product of offshore wind generation. Does that mean that, in your proposal, they can say that they're going to use offshore wind as the energy source to produce green hydrogen onshore, and is that what you're referring to there?

MS. LYNCKER: It would -- Thank you for the question, and it would be offshore. If electricity was sent onshore, and it was produced onshore, it's not a BOEM -- It's out of our jurisdiction. This specifically pertains to if they were going to create a hub offshore to produce green hydrogen.

 MR. DIAZ: Okay. That sounds like a little bit more than a minor edit, but my next question is, is there any interest, outside of this process, for any sites off the coast of Mississippi at this point?

MS. LYNCKER: Just to go back to your last comment, there would be subsequent review, and so they could put their intent is to produce this wind energy to develop hydrogen, and, after that, there would be subsequent site-specific reviews on what that would entail, and there would be additional NEPA consultations, et cetera, and so it's not just a -- This was included in the last, and so the minor edit is to make it clear this is possible this time.

To your second question, our call area that we currently have our environmental compliance for, and we have our consultation, and we have our wind energy areas, that is west of the river, and so, looking east, and further to Mississippi, we have had some companies come in and want to understand the potential in those areas, and they have proposals, and we have worked with our NCOS partners to look at what's there.

The reason why that area was not included in our current call is there was a number of environmental resource conflicts that, at the time -- There was limited industry interest at the time, and so we are working -- There is nothing formal, at this point, as far as an unsolicited proposal to BOEM, but we have looked into that area, with a company's specified interest in an area, and are working with them to minimize conflicts. As we move into GOMW-3, and we're revisiting the area in the Gulf, we are going to expand our approach, and understand the conflicts across, including areas further east.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you very much for your response. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Just to be clear that the Mississippi/Alabama project -- They have not -- They have not even started in the timeline that you presented on your first slide, or your second slide, of your presentation, correct?

MS. LYNCKER: It's a separate process that came in with -- It's outside of the call area, and this process is moving forward with the area, the geographic area, inside of our call area, which is all the way from the southern boundary of Texas to the most western part of the river. The company that has proposed a project on the east, they have come in, and where we are with that is understanding exactly what they were proposing, and understanding the conflicts in the area, so we could maybe help them define something that would work as a project, and so, yes, it's outside of this, but it would have its own full-blown process, with environmental review, consultation, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. I had Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the presentation, and I always appreciate you all coming and keeping us up-to-date, and particularly those that are here, and listening in as well, and I hope you would continue that in the future, because I think it's very helpful on the outreach side.

My comment relates to the intersection of the council providing feedback to you that's consistent with your timeline. The body that is primarily interested in this, from the council's perspective, is the shrimp industry, and our access to that is the Shrimp Advisory Panel. They meet infrequently, and, as you know, we meet five times a year.

Recognizing that you've got your timeline, that you want to continue and expedite, it doesn't necessarily mesh with our ability to provide that input from the section of the shrimping industry that's represented by the Shrimp AP in a timely basis, and this is a problem that was mentioned back in Mr. Celata's days, several months ago, but I don't see a resolution, and so I would ask that you consider working with council staff on a way that we might be able to provide the input from the industries that are affected, that we have purview over, to provide that input to you, other than the individual, or organizational, outside the council process, the input that you would get, so that we can have the council perspective as well. I don't have the answer, but I would just hope that you would consider and work with council staff to see if there's some nexus in making that happen. Thank you.

MS. LYNCKER: Thank you for that comment. I definitely took a note, and I would like to add that Mr. Celata did attend the last Shrimp Advisory Panel, and he did present, and, again, we do have our formal comment period ongoing now, with the start and end date. However, we are always open to taking comments, and concerns, and so I look forward to finding a solution to that concern.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I was going to say the same thing. We did have Mr. Celata give a presentation at the recent Shrimp AP meeting, and I think, also, Ms. Bosarge gave a quick overview of the workshop that was done in California, and I believe she attended that as well. I would note that we had a quick call with our RWE, the lease block, and they are working on a communications plan, and we'll be bringing that to the council as well in the future.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will just add that I feel like BOEM has done a tremendous amount of work reaching out to the industry, and there's been really good communication on both sides. I can also be used as a resource, and I certainly won't carry the full bucket of water for the council, but I am a taskforce member, just like John Walter is, and we will be speaking, with regard to environmental compliance associated with wind energy, next week during the taskforce meeting.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the presentation, and, as Mr. Gill said, we appreciate you keeping the council informed. On slide 7, you mentioned the fisheries compensation mitigation fund, and I'm wondering if there's any details on that fund, who is going to oversee it, and how that's going to work. I know there's been talk about it, but I haven't heard any details about it, and I was wondering if you had any additional details about that particular fund.

MS. LYNCKER: BOEM does not administer the fund. The way that this is written in, it's not required. It is required in oil and gas, and we found it very important, and we're adding it in, and we're incentivizing it as a bidding credit, and so BOEM does not administer it, but we do oversee it, and so they will provide their bidding credit, their proposal to us, and we have an auction panel that reviews it for adequacy, but, really, how it's done, in the Northeast, is there was a number of lessees that got together and

created a coalition.

1 2 3

They created a fund that they put funds into, and another way would be a third party could be hired to create a fund, and so it's really the onus is on the developers for this. BOEM's role is going to be overseeing, you know, the adequacy of their application for it, and then the adequacy of when they're pulling the fund together to -- You know, how they plan to administer it -- We will review that, but it is really the onus is on them, until, you know, law would be created to require it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you very much for the presentation. I want to go back to slide 9, about the meetings, and you said the detailed information about these meetings is on your website?

MS. LYNCKER: Yes, it is.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you.

 MS. LYNCKER: We encourage you all to join any and all of these meetings, and the same information for the proposed sale notice will be covered, but it's always great to hear from others, and the questions, and, if you want to speak as well, please reach out. We have points of contact on our website, or reach out to me, and, you know, in addition to these meetings, we met with Southern Shrimp Alliance at the end of March, right when this announcement came out, and we went map-by-map, block-by-block, looking at moderate to high shrimping and considering, you know, ensuring that we minimized impacts, and so I heard the comments about, you know, the main targeting being the shrimping, and we take it seriously, and we want to make sure we cover all the ground for that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Walter.

 DR. WALTER: Lissa, thanks so much for coming and presenting this to us, and I think that the engagement has been very strong from BOEM here, and as evidenced by the upcoming slate of meetings. I really want to thank you for scheduling the taskforce meetings, and that was something we had said would be a good idea, and I think you've gone above and beyond on these opportunities, and so I hope the people who are interested attend these meetings and are able to provide comment.

We'll be providing a letter of comment on the proposed sale notice,

and I had one question. In the addition of green hydrogen to the opportunities that the lessee has in the areas in the areas that they lease, do you want us to comment on that, and then the follow-up question is that, in our marine spatial planning, we did not actually consider the substantial water removals that would have to occur with green hydrogen, and so I think that does probably warrant comment on our part, and, also, if you could just elaborate on whether you're expecting us to provide comments, and, if not at this notice, what would be the process, going forward, for commenting on that? Thanks.

MS. LYNCKER: Yes, please comment now, and please comment with your foreseeable issues now, and so this does not have a company the ability to go produce hydrogen. This is acknowledging that, with the current business portfolio, business line in the Gulf, that there's no offtake to the grid at this time. Companies are looking at other ways, and BOEM is looking to provide access to other uses, potentially.

You know, right next to leases could be other ways, and so one thing that makes a lot of sense about this too is that, as we create our renewable energy program, and our renewable energy regulations, we are focused on wind, because wind is what we have right now, and it's what we know, and it's what we're working with, but the Gulf of Mexico is a multiuse basin, and so we are continuing to encourage that view of expanding that this is all of the above.

In the future, there could be solar, or there could be hydro, and so hydrogen is another energy form, but we're really moving in the direction of what does it look like if wind is going to produce energy, to produce another form of energy, and that is a conversation that's happening internally, and down the line, but we really want to get everybody thinking like that, and so, yes, please add your comments in for that.

It's currently a wind lease, but it is going to be allowed to, you know, potentially -- We're looking at what that means for the lease instrument, and that's why we have this comment now.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for that question, Dr. Walter. That was a concern of mine that I had, when Ms. Lyncker was answering Dave's question earlier, and the volumes of water that that's going to take, and it reminds me of the LNG days, with the water that may not be physically removed, but, you know, the entrainment issues, and the actual mortality from the process of, you know, converting water to hydrogen, and with larval fish eggs and those types of things, and so that is, I would think, a concern to look

into. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so sorry, and I need to circle back regarding -- I think it was the Shrimp AP's concern after Mr. Celata gave his presentation, and that was specific to the unsolicited bid process, where there's only a thirty-day comment period, which is not conducive for our process for the AP, or for the council, and so I guess it's still unclear if that process has been fully fleshed-out for the unsolicited bids, and how we would engage on that, and I apologize if I missed some of that earlier, and could you please explain that again?

MS. LYNCKER: Thank you for that, and I did not hear his explanation, but I will do my best to try and help, and there is — He could have been referring to those requests for competitive interest that is required to go out, and that is thirty days, where we're ensured that there's no other company there in the area that wants this same area. If not, we would have to have an auction, and so the request for competitive interest is a timeframe, but that is not the only timeframe for comment and input.

This would move through an environmental review that would have some type of environmental assessment. If not an EA, likely an environmental impact statement, and it would have public meetings, and comment periods, associated with it, and we would have a consultation, and so it would not -- The thirty days, and I don't want to -- I don't know what he was referring to, but I really think it's the request, the initial request, for competitive interest, that we would put in the Federal Register notice that would initiate that this area was under consideration, and is there any other competitive interest, and that's part of our authority. We have to ensure -- You know, if there's competitive interest, we would then do, for fair market value -- We do an auction, to ensure the American people got the fair value of it.

I think that's what he's talking about, but it is not the only time period, because that would be likely, you know, a three-year, or more, process for this to happen, and it's very different than moving through like we did where we did the programmatic on this large geographic scale, and we're moving through with these wind sales over there, and this is a site-specific process, and it would include all the steps, and so hopefully that helps.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you very much. That's very important, and very helpful. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. I am not seeing any more questions,

Mr. Lyncker, and we do appreciate you coming to our council meetings on a regular basis, the agency, and we look forward to any information you can provide to us regarding wind energy, and so thank you very much.

MS. LYNCKER: Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so that will take us to our scheduled break, or very close to it, and so we're going to break for lunch, and we'll reconvene, and begin public comment, at 1:30.

(Whereupon the meeting recessed for lunch on April 10, 2024.)

- - -

April 10, 2024

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

- - -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at The Lodge at Gulf State Park in Gulf Shores, Alabama on Wednesday afternoon, April 10, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, everyone. I think we're ready. I apologize for the delay. Good afternoon. 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.

The Sustainable Fisheries Act requires that all statements include a brief description of the background and interest of the persons in the subject of the statement. All written information shall include a statement of the source and the 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 all written comments will be posted on the council's website for viewing by council members and the public and 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. We will welcome public comment from in-person and virtual attendees. Anyone joining us

virtually that wishes to speak during public comment should have already registered online. Virtual participants that are registered to comment should ensure that they are registered for the webinar under the same name they used to register to speak. In-person attendees wishing to speak during public comment should sign-in at the registration kiosk located in the back of the meeting room. We accept only one registration per person.

Each speaker is allowed three minutes for their public testimony. Please note the timer lights on the podium or on the webinar. They will be green for the first two minutes and will blink 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.

If you have a cellphone, 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 have any private conversations outside the meeting room. Please note that public comment may end before the published agenda time, if all registered in-person and virtual participants have completed their comment. First, we will rotate between those in-person, and then we'll go to virtual, until we run out of either list, and so first we will go to those in-person, and we have Mr. Lawrence Marino, and Brian Lewis will be our virtual person. Mr. Marino.

PUBLIC COMMENT

 MR. LAWRENCE MARINO: Good afternoon. My name is Larry Marino, and I'm here on behalf of Louisiana Attorney General Liz Murrill. I would like to address the quota redistribution program under Amendment 60.

As for shares going into the program, shares in inactive accounts should obviously included, though there should be a grace period of a year to two, to account for sickness or boat problems, and we all know that this category is small potatoes, because, if someone can't fish their shares, they're going to lease or transfer them. They shouldn't be able to lease shares for more than a year or two either, because then they're no longer a fisherman, but this should be dealt with under Amendment 59.

Adding the annual allocation above certain thresholds is a great idea. The threshold should be the quota at the institution of the IFQ program, since that was what was actually given away when these

shares were created. Shares should also be recovered upon the death of the shareholder. Transfers to others, and especially to companies, can't be allowed to be used to circumvent this.

Termination should depend on the death of the original grantee of the share, since it was their catch history that gave rise to the share in the first place, but it may be that there's no way to track the original recipient to any given share, and, if so, then we now have to look at the death of the current shareholders, and it would have to be tracked through the companies, and partnerships, to the individual level, as NMFS showed that it can do in the appendix to the presentation yesterday.

Perhaps, more simply, there could be a fixed exploration based on a likely working lifetime, such as twenty years, running from the last transfer before the amendment is effective. Lastly, there was no discussion yesterday regarding annual or periodic reclamation of percentages of shares. Adaptive management, or whatever you may want to call it, was discussed in several presentations to this council within the last couple of years, and I think it needs to be one of the options explored.

As for distribution of the shares, whatever you call it, a quota bank or a reserve pool, my understanding is that the middle man has to be outside of NMFS in order to charge fees, and I think you need to charge fees to cover the cost of the thing, and to help the fishery, though much less than the \$3.00 to \$5.00 a pound, or more, that is being charged now, and so presumably this operator would have to be a non-profit entity, and its governance will be critical.

It needs to be governed by council appointees and directives to address how distributions are made, and distributions should be based on the needs, such as those that have already been discussed or others that the council identifies, now or in the future, and the quota should be distributed as allocation, and not as shares.

You have the chance to correct the original error of giving out all the shares. Give out allocation instead, so you can address different problems as they are identified.

One last idea that I've heard recently actually addresses both the from and to aspects of the redistribution, and the idea is to cancel all shares, and provide a credit to the shareholders in the amount of the current value of those shares, and then auction the quota each year. The shareholders can use their credit until it's gone, while others have to pay cash. This will take a while, but

eventually it would dig us out of the private ownership hole that we're in, and it would allocate the fish efficiently, according to the highest bid, and it would make the fish equally available to everyone.

Set-asides can still be reserved as well, and there is other details that would have to be addressed, but this idea starts with everyone having to pony up, instead of just a few starting with the advantage of already owning the right to the fish, and the proceeds for the fish would go to the public, instead of the private shareholders. This idea also should be considered among the alternatives. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Marino. Next up, we have Brian Lewis.

MR. BRIAN LEWIS: Good afternoon. My name is Brian Lewis. I own a commercial fishing vessel that fishes out of Clearwater, Florida. We harvest all the different reef fish, and I want to just commend all of you guys for the hard work that you put into trying to manage our fisheries, and you've got a heck of a job to do.

I want to just shed some light on some things. Number one, the gag grouper, right, and so I just want to let you know that we're tossing back anywhere between 300 to 600 pounds of gag grouper a trip, because we don't have any allocations, okay, and so, initially, the IFQ program allowed us to be able to -- I own some shares, which I purchased, and then I lease the rest, and so I was averaging about 3,000 pounds of gag grouper as allocations, at the beginning of the year.

This year, I was only allocated a hundred pounds, and so I already landed that, in one trip, and now I'm forced to throw back, because we have no access, and so, that said, we were also selected to fill out the logbook for discards and bycatch, which we're complying with, which will be noted on that, and this allocation that's been being withheld for all these years -- Let's see.

The IFQ program for grouper-tilefish was started in 2010, and here we are in 2024, and we've had no access to any of that allocation that's been, you know, withheld. In 2007, red snapper, the same thing.

I support a quota bank. I participate with the Shareholders Alliance group's quota bank, leasing red snapper, averaging about 10,000 to 12,000 pounds of red snapper for our bycatch, and so, that said, we also need to find a solution for all us fishermen

here in the Gulf to address the bycatch of gag grouper. I believe that our gag grouper fishery is much healthier than being prognosed at, and so, that said, that's all I've got, and I appreciate the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for giving your testimony. Any questions? Ken Haddad, and Katie Fischer is on deck.

 MR. KEN HADDAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and council members. My name is Ken Haddad, American Sportfishing Association, and I am going to focus on FES, and so pardon me, but it's just something that's bugging us at this point. I think this may follow some of your discussions to back off using FES-based management decisions until the pilot is completed and BSIA is determined. In Draft Amendment 58, you are directed to determine recreational commercial allocations while recognizing the council has passed a motion to make FES-based allocation -- Not to make any FES-based allocations until after BSIA is determined.

At the last meeting, we were kind of assured that no decisions would come up relative to allocation that impacted the recreational sector. Well, here it is, and so we again ask that you rescind that motion on FES-based allocations.

We're uncomfortable with any FES-based actions until the FES issues are identified and fixed. You're using FES to determine stocks and continuing with management plans, knowing that data are likely inaccurate, and, as a former manager, it's just contrary to anything I've ever seen. We ask that you back up and look at what you're doing, and I'm going to make an analogy that I will probably regret.

Think of it as a can in beans in a production line. The production manager determines that the cans are only being half filled, and an error has occurred. The manager doesn't say, well, we will just let a bunch of cans go out half-filled until we solve the problem. He shuts down the production line and solves the problem and starts back up with a full can of beans, and so I would argue that you're giving us a half a can of beans and a lot of gas.

Very quickly, on mackerel, we don't want any management actions that don't have an impact in solving whatever the issue is, that we're not exactly clear on yet. For example, if you were to go to a two-bag limit, would it reduce catch meaningfully, or just reduce access for those that fish for three fish, and we don't understand that yet, and we would not support a bag limit below two fish with the current unknowns in the fishery, and we know that seasons, and

the migratory aspects, make this confusing, but we're more cautious on where is the problem, and how do you fix it, and I don't think that's been fully vetted yet. Thank you.

1 2

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Ken. We have a question from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I'm going to put you on the spot. I'm a little confused. You want the council to rescind the motion, but then the analogy you gave was to stop production and fix the problem, and so help me understand.

MR. HADDAD: Well, right now, there's just a motion that addresses half of the FES picture, and there is no motion that says hold off making any management decisions until the FES problem is solved, and it's just hold off making any FES-based allocation decisions, and so does that --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ken, you said that you could probably live with a two-fish bag limit on king mackerel?

MR. HADDAD: I'm winging-it when I say that.

MR. WALKER: I understand that you don't want one, and it's three now. What are your thoughts there?

 MR. HADDAD: We heard -- I think it was Ryan that kind of explained there's a small gain in the bag limit setting overall, unless you go to one, and, typically, in the private recreational world, a two-fish bag limit is the minimum, and you start losing the will to fish when you get below that, and so, unless there is clear evidence that this is a fishery issue that can only be addressed by bag limits, we wouldn't want to consider anything below two.

MR. WALKER: Right, and, on those same lines, what are your thoughts on the Spanish mackerel bag limit?

MR. HADDAD: Not any clear thoughts. I think Alternative 2 and was that the -- I think we're good with Alternative 2.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I mean, I was just going to point out that Alternative 2, for that action, was the ABC and ACL. This particular document that we currently have doesn't address bag limits, and we're trying

to figure out if that's something we should --

1 2 3

MR. HADDAD: Right, but there was an Alternative 2 that was a motion for a preferred, and we're good with that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions? Thank you, Ken. All right. Next, we have Katie Fischer online, followed by Bob Zales. Katie, are you there?

 MS. KATIE FISCHER: Katie Fischer, Matlacha, Florida, fish house owner, and also a vessel owner, and I would like to thank you all for the discussion on distributing the IFQ shares yesterday, but I would like to ask the council, and what is the deadline that you have set to make a decision on these issues, and why aren't deadlines set for all issues, outside of the assessments discussed at meetings?

I know this is a painfully-slow process, but there is no accountability to any timeframes for many of the topics discussed at meetings, and, to everyone at the table, you know, timeframes really don't matter to you all, because you aren't affected by these decisions, but it affects the fishermen. Deadlines would help the council stay on track, so we can continue moving forward to better our fishery and the lives of the people who participate in it.

I think I can speak for a majority of fishermen who participate in these meetings when I saw distribute the shares held by National Marine Fisheries. You guys have been talking about this for five years. Just distribute them to the IFQ accounts with landings, but no shares, and be done with them. It's such a small amount of fish that, I mean, I hate to say it doesn't matter, but it doesn't, you know, and it's such a small amount.

I do believe, when distributing these shares, regional fisheries should be taken into account for red grouper. Red grouper is a Florida-centric fish, fishery, and it would help restore the access to our area that has been sold out over time.

In regard to active accounts, this is a substantial amount of fish that represents lost fishing opportunity for those who are actively fishing. I support a periodical process by National Marine Fisheries to reclaim inactive shares every three to five years. Inactive would mean there is no movement within the account, no leasing, no nothing, and the shares are just sitting there. I know that hardship was brought up, in regard to an account yesterday, and chances are that that fisherman would be leasing

their shares during that time, you know, in order to make money, because they're not making money fishing at the time, and so that really wouldn't be an inactive account.

There was also discussion on definitions of "new entrant" yesterday, and I think a very simple definition of a new entrant now would be any fisherman who has entered the fishery post-IFQ implementation and that did not have the opportunity to qualify in the beginning for shares.

I support these inactive accounts, the shares from these inactive accounts, being redistributed to fishermen who weren't initially awarded shares. Any future distributions would go to any fisherman who has entered the fishery since the last distribution, and then the IFQ program as a whole -- I just want to talk about this.

You know, I'm not sure why we're always trying to reinvent the wheel, every time issues come up, and the IFQ system that we currently have works well. However, its major flaw is the one-time qualification for shares. A fluid program would be a very easy solution to the issues we are facing today, with the lack of the next generation of fishermen. A periodical qualifying program, say every five to seven years, would solve a lot of our issues, and it would be relatively easy for National Marine Fisheries to achieve, since we've already done that process.

Then, lastly, I would like to say, Bob Gill, thank you for your motion, and we support that, and then, also, I do also support a stop on all allocation decisions until we figure out what's up with FES, because we all know it's an issue. There's something up with it, and so thank you so much for the time. I hope you all stay staff out there with that weather.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Katie. All right. Next, we have Bob Zales, followed by Ronald Chicola online.

MR. BOB ZALES, II: Bob Zales, II, Executive Director of Southeastern Fisheries Association. First off, and I'm going to try to be quick, and my favorite subject lately is the excessive discard mortality from private rec anglers and the lack of accountability.

We would really like to see, because we think this would help with a lot of the problems we've got in various fisheries, if we can get a handle on the effort that these people are putting on the fish, so that you can then try to identify the number that's out there and work on trying to get the data system fixed, so that you can collect the data, so that we know what the fishing mortality from discards is in a better way than we do now. That's been a big issue.

Amendment 53, a court case is going through the process, and we support Bob's motion yesterday about getting involved in 53 again, and, if I remember, I think somebody, staff or somebody, indicated that there really wasn't any new information on 53, because the FES system is still years away from getting fixed, but clearly we do have new information.

Number one, when it comes to the economic analysis, we know for certain that it was wrong, because, the year after 53 changed allocation, the recreational sector went from a year-round fishery to a closed fishery, and it's closing sooner and sooner every year, and that clearly is contrary to what the economic impact analysis said.

When it comes to the data itself, we know that the recreational part of that was overestimated by at least 40 percent, and so there's information to play with now, so we can try to move this forward to get something in there.

Lastly, I will talk a little bit about the king mackerel stuff, and I sent you all a couple of emails about Spanish and king, and providing a little bit of the history there, because, in looking at the table, there's really nobody here that knows the history of king mackerel from way back when we started in management, and, when it comes to the charts you showed, on the one graph with the migratory patterns, years ago -- If I remember correctly, and I don't remember the guy's name, but the mitochondrial DNA system was just beginning, and so they looked at king mackerel. They identified a western stock and an eastern Gulf stock; the western stock being attributed to Mexican fish.

At that time, we used to have Karen Burns, who worked with the Mote Lab, and you used to have information that you knew a little bit about Mexican fish, and the catches, and that hasn't been mentioned in years in the king mackerel fishery in the Gulf of Mexico, and I don't know if that's part of the problem, and it could be, and I'm not sure that playing with harvest levels of kingfish is the problem.

 I don't know that they're not there, and I think they're somewhere, but they're just not where they have traditionally been, and that's something that we've got to try to figure out, and so any questions?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I have a question from Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: So I wasn't on the council, obviously, when the analysis that you're talking about, with the eastern stock and western stock of king mackerel -- Can you elaborate a little bit more on that, but kind of not take real long, and we don't have a lot of time, I guess, but --

MR. ZALES: I'm sorry. Could you say that one more time?

MR. SCHIEBLE: So, elaborate on the eastern and western stock with king mackerel that you talked about just a minute ago here.

MR. ZALES: We went through this years ago, because the mixing zone was the big thing back then, right, in the Keys, and the South Atlantic and the Gulf stocks and the two councils playing together the whole time. Then they got into a situation to try to figure out -- Because it started with -- It was basically on the commercial side, if I remember, because you would have the western stock of fish move from Mexico all around up to Louisiana.

On the east side, they would go the other way to Louisiana, and the shrimpers were catching the king mackerel stock, or they were fishing kingfish, and they're shrimping catching them, and they were hook-and-line catching them, and they were catching the quota before the eastern side could get to it, and so they got into the thing of, okay, let's figure out where they are, and that's where that mitochondrial DNA study came from, and it showed the two separate stocks.

 The information that Karen Burns was able to bring back to the council, and I don't remember all the details for it, but I know it was significant in trying to figure out how that went, and then, once she passed away, and Mote kind of fell off to the side of not doing that anymore, then we lost that information, and that history, and, how that will play into the overall stock of kingfish, I don't know, but it was there, and, to my knowledge, the stock hasn't been reidentified, and so we're still looking at a Mexican stock and an eastern Gulf stock.

MR. SCHIEBLE: A real quick question, and so the mixing, or the conversion, zone, I guess, for those two stocks, is off of the mouth of the river, right, the dividing point?

MR. ZALES: What now?

 MR. SCHIEBLE: The dividing point for the two different stocks is the mouth of the river, the Mississippi River?

MR. ZALES: Yes, and it was kind of -- It wasn't -- I don't know if they really thought of the mixing zone like off of Louisiana, but they converged there, and I know that, back then -- This is I'm talking the 1970s, is when I first noticed this, and we were in the charter business in the Panhandle, and, in the wintertime, there were no tourists, and so we went to Louisiana and worked in the oil field.

Working over there, people were catching twenty, thirty, forty, fifty pounds of kingfish, and we're telling that, okay, I wish we had those there, and I wouldn't be here, and I would be in Panama City, and they didn't really want them, and they were catching them, but those big fish showed up, and then we had a couple of commercial fishermen from the Panhandle, and one of them was a fellow by the name of Bubba Hanson, and he went to Louisiana and started the commercial fishery there, and so that's how it got started. The bigger fish seemed to live off of Louisiana, more than they did, you know, from the eastern side of the Gulf anyway, and so how that plays in there I don't know, but that history is there.

I know Doug Gregory -- He has that history, because he was involved from the get-go, before me, but there are very few people around that still know the history of that whole mackerel fishery.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Zales, for coming. Your historical knowledge, and a lot of the other fishermen's historical knowledge, is very valuable, especially on this issue, and many times you've told me that the bait was not good off of Panama City, when you all were not doing good with kings, and what specific bait fish were you referring to whenever you made those comments?

MR. ZALES: What we call cigar minnows, and the technical name I can't remember right now, but cigar minnows, but even the herring, and, over the past -- I'm not going to go all the way back to the oil spill, but after the oil spill, the bait was kind of not around, and so clearly kingfish aren't coming up from the Keys to look at bikinis on the beach, right, and they're looking for food and looking for temperature and stuff like that.

Over the past several years, and you've heard me say this many times, and last year was the best year that I've had in kingfish

over the past five years. It wasn't real good, but it was better than the other four, and so what it's going to be this year I don't know, but clearly there's an issue with kingfish, and so I don't know, and I think it's more about maybe the bait, the ecosystem, or something, that they're traveling someplace else that historically they weren't traveling before, and so I don't know that there's a problem with the stock, other than a problem of where the stock is.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: In thirty seconds or less, what's your opinion on Spanish mackerel?

MR. ZALES: What now?

MS. BOGGS: Spanish.

MR. ZALES: Spanish, from what I'm hearing, because I'm not in the charter business now, but from what I'm hearing, they're catching them good, and last year we caught them good, and right now they're catching them good, and I don't think there's a problem with Spanish mackerel.

I think that, you know, clearly fifteen fish, which you all saw the email that I sent, is way too high, but that was done in a period of time where we were trying to prove a point, and, you know, the point it proved, in a sense, because we never caught what they said was available, but, you know, ten fish I think is a reasonable limit, and I don't think there's a problem with that fish.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, Bob. Thank you.

MR. ZALES: Okay. Thank you all.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we have Ron Chicola online, followed by Jeremy Young.

 MR. RONALD CHICOLA: Thank you, Andy, for your motion yesterday on Amendment 60, trying to get something going on 60 and 69 tomorrow, hopefully, or 60 and 59. On the kingfish, I talk to fishermen, almost once or twice a week, down in Mexico, and there ain't no kingfish down there either, and there hasn't been for two or three years. It's really fell off down there.

47 Kingfish went by the same place as the sharks, and they ate all

the little kingfish, and they've taken a toll on the kingfish, and the Spanish in the western Gulf, and the groupers in the western Gulf -- They will never be like they were in the 1980s, I mean, when we slaughtered them, but there are still plenty of grouper just scattered along in the mud bottom, you know, and you've got to dig through the eels to get them, but there is a few, and you can do 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 a trip, and it's hard work, you know, but you can do it in the Gulf.

As far as dividing it in two, it needs to stay in three, like the science has said, because it's really three different fisheries. I mean, the western Gulf is a totally different fishery than the middle part, and then the eastern Gulf is definitely a different fishery, and so I think it should be divided into three, and the EEJ presentation today was really good, if the council would really do something about it and take their word to listen to Lawrence.

Every meeting, Lawrence gets up there and tells you all what he thinks, and nobody ever takes his recommendations, and they're really good, and that's about all I've got today, and I enjoyed the EEJ presentation, and thank you, Andy, for pushing the council, and keep pushing on, and maybe they will do something for a change. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chicola. All right. Next, we have Jerome Young. Next would be B.J. Burkett online. Mr. Young.

MR. JEROME YOUNG: Jerome Young, Florida Keys Commercial Fishing Association. I'm not sure how I got on there, but since I'm up here anyway, one comment that I made to FWC earlier is, as far as the king fishing, the fleet this year, three boats were not able to fish, and so, when you're looking at the ACLs, or the catch limits, and the landings, there's three boats that did not fish, and so that's a hundred-and-twenty-something thousand pounds that you're not going to see. They're trying to get out, but they may or may not, and so take that into consideration when you're looking at that.

I noticed that a lot of your data that you're using -- It seems to me that you're using the ability, or the landings, compared to the ACL, as an indication of the stock, and I don't know if that's true or not, but that's the impression I got, at least with the commercial side, and so I wanted to offer that to you, and that's all I've got.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Young, we have a question for you from Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: So, you said that three boats weren't able to get out, and was that like for the entire three-month season they couldn't get out, and they were just offline?

MR. YOUNG: Well, they started out fishing, and they ran into some issues, and they're trappers, and they ran into some issues getting the traps in in time, and so they had to go back to that, and they haven't been able to get it back together, and they say they're going to go, but I don't know if they're going to be able to or not, but, you know, within that group of guys, there's only eleven boats, and so they've allocated, amongst themselves, 61,000 pounds, and, if they don't catch that, it just goes uncaught, and so that's how -- The other boats aren't making it up.

MR. WALKER: Very good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: All right.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so Mr. Burkett is not currently online, and we will follow-up with him later on, at the end, but next will be Brad Gentner, followed by James Stevens online.

MR. BRAD GENTNER: Good afternoon, everybody. Brad Gentner, Gentner Consulting Group, and I'm here representing Coastal Conservation Association. First off, I want to thank the council, and the agency, for thinking about collecting adequate economic data on recreational anglers and for-hire businesses and trying to balance burden with needs.

I fully agree that good scientific management requires that economics be used proactively in the management process. Humans are a part of the ecosystem, and incentives matter when developing policies. Cost and earnings data is the keystone to capturing incentives and designing incentive-compatible management options. To that point, better private recreational data is needed to help improve proactive scientific management as well.

We can do much better than choice experiments, which seem to get thrown around a lot, for private recreational values, and the new state surveys are a perfect vehicle for capturing real preferences for fishing trips, instead of hypothetical preferences. I would urge NMFS, and staff, to begin using economic data proactively to improve fisheries management decisions and outcomes.

 I also want to draw attention to and thank the states for improving catch data collection in the Gulf. From what I saw yesterday, the state reports were proof that state management, and state data collection designs, are a providing a much higher level of recreational access, while protecting sustainability of the stocks, and nobody went over last year. Well, except for Mississippi. They get ten fish, and they caught eleven.

Finally, you have a data system that would allow the in-season monitoring, in nearly real-time, as the management system demands, and we need to work towards declaring state data BSIA for monitoring and assessment, as it's clearly a better system. We can't continue to make decisions based on FES, while all these questions are out there, and we also need to work towards more state management of species that are important to the recreational sector. That's all I have today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Brad. I don't see any questions. Thanks again. All right, and so, next, we have James Stevens online, and apparently Mr. Burkett is back with us, and so we'll go to him after James Stevens. Mr. Stevens, are you there?

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: No, it's not working. All right. We're going to move on right now, and we'll see if you can get you guys back.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So, Emily, is -- You've got them both? Okay. All right, and so that will take us then to Elizabeth Boggs.

 MS. ELIZABETH BOGGS: Good afternoon. My name is Elizabeth Boggs, and I'm from here in Orange Beach, Alabama. I'm a second-generation charter fisherman, and I'm one of three offshore fishermen, or fisherwomen, in Orange Beach, Alabama. I wanted to talk to you all today about a couple of different fish, especially king and Spanish mackerel.

The Spanish mackerel in Orange Beach, we do see a lot of them, but I would like to see us reduce the bag limit to ten fish per person, and possibly even a thirty-fish-per-boat-per-trip limit.

Lots of women and children come get on our boats, and so, when we have those limited number of people, it's very interesting to look at the number of fish they take home, and so the smaller ten-fish-per-person bag limit I feel would be very suitable for what people typically utilize on our trips, and then, on king mackerel, I just wanted to say that the number of fish, and also the summer, was very low, and we didn't see a lot come into the docks or to the

marina.

 Cobia is another one that I wanted to speak about. I don't see any of them come into our docks or hear about anyone bringing any in. We have several captains, at our dock, who have moved here from the east coast fishery, where they are saying it's absolutely shocking to see the very few number of cobia that we have here.

Amberjack is another one that I wanted to speak to you all about. Amberjack, what we're seeing right now is amberjack that are so small that juveniles are being harvested, due to their similarity to almaco jacks, and it's amazing to look at the different species of fish and see how similar they are, and we're seeing so few legal-sized amberjack that there are many smaller amberjack that are barely even twelve inches long being harvested.

 You don't see any of these fish, king mackerel, cobia, or amberjack, coming into the docks, and you don't see people going out and targeting them, just because that's something they don't feel they have the ability to catch, because the stocks are in such poor shape.

I would also like to touch on king mackerel again and say that I would like to see them go to a one-fish-per-person-per-day bag limit, and that's kind of what I have.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, Elizabeth, please tell the council how old you are.

MS. E. BOGGS: I am eighteen, and I will be nineteen in two days. If you can't tell, I'm kind of freaking out about being up here in front of all of you all.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Elizabeth, Ms. Boggs, we have a question from Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: So not really a question, but I'm going to just say that your mom was bragging on me, and so I've been told that you submitted for your hundred-ton license, as of when you turn nineteen, and is that correct?

44 MS. E. BOGGS: Yes, and I went and filed my paperwork today, and it will be sent in on the 12^{th} , on my birthday.

MR. STRELCHECK: Congratulations.

MS. E. BOGGS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Elizabeth, you're popular this afternoon. Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: I'm from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and I knew that you had been studying for your license, and so I have a question about the navigation rules of the road. Congratulations.

MS. E. BOGGS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Congratulations, and happy birthday, Elizabeth. All right, and so we're going to go back to the phone, or online, and Emily is -- Who do we have up, B.J. Burkett or Mr. Stevens?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: I think James is up first. James, are you on the phone, sir?

MR. JAMES STEVENS: Yes, ma'am. Can you hear me?

22 23

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: We can hear you now. Go ahead. Your three minutes starts now.

MR. STEVENS: Yes, ma'am. My name is James Stevens, and I commercial fish out of Apalachicola. I've been commercial fishing for about thirty-five years now, and we mainly target gag groupers. You know, for most of my life, about the last probably ten or twelve years, we've been targeting snappers as well, because they have gotten -- over here, and so our gags are mainly -- They mostly have been a bycatch.

You know, we have caught our full quota that we get every year, and we've released probably another full quota, plus some of our — quota. Now, the last three years on the gags, it's getting better every year, and so went from catching maybe, you know, 20,000 or 30,000 pounds of gags as a bycatch, mainly, and we have rarely ever targeted them, since we got the snappers to 1,800 this year. We were not targeting — We're throwing back a hundred head a trip, trying to catch red groupers and snappers.

The stock is fairly healthy, and is it like it was twenty-five or thirty years ago? No, but it's a lot better than it has been in a long time, and it's really putting pressure on the other species as well, and we're losing, you know, half of our yearly paycheck. I just felt that I had to say something, you know, about this, and

I don't know what we can do to change it, and maybe do away with IFQs, so, you know, you don't have to target -- You know, you can get away with a bycatch, so to speak, and you don't have to put pressure of one species of fish that --

Do away with IFQs, but you don't get paid for them like the snappers, and, you know, we've got to catch a lot of them to make any money, because the lease is so high on them, and so you're really -- You're catching a lot of other things that we wouldn't normally be catching. I guess that's it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you, Captain Stevens. Any questions? I don't see any questions. Thank you, and so, next, since we have the phone, Mr. Burkett, are you there?

MR. B.J. BURKETT: Yes, and my name is B.J. Burkett, and I own and operate two charter boats in Panama City, and also a commercial fishing boat. I also want to touch on the gags. I mean, it's — I know you're trying to rebuild it, but you all got in this — In the avenue of just doing all these drastic cuts. I mean, we told you all, four or five years ago, that, hey, you need to start looking into this, looking into this, and maybe a smaller reduction, and there's nothing small. Everything that I've noticed, over the last few years, that fisheries does is drastic, and, I mean, and you're cutting people out of the loop.

I mean, -- in the fishery, to where we can all have our jobs together, but, between gags, we're throwing back -- It's kind of sad that -- You mark my word, and, in three or four years, your data is going to show this, but your data is so far behind that it's not showing what is out there and being caught, and hopefully not wasted. Hopefully the dolphins, and the sharks, are being nice to the gags, and letting them swim back down, but I kind of doubt it. You all need to pay attention to what these fishermen and all are telling you all just a little bit more, and it would go a long way.

I also want to touch on the amberjack, for the rec side of it, and we appreciate the May season. A little more of a heads-up would have been great, but my big concern about this is, if you -- If we have this May season, we don't want this to overfish the stock, and then we get penalized again next year, and so please tread softly on that.

King mackerel, they need some help. Before we do anything drastic, which is kind of the new way, I would love to see some data on it, and let's start with some softer changes, before we go from three

fish to a half-a-fish, or one fish every three days, or something crazy like that.

 Spanish mackerel, I would be good going down to ten, or maybe seven, and I feel like they may be declining a little bit, but it's definitely nothing drastic, and I want to take "drastic" out of your vocabulary.

State boats, we're having a huge problem with them outside of nine miles, and also in our closed zone off of Panama City, and it's about fifty miles south, and they're daily in there catching the fish, in that zone we're trying to protect, with no enforcement, and that's pretty much all I've got for you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right. Next, we have Jim Zurbrick, followed by Ryan Mallory, who is online.

 MR. JIM ZURBRICK: Thank you, council. Jim Zurbrick, from Steinhatchee, commercial fisherman and fish dealer and a long-time participant in the process. Elizabeth there, that's being young, right, and you're going to be nineteen in two days. When you get to be my age, and I'm going back the whole 363 days, to whatever that age is, and I'm not going forward.

I want to say, right off the bat, that Katie Fischer -- I like that approach, and she made some good sense, and we spend a lot of time on those few fish that have been in that account, and I will say that the Shareholders Alliance has demonstrated, over these years, that they're probably one of those, like Mr. Marino was talking, those 501(c)(3)s that could actually know who to get these fish to, if the bureaucracy doesn't want to get involved, and it is a bureaucracy.

A couple of things. On Amendment 58, boy, that's going to be a mess, when you really get into it, and it will be tough, you know, especially with the IFQ component, and you're going to have, you know, buckle up and hold for that.

Amendment 60, obviously, it's got a few caveats, and I support allocation only, giving it out, allocation only, unless we think that getting the actual share ownership is going to be more beneficial, and we haven't seen that analysis, right, to see what an actual ownership gives you, other than just access to allocation, and so maybe that isn't important.

I disagree with, the moment a guy dies, the moment, that all his shares are gone. That I don't agree with, but there needs to be

a phase-out period, if there's not somebody in the family immediately that's going to take over the fishing business, and, obviously, it's not going to -- In the future, it's not going to be a leasing business, and there is going to be some kind of catch component to it.

My State of Florida does a tremendous job, and I want to see them manage the red and gag groupers both, from here on out, and I do have faults with the SRFS, and I don't think that there's not a mandatory component of groundtruthing, where you have intercepts that are -- You know, you know where to go, and that's just a component, but, as far as the data, my state does a much better job, I feel, than what we've been doing at the federal level.

The deepwater groupers, we need to get a handle on it. People have been talking about it for a while now, and there is a problem, and I don't deepwater fish, but I talk to a lot of people who are, and so let's not get to the point where, you know, we sounded the alarm early, and we don't do anything. We need to do something, and I don't know what that is, and, as far as king mackerel, I've listened to a lot of conversation, and I think precaution, because maybe it's not about the stock itself, and maybe it's about other things that are causing it, and I thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, Captain Zurbrick. We have a couple of hands. Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Captain Jim. You're familiar with the fishery, and do you have any thoughts on how the council might equitably divide up the shallow-water quota among shareholders, you know, if we have to split the scamp and the black, as most of us refer to it?

MR. ZURBRICK: Well, we all remember the foul-up initially, when we were calling black groupers gags, and vice versa, and we worked through that, and so I have to believe that the agency is thinking that through, and we'll have to see what the analysis is, before I could even speak intelligently about it.

MR. WALKER: It's going to be tricky. Any input on that topic, at any time, please let me know.

43 MR. ZURBRICK: You got it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Frazer.

47 DR. FRAZER: Hi, Jim, and so I'll stay on 58, and so how -- I mean,

how important is multiuse in your fishery, in your business?

MR. ZURBRICK: I think the multiuse, over all the species, is a pretty good -- That's that ecosystem management, where we're fishing -- Like the guys that don't have the gags, but maybe they've got snappers, and maybe they'll give up a two-to-one, or one-to-one, and maybe we can start massaging what we're actually catching by exchanging fish that we have, you know, in our IFQ, and so maybe multiuse is not just a grouper type of multiuse, but a whole complex.

DR. FRAZER: I guess, maybe more specifically, do you take advantage of the current multiuse flexibility?

MR. ZURBRICK: Yes, it is important, and especially there's times when -- I mean, we're all into multiuse on gag right now. I'm sorry. There is no -- Just gag.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Zurbrick. All right. Next, we have Ryan Mallory online, followed by Captain Randy Boggs.

MR. RYAN MALLORY: Good afternoon. I just wanted to touch on what Mr. Zales and Mr. Young said about the king mackerel fishery, that, you know, in the late 1970s, and early 1980s, there was a lot of east coast fishermen that went to Louisiana, and partaking in that fishery, and, I mean, we've seen trends over the years. In 2010, they didn't fill the quota. The season opened on July 1, and they didn't fill the quota until February.

The year after, we caught it in sixty days, and then, every year, it would go a little less, or a little earlier, whatever it may be, and I just don't want to see us, you know, shooting first and asking questions later, and I think we really need to figure out what's really going on before we start cutting all these ACLs, because this isn't just going to affect one sector, and this is across-the-board.

You're talking -- If you do seasonal closings, and, when the fish are up there, give people the opportunity to fish, they're not going to be able to fish, because, in the northern Gulf, that's when they're spawning, and I just don't want to see people lose opportunity to partake in a fishery.

As for what Mr. Young said about the roller boats fishing in the Keys this year, there is a lot of issues we had with weather. I

mean, the hook-and-line, we could have easily caught our fish, if we had ample weather to fish this year, and, even right now, I mean, you all can see it. You're having bad weather, and it's blowing twenty to twenty-five down here now, and so I just -- You know, I really think we need to step back and try to identify what's really going on and see what we can do, as opposed to just cut everybody across-the-board and then be like, all right, well, what's the problem, and so that's my input on the king mackerel fishery. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a question for you, Mr. Mallory, from Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: So, are you a participant in the commercial king fishery down there in south Florida?

MR. MALLORY: I, for years -- For years, all I did was travel chasing kingfish, and I've caught -- The year of the spill, I actually went and fished in the Carolinas, and then, you know, every year since, I've fished in the Gulf, and I've fished, you know -- I've unloaded kingfish from Texas to Key West, and I know that the chart that you guys showed, that those fish in the northern Gulf, and I lived in Louisiana for eight years, and fished there year-round, and it really gave me an understanding of the kingfish.

 May, June, and July, you need to be from Galveston to off the Atchafalaya. September and October, those fish are in the west delta, right there in the pocket, and that's where they just — They settle in, and then, by November and December, those fish would be right off of say Cameron, Louisiana, and they're heading — They're gone. They're heading south.

MR. WALKER: (Mr. Walker's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. MALLORY: I'm sorry, Mr. Walker. You cut out.

38 MR. WALKER: So, are you still a traveling king fisherman, and, if so, do you still go to the western Gulf?

 MR. MALLORY: I'm really -- I don't know if I'm going to go to the western Gulf this year, but I actually -- When I stayed in Louisiana, I fished snapper, and then, during the kingfish season, I would fish it, but then it got -- The lease got so high on snapper, I did better chasing kingfish.

47 MR. WALKER: All right, and so, if you didn't go to the western

Gulf, why would that be? Would it be the lack of fish or other factors?

MR. MALLORY: A lot of people don't factor in -- You can actually look at your landings, and 202 was really your last significant year of landing for kingfish in the western Gulf, for the fact that there's not many fish houses left, because of all the hurricanes, and that was -- I king fished July and August in Cameron, Louisiana, and Hurricane Laura came and just wiped it off the map, and the same thing in 2021, with Ida, and it shut down Grand Isle and Leesville, and these areas -- Leesville and Grand Isle, I would feel comfortable to say that 70 percent of the western Gulf quota is landed at those points, and so, if you don't have the infrastructure to support the fishermen, whether it's

ice, fuel, or facility, you're not going to have the production of the fish, and I truly believe that's another reason that you don't have the participation, commercially, that you've had

18 historically.

MR. WALKER: That's great input. Thank you very much.

MR. MALLORY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Next, we have Captain Boggs, followed by Captain Scott Hickman, who is online.

MR. RANDY BOGGS: Good evening. My name is Randy Boggs, and I've been with the council process for quite a few years. I don't come as much as I used to, and, in the 1990s, I was on the king mackerel, cobia, and Spanish mackerel stock assessment, and it was one of the first -- Or advisory panel, and it was one of the first ones that I sat on.

I remember when they talked about the east and west split of the Gulf, and the fish congregate, in the wintertime, where they're constrained by temperature, in the Keys and off of southern Florida, and we've allowed the roller boats down there, and the hook-and-line fishery there, for many, many years, and it's a huge harvest -- Years ago, the numbers -- This is from years ago, and it was three-plus-million pounds that were harvested when the fish were aggregated by temperature, and they couldn't go anywhere, because the water was too cold to support the fish.

You get them aggregated, and a lot of the fish that are caught in there are huge fish, which are the spawners, and there was a lot of talk about them. With the DNA sampling that the fish have, it's like a homing instinct, where they go east or west, and they

could go up the Atlantic coast or come into the Gulf of Mexico and go to the western oil rigs and stay. When you harvest those older, bigger fish, if it is true that they do have the homing instinct to go to the western Gulf, that's where they've gone.

I run a headboat every day, and my predominant fishery now is beeliners, and, in the 1980s, the 1980s or 1990s, when we came off the closure, and we had a closure back then for a year, or eighteen months, and they completely closed the kingfish down, and they opened it back up with a one-fish-per-person-per-day bag limit, and, back then, we had eight to ten or twelve cutoffs a day from kings eating the beeliners off the line, you know, and so that was a regular occurrence.

Nowadays, you don't see that. I don't think it's that the kingfish stocks have moved, and we may discover some kingfish that are migrating to a different area, but I think that the kingfish are in trouble, and they need some help. There's a lot of harvest. You know, when you've got fish that's constrained by temperature, they get harvested.

One of the fish that I've heard a little bit about today is cobia, and like the cobia are in dire straits. The fish are in trouble. I know they're catching fish when they get off the rigs in Louisiana, but they really need to do something with those.

Spanish mackerel, very quickly, ten fish per person would be fantastic, and I think that's enough fish. Thirty fish per day, or per trip, on a boat, and that would be five fish on a six-pack boat, and it would be less fish on a multi-passenger boat, and that would kind of constrain the harvest a little bit, and I think that's a fair and adequate bag limit. Thank you, guys, and that's pretty much all I've got.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Randy, we've got a question for you. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I'm not going to ask your age.

MR. BOGGS: This is a trap. She ain't talked to me in three days at home, and so I know this is a trap.

MS. BOGGS: You're the first charter boat captain that's come up here that I can ask this question. I know that you report to the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey, but do you support a data collection system for the charter-for-hire, the six-passenger, multi-passenger boats, and is there anything that you would like to see or not see in that data collection?

MR. BOGGS: I would love to see the data collection put back in place for the charter-for-hire. We all know that one of the biggest things is always the stick in the deal, and it's the economic reporting of what they make, and that's -- We have some fishermen that believe that they don't want VMS on the boat because the government is going to give away the rocks off of Panama City where they fish, or Destin, or whatever part of the Gulf you fish in, and, well, you can buy a charter and do that.

The charter-for-hire needs data collection. You know, the economic part of it, I know it's important, and I talked to the officers in the state, and, you know, if we do have economic injury, the states generally administer those programs, and they figure it out by trip logs, and by what we report in the state now, and we have to report the red snapper and the other stuff, but they have a pretty good idea of what these guys are fishing, and what they're making.

It's just getting them to report the economic side of it is going to be very, very hard, because a lot of these guys believe that they're going to turn it into the federal government. When I was part of the Headboat Collaborative -- I know how hard it is for data sharing among the agencies, and, being part of that, it's next impossible for them to share anybody's data, and you guys that have been a part of that know what that's like, and so, yes, we need a data program for the charter boats, and we really do.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Next, we have Scott Hickman online, followed by Captain Dylan Hubbard.

MR. SCOTT HICKMAN: Thank you. Captain Scott Hickman, from Galveston, Texas, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Gulf Council. Thanks for hearing me today. First off, I would like to say a little bit about myself. I'm a charter-for-hire permit holder, a commercial IFQ shareholder, a thirty-seven-year professional fisherman out of Galveston and western Gulf of Mexico. I'm one of the original Charter Fishermen's Association founding board members, and I'm a commercial king mackerel permit holder and fisher.

I would like next to speak to the IFQ system for reef fish in the Gulf of Mexico. It's a great system, and it's one of the few things in the Gulf that's currently working, and its conservation based, and it's accountable.

As far as these unused shares, and these unclaimed accounts, I think the Gulf Council has got a unique situation right now to do

something good for our country, and another thing is, given their service to this country in a way that most people have not, and I would recommend the Gulf Council develop a veterans' new entrants fisher program for the unused shares.

I would like the council to keep working on the fishery ecosystem plan. With all the issues we're having with climate change, it's a step in the right direction, and I would like to see that move forward quicker.

You know, as far as the offshore wind presentation earlier, it was great, and the Charter Fishermen's Association supports these projects in the western Gulf of Mexico. CFA just recently signed onto the Graves and Veasey reef bill, which we're fully behind. Wind energy was not put into that, and I think these structures, and some of those components from these offshore wind structures, would be great additions to our artificial and natural reefs. Access for anglers will -- be on these platforms and structures, and so will be the recruitment of many fish.

As far as the king mackerel stock, in my thirty-seven years, I can't believe a fish that's been a nuisance my entire life is now something rare. The western stock is terrible, and I think a one-fish bag limit is a step in the right direction. One of the strange things I have is -- One of my old deckhands is a captain down in Puerto Rico, and another friend of mine owns a lodge in the Bahamas, and they've seen a large increase in king mackerel, which leads me to believe that the record-high sea surface temperatures the last few years -- Those fish are moving to new areas.

SEFHIER, the apps that we were using worked well, and the new technology, Starlink cellular bridge technology, will be in place this time next year, where smartphones will work offshore, and you will be able to do a hail-in and hail-out with a cellphone, with no additional equipment, and it's easy for the captains.

The economic survey is an important part of that program, and, from what I hear, the apps that are being used -- They can get an algorithm in them that randomly selects fishers for an economic survey, before they come in, and not to burden everybody with having to do it everyday.

I've got a good friend, named Bill Platt, and he's the number-one king mackerel tournament guy in the Gulf of Mexico, and he's the Yamaha-sponsored guy, and he's well-known, and he does more tournament king mackerel fishing than anybody in the last twenty-

four years, and he says it's that bad, from his standpoint, and he travels all over fishing for them, and he spends a lot of money fishing for them, but I think a one-fish bag limit is the conservative approach, and let some people go catch some fish, and we can get the data, and we can get the science.

I think the fishery is worse off than people think. I went weeks last year without seeing a fish, and, five years ago, on my trips, I would catch 600 or 700 pounds a day, and I'm lucky if I get one or two fish, and so, that being said, I appreciate you all's time, and it's a lot nicer here over in west Texas, and I hope the weather clears up for you all, like it has for us here.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you, Scott. We appreciate it. All right. Next up, we have Dylan Hubbard, followed by Jesse Heiser online.

MR. DYLAN HUBBARD: All right. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. First off, on amberjack, thank you for the added access. It's great. It's a great opportunity to sell some more trips and provide more access for our private recreational angling fleet across the Gulf. However, it is a little disappointing to have this positive news overshadowed by some negativity or a lack of understanding of why it's such a last-minute season announcement, due to having such a delay from state management data collection programs.

Gag grouper, I was really hoping to leave this meeting with a plan for our business in the fall, and the fleet was really hoping for this as well. It's a super economically important fishery to our region, and we're happy to see all the effort going into preserving access and working on the acceptable draft numbers that came out of MRIP-FES to start.

Also, it was good to see the shore numbers not used in the ACL overage consideration, due to that unacceptably high PSE. While there are some positives in this extremely-dark circumstance, we really need to have as much advanced notice as possible to plan out our fishery businesses, and I would like to ask this council, and NOAA, to try to prioritize notice as soon as possible, so our season projections are made known and we can move forward. It was noticed, in the Federal Register, at this meeting that we would see gag grouper season projections, but we've not seen them yet, and we're all waiting on pins and needles.

I would also implore this council, and NOAA, and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, to expedite efforts to update the science

on this fishery, through interim analyses or whatever tools we have. Due to the cyclical nature of this gag grouper fishery, we're confident that we're seeing changes on the water that aren't being captured in the latest science, especially since our last assessment, that we're managing on now, has a terminal year of 2019.

For red grouper, we're happy to see the red grouper stock assessment underway, and we look forward to positive information that has to be forthcoming on this rebounding fishery biomass. Also, we're thankful to have season projections at this meeting, so we can better plan out our summer fishery. However, I would ask NOAA, and specifically NOAA OST, to work with the State of Florida, as these red grouper landings for Waves 1 through 3 start to come in, so we don't get to the fall and have the issues with Wave 4, like we did last year, and just really incredibly glaring FES problems, and so hopefully, through closer collaboration, we can ensure any issues are caught more quickly, and we can move into the fall with confidence in our data and projections and core statuses, and hopefully a fall red grouper reopening.

I also want to make sure that I mentioned the enforcement issues on spatial area closures, and our federal enforcement, and state partners, have an impossible job. Much like trying to count fish in the entire Gulf, trying to enforce the entire Gulf of Mexico, and these complex regulations, are very difficult. However, it's hard to stay legal with all these changing regulations all the time, but we're resilient, and we do what we need to for the health of our fishery.

However, this twenty-fathom closure for recreational fishermen, that we currently have in February and March for grouper spawning aggregations, is impossible to enforce, and it only negatively impacts our federal for-hire fleet. It doesn't apply to the commercial fleet, and the recreational fleet is very hard to manage, and, honestly, just blatantly ignored, and so we have a very big enforcement problem, that is unenforceable, and it's a regulation that's in place to protect spawning aggregations of gag grouper, which aren't even open at this time anymore, and it's an out-of-date regulation that needs to be removed, and I'm extremely out of time, and so thanks for letting me run over.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Dylan. Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: So, Dylan, I know you do a lot with your fleet now in Madeira Beach, and do you all fish for the king and the Spanish, and, if you do, what are you all seeing down there?

1 2

 MR. HUBBARD: In thirty seconds or less, so we do fish for Spanish mackerel and kingfish. For me, in my business, it's more of a bycatch fishery, and it's not a directed fishery. We do some directed fisheries, but it's always in a very short-duration trip, and so we would support the DCBA proposal of moving to five mackerel per person and one king mackerel per person. I think moving to two king mackerel doesn't do enough. One king mackerel does something, and it has a small impact, and, as that fishery hopefully cyclically rebounds, it will help form more fish, as it's coming back, and so that's the idea, and I think it would be a positive impact to start changing some stuff.

MS. BOGGS: Then, of course, about data collection, and is there something that we can do to get the buy-in of the fishermen to provide some type of economic data?

MR. HUBBARD: I think asking trip costs is important, from the presentations that we saw, and there was a lot of stuff that wants to be asked, but we have to keep it simple, and we have to keep it to what needs to be there, and it seems like trip cost would be an effective thing to ask, but it's already been said that only a portion of the fleet, a subset of the whole, would accommodate this, and so I think what Scott said earlier would be the best, some sort of algorithm, and I know the good people at Bluefin could accommodate that, in the VESL app. Andrew Peterson, and his team, are very able, and willing, to accommodate that, and so I think some sort of randomizer, to ask a certain subset of declarations an economic question, would be a good solution to this problem.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dylan, you provided your comments in writing, and I appreciate that. I've got them pulled up, and it's easy to digest, and it's good to see your notes also correlate with those, and, regarding season closures for king mackerel, what are your thoughts there? We talked about that, and some of the complexities, and, from your perspective, what do you think about that?

 MR. HUBBARD: For king mackerel season closures, I would like to try to avoid a seasonal closure. They're only here for a certain amount of time, especially in my area, and they're very quick, and it's very weather dependent, and so trying to get a season would be very difficult, and I don't think it would do much in our area.

MR. GEESLIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Dylan. All right. Next, we have Jesse Heiser, who is online, followed by Anthony Colletti. Jesse, you might be muted. Jesse, we're having some technical difficulties on our end. We'll come back to you here as soon as we can. Anthony Colletti.

MR. ANTHONY COLLETTI: Good afternoon. I'm Anthony Colletti, commercial fishermen and owner/operator. I would like to talk about the kingfish. We've traveled from the east coast of Florida all the way around the coast to Louisiana, for years on end, and, a few years ago, we lost the fish house infrastructure, and we've lost a lot of habitat, which has changed the migration pattern of the fish, and we've lost fifteen legendary commercial mackerel fishermen that used to come to Leesville every single year.

There's a lot of different variables that are changing, and no two years will ever be the same with weather, and you can outstand Mother Nature, no matter what you try to do. As far as the lack of participation, these guys have retired, simply gave up after the hurricane, why would you go back somewhere where you can't really operate out of comfortably?

 Personally, I've done fairly well mackerel fishing this past year, and we fished -- We more stuck to the western Gulf, and we did see what I could consider a flurry of fish through the summer months, which was good, and, as far as south Florida goes, there was 500 pounds of small fish that were caught by the hook-and-line boats. I'm friends with several of them, and I believe the stock is healthy.

I'm under the impression that the migration pattern has changed, just as it has with the amberjacks. I've been finding the fish that I've been harvesting in deeper waters, where not many people are willing to go, and, quite honestly, I found some of them by accident, when I was reef fishing. You would see the mackerel jumping, and you start fishing for them, and you catch your limit.

 As far as the amberjacks go, I'm still seeing the amberjacks. The last trip I was able to do with the thousand-pound limit, I had a fifty-three-pound average on all of my fish. There's times that I can't beeliner fish, because you can't get them in the boat, and the amberjacks take them.

Another issue we're having is the sharks. If you start pulling

some kingfish, and you get them up and biting, and you're not getting them past a school of sharks that are following the boat. It's just not going to happen. We're going through more tackle than ever. People are getting hurt trying to catch these fish, and the sharks are a nuisance.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have some questions. Mr. Dugas.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Two questions. The first one is, on kingfish, are you fishing anywhere west of Leesville?

MR. COLLETTI: Yes, I am. More so off of Cameron, and I've fished off the mouth of the river as well, at times, and there is -- With all of the oil rigs that have been removed, there is limited areas where we're coming across these fish anymore, but, when we do find them, normally the fishing is pretty good, despite the sharks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: What about -- Are you getting to Texas any?

MR. COLLETTI: No, and I haven't made it that far yet, but I may be working my way that way this year.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Last question. On amberjack, I'm not asking for your specific location, but in what general area are you fishing?

MR. COLLETTI: West of the river.

30 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I have a few people. I have Ms. Boggs, followed 33 by Dr. Frazer and Mr. Diaz.

MS. BOGGS: So, I have two questions, and they should be very quickly, and do you own or lease allocation?

38 MR. COLLETTI: I own and lease the allocation.

MS. BOGGS: Okay, and then you referenced the fish in south Florida are smaller king, and what do you identify -- Or how do you define a small king?

44 MR. COLLETTI: Well, they grade them, you know, when we sell them, 45 five to seven pounds, ten to fifteen pounds, and then fifteen and 46 up.

MR. BOGGS: So, you're saying they're the five to seven-pound range?

MR. COLLETTI: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks, Captain Colletti, for coming. When you started your talk, you said -- You know, you were talking about factors affecting the kingfish, and there is lost fish houses, because of the hurricanes, and loss of habitat, because of oil rigs, and then you made a reference to the fact that there are fifteen of the kind of elite fishermen that are no longer in the business, and so, as a traveling mackerel fisherman, how many people do you typically travel with, and how is that kind -- The fact that you've lost that many fishermen, how does that affect the social dynamics of your industry, right, and your ability to catch fish?

MR. COLLETTI: Well, all the way around, and it's hard to play ball without a full team. I will, without the oil rigs being there as well, and, you know, you get out of the pass and which way do you go? You used to say this rig would hold these fish here, and you would go catch 500 or 600 pounds, and then carry on to the next set of rigs, twenty miles down the road, and then you would find the mass of fish, and you will fill your boat up and go back to the dock.

Without the participation, with everybody working together, and I'm only one individual, and, like I said, there's really only five guys left out of Leesville that will dedicate time to go look for mackerel, and that goes for the Venice fleet as well. I think they had maybe fifteen or twenty boats over there, and there might only be six or seven of them left, and so the participation is down drastically.

DR. FRAZER: Again, just to reiterate, that affects the efficiency of your operation.

40 MR. COLLETTI: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I think you touched on some of my questions, but, when you said habitat, you were speaking about oil rigs, was what you were referring to, correct?

MR. COLLETTI: Correct.

MR. DIAZ: How big of a deal do you think the loss of oil rigs in the Gulf of Mexico has been to your kingfish fishery?

MR. COLLETTI: Well, I believe it has affected the kingfish fishery, the snapper fishery, every fishery, and it's not just one — You're removing habitat, you know, and it's a whole ecosystem, and, when you remove that, you have nothing left but pipelines on the bottom and mud. These fish are going to move. If there's no bait, they're going to keep looking for their supper and somewhere to call home themselves. I mean, if my house blows away, I'm not going to sit there in the dirt and look for food. I'm going to keep moving and find somewhere comfortable to live again.

MR. DIAZ: I want to thank you for your testimony. It's been very helpful, and so thank you.

MR. COLLETTI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Captain. First of all, I just wanted to tell everybody in here that, if you ever get a chance to talk with him, tonight or anytime, about his hurricane story, it's very compelling, and very interesting, and this is one of the bravest guys I've seen around, based on that story, for sure.

My quick question, and I had another one, but it was already answered, and, when it comes to amberjack, you said you had a fifty-three-pound average in the last trip that you were able to make of a thousand-pound limit still, right, before it changed to seven fish, and so you're losing roughly -- Now you're losing about 600 pounds per trip that you cannot harvest any longer right, if you had that average every time, right?

MR. COLLETTI: Fairly close to that average every time.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Did you used to make amberjack trips, which were solely for amberjack, or was it always a bycatch fishery for you?

MR. COLLETTI: I used to target amberjacks, when they were 2,000 pounds a trip, and we were reduced to 1,500 pounds, with the rebuilding of the stock, and we went to 1,000 pounds, and now we're at seven fish, to where my boat can't even afford to leave the dock if I was strictly to go target them.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: Thank you. I had a quick question. If I understand correctly, you said, with the loss of habitat, the king mackerel migration moved further offshore.

MR. COLLETTI: Correct.

DR. BANKS: About how far offshore are you finding that migration pattern has shifted?

 MR. COLLETTI: Approximately sixty miles or so, which most smaller boats won't even put the time in, or the effort, to go look for them, and, I mean, like I said, I was surprised that I found them where I found them. I was reef fishing, and I saw the fish jumping, and I started fishing for the mackerel, in 400 feet of water all around, fishing on a lump, and, you know, in my opinion, there was plenty of fish for me to catch my limit. Each trip that I made this season, of 2024, when I was able to get out, I had my limit almost every single trip. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Okay. Next, we have -- We'll go back to Jesse Heiser online. Jesse, you might have to unmute yourself. Jesse, we can't hear you. You might need to unmute. All right, Jesse. We can't hear you. We'll try you again in just a little bit. Thank you for your patience. Next, we'll go to Mark Tryon.

MR. MARK TRYON: Mark Tryon, commercial fisherman, Gulf Breeze, Florida. I rod-and-reel fish for reef fish, primarily red snapper, and I do have a king mackerel permit, and I have caught king mackerel, over the years, as a bycatch, and not as a directed fishery, and so I've seen, as you've heard, quite a decline in the fishery, and I really didn't intend on speaking about it, but it seems like a popular topic now.

 It would seem, to me, that we went from, recreationally, two fish to three fish, when nobody was asking for three fish, but we went to three fish anyway, and the least I think we could do, at this point, is go back to two fish, which puts us back where we were originally, and consider going to one fish, to actually make some sort of progress here in, you know, attacking this problem.

One of the things that I want to discuss, and there hasn't been too much discussion about it today, is what is the council doing to address the recreational overfishing in the Gulf of Mexico, and I know there's somewhat of an effort that is getting underway, but we need to make much more of an effort in that regard. We need to

accurately quantify effort, and ultimately have an accurate common currency amongst all the states.

At the meetings, and in general with the use of the time of this council, we seem to be spending lots of time, and resources, on I guess what I would call IFQ reforms, and not much time spent on addressing, which in my opinion is a much bigger issue, the recreational overfishing.

Another thing is we need to -- I think we all know this, but we need to react faster, and more efficiently, to changes in stocks. I mean, this king mackerel situation is a textbook example of that. We went from having easily catching the quota on the commercial side, and having closures every year, to now, in aggregate, we can't even catch the quota, you know, I guess even with the gillnet people, and they seem to be more efficient than the rest of the sectors.

You know, we've seen this is a problem, and now we're responding to it, and I think we should have gotten, you know, ahead of the problem a couple of years ago, and not when it becomes chronic, okay, and the same can also be said about amberjack, cobia, gag grouper, and, even oppositely, the triggerfish. If you remember, this was an issue. We were catching tons of them, and it took us time to get it increased to twenty-five fish, and now, all of a sudden, we're going -- I don't know why, but we're kind of sliding back the other way, and it's hard to catch the twenty-five fish, and so, anyway, I guess that's about all I have to say for today. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. We have a couple of questions for you, Captain Tryon. First, we have Mr. Geeslin, followed by Susan Boggs.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Tryon, specifically, when you mentioned recreational overfishing, specifically what fisheries are you referring to?

MR. TRYON: Primarily in red snapper, and I say that, and I've testified before up here, or at public testimony, where, if you were to -- I don't have the numbers right in front of me now, but, if you were to take the total pounds of quota, and divide it by a certain number of anglers -- I think, in the past, it's come out to a very small amount of red snapper that each recreational fisherman would be allowed, and yet we're fishing for months and months now, and so I think it's obvious that there is overfishing, and I see it, because my landings are going down.

You know, we have all this talk about folks don't like leasing. Well, I would rather catch the fish than lease the fish, but, if my catch rate is going down, and I'm catching less, and I'm leasing more, and not because I want to lease more, but it's because I can't catch those fish, because they're not there anymore to the extent that they were before.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, he touched on something that's near-and-dear to my heart, which is triggerfish. Do you see that species, and I've heard a couple of other captains that I've talked to in the past -- Of course, we've been on triggerfish for five or six years now, and we still don't have any data on it, but do you see that they're like a cyclical fish? You're saying now you're having a harder time catching them, because we've increased the quota, but do you see any cycles like that with triggerfish?

MR. TRYON: It's been -- Over the years, it's been up and down. Now, when I first started fishing for them years ago, it was -- This is back in the early 1990s, but we had -- I know it was like, recreationally, there was no bag limit, and I don't think there was any, you know, trip limit, that I recollect, on the commercial side, and the fish were quite small, and so I'm originally from New Jersey, and I came here catching triggerfish, and they were a foot long or so, and I assume that's -- You know, they didn't get much bigger than that.

Then, when we started to put in these, you know, controls, to control the harvest, all of a sudden, we started to get some big ones, and they became quite common, but I don't know, and I can't -- In this case, I'm not going to say recreational overfishing, because the limit is only one fish per person, and I really don't see that as, you know, causing the -- I think it's either a temporary decline, or it may be they're just not where I'm fishing, and they're somewhere else, and they could be fifty miles east or west or whatever, but, right now, there's not a heck of a lot of them. I'm catching, you know, three fish a trip on day trips now, something like that, you know, whereas, before, when it was sixteen fish, I could have caught thirty, forty, fifty fish easily in a day, and so it's really gone the other way quickly, for some reason, and I have no idea why.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you, sir.

47 MR. TRYON: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We're going to go back to Jesse Heiser, one more time. Jesse, you're unmuted, or can you unmute yourself?

MR. COLLETTI: I just spoke to Jesse on the phone a few minutes ago, and, for some reason, it's not connecting, and would it be okay if I called and put the phone up, so you could hear what he has to say?

MR. JESSE HEISER: Sorry about that, guys. I tried everything to be able to talk to you all, and it would not let me, and so here I am. Most of this, I'm going to reiterate what Anthony said, because I am one of the other two king fishermen out of Leesville, out of the five that are left there.

I'm a fulltime commercial king fisherman, and I travel all the Gulf zones, and I've been all the way to North Carolina. Like what he said, mostly, there's a lot of things that has changed in the last handful of years, and a big one, if we're talking Louisiana, is the oil rigs being gone, and definitely don't count out the oil spill, and what it's changed, and how it's changed the bait situation and stuff over there.

There's less participation, and most of these older guys are getting out, guys that I have looked up to, and, as everyone knows there, there's not many new participants in commercial fishing, and that's in every fishery that that seems to be an issue, and so we just need to think about that one.

 Also, the sharks and porpoise are -- Like it's the worst I've ever seen, until next year, and we'll be saying it's the worst that I've ever seen, and so it's hard to get fish past them, and, also, what I've noticed in the last handful of years is, when you do find the fish, they're moving at an alarming rate, and like we'll be there one say, and they'll be gone the next, and, when you've got only a handful of boats, and that's every zone a lot of times, with only a handful, and it makes it hard to find.

They seem to be -- I don't know why they've started moving so much, and, you know, sometimes we go out there and you'll think, man, those fish are hurting, and, other times, you'll go out there, and, a few times a year, you'll think where have they all been at, and I think everybody in our fishery, that does what I do, would say the same thing. There's a handful of instances this year where I've went out there and actually thought, wow, where have they been at, you know?

Somebody just touched on the gillnet down there, and, on that, if they would have done what they usually do, and this year was different for them, and they would have met the quota. I was there, and I fished around them guys. They broke the quota up amongst themselves, and so, instead of making -- They all stopped, and, of course, like that one guy said, there was only a few that didn't catch it, because they didn't go. If they would have normally done what they do, they would have caught their quota.

Also, the last two years, I mean, I've started catching a lot more smaller fish at certain times, and so I feel like that could be a -- That's definitely a plus, compared to what we were doing, and so, I mean, I do see it rebounding quite a bit the last couple of years, as far as that, and that's all I've really got.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Jesse. We have a couple of questions for you, and so hang on on the phone. Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: Yes. Thank you. I have a question, and so I'm not positive what you all are getting for your kingfish, but I know kingfish prices have been really good, and it's up and down a lot, but some of the highs that it's hit have been unprecedented, and I still don't really understand why so many are leaving the fishery, with such good prices on fish, and am I wrong there?

MR. HEISER: I couldn't hear that. I'm sorry. I can't answer questions, I guess. I can't hear him.

MR. COLLETTI: He's wondering so many are leaving the fishery with the prices being the way they are, and I think the majority of the guys are simply retiring, and they're getting too old, and, I mean, I'm not going to speak for you. If you want to answer that, go ahead.

MR. HEISER: Once you hit sixty-five or seventy, this kind of lifestyle is very tough, and it's getting tougher, and I'm still young, you know, and the majority here is -- You've got to think about, and Louisiana -- No offense, but it can be a tough place to -- That is a big one, and Anthony touched on the other one, and the infrastructure is even worse than what it was, and so --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. No one else? All right, Jesse. Thank you very much. Sorry for the issues we had getting you on the phone here, or online.

47 MR. HEISER: Thank you, guys.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Next up, we have Kelia Paul. It looks like we have cleared out all those folks that were waiting to speak online, and so you can see your names up there, and just be prepared to come up after the person finishes their testimony, and so Kelia Paul.

 MS. KELIA PAUL: Good afternoon, council. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Kelia Paul, and I own two dually permitted vessels out of Panama City Beach, Florida, and I'm the President of the Panama City Boatmen's Association. My comments today will reflect the will of the association.

 Again, I will be short and sweet, and I do want to thank NMFS for the May amberjack season. As a whole, Panama City has stressed the importance of our businesses having that May season, and we are appreciative for it this year. We would have liked more notice, but we'll make it work.

For Spanish mackerel, we do agree that the bag limit needs to be reduced, but we would like to see it between seven and ten fish. We believe that five fish will drastically increase an already high discard mortality, and we do not want to further exacerbate the issue. We do rely heavily on those short, family-based trips during the spring break season, and so we would like to conserve that fishery, while being able to still execute the fishery.

For kings, we also agree there's something that needs to be done, and we're also struggling with the correct steps to take. While we appreciate that the issue is most likely environmental, that doesn't mean this council can't take some provisions now. We spoke against the three-fish bag limit when it was passed, and, at minimum, we want it moved back to two. If the stock would benefit substantially, which we haven't seen yet, but, if it would, with a bag limit of one, we would fully support it.

We are concerned with an increased discard mortality, just like with Spanish, with a bag limit of one, however. We also support an ACL reduction, based on the five-year dataset, and that's it for me today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you. We have a question from Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I apologize, and I should have asked some previous charter captains this earlier, and so we are now pushing the charter-for-hire season from June 1 into late August, and I've

heard a lot of input about that, and a mid to late-August timeframe not being all that helpful to you, and I would be curious if you are interested in modifying the season, and what you would like to see.

MS. PAUL: We had a conversation around that in the meeting in -- At the January meeting, and we would like to see it mid-May, because amberjacks in May are -- This is the first year we've had it in how long, and we do have May tourism, and so, if we could bump it to May, and not use them after -- Once, I don't know, that first week, maybe first ten days, of August, it's dead at home, and we are not utilizing those fish. They wouldn't be helpful to us at the end of the fall season, when the waves would come out, and, because of the wave data, that doesn't help us, and so we would like to see a May 15 start, or somewhere in there.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I had to remember my question. Does PCBA have a stance on the data collection system that the council is looking to do, and any suggestions of how you might go about the economic data?

MS. PAUL: We fully support standing SEFHIER back up. We were really disappointed when it fell. I think -- You know, I watched the presentation this week on the economic piece of it, and it is a big point of contention, and everybody knows that. There's a lot of them that don't want to do it, and I think, if we take an approach like the commercial fishery does, with that 20 percent survey sampling size, it might be a lot more digestible, and you may get a lot more participation.

As far as the VMS piece of it, I'm dually permitted, personally, and so it's six-to-one-and-half-dozen of another, and I don't care about the VMS. I think Randy is the one that said it, and you can buy it now, and so it's not really required here anymore, but, if we're going to lose the program over VMS, it's not worth it, and so that's kind of where we stand. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. We have Captain Dale Woodruff, followed by Captain Clarence Seymour.

 MR. DALE WOODRUFF: Good afternoon, guys. Thank you all, again, for coming to the social last night. I thought it was pretty awesome. The venue was awesome, and getting to see our family of state guideboats and federal for-hire owners and crew members together for that setting was also awesome.

 Keep in mind that every federal for-hire boat in that marina that you all saw, and all the ACFA for-hire charter boats, was in compliance with the SEFHIER program, before it was shut down, and there's only a couple of boats in our marina now, and they're new entries, but they're for the data too, and they are ready. They are up and ready to go.

22 23

The need for SEFHIER to be up and running again is urgent, and the ACFA will support it. Yesterday, I heard a council member say, "manipulating data", and I say the data was purposely, or carelessly, manipulated, kind of like Bidenomics. You know, you tell me things are great and then I go gas up my truck, and, you know, you show up with an astronomical number of gag that was caught from the shoreline, and somebody has to take a commonsense approach to this.

I feel that all final reports should be carefully examined and critically scrutinized before being brought to the public, and that just fell through the cracks, and somebody didn't do their job. The federal for-hire, it seems like that's what we've always questioned, was the validity of the data, as far as the outcome.

King mackerel, I talked to the guys from the ACFA, and they support the one king mackerel. They're okay with going to five Spanish, and we feel like that could be a good step in the right direction. Then, you know, all I ask is the amberjack -- I know we just got a May season, and please be careful with that.

We don't want to go over, and, you know, I've stood up here for years, and we've stood up here for years, and we want to stay under. We want to stay almost there, but just a touch under, and let's not bust this thing out of the water again.

This is a fish that we need to come back, and I will say this probably to the day that I die, and I don't think you can hook-and-line regulate the amberjack back to where it needs to be, and we have to our grass back. We have to get the vegetation on top, from offshore, back up to our beaches, and, if we start seeing that, year after year after year, probably within five years, I can guarantee you that we'll see a healthy amberjack fishery, because we will have the other baits that we need that we're not seeing as much of anymore, such as the hardtail, the abundance of alewives, and the cigar minnows, and so, other than that -- Is that it? Think you all are good? Okay.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. We have a question from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Two questions, Dale. Do you hold a CMP federal permit, a coastal migratory pelagic permit?

MR. WOODRUFF: I do.

MS. BOGGS: Okay. Thank you for that, and the other thing, as far as ACFA's position on data collection, with the economic component of it, do you all have a stance on what you could --

MR. WOODRUFF: Just keep in mind we're always -- Human nature is always to do the least thing as possible, a lot of times, and, yes, a lot of people are scared of the federal government. With the sampling, I like the sampling idea, and I think our guys -- We're for the SEFHIER, and, if we can go to a 20 percent, or 30 percent, and I like the idea with setting up an algorithm. You know, maybe, once every ten or fifteen trips, you get sampled, and probably the lingo on that economic is "as advertised", and what is your trip as advertised, and I think that may relax a few people.

I mean, I don't -- Personally, and not speaking for the ACFA, I'm 100 percent for it, and I'll tell you what I'm making, okay, and, if you need to know exactly what I'm burning for fuel, or how much it costs, what my trips are, and it doesn't matter with me. I will do it. I don't have a problem with it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, I'm going to ask Andy's question. With the seasons of red snapper getting longer and longer, does ACFA -- I'm catching you on the spot, but, if not this meeting, could you let the council know, and would they look at, or entertain, extending the season, or moving the season forward, to earlier May, or some other start date?

MR. WOODRUFF: That's always a good talking subject, that we do talk about, and, you know, as the president of the association, and talking to our guys, we would love to have the flexibility with all seasons, and not just red snapper, and that's why we need the SEFHIER program. We feel like, once we get the SEFHIER program going again, then we can have some flexibility.

You know, I understand that May would be a great time for some people, and I understand that July and August would be a great time for a group of charter-for-hire boats, and how can we get that flexibility, and that's what we need to -- If we want to get to that, I feel like how is to start getting our reporting system

back up and going, urgently.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you, Dale. All right. Next, we have Clarence Seymour, Captain Seymour, followed by Austin Abrams.

MR. CLARENCE SEYMOUR: Good afternoon, and thank you, council, for having me today. Captain Clarence Seymour, Charter Boat SYL, Biloxi, Mississippi. I've got a few things. The SEFHIER program, I'm on the Data Collection AP, and we've worked really well, and so I think we still have a lot of things to work on, and I believe it's moving in the right direction.

King mackerel, I can support one or two, and, yes, the king mackerel are down. Spanish mackerel, our numbers were down in the northern Gulf, out of Mississippi there, and so ten would probably work for us.

The charter-for-hire buffer of 9 percent, since Amendment 40, we've been under, and I think either the payback is not really a good idea after the last wave, because it turns into a November season, or October, and so maybe, like Andy was talking to the young lady right there, a Memorial Weekend start would probably do good for parts of the northern Gulf, as us, and, now, flexibility for Texas, and they may want a longer -- Because I heard Texas weather is terrible, and that's all I hear, but the buffer is pretty important, because I think we can go to, you know, a 4 or 5 percent buffer on our total catch limit.

The next thing is that I had a story, and a guy called me the other day, and it's about cobia, and we know we all, for the last three or four years, are at dire straits on cobia, and it -- We've got the thirty-six-inch fish to the fork, and it's working pretty good, as far as I can tell, and the thing that the fellow asked me was he was confused about the federal law in the EEZ, inside the three-mile boundary of our state, which is still two fish per person.

We're neighbors to Louisiana also, and so it's really a catchtwenty-two, and anglers could get in trouble by not having the same limits on the federal side as the state side, and so I think it's a real slippery slope, that we probably need to address sooner or later, but they always call me and ask me about different things that's happening in the Gulf, and I try to keep everybody informed on everything, but that's it for what I've got today. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a couple of questions. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Seymour, for driving over in this weather. I appreciate you making the trip. I know, at one time, and I'm kind of putting you on the spot, and I know you're not necessarily representing the whole charter boat industry, but if you could help me understand.

I think there was a while when the Mississippi charter boat folks were not very enthusiastic about SEFHIER, and my perception is that more people have come around a little bit in Mississippi, but where do you think they're at now? We're trying to move forward with a new iteration, and do you think the Mississippi charter boats -- I know I'm asking you to speculate, and I apologize for that, but do you think they're generally more accepting now, or they're still apprehensive, or what do you think the kind of pulse of the fleet is there in Mississippi?

MR. SEYMOUR: Well, the consensus has been the start was it was hard to convince it, because our fleet is getting older still on the federal for-hire fleet. We do have some new participants, which is my son and I think another fellow just got a federal permit, and so I do get to -- We are seeing the younger guys starting to try to get in in our area, which the SEFHIER program is -- They understand it's going to be best for their future.

Us seasoned guys, that has had permits in Mississippi, we're going out, and so that was the whole point of being able to get the SEFHIER program, you know, and everybody get the kinks worked out of it, when it comes to it, and one of the most arguments that I heard about it was the VMS, of course, and, you know, that program -- I don't want to see our 4th Amendment right violate our SEFHIER program again at all, but I think what's left, out of the ten or twelve federally-permitted in Mississippi, and I think the SEFHIER program should -- They shouldn't have a problem with it this time around, I believe.

 $MR.\ DIAZ:$ Thank you for that. I like the way you refer to the older gentlemen as seasoned folks too, rather than older, and I think I'm going to start referring to myself that way, and so thank you, Clarence.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I had a couple more people. Ms. Boggs, followed by General Spraggins.

 MS. BOGGS: So Dale pretty well touched on what I wanted to ask, but I did want to say thank you for being here, because we don't -- I don't think -- Very rarely do we see a charter-for-hire from

Mississippi at the meetings, and so I really appreciate you being here and providing input today. Thank you.

MR. SEYMOUR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Captain Seymour, thank you, once again, for coming over, and I agree that we -- You know, maybe if they could look at something for opening the season a little bit earlier for you all, and, I mean, obviously, we're going to open it on Memorial Weekend for the recreational type, but to be able to do the federal at the same time, and I don't know what it would take to be able to do that, and that's up to Andy and some of them, to be able to make those decisions, but that does make a lot of difference, especially because of the amount of traffic that we have there in south Mississippi during that time.

I've been on boats, and they've said, man, we wish we could just go out another few more miles, and we wish we could catch some for you, because they're out there, but we can't do it, and so I understand that, and we appreciate what you do, and thank you for taking the time to come over here, and I hope you have a safe trip home.

MR. SEYMOUR: Well, I appreciate all of what you all have been doing lately. Our reef fish program is going really well, and I have to commend the state, and all that good work you all have been doing, your staff.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Well, we're trying, and we've got quite a bit more that we're about to put in the water, I hope, and so it should be -- We're trying to get as much as we can to be able to help you all be able to have more fish to be able to catch.

MR. SEYMOUR: You were gone a couple of meetings ago, but I did talk to Trevor and them, at one of the CMR meetings, about doing a public testimony on cobia for our state, where we could start listening to the public on what they think about going with the federal guidelines, and so I haven't reached back with them, but I will when I get back.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Okay, and I will touch base with him, too.

MR. SEYMOUR: Yes, sir.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: All right. Thank you.

MR. SEYMOUR: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we have Austin Abrams, followed by Captain Alicia Paul.

MR. AUSTIN ABRAMS: First off, thank you for you all coming and listening to us and doing everything that you all do. We know what you all do is not easy, and then listening to us is pretty hard, and so -- But my name is Austin Abrams, and I'm with Tarpon Dock Seafood and Hunt's Oyster Bar, and I really want to talk about the discard rate on the gag groupers right now.

Right now, we have most of our boats fishing west, and the only boats that we've got fishing east are our red grouper boats, and the discard rate on those right now is very high. The last two or three years, we've had a very good season on gags, but, you know, the -- Like B.J. said, I think you all will see that in the next two years, when you all's -- But that's a real concern for us, is the discard rate right now.

Then I want to talk about -- We had a meeting in Panama City, about five months ago, about the closure of the free space, and we didn't even know about this meeting until our fish sampler told us that came to the shop, and they said, hey, they've got a meeting over at the NOAA office in Panama City, and we didn't know anything about it, and there is only two people in Panama City that are tuna fishing.

The meeting concern was we want to close the free space and open up the northern block, and we've been tuna fishing for fifteen or twenty years on the free space, and the reason why they want to close is because of the Rice's whale. I've asked every captain I have, and they've never seen a Rice's whale in the free space, and just to close the free space for the Rice's whale, that we've never seen, is absurd.

You know, I know you all didn't talk about that today, but that's a real big concern for us, and then the king mackerel, and we used to have boats that would come to our dock that came from the east coast, that followed them all the way east and west, and we haven't seen those boats show up at our docks in eight years, and I don't even know where they're at, and our boats aren't catching them anymore. You know, we've tried, and we're not getting them, and I don't know if it's because of they're moving farther out, or getting in deeper water, but we don't really see that anymore.

 Then I want to talk about the bluefins. You know, we used to start tuna fishing in March, and we don't do that anymore, for the last two or three years, and we haven't tuna fished until about June, because the bluefin are so thick from March to June, and, I mean, it's absurd, and they're outrageous right now. I mean, they're sinking our gear, or our tackle is getting lost, and it's gone, and I really think there's something that could be done about bluefin, do a lottery, or open it up a little bit, because I feel like there's a bunch of them out there, but, other than that, that's it. Thank you.

 $\mbox{{\bf CHAIRMAN ANSON:}}$ We have several questions, and so, first off, I will go with Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Abrams. You mentioned, or you alluded, to the problem with the discard rates in the gag fishery, and what are your proposed solutions for that?

MR. ABRAMS: I know we talked about, at the last meeting, or a couple of meetings ago, about the closure of gags for the first six months, you know, for the spawning season, and a lot of people were -- But, you know, it's really hard to do something. You go red grouper fishing, and you're going to catch gags, but now, as everyone says, we're catching gags for bycatch, and it's very -- You know, it's not really good when you're throwing 600 or 700 pounds back in the water, and it's just -- Nobody wants to see that, but they are catching them, and they are there, but, right now, we're just doing it as bycatch, and, when you're red grouper fishing, we're pretty much catching all our gags doing that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Abrams. I know we were at your place a meeting or two ago, and you have an extensive commercial operation over there, an impressive operation, I might say, and you've said that your kingfish guys are crying, and they're not catching them, and I'm assuming these are veteran fishing guys.

MR. ABRAMS: Yes, sir, and we have Captain Smitty, and he's in his lower sixties, and I remember, a couple of trips ago, he went to go try to catch some kings, and he didn't have one, and he's been doing this his whole life.

MR. WALKER: Along those same lines, where have the kingfish prices been? I know it varies a lot, but --

47 MR. ABRAMS: I spoke to a couple of people down south the other

week, and they're pretty high, and I heard \$5.85 on kings, and
that was to me, and I just -- I couldn't do that. I try to help,
but I couldn't do it.

4

5 MR. WALKER: One more thing, and I'm not -- Is it a 1,200-pound 6 limit up here too?

7

8 MR. ABRAMS: For?

9

10 MR. WALKER: The kingfish trip limit, commercial?

11

12 MR. ABRAMS: Yes.

13

14 MR. WALKER: So, if you can find it, and catch a limit, you can 15 make six-grand in a day.

16

17 MR. ABRAMS: Yes, we could, and they're not doing it.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Frazer.

20

DR. FRAZER: Thanks for being here, Austin, and so none of the captains, that you're aware of, have ever seen any whales in the free space?

24

25 MR. ABRAMS: No, we haven't seen one.

26

27 **DR. FRAZER:** Where do you normally see them?

28

29 MR. ABRAMS: We don't.

30

31 DR. FRAZER: Okay. I just wanted to know. Thank you.

32

33 MR. ABRAMS: Thank you for asking that.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

36

37 MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I make a few comments, and one, the free 38 space I assume is the donut hole, and is that what you're referring 39 to?

40

41 MR. ABRAMS: Yes, sir.

42

43 MR. STRELCHECK: Okay, and two, it's pretty hard to see one of the rarest species on the earth as well, and so --

45

46 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for coming, Mr. Abrams.

47

MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: One other thing for you is that we don't regulate HMS species, the bluefin that you were talking about, and we don't yellowfin -- We don't regulate them at this body, and so --

MR. ABRAMS: Yes, sir. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right. Captain Alicia Paul, followed by Eric Brazer.

MS. ALICIA PAUL: Alicia Paul, Panama City. I own and operate two dually permitted vessels, and I do own a commercial king mackerel permit. I will start today with the jacks. Thank you all for the May season. As much as I love it, I kind of hate it. We're going to overfish it, I'm afraid, but it's good to set a precedent for, you know, the future. We've asked for them jacks in May, and this is going to show you that we are going to harvest a lot, and so keep a close eye on it.

Kingfish, I support a two-fish bag limit, or even one, if we've got to go to one, and we all know there's a problem there. I paid for my boat, in 2017 and 2018, commercially harvesting king mackerel. Since then, I have not been able to, and we have unprecedented highs, as far as the price goes, and I would love to go make six-grand in a night, but I can't go.

Spanish mackerel, we have a nice little family business in the springtime, and we depend a lot on those Spanish mackerel, and so, to go from fifteen to three is going to hurt, and I would like to see a ten-fish bag limit.

 Red grouper, I brought that up at a social the other night, about the twenty-fathom closure, and it kind of gained some ground with some of the other captains, and I've heard some testimony on it already today. The only person that's hurting is the federally permitted guys. The rec guys are running right past 120 foot of water and catching them and bringing them home, and we can't -- I know that it was implicated because of the spawn, but the gag grouper -- It's kind of an outdated rule, and so I would like to see a change there.

SEFHIER, please continue to support it and stand it back up. If the 20 percent economic data is good enough for the commercial sector, it ought to be good enough for the for-hire sector. Make it a red robin, where you can do it on that app, but let's get it stood back up. That's really all I've got for you all today, if

you don't have any questions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Alicia, I always appreciate your testimony. Back to Spanish mackerel and tell us what that means to your business and what you would prefer as a bag limit.

MS. A. PAUL: In the springtime, we run a lot of three and four-hour family trips, and I market them as an ecotour, with the opportunity to catch a Spanish mackerel. The fish show up in our bay, and they're thick, and they're quick. Fifteen fish is not a problem, if we can catch them. Now, we've had some cold fronts that has affected that in the spring, but we have many days where we hit our limit, on a five or six-passenger trip, within a couple of hours.

If fifteen fish is too many, and I would hate to see it go back to three, because then I'm back to remarketing my brand, and selling that trip in a whole different manner. Three or four hours doesn't really give us enough time to get offshore, and so we troll for those fish in the springtime, and it would drastically affect us if we went from fifteen to three. Ten, or seven, and five would probably even hurt, but seven to ten would be great.

You know, there is a little bit of a decline in the stock, and you can tell that, because it's not as thick and quick as it used to be, but I would definitely not see that huge reduction, or like to see that huge reduction.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you.

MS. A. PAUL: Thank you all, for you all's time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other -- I have a quick question, going back to the Spanish mackerel, and do you support a vessel limit, like a ten-fish-per-person and a vessel limit?

MS. A. PAUL: Sure. If it's a sixty-head vessel limit, or something like that, or fifty-head, whatever, ten fish per person or a fifty or sixty-vessel limit, that would be fine as well. That's plenty of fish, and, most of the time, you know, a lot of them, they don't want that many, and they're just taking some to eat fresh that night with their family, go to like a cooking restaurant, and so my thoughts is, you know, I don't want to overharvest, but I don't want the mortality rate to be high either, because, as with the king mackerel, and the Spanish mackerel is the same way, and you can't just throw him back in the water and he is going to swim.

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right. We have Eric Brazer, followed by Jerry Whisenhunt.

 MR. ERIC BRAZER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Eric Brazer, Deputy Director, Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm going to lead with Amendment 53, and that's probably no surprise. We are disappointed that the council didn't take the opportunity yesterday to get out ahead of the SEDAR 88 process and to initiate something to at least get it on the action schedule now and to start thinking about it.

You know now that the economic analysis in Amendment 53 was wrong that and that, quote, in final Amendment 53, the Fisheries Service ranked allocation alternatives using the net economic benefit analysis it rejected in adopting final Amendment 28, end quote.

You now know that the fundamental -- The foundational premise for Amendment 53 has major concerns with its accuracy. FES overestimates recreational effort by 40 percent or more, possibly, and it's looking that way. Just look at how much concern, and public comment, there's been about FES at this meeting, and the last meeting as well, and how can we forget the last meeting? This is what you based Amendment 53 on.

You know now that SRFS is a more appropriate methodology for gag, and all signs are pointing to it to be more appropriate than FES for red grouper as well, and so, whether you start an action this week, or you wait another seven months to do it, the council should have the opportunity to reconsider Amendment 53, including its allocations and socioeconomic analysis, with a legitimate economic analysis and a more trusted state dataset, and the public should have the opportunity to participate in this in a transparent way.

It's not enough, frankly, for the agency just to provide the final product. This record must be reopened, and the council, and the public, must be a part of this process.

 All right. Now that I've gotten that out of the way with, let's go to IFQs. We support the process that you guys have identified, and you're working through now, and we encourage you to approve a vision and purpose and need statement tomorrow that focuses on identifying the universe of shares to reclaim, that defines the universe of recipients, and confirms the distribution methodology, and it seems like those are the three primary components.

We also support the establishment of an appeals process and some sort of provision that would require more timely notification when a shareholder dies. I don't know what that process looks like, but we're happy to support whatever that looks like.

As I have said before, we want you to consider how communities and allocation, or quota banks, would participate in this program, and you've identified them as useful tools that can support equity issues and help facilitate shared allocation distribution, and we just ask that you don't inadvertently prohibit or restrict yourselves at this point in the game.

It's important to consider equity, but it's going to be up to you guys to determine what that means, as there's no one-size-fits-all, and I will wrap-up on this comment, but all we can say is that we recommend that, as you move through this document, and start to develop actions and alternatives, that you identify the equity tradeoffs with each one of those and you determine how you're going to evaluate those tradeoffs and prioritize conflicting objectives, but to do it in a way that inspires stakeholder confidence, and then we support the FFP. Sorry that I ran out of time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Eric. I'm going to ask you the same thing that I asked Jim Zurbrick. Any suggestions on an equitable way to split up the scamp and black grouper commercial allocation, because I don't know yet. I am looking for all the help I can get.

MR. BRAZER: I wish I could give you an answer, Captain Walker. I don't know. You know, I looked at the documents, and I actually have my notes here, and so that document considers eight different management actions across two IFQ complexes, three different fishery sectors, two different fishery management councils, two different recreational data currencies, and the potential for a third, and eight different grouper species, including three that have the word "yellow" in them, and so I can't answer your question right now, Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: You can see why I'm looking for all the help I --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. I have Mr. Strelcheck, followed by Mr. Gill.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Eric, for your testimony. A similar question that we also asked Jim about is flexibility measures, and

so can you weigh-in on that?

1 2 3

MR. BRAZER: I mean, that's -- I know they exist. I know they provide opportunities for improved equity in the fishery, and I think -- You know, I would defer to Jessica, and I hope that she can bring back a dataset that really shows how those flexibility measures are used, and for what species. If they're no longer relevant, then we should consider streamlining and eliminating them, but I can't -- What I can't speak to is the impact on the marketplace for what something like that would look like, but, if you put it in the document, we get to analyze that from a socioeconomic perspective.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Eric, I think you give good testimony to the council, and I would like to hear what you didn't get to say.

MR. BRAZER: Ed teed me up really well for that, and it was just shallow-water grouper, and then just, you know, a plug for the NOAA Fisheries Finance program, especially in the context of these equity discussions. We really hope that -- We look forward to seeing more FFP representation at these meetings, more communications, more outreach, and we would, you know, continue to ask the agency to consider how to improve accessibility to this program, and it's not very easy to access these funds, and, if there's ways to improve how fishermen can access them, then we would like to help work with you on that.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Eric.

MR. BRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we have Jerry Whisenhunt, followed by Captain Jim Green.

MR. JERRY WHISENHUNT: Jerry Whisenhunt, and I have charter boats on Dauphin Island. I have three of them myself, and, actually, I'm speaking for a few of the other captains that I visited with before I came. I started off, and I appreciate you all for having this public forum to come and speak.

I sent letters to the state, and, fortunately, they got me in touch with Susan, who clued me into what was going on here, and I found

out this is where I am supposed to come to speak to get things done.

Our concern was simply moving the start of snapper season up to match the vacationers, especially us in small, six-pack boats that revolve around vacation season, and adding more dates to the end doesn't help us much as catching the early vacationers, especially Memorial Day, and that was my primary reason for showing up.

Having been here, I've heard a lot of discussion on the SEFHIER, the VMS, and we had those on our boats, and I was okay with it, but I know that became a hanging issue, and a suggestion from me is give us some flexibility with dates if we're willing to put them on there. The guys that don't, don't be flexible, and they will come over.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you. You said your primary motivation today would be to see if you could get snapper season moved up, and what would be a good time for you all that would maximize your season, if you were to move snapper season forward a little bit?

MS. WHISENHUNT: Mid-May, and that's about the time we see the vacation folks show up, especially Memorial Weekend. I mean, it's from there on, and it's wide open.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, first of all, I would like to thank Scott Bannon for getting you in touch with me, and I appreciate you driving over here today. The ferry wasn't running, and so he had to take the long way around from Dauphin Island, in this terrible weather, and so I appreciate that, and I hope that you stay engaged. I hope we don't just see you at this meeting, but, since you're here, I'm going to put you on the spot about king mackerel and Spanish mackerel and what you all are seeing over on Dauphin Island.

MR. WHISENHUNT: The kings, our season has been slow the last couple of years, and it's not been as hot as it has in years past, and so it is a little slower. The king mackerel, yes, it's been tough for the last few years. The Spanish, I don't fish for them a lot, and we're pretty much offshore, and they're nearshore. I see the guys fishing for them, but I will just be honest that I can't give you any intelligent input, but, yes, the king mackerel -- It's been tough for the last few years and cutting our numbers back a little probably wouldn't hurt.

MS. BOGGS: I want Emily to raise her hand, because she can help you get signed up for newsletters and other things to stay in touch with the council process.

MR. WHISENHUNT: All right. Thank you so much.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right. Next, we have Captain Jim Green, followed by a former council member that I forgot to recognize, Captain David Walker.

MR. JIM GREEN: Hello. Captain Jim Green, President of the Destin Charter Boat Association and President of the Charter Fishermen's Association. Both organizations appreciate the council's effort on moving the for-hire data collection document forward. We have a wealth of knowledge from our experiences, and we need some guidance moving forward with the agency on validation, which we are happy to help with in any way, Andy, but we're moving forward, and, on behalf of both organizations, we are really grateful for this council's commitment to that.

With that, we support, and request, these preferred alternatives in the document. Under Action 1, Alternative 2, under Action 2, Alternative 2, and then, under Action 3, Alternative 2a and b.

It's important to remember that reporting at the trip level supports harvest data validation, which is really the cornerstone of any data collection program, and I think anything other than reporting at the trip level will undermine that validation effort.

We also believe that trip declarations for all permit holders is vital, for several reasons. During the committee, Captain Walker spoke about checking traps, and I saw the issue right there, with it being considered fishing, and I think we need to take a look at the wording in Action 3, and maybe apply it to "engaged in federal and state-managed fishing", or something of that nature, and wordsmith it to where it includes the report -- The fish that were in the reporting, and checking bait traps should not be included, or the intended capture of fishing activity, when it comes to the context of this document to our industry.

When it comes to declarations, we believe it's important to capture any commerce activity of the vessel, and I also believe that Mr. Strelcheck spoke, in committee, about the declarations helping with enforcement, when it comes to non-reporting, and so, with that, declarations should be required at the trip level, because these attributes, and what they provide, helps with the integrity

of the program.

Both organizations support a reduction in kingfish to one from three, and we think that this will help protect the fish as they're coming back, as they're rebuilding. We support a fifteen-fish to five-fish reduction on Spanish mackerel. Destin has always found that fifteen to be a little too high, and they try to stretch those out as much as they can.

When it comes to gag and red grouper and lane snapper, we support Captain Dylan Hubbard's testimony on those species. I want to thank Mr. Diaz for bringing up the buffer for the for-hire fishery, concerning red snapper, and we have -- We have always underfished, since Amendment 40, and we've always took pride in that, that we've maintained not overfishing, but we want to maximize that, and I think that we have a good enough track record now to where we can fine-tune that and look at reducing that buffer, where possible.

You've heard a lot today about kingfish and habitat, and both of our organizations are really supportive of the offshore wind energy initiative in the western Gulf. Since idle iron, under the Obama administration happened, we've seen a decline in red snapper, amberjack, cobia, king mackerel, and, even though it's anecdotal, you've heard a couple of people here, and it just lends to the fact that a reduction in habitat goes to a reduction in biomass, and so, with that, we support that, and I really appreciate the opportunity to speak today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, have you all discussed a move in the opening of red snapper season, and when you all might like to see that, as our seasons continue to get longer?

MR. GREEN: We've discussed it at DCBA, and we're kind of -- I can just speak to DCBA, and, of course, CFA is Gulf-wide, and there's a wide range of what that entails, but, in Destin, we've talked about it. We've talked about how it used to be a spring and fall season, back when I was a kid, and to be honest with you, we really have to see what those numbers are. You know, I can understand us, in the eastern Gulf, wanting those couple of weeks of May, and I can understand where, if I was in Texas, I would not want that, if it was just going to take more days away from me, and I think we need to weigh what that is.

You know, in the charter industry, we sell opportunity, and, if one May day equals three days in September, then, you know, I think

that's that we need to look at, and what is that opportunity for the anglers to come when it's not so busy, when the prices are lower to come to our towns, and rent a condo and do that kind of stuff, and so I would say none of us are opposed to looking at it, but we really would want to know what that actually means, you know, and what does one day in May equal on the backside of what we already have. Thank you all so much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, Captain Green. Thank you. Next up, we have Captain David Walker, and the other former council member that's in the audience is Captain Johnny Greene, in the back there. Johnny, if you can stand up. Thank you. It's nice seeing you. Next up, we would have the last person, and that would be Captain Johnny Williams.

MR. DAVID WALKER: Good afternoon. It's good to see everyone. David Walker, Alabama, Walker Fishing Fleet, Fishing Vessels June Sue and Lovella, commercial. My first fishing trip in the Gulf took place in 1975, at the age of twelve, aboard the New Florida Girl, out of Destin, Florida. The good lord willing, I'll be back offshore next week, continuing to celebrate forty-nine years of fishing in the Gulf of Mexico.

The IFQ program has been the most successful FMP we've ever had in the commercial fishing industry, and it has met its goals. I think the Fisheries Finance Program provides opportunities for others to enter the fishery, and, if the Fisheries Finance Program needs more flexibility, I support that.

I am concerned, as others have mentioned, about king mackerel and amberjack, and I would also like to make the comment that gag groupers appear to be coming back, and we've already caught up our quota in the first few trips. In closing, I would like to say congratulations to Elizabeth, and I think she's already left, and I know that Susan is proud of her, and just thank you for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Walker. We have a question from Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: I waited for that. David, you've been around a long time, and you're one of the more experienced guys up in this neck of the woods, and can you give us your input on the status of the king mackerel population?

MR. D. WALKER: King mackerel is more abundant than many years ago, and it seems like, each year, and I have get back maybe around

the oil spill, during that time, and it seems to slow down a little bit after that, and -- Some other areas, you know, some guys are saying that there's plenty of them, but I know, in Leesville, in talking with those guys, it's been pretty said, and I can remember catching a lot of king mackerel, but I can't ever hardly -- I could eat the king mackerel that we caught last year.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right. Last on the list, but certainly not least, Captain Johnny Williams.

MR. JOHNNY WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. I'm Johnny Williams, Williams Party Boats, Incorporated, a third-generation party boat operator out of Galveston, Texas. I'm here today to request that you all convene a panel again to examine Amendment 42 again. I think it was a very successful pilot program that we had, and I encourage you to look at the advantages for everyone that this program offers.

Number one, it offers an advantage to me, and I can prosecute my fishery, my business, better than the federal government can, and so why not give me that opportunity? As far as my customers, it gives them an opportunity, too. At the current situation, we're able to fish starting on June 1, and we don't even know how long we're going to fish normally, until close to when the season starts. We would have a lot more clarity if we had 42, because we could start fishing on January 1, and finish on December 31, if we want, and we get to choose the days that we want to fish.

Also, the fish. If we're fishing outside the normal season, like in the wintertime, like we would be doing often, we would have a lower fishing mortality, and the fish have a much higher survival rate during the winter months, when the water is cooler. I mean, I've been saying this over all the years.

 The recreational fishermen, we get an awful lot of pressure all at one time out there in the summer months, and, if we had 42, we could have, you know, the pressure throughout the year, rather than all at one time, and there's a lot of release mortality that's due to that pressure of these spots getting hit over and over again all the time.

It would be good for the charter boats, because they wouldn't -- A lot of them fish some of the same spots that we fish, especially, you know, off of places like Orange Beach, Alabama. It better serves all the National Standards, or most of them, especially the safety-at-sea, because some vessels go out probably in weather they shouldn't be going, because the weather is inclement, but

they go anyway, because they know that they're going to lose a day if they don't get to go fishing then.

Like I said, we've already had a program, and it was working really well. We have a -- We basically have a catch share program for the states right now, and they get to choose the days that they think is more beneficial for their fishermen, for the recreational sector, and so, basically, we already have a catch share program for the recreational fishermen, and I would like to be offered that same opportunity.

 One of the pitfalls that we had in the commercial industry was the initial allocation. At that time, there were no fish basically being caught in the eastern Gulf, as far as red snapper were concerned, but we don't have that issue now, and red snapper have been abundant in the eastern Gulf for a number of years.

Just to kind of wrap it up again, you know, I hope you all become more dynamic. Anybody can look at data that comes in front of them and says, okay, you know, we're going to get a two-fish bag limit, and we're going to get June 1 to -- What's the other date? It's seventy-three days, or something like that, and, I mean, it doesn't take a whole lot of work to do that, but hopefully you all can be more dynamic and try to get something in place that's going to benefit everyone, like I just tried to point out. I don't really see where anybody is going to be disadvantaged by this, and I encourage you to bring it back up for consideration. Thank you very much and have a great evening.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: You know there's no bigger champion than I am for Amendment 42, Johnny, but, that being said, if -- You're here for -- I know Gillian fishes in Texas, and I know you're not there that much, but if this council looked to at least move the start date, what would work for -- Or change some dates, and what's better, more flexible, for the State of Texas? Then I have a follow-up question.

MR. WILLIAMS: What would be better for the State of Texas, as far as what?

43 MS. BOGGS: For the charter fleet. I mean, I know you all have a lot of rough weather, a lot of times.

46 MR. WILLIAMS: We do, and, like I said, one of the National Standards is safety-at-sea, and this would certainly satisfy that.

Also, the fact that we have, you know, people, in the summertime, flock to Galveston, and then it's really robust at that time of the year.

If we were fishing outside of the normal season, we would have — I'm not saying we would have a tremendous impact on the economy in Galveston, but we bring a lot of people into Galveston to go fishing, but, I mean, you all — The whole coast is really a tourist location, and you can see there are certain lulls, and there are certain other times where you're real robust, and it would bring people in, if we were fishing when we could fish outside of the normal season, as we do right now. Like I said, I would certainly like it, and it would benefit me more than anybody, because it gives me the flexibility to fish when I want to fish.

MS. BOGGS: Then I know -- I think your smaller boat does some king fishing, and what are you all seeing with the king mackerel off the Texas coast?

MR. WILLIAMS: You know that I've been up here, for probably five or six years, whining about the king mackerel situation, and I'm very encouraged that finally we're getting something done, after all this time, and I applaud you all for that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Captain Williams, thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I'm sorry. We do have -- Captain Williams, I'm sorry, and there are two others that I think would like to ask you questions, and that would be Mr. Geeslin first, followed by Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you. Mr. Williams, you heard Ms. Paul talk about -- I asked her about the Spanish mackerel limits, and I believe another commenter talked about vessel limits for king mackerel, and for Spanish mackerel, and what are your thoughts on vessel limits particular to your business operations?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, like I say, the Spanish mackerel don't make up a big component of the catch on any of my boats, and so, you know, the people that depend on the fish -- I would rather see them be involved in the decision-making process than myself, in that regard, but, as far as king mackerel, it's terrible off of Galveston, and I've been up here complaining it for years and years, asking you all to please do something, and, like I say, I applaud you all for finally getting something done about it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Johnny, for being here, and we all know that I'm a huge fan of the Headboat Collaborative, having helped run that for a while, and so I certainly support the idea that you can run your business better than the government.

 Susan was trying to ask you, with regard to the red snapper season, right, and I hear, obviously, your want for flexibility, but, given that we open on June 1, and, right now, are closing in August, and, you know, we haven't heard a lot from Texas captains about, you know, the season structure and what would benefit you, given weather conditions, under the current season conditions.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, certainly, unless we're having a hurricane in early August, or something like that, and the weather is generally better in the summer months. However, I mean, we have really nice days in January, February, March, usually after a cold front, or a northern, comes through, and it will blow hard out of the north for a couple of days, and then we'll have a few nice days of weather, and stuff like that, and so, I mean, we could have good or bad weather anytime of the year, but probably the better time for the weather generally is in the summer, even though, usually, the first two weeks of June are pretty tough off of Texas, but, like I say, if we had the flexibility, you know, to fish when we wanted to, we could basically choose our days.

The states do it for the recreational fishermen, and, I mean, the precedent is there, with some of the states let you fish on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, you know, instead of all during the week, and so we've already got a precedent, and we would just like to be afforded that same opportunity. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right, and so that wraps up all of public testimony. Thank you to everyone who wanted to speak here in-person, as well as online, and we're scheduled to go until 5:00. I'm thinking maybe we can knock out a couple of the reports, SEDAR and maybe closed session, this afternoon. Mr. Schieble, do you have any preference in maybe doing Shrimp this afternoon, with a half-hour, and is that going to be enough, or do you want to just wait until tomorrow?

 MR. SCHIEBLE: I'm ready to go, but I don't know, and we left a couple of things for Full Council out of the committee, because we ran out of time, and so I can't gauge how long this is going to take.

try to knock out those shorter reports here. (Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

a.m., with the Shrimp Committee.

regular intervals.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So, let's take a ten-minute break, and then we'll

COMMITTEE REPORTS

GULF SEDAR COMMITTEE REPORT

Fisheries Commission Liaison report, and I think that will wrap up

the rest of today, and so we'll start up again tomorrow, at 8:00

We'll go ahead with the Gulf SEDAR Committee report. The committee

adopted the agenda, Tab I, Number 1, and the committee approved

the minutes, Tab I, Number 2, of the June 2022 meeting as written.

SSC Initial Discussions about the Current SEDAR Process, Tab I, Number 5, Dr. Nance discussed SSC recommendations for the SEDAR

process in response to its review of the SEDAR 74 research track

assessment of red snapper. The SSC thought that more flexibility

was needed in the SEDAR process, with key stocks assessed at

of the research track assessment process, as it did not achieve

the intended gains in efficiency and other process improvements.

Further, the SSC thought the use of independent CIE peer-review,

and other working groups, could be evaluated on a case-by-case

March 2024 SEDAR Steering Committee Meeting Report, Tab I, Number 6, council staff summarized the proceedings from the March 2024

SEDAR Steering Committee meeting, including the SEDAR project

requested and provide any recommendations to the council.

The SSC will continue to evaluate the SEDAR process, as

Thank you.

4 5

1

6 7

8

9

10

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, folks, and so we've got a little less 11 than a half-hour for the rest of the day for our scheduled time, 12 and I would like to go ahead and use those minutes to work through 13 some of the remaining agenda. We are ahead of schedule, but what 14 I plan to do, for the remainder of the day, is to go through the Gulf SEDAR Committee report, the closed session report, and then 15 16 I've asked Dave Donaldson to provide the Gulf States Marine

19 20 21

22

17

18

23 24 25

31 32 33

34

35 36 37

38 39

40 41

42 43 44

45 46 47 reports, schedule, and key stocks for SEDAR assessment.

Regarding process modifications, the SEDAR Steering Committee reviewed a presentation from the Southeast Fisheries Science

allowing capacity for addressing emergent concerns, improvements

The SSC recommended against the continued use

Center (SEFSC), which proposed assessing key stocks regularly,

102

to timeliness, and implications for the assessment schedule beyond 2026.

SEFSC recommendations also proposed eliminating the research track concept and assessment nomenclature, for example operational, benchmark, standard, and update, and employing more efficient assessment methods for improved timeliness.

A council member noted the need for the councils to simplify the assessment process to increase throughput and timeliness, thereby allowing the councils to address management needs more nimbly. They added that increasing degrees of complexity result in additional costs in terms of time, which affects the difference between the terminal year of the assessment advice and when a management change using that advice might be implemented.

A committee member asked how a rotating schedule might improve assessment capacity. The Southeast Regional Office replied that some options, like management strategy evaluations (MSE), may play a role in creating efficiency gains in some areas. They elaborated that staffing is not likely to increase, and, thus, the efficiency gains need to be explored wherever else possible. The SEFSC agreed that better matching assessment needs with available resources would help optimize the capability of the analytical agencies (i.e., the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute) to respond to management needs.

Further, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center recalled discussions from the SEDAR Steering Committee which encouraged exploring assessing stocks in simpler ways outside of the SEDAR process.

A committee member asked if the MSE-type work would be handled outside of the SEDAR process. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center replied that it depends on the scope of work and resources required. Council staff clarified that the Gulf Council has, in the past, requested that MSEs occur outside the SEDAR process. However, the SEDAR Steering Committee acknowledged the stresses on human and other resources in the SEDAR process.

Other council members were encouraged by facets of the reenvisioned assessment process. Council staff discussed which key stocks would be considered for the Gulf. Key stocks would be those which are important to management, but not necessarily the most data-rich species managed by the Gulf. These preliminarily included: red snapper, red grouper, gag, king mackerel, greater amberjack, gray snapper, gray triggerfish, and vermilion snapper.

A council member asked why shrimp was not included as a key stock. Council staff replied that the goal was to use the current assessment of shrimp to assess those penaeid stocks. The council member thought it was immaterial how the current shrimp benchmark assessment evolves, as to whether shrimp is a key stock for future assessments.

 A committee member replied that there are dozens of species managed by the council and that not all species can be labeled as key stocks. However, just because a species is not labeled as a key stock, it does not mean it will not be routinely assessed in some way.

Another committee member requested consideration of yellowtail snapper as a key stock and mentioned that he considered cobia as much of a key stock as king mackerel. Council staff clarified that the assessment of key stocks would be negotiated between the SEDAR cooperators, like the Gulf Council, and the analytical agencies. The proposal will be reviewed next by the SSC, after it undergoes further development.

Review and Discussion of Gulf of Mexico SEDAR Schedule, Tab I, Number 4, council staff reviewed the SEDAR schedule for Gulf stocks through 2026 and clarified that the initiative to implement the routine assessment of key stocks was expected to begin in 2026.

Other Business, a council member asked about a motion passed at a previous council meeting regarding revisions to the SEDAR process, including incorporation of state surveys for recreational data and conducting assessments outside of SEDAR. The SEFSC replied that, beyond the discussions and presentations at the SEDAR Steering Committee in March 2024, they were exploring methods such as using percent change in a representative index for adjusting catch advice. The SEFSC thought that work on this motion was making progress and would bring more details at a future council meeting. This concludes my report. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a couple of comments, if I might. In selection of the key stocks, I think it's going to be critical for this council to parse that down to as small a number as they can. If they don't, then what you will have is business as usual, and you will accomplish effectively nothing, and we typically don't do that. You know, we always go for the benchmark assessment, as opposed to an operational, and cutting away a species that, particularly, one member might think is important in their area, and so it's going to be a very difficult

thing, but, in order to make this new process work, which I think is a good step, it's going to take some discipline amongst the council, and so, if we don't do that, we won't be successful in the new approach.

The other comment that I wanted to make was that, while I think the SEDAR Steering Committee came to the right conclusions, in terms of forging a new path on how to do assessments, what I didn't hear is there was a sense of urgency, and my recommendation is that this process needs one.

For example, for 2024 and 2025, according to the schedule, the center is providing -- Well, to the council, by the time it gets there, one assessment per year, and the rest are all coming out of the FWC. That, obviously, indicates the SEDAR process isn't working, in terms of helping the council do its job, but it also indicates, to me, that we need a sense of urgency to get the new plan on its path as soon as possible, and so one of the things that was not done, at the Steering Committee, which frankly surprised me, was there was no action plan, and it was, okay, we maybe have a special meeting, et cetera, but I did not get the sense that as soon as possible, to get this program on track.

For example, you might set a goal, which is probably unattainable, but to have the new plan in place by 1 January 2025, but, if we don't push it, it's going to take the normal speed of business, and not be effective, because we won't start the new assessments until later, and so I think that's the approach that we need to take, as a council, relative to that process, and I would strongly recommend it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So, to those comments, I know -- I agree with you that the -- You know, we need to strike the iron while the iron is hot, for sure, and, you know, there is some thoughts that need to be sorted internally amongst those assessment staff, as to how really, you know, this kind of vision would interplay with either the council, relative to the key stocks issue, and then how that would fit in with the remainder of the schedule going through and starting up in 2026, and there are less than two years to the 2026, and so, you know, what they had requested, from the councils, was the list of these key stocks, so that it would help them in trying to --

Again, we're not talking about time blocks, but, at the end of the day, you're still talking about resources that will be needed, whether it's, you know, the people on the ground doing the assessments or all of the throughput to get the data prepared to

do the assessments, and so there's that schedule that's involved behind the scenes.

My understanding is that we are going to have a phone call, and there's a doodle poll that I completed the other day for a May meeting, to try to talk about this one more time, to make sure that we're still on the same page as we kind of -- As this process is crystalized, and I think it was August potentially would be another meeting that was mentioned at the SEDAR Steering Committee, but I don't know if Dr. Walter would like to speak to a more definitive timeline that maybe the agency is really circling on the calendar to have something that's on paper, but, you know, there is a desire, at least amongst the, you know, council directors and chairs that were present at the meeting, that this does need to be done as quickly as possible. Dr. Walter.

MR. WALTER: Mr. Chair, thank you, and, Bob, I think that --Speaking from my staff, I don't think they could be any more encouraged by this and motivated to make this happen. I think this is something that they certainly are very interested in working with the Steering Committee, and with the council staff, to make this happen.

One thing that I think -- The running joke was what the over-under is on the number of key stocks, and I think that we -- We brought this to the council, and now the key stocks seem to keep growing and growing, and I think that's not -- I think what we need to be cognizant of is identifying something as a key stock is not saying that that is a lower priority. It's in how we probably are going to assess it.

I think maybe if I could try to clarify and help with this for the council, and it's I think we're hearing, in a lot of cases, that it's -- That we want more frequent advice, because things change more often, which means that we're actually prioritizing the frequency of advice to be current with what's going on in the water, which would mean a less-complex assessment, and so it's not less priority, and it's not like shrimp is a less priority, but it's that we just want to be able to update it more rapidly, which is actually what that assessment modeling approach that's being developed is doing.

It probably doesn't need that full age-structured SEDAR-inclusive process, and so maybe, rather than use of the word "key stocks", because it kind of says that that's a priority, it's -- I don't know the right language, in terms of what we would do to get them, but at least put them in the right -- What would be the best tool

for the job.

For other ones, there's just a substantial degree of complexity, and it's going to take the time that it takes, and red snapper is sort of that keystone one that has so many different parts that it really needs that full, inclusive thing, but others, that were maybe Florida-only ones, that are a little bit easier to compile the data, but have strong cohorts that move through, that we really need to capture -- That might be one that we need to get more frequency of update, because something comes in, and we see these fish, but the assessment is five years stale, and we're missing the boat, and I think that's where the council could say do we want more rapid advice for these ones, because we're hearing, like for gag, that the fish are there, but the assessment is lagging, which means maybe dialing back on the complexity to get a more rapid update.

Shrimp is pretty clear, and other ones may be -- So that would be the prioritization, and so maybe that's what the Steering Committee -- We're not going to get to that here, but I think, rather than just piling on the key stocks, thinking about how to put them in the right place. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I was going to make a similar point, and so John kind of emphasized what I was going to say, right, and we did talk about this some at the SEDAR Steering Committee, right, and do we want to build an assessment that's a Honda Civic, or a Cadillac, or a Maserati, and, obviously, the nicer you build it, the longer it's likely to take, and so, you know, to me, we get hung up on terminology a lot of times, right, and so "key stocks" -- People think of that as key stocks that are important for me to go out and catch, and, as John is pointing out, we're envisioning it more as like the framework for the complexity of the stock assessment, and then what are some things that maybe we can step back from those really complex assessments and do some sort of simpler methodology, or approach, and so we'll continue to work on this.

 Your point is well taken, Bob, right, and so there is an urgency, and that's why we're scheduling that meeting in May, and then following-up in August, and we also have a lot of things that are in the queue, right, to be worked on in 2024 and 2025, and so we've already done the data preparation, to kind of get that underway, and that's why the 2026 timeframe was started.

The other part of this is the perfect storm with MRIP-FES, right,

and so maybe less so in the Gulf, but a lot of stock assessments in the South Atlantic were pushed back, simply because of that FES issue, and so we're factoring that in, but we've talked with the center about some work that could be done, and Kevin alluded to it, right, that could help set us up for greater success, by doing that data triage, and work, to kind of standardize processes, and so I think we're building towards something that could be much more timely, and successful, but we still have some work to do.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: I will just add -- I will quickly add on to what Dr. Walter and Mr. Strelcheck just said, relative to your comment, Bob, about the -- You know, the complexity issue, and that, you know, things kind of bog down, and, at the end of the year, we end up with one or two assessments, and so, you know, trying to rightsize the assessment with the species, and the data, right, but then there's also going to be some discipline on the council side too, to, you know, say, well, you know, you can go for this assessment, but it's much more complex, and it's much more time consuming, and it's going to result in less assessments at the end of the year, and so, when this process comes out, at least as it was initially described at the meeting, you know, there is the potential for the council to, you know, add some things, recommend, or want to do a more complex assessment, but, you know, we have to realize that is going to impact the process, and the throughput, and so, you know, it's going to take both sides, basically, to try to get to the end goal. Yes, sir.

MR. GILL: I completely agree, but I do note that, historically, the council does not have that discipline. We never have, in m experience, in twenty-some-odd years, and so it's a new page, and it will take some tough thinking, and compromising, to get to that, and my final word is KISS, and it's all about KISS-ism, and that's exactly where we're at, and I strongly support what the center is doing in that regard.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Yes, and we'll see that shapes up going forward, and, obviously, council membership changes over time, and the needs change, but, you know, certainly with this membership, and what we've gone through in the school of hard knocks for assessments, and the SEDAR research track assessment, both sides are unhappy, and so, you know, I would like to think that we can come to the happy medium, where we can -- With an eye towards throughput, and having assessments to help us with management, that we can kind of restrain ourselves, if you will, at the end of the day, with trying to go for the more complex assessments. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I am going to probably reiterate some of what's been

said, but the historical knowledge around this table only lasts so long. I mean, you've got basically some state people that's been around for a long time, and you're the longest-serving state person right now, but the rest of the folks are only around for nine years, and I don't think there's many people around the table from when we were trying to ask for the very best red snapper assessments that were possible, and there were some costs to that in the past, and so that speaks to the council discipline side.

We didn't get much for asking for these Cadillac assessments. We didn't get much, and, from my perspective right now, and it's what I said the other day, is we need to keep it simple, and we need more timely data, and we've got to have more throughput, and everything we do has to look at those three things, and the council just can't keep going. I mean, the people that's coming up here and saying, look, gag has changed, and our assessment is stale. We don't have a good way to do anything with it now.

Hopefully the staff, in the future, and what few state people is around here, can remind people of historical times, when we tried to ask for these Cadillac versions, and we didn't get much for it, and so -- And I hope Dr. Walter -- I think he was asking what our opinion is, and I'm trying to be loud and clear what mine is now, simpler and more throughput. We've got to have it, more timely data, and that's the focus, and so --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Yes, and, again, the staff is working on that plan of what their vision would be, and it was -- You know, as the plan was kind of just laid out on the table at the meeting, and there was discussion on, you know, making it very explicit in what could be available, under certain data situations for a species, what those costs would be to do this, and what it would cost to do that, so that, when you go down the list, you basically say, okay, it's going to be three months to do that, and it's going to be three months to do that, and two months to do that, and whatever to do that, and, at the end, this is what we're shooting for, to try to get an assessment through, but you know, more on the frontend, what that is, and so, as you add more things to that list, it's going to add more time, and so it will very explicit for the council to know, going in, that I'm going to give up, you know, timeliness, in order to do this certain task related to this species, is what the vision was at that time, and we'll have to see what the final result is, when the process comes up. Dugas.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to add to Mr. Gill and Dale's comments, I believe that we rely too much on the

SEDAR process, or the Science Center, and I could be incorrect when I say that, but I think there's other options available that we should look at to get data, and it could be state data, and it could be asking universities to help out with some stock assessments, and it could be groups like LGL, and I think they are overloaded, and I think we have other avenues, and we're just not exploring them.

I could be totally wrong, but that's my opinion, because, whenever — I know that we're given — The Science Center is dealing with three councils, and not just us, and so they have a lot on their plate, and we hear 2026, the year 2028, and Dale just said it. There are people back there waiting on data that's going to affect their business, you know, and so I think waiting until 2028 is somewhat unacceptable. We need to move in a quicker fashion, and I don't have that answer, but I would like to entertain a different route.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Froeschke.

 DR. FROESCHKE: Following-up on Dr. Walter's comment, and it kind of got me thinking a little bit differently. The way it seems to me is you would want a few stocks, but refreshed -- So every three years, and so, in year-four, you start year-one, and so, for example, you know you want red snapper, and that's an age-structured assessment, and that probably takes two slots, and that's year-one. In year-two, say you do red grouper and gag, because we have enough to do two stocks a year. In year-three, you pick two other ones off the list. In year-four, you start over again on red -- To me, that's it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So what's unknown, unfortunately -- What's unknown, unfortunately, in my mind, is that, you know, again, they're not trying to set up our normal SEDAR schedule, where there's a time block, and it goes through quarters, but, you know, I think there's going to have to be a realization of how long something will be, based on available resources and what it is that's being requested, the type of model, the type of add-ons that you do to that model, and so I think their intent was to try to get kind of the lay of the land on what the base would be for those key stocks.

You know, it might be wise to whittle down the list of eight to a much smaller number, but I think they were really looking for the intent, from the councils, to figure out and engage what it was that the council had interest in, and they would kind of go back to the drawing table with the list of all of the species, from the

other two councils, and not just our council, but the other two councils, and then come back, as it fits into this potential, you know, throughput of what the key stocks would look like and what the potential would for recurring or having the follow-up assessments done at a certain level of assessment, or type of assessment, with maybe a minimum amount of add-ons.

That's what I intended, or what I got, from that, and so, to make that process easier for them, and then be able to do those species, or key stocks, more frequently, then, yes. If you reduce the number of species, you will have more throughput, and more regular throughput, but, in preparation for what the resources would be, and if you want those done on a regular schedule -- You know, a regular schedule could be every other year, or a regular schedule could be every four years, and so -- Mr. Rindone.

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and, to that point, I think what's germane to this conversation is the species that we're talking about -- Like do we expect there to be also a lot of new information involved, because, obviously, like you were inferring, it's going to affect how long these things can take, and so, for some of the species that we had initially talked about at the SEDAR Steering Committee, like king mackerel as an example, and, with the example of Dr. Banks, and colleagues, recent publication, there hasn't been much more to come out about king mackerel recently in the Gulf, and so that's something that, you know, while it's important to us, it's not something that we're going to expect there to be a continual data evolution through time, compared to something like say red snapper or one of the other groupers.

They were thinking about what needs that, you know, that additional examination through -- You know, being as part of our key stocks, that's something that you guys can think about, and so, you know, red snapper, obviously, and gag, obviously, and red grouper, obviously, and whatever other species, you know, might be of interest, and, right now, you know, greater amberjack has got the Great Amberjack Count going on, and there's a lot of renewed interest. As tangents to that, what other funding has come through for greater amberjack research, and gray triggerfish, on and off, gets some --

You know, probably less attention than Dr. Simmons would hope that it would, but just as like ideas of, you know, what sorts of -- What species do we think are going to be perennial research targets that, again, have newly-evolving information on the regular, versus things that -- Like vermilion, where there really isn't functionally a new dataset, or a new analysis, to consider for it,

and so it's something the Science Center could just crank at, and so --

CIIATDMAN

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: The other thing I think, in the prioritization, or what are key stocks, is there's a lot of things that we also try to get out of our stock assessments, beyond just an annual catch limit, or stock status, and so I think that's where -- If we're really only wanting an annual catch limit to be updated more rapidly, then we don't need the full assessment to give us things like allocations, or even necessarily stock status.

If we just want to be current with what's going on in the water, and be more flexible, so that fishermen don't say, hey, you guys are missing out on this, then that says something that's simple, that updates the catch limit a little more frequently, and then, every, you know, eight years, maybe, we do the full thing, because, really, we're not going to want to allocate that often anyway, nor did we ever have the bandwidth to do the assessments on that higher frequency, and so I think that's where matching the need to the — The tool to the need I think is helpful, and so, if this council maybe could say, for those stocks, which ones do you want to be able to update the catch advice every two years, or three years, something — Then the guidance would say, okay, we'll match that need that you've identified with the tool, and I think that would be helpful guidance to get.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So that's a great point. Looking at the list of species, the eight that were identified during the Steering Committee, do we want to reduce those, or we should identify which ones we want every two years, or every three years, and, I mean, we should probably do that now, and it would be helpful for Dr. Simmons, and staff, when they go to the SSC, to at least have them review it before it goes back to the Science Center. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, I don't have an internet connection, and can we scroll -- Wasn't it listed in your report? While I have the mic, I believe triggerfish was one of them, and we've been waiting on triggerfish I think now for five years, and I would really like to hear something on triggerfish. It may not be a priority after that, but I think you need to start with triggerfish, because we've looked at everything else.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So, again, of all the species every two years, or certain species every two, certain species every three, or -- I mean, again, I'm just trying to help them, as they kind of look at

data availability, type of stock assessment, whether or not that's possible, you know, other advice they might be able to bring back on the first iteration of the draft process. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so perhaps understanding exactly what we're calling key stocks would be helpful here, because my impression, and this could well be wrong, is a key stock is the one that's got to go the full monte assessment process, and, if that's wrong, then -- It's not? So, let's discuss exactly what a key stock is, so that, as we go through this, we're all of like mind on making those selections.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Well, in my mind, a key stock is a stock that has interest to the council relative to changing abundance, and that could be due to increased fishing pressure harvest, you know, due to economic conditions, and, you know, the economy may get better, and there is sort of lots more people on the water, or it could be a stock that has, you know, impacts due to climate change, and so it's showing up maybe in more abundance in other areas, as well as its, quote unquote, home range, and it's starting to, you know, populate higher numbers, and so it could maybe be worthwhile to have an assessment, to show that there's availability to harvest more fish, and so that would be a key stock at that point in time, but it does not apply necessarily to it being data-rich or having a certain amount of data to do a certain assessment.

Is it a stock of importance, and interest, to the council for managing, and, yes, that could be fluid. Three years from now, this list could be changed, you know, and it may not be the same eight, but, for now, they just want to get their minds wrapped around what is it that the council currently has interest with, relative to frequent, or a, you know, regular assessment schedule, in the near-term, to help them kind of align with the data that's available with the assessment that could be provided, with the output that could then be provided. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: To that point, and, okay, I understand that better from your perception, and my concern with that is that's fundamentally inclusive of all the stock that we normally talk about, and so, you know, in terms of helping the process, it doesn't get us down to a simpler system, and it just says, hey, we're interested in everything that we talk about normally, and I'm not including wenchman, but we're not getting any further down the road, and so I'm -- I've got problems there.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Yes, and so, for this list of eight, there may be two species on this list that would need to be assessed every two

years, and there may be four species that need to be assessed every three or four, just so that we have something that's regular, that doesn't get impacted by the fishery, or the environmental conditions or what have you, that causes a lot of variation, but they get just assessed less frequently, but they get on the list as a regularly-assessed stock, because they need to kind of be planning on -- You know, they need to have the data available, when that's going to occur, and all that stuff needs to be going on behind the scenes.

You know, you could ask -- We could ask for, you know, every other year for all the eight species, and I'm afraid we might get a very funny look from the folks, when they come back with the plan, but at least it would be some information that they have to go forward with.

MR. GILL: A quick back on that, and so, to help -- Since this concept was initiated by the Science Center, can we ask Dr. Walter to provide what the Science Center's concept of, quote unquote, a key stock is? They're the ones that created the terminology, and perhaps we can understand where they're coming from, and it would help us get our arms around this. I'm having difficulty.

DR. WALTER: I think, actually, it was a John Carmichael concept, and we borrowed it from the South Atlantic, and the idea was essentially that these are the ones that we get the most -- Shall we say public attention on, and so that's the primary reason why they would be key stocks, and it kind of almost had little to do with all of the other aspects of it, and these are the ones that we hear the loudest about, and start from there, and what I was trying to do was to get a little bit away from getting hung up on definitions and say how often does this council think they need current catch advice information.

Not what degree of assessment, and not degree of whether it get the full monte or not, and, if you say you want catch advice updated every two years for this stock, we'll come back and say, okay, then you need this thing that's really rapid, and you're going to need an index-based approach, because we can't do all the ageing to do that every year, and you will say, okay, good, you're meeting what I wanted, and so I think that's the really -- How often do you feel you need to update these, so that people don't say we're missing the boat on these.

I think taking it from there might be helpful, and I would say just offering up something like red grouper and gag, where we tend to see these waves of recruitment come in, and, for as long as

I've been here, we've either ridden a wave of recruitment in red grouper, and have been on the positive side, and overestimated, and, on the backside, we wind up overfishing, and so it's just this cycle of, if we could be a little bit faster on that, I think we would have done much better, and not had this boom-and-bust. That's just an observation I've had, and I think that's -- How often do you want catch advice, and then let's try to work from that. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I know I had a few folks over here. I had Dr. Sweetman, and I had Dr. Frazer, and I had Ms. Boggs, but, Andy, you had your hand up, and was that to this part of the conversation or something else?

MR. STRELCHECK: I'll wait.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: You'll wait? Okay. C.J.

DR. SWEETMAN: All right. At the risk of trying to throw something out there to try and potentially prioritize some of this, based on what I've heard around the table from the Science Center, and so let me think about this.

I almost want to categorize these eight species that we have on there a little bit differently, and so my thought process here --You've already mentioned red grouper and gag grouper, and I think those will probably fit in one category as well, and probably similar with red snapper, in terms of stocks that we hear the most about, things that are important there.

Part of me almost wants to throw gray snapper on there, that kind of list of four, in terms of that, just because it's one of the most commonly-caught-after and sought-after species here in the Gulf, and then I feel like king mackerel and greater amberjack are kind of a separate category in and amongst themselves, because they're both kind of experiencing fishery issues along those lines, things that we don't necessarily know what's driving some of those declines, and then vermilion and triggerfish, and I almost put in kind of another category altogether along those lines, because — I'm not trying to say that none of these stocks are important, or important to the entire assessment process, and we, obviously, would like to know as much as we can, to better manage these things, but trying to think of giving you guys what you need to try and make progress at that SEDAR Steering Committee.

I don't know if that's helpful at all, from a timing perspective, what you were asking for, John, there, and that's a little bit

challenging to do off-the-cuff right here, in terms of like the cyclical aspect of it for each individual species here, but, in terms of relative importance of the stocks, of what we hear about landings and things along those lines, and trying to make progress, and please feel free to disagree with me, anyone, and I'm just trying to move this forward here a little bit.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Just to reiterate what C.J. said, I think 85, or 90, percent, of all the angler trips are devoted towards red snapper, gag grouper, red grouper, and gray snapper. You know, so we can only expect that there's going to be continued pressure, and so continued updates -- Those are key species, or key stocks, in my mind.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Since you just finished up the mic, I mean, every two years, every three years, for those?

DR. FRAZER: I think every three years. I think I would be good with that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I agree with Florida on everything except gray snapper, because that's not an important fishery to the folks up here.

DR. FRAZER: (Dr. Frazer's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. BOGGS: Okay, and well I don't have -- I can't see anything, and I'm blind here, and so -- But I would -- I mean, to me, we don't seem to hear a lot about gray snapper, and we don't hear a lot about vermilion snapper. You're right, Kevin, that, two years ago, we caught a ton of them, and I hadn't seen any in a year, and so is that one of those cyclical species again? I don't know, but you're right. Two years ago, we were catching a ton of them, but we haven't been.

All that being said, I mean, to me, gray snapper and vermilion snapper would be at the bottom of the list, and, of course, I'm still going to champion old gray triggerfish there, because we keep waiting on that one, but the species that are so critical, and so controversial, the red snapper, the red grouper, gag, and I don't know if you can group those together, since -- Being the species that they are, and, of course, king mackerel, greater amberjack, gray -- When I get a computer, I will have to look at

the data.

1 2

3

4 5 6

7 8 9 10

11

24 25 26

23

27 28 29

30

31

40 41 42

43

38

39

44 45 46

47

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to emphasize a two versus threeyear cycle. I mean, I usually takes us a good year-plus to react to the science, right, and so I think three years is probably going to be reasonable, and we did talk to the SEDAR Steering Committee about not only speeding up the science, but also speeding up the management response to the science.

In terms of the key stocks, I guess I'm thinking about it a little bit differently, but I like the thought process with regard to gray snapper, and I was thinking the ones that potentially would be more in that less-complex, less-time-consuming stock assessment category would be gray snapper and vermilion snapper at this point, and that the other six would kind of be our key stocks, but I think amberjack is one of those that I also have a little pause with, right, because it's been in that Tier 1 stock assessment category, and maybe it's time to do something different, and an MSE, or something like that, is a new approach, and so I could potentially drop that out of the key stocks list as well, into a lower-tier assessment that's still going to provide management advice, but just in a different way.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I guess maybe just a question for Dr. Walter. I thought one of the reasons we were kind of going through this exercise is, once we identify these, with the understanding that we need this advice, you know, within two to three years, then we would work with the SSC, and you all, to figure out, you know, the best process, the least complicated, you know, model that we could use to get the advice we need, but the first step was identifying the key stocks, and then the next step would be decided what type of assessment was needed, how frequent does it have to be, can it be a simpler approach, and does the simpler approach have to happen after a more complex approach, and we would still have to work through all those things, I think, based on the data that's available, with the SSC, but I think, if the council can hone-in on those very key stocks, that would be our next step, but I guess that would be my question to you all.

DR. WALTER: Well, I was responding to the fact that we were having an expanding list of key stocks, and so I wanted to try to say that I think we could help narrow that, and do exactly the process you said, but say how often we need that advice updated, and then

take that to the SSC and say, okay, for this, we need that advice very rapidly, and we need high throughput, and that's going to be a different process than maybe one where we say we could be fine with every five years.

I was offering that up because I thought that might help, because we were struggling in deprioritizing anything, because we don't want to make that statement, and so that was where I was saying that, if that would help us to then take it to the SSC, as to which tool would do the best to meet the needs.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Levy.

MS. MARA LEVY: Just a question, because I'm hearing a lot about these are things you might consider in determining what these stocks are, but I haven't really heard any discussion about how stock status plays into it, right, and so those stocks that are overfished, or in rebuilding plans, and, you know, under the Magnuson Act, the agency is required to review rebuilding progress every couple of years, and so I'm not sure how that fits into this whole scheme, and so I'm just bringing that up.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: So that was going to be pretty similar to my comments. I mean, if I just had to pick species that are monitored regularly across the Gulf, I would say red snapper, gag, red grouper, and amberjack, but amberjack has had all this trouble, and it needs more monitoring, right, and so I don't know if -- As Andy suggested, maybe it's time to move that one down the list a little bit, but, as Mara said, it's still overfished, and it's not recovering, and so we kind of have to keep a look at it, and so I'm just not sure what the parameters are.

Then it doesn't seem like we're trying to -- With this work, we're not picking the most urgent ones, and like, to me, king mackerel needs to be looked at almost on an emergency status, but I don't think we're looking at that here, and we're trying to pick the regular every couple of years things, and so that's my comment.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Directly to what Captain Walker was talking about, one of the goals that was discussed at the SEDAR Steering Committee, with respect to this entire approach, was to allow for some additional bandwidth to accommodate those sorts of emergency or otherwise unplanned sorts of issues that

need to be taken up, and so, when you guys are considering exactly how many key stocks -- You know, that is another consideration to pin up to the board in your mind, and like I don't want too many, because, if there's too many, then there's no room. There's no assessment capacity by the center, or FWC, to deal with an emergency situation like that has been described for us for king mackerel.

To a previous note about vermilion snapper and gray snapper, just a reminder to you guys that those two species combine for a little over ten-million pounds in landings in the Gulf a year, and a little bit more vermilion than gray snapper, but suffice it to say that, you know, they're popular target species, and we don't have any pressing issues with them, and that's not to say that we never will, or anything is expected, but, you know, ten-million pounds of landings between the two of them is also considerable.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So that was a good point, Ryan, about the throughput still on the number of stocks, and, the more stocks you have, the less chance you have to add in those species that, you know, aren't identified as the key stocks, and so almost -- You know, you would defer mostly to the most simple assessment, in my mind, that will provide you the status determination criteria, when and if you need it for those species, and so, you know, that's kind of, I think, the way I'm looking at it, so that you have some capacity to add in species, because you will need to add in species at some point, and so -- Either that, or you give up on the frequency one year, and you drop out of the cycle, and it's one cycle that's four years, instead of three, you know, something like that, but I have Mr. Dugas.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with Captain Walker with the amberjack and mackerel. They need to stay up on the list, but I had a question for Andy. You mentioned, you know, separating or doing a different assessment for amberjack, and can you give us a little more explanation of how that looks?

MR. STRELCHECK: Dr. Walter could go into a much more in-depth explanation, but there's lots of different methodologies for conducting stock assessments, right, and so you don't have to do an age-based stock assessment, which is kind of the top tier, and you could do a simpler approach, which is like a stock, you know, production model that uses less rigorous data, and, you know, it doesn't incorporate age information, and so it's really kind of a spectrum of types of assessments that are used, and there is limitations, and caveats, to some more than others, right, and so the scientific community has certainly vetted these assessment

tools, and there's a -- The bottom line is there's a broader toolbox than we tend to rely on, right, and so I think there's opportunities there to kind of rethink that.

The council has to be accepting that that would mean change, and simplification, of the assessment process, with the benefit of increased throughput and timeliness, and then, as Mara has pointed out, how does it affect some of the management benchmarks that have some determination criteria and other things we use to manage the fisheries, right, and all that would have to be incorporated, but there is certainly, to me, opportunities to look at these simpler approaches, and like the most simplistic, which you've seen, is doing interim analyses, where you just rely on like an abundance index as a trend in the stock's health and status, and, as that goes up, or goes down, we adjust catch levels based on that, right, and that can't be the sole basis for all our management, but it certainly can be an interim basis that we use in between major stock assessments.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so, Dr. Simmons, you've put up just kind of a summary, as you have guessed where we are right now, just to have something for folks to look at, and comment on, but, basically, reducing the list from eight to five, and identifying a schedule of every three years, and, obviously, you know, they wouldn't be able to do all five species, you know, each three years, and they would have to spread those out, but is this, you know, palatable to folks? Does anybody want to add some more detail or changes to this? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I'm sorry, but gray triggerfish needs to be on this, at least the first iteration, because, again, we had this gray triggerfish stock assessment that we were going to get, and the data was flawed, and then we were going to get it, and then it was like, oh no, we've got to start all over again, and it's been five years, and we're still, what, two or three years from triggerfish data, and so, if there's any way we can at least move triggerfish to the top of this list, through the first iteration, where at least we can maybe a baseline, and then we may not have to look at it for ten years.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Walter.

 DR. WALTER: Maybe I could help sketch out -- After seeing this, I'm seeing a path forward for how this -- Maybe I could just illustrate that for a minute, and so, moving forward, if we were to say, okay, every three -- We want this catch advice for these ones updated every three years.

1 2

We would sketch out probably a program that would do a full stock assessment maybe every eight years for these, and, in the interim of those, we would probably do an interim assessment that would update that catch advice every three years, punctuated by the full assessment on a much wider timescale for those, and, if we sketch that out, that would be something that I think people would understand, and they would say we're going to get that rapid advice, that is updated, and we'll get the stock status, but on a more wider time scale, giving us time to integrate new information.

I think that would provide then the bandwidth, as Ryan said, for those sort of immediate problems, like triggerfish and king mackerel, so that they would get that assessment, that we actually don't know what's going on, and we kind of need to do some science to get in there, but maybe triggerfish wouldn't be one of those where we need it every three years, and that one -- So, once we do that initial one, it might not rise to that, and I think that's where separating that -- Getting triggerfish done, and, yes, agreed, if we can find the bandwidth and carve out the time, but these would be the ones that would get that schedule. Then having that schedule laid out I think would be very useful for us, and it would provide clarity. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: To that point, Ms. Boggs?

MS. BOGGS: So, I'm sorry, but I'm going to harp on triggerfish, and so you were talking about carve out the time, and the bandwidth, to do this, and five or six years is not enough time to carve out the time and get it done?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: I will give that to Dr. Walter, but, in 2025, we're scheduled to start the benchmark assessment for gray triggerfish, which predates the implementation of this plan to do this key stocks approach, and so the triggerfish will have the full -- You know, it will have everything that's available thrown at it to try to set up what we might do, knowing that this is a plan that we're trying to consider, and, you know, that will be part of the planning process for that assessment, and trying to set up something that can have some sort of index-based procedure based off of it, using it as a foundation, using this benchmark assessment as a foundation.

That is scheduled to happen before this even comes into play, and so it might not be that -- When we're talking about putting this

in place in 2026, we'll be beyond that not having an assessment for triggerfish.

 The other thing that I wanted to mention, just with respect to something that Mr. Strelcheck said about calling it an assessment top tier, like an age-structured assessment as being top tier, is that part of what we discussed at the SEDAR Steering Committee, with respect to things like right-sizing the assessments, and basically using the right tool for the data that are available, is it might not necessarily be that a particular species can have an age-structured assessment, and so it not getting one does not mean that the best work is not being done on that species, and it's all contingent upon the data, and so I just kind of --

Especially when we're communicating with the public, I kind of caution you guys to think about like word use, and creating a hierarchy of like the value, or ability, of a certain assessment to answer a question, and it's all dependent on the data that we have, and sometimes we have shockingly little, and sometimes we have a lot, and so --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Just to follow-up to your comment, based on what Mr. Rindone just said, so we're still -- I think there's two issues here that, again, and it's homework for the council, relative to going forward with trying to set up the process and to inform, or give, information to the assessment folks at the Science Center, but key stocks and frequency.

Are these the key stocks? Has it gotten whittled down now from eight to five, or you can add another section on here that says gray triggerfish every five years, based on what Ryan said, and we'll have an assessment in a couple of years, which is prior to when this is going to roll out, this 2026 and beyond, but triggerfish may not need an assessment every five years, just because of the nature of the species and what have you, but it will need to be on the list, so that the Science Center can use it to evaluate how they're going to go lay out this initial process, this initial workflow and product.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I think so, because we've waited so long, and we have bad information, and the science was bad, and we had to throw it out, and we had to start all over again for 2025, which I did know that, Ryan, but I just -- If there's any way -- But yes, because we don't know, in 2026, I guess, when we get the final stock assessment, what that's going to bring.

It may be that we -- I don't want to be then trying to come back

and add it to this schedule to reschedule, or to amend, update, but, if it comes back, and I don't know what it could possibly say, but, if it comes back, and it says something that we don't need to look at it for ten years, then you could take it off, but, if it's not done, I'm going to come haunt you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So I will just offer it again, and this is Dr. Simmons' interpretation of the conversation that's been held this afternoon, relative to the request, and this is what she has, as far as five species, frequency every three years, and I guess the Science Center will take this, along with the other councils' requests, and then they're going to be working on that, relative to folding it into their plan.

MS. BOGGS: Well, no, and I would like to add gray triggerfish, and that's what I said, but then you might see that you can take it off.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So, is it for five years then, initially, at this point in time, based on your best available information?

MS. BOGGS: Which is none, and so I guess yes.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay, and so, Bernie, if you could add gray triggerfish down there as the stocks needing catch advice every five years. That brings us to six of the eight. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to disagree with Susan. You know, if we're going to do this, then we need to consider putting a longer list of more species, right, and we're trying to encompass everything, and the intent that we're having this discussion is, and it's not for the immediate assessments coming up, and, as Ryan pointed out, trigger is right there, and it's going to accommodate the needs of triggerfish in the near term, but this is talking long-term, and, if we get into a longer list, we need to have a much more thorough discussion, and it would be a whole lot longer, and we're talking about longer time cycles.

For example, I could argue that vermilion don't need catch advice except every eight years or something, because they breed like rabbits, and they've never been in trouble, in twenty-some-odd years, but I don't think we need to go to that specificity. I think we need to specify the top end, delete that five-year thing, and move it up to three, so we can get this process going, and on track, and not get focused on every other species that we deal with.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: I will add to that. I talked about it a little bit earlier, and maybe I wasn't so clear, but I think, for this exercise, where we are relative to this new process that has not been fleshed out, less is more at this point, and so, the more species we add to this, the less opportunity we're going to have to throw in that species that we would like to have assessed, at whatever time schedule. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Under duress, I will remove gray triggerfish.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, I think this is -- You know, we've got a lot of work to still do on this, and I think this is just our starting point, right, and so this is helpful, I think, for our staff to take this, and work with the SSC, work with the Science Center, and we can lay out the data we have available and start thinking about what kinds of assessments we need, and we can have the SSC weigh-in on that, and see where some of these other species could fit in, and try to bring that back to the council, once they get some of that process more fleshed out internally, would be my suggestion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: To that point, Mr. Gill?

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I think it would be very helpful, for the council, if, when you're talking these other assessments, what the output would be for the council. It won't be the same as what they're used to, right, and, whatever that is, so that the council knows what they're getting, but set the expectation level correctly.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: So it's late, but I think one thing that might help is I can send around Shannon Calay's presentation from the SEDAR Steering Committee, which kind of maps out how this would work, but one of the things that I wanted to emphasize is we're saying these are kind of key stocks, however we're defining that, and that means, every year, we're going to assess one to two of these, right, and that doesn't mean those are the only stocks that are going to get assessments at that point, and others are going to just fall into a lower tier of complexity, in terms of stock assessments, that maybe can actually be completed faster than these key stocks, and gray triggerfish, vermilion snapper, other species, are going to fall into that category, and so a visual aid might help. I think it's too late in the day to bring that up

now, but I will try to pass that around before tomorrow.

3 4 5

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Any other discussion for SEDAR Steering? I don't think we're going to do the liaison report,

Dave.

6 7

1 2

MR. DONALDSON: I'm not moving to primetime.

8 9

10

11 12

13

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay, and so we are past our scheduled time for today, and, you know, paybacks aside, we're just going to kind of close it up right here, and we're going to start with our first scheduled report, which will be Shrimp, tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. Thank you, everyone.

14 15

(Whereupon the meeting recessed on April 10, 2024.)

16

17 18

April 11, 2024

19 20

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

21 22 23

24 25

26

27

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at The Lodge at Gulf State Park in Gulf Shores, Alabama on Thursday morning, April 11, 2024, and was called to order by Vice Chairman J.D. Dugas.

28 29 30

31

32

33

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: We're going to get started. Mr. Anson is not present, and he's not feeling well today, but he will be online. Before we get into the Shrimp Committee, we're going to let Ms. McCawley give the South Atlantic report. She has to depart early this morning.

34 35 36

SOUTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

37 38

39

40

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chair. I'm not going to read the whole report to you guys, and I'm just going to hit some highlights and let you all ask me some questions. I think you all have a copy of this report.

41 42 43

44

45 46

47

This is from our March council meeting. The South Atlantic worked on the SEFHIER program, and the council will be assembling an advisory panel to explore improvements to this particular program, and the council approved the structure of this AP and will begin appointing members to this group in June.

2 Th 3 th 4 fo 5 bu 6 at

The council is also discussing for-hire unlimited entry. Unlike the Gulf, the South Atlantic doesn't have limited entry in the for-hire sector, and so the council has looked at this in the past, but it's talking about picking this back up again, and they looked at data that went through 2020. There are some data issues at the Southeast Regional Office, and so we can't see data that's newer than 2020, and the council intends to wait to hold scoping hearings on this amendment until they can get this updated data from 2021 forward, and so they are in the process of moving this forward, but it is in the early stages.

Lots of items happened in the Snapper Grouper Committee at the South Atlantic, and so the South Atlantic is continuing to work on their private recreational permitting amendment, which is Amendment 46, and this would require a permit for the private component of the recreational sector that is fishing in federal waters, and the intent is that it will go out to some APs, between now and the council's June meeting, but the intent is to consider approval for public hearings at the September council meeting.

For red snapper, the council received an overview on three projects proposed by Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission that would be exempted fishing permits to allow harvest of red snapper. There were a total of five projects that were recommended for funding, and this is looking at recreational discards, and the council provided comments on the FWC proposal.

Also on red snapper, NOAA Fisheries notified the council that the agency is considering interim measures to reduce overfishing of red snapper during the 2024 fishing year, and then, continuing on red snapper, the long-term item that the South Atlantic Council is working on is the management strategy evaluation, and the Management Strategy Evaluation Planning Team will compile a prioritized list of management strategies for the council to review at their June meeting.

Black sea bass, and so the council is working on black sea bass, and they received a presentation from the Science Center on revised projections of future catch used for setting ABC and a rebuilding timeframe, and there was lots of questions, lots of discussion, on black sea bass happening at the South Atlantic. There's a framework amendment that is modifying gag and black grouper recreational vessel limits, and this is based on the recent action that the council took, that there was some confusion about the codified text, and so we're going back in and fixing that, and, also in that framework amendment is on-demand gear for black sea

bass pots.

This would expand the use of on-demand pots, and there's been an exempted fishing permit right now to allow the use of this on-demand gear, but there needs to be an action, we think, and that's why we're going through this framework amendment, in order to allow this for use in the fishery, and this is to help with interactions with right whales.

The snapper grouper commercial fishery, the council is continuing discussions of the commercial fishery, including the current permit structure, what we call the two-for-one, and looking at trends in the fishery, and the council intends to go back and look at their vision blueprint and see what they originally intended for the future of the commercial fishery, the commercial snapper grouper fishery, in the South Atlantic, consider if they want to maintain this path forward, get feedback from stakeholders in a focused way, and then figure out next steps for the commercial fishery.

Then the council also, like you guys, are working on coastal migratory pelagics amendments, and, right now, what the council is doing is they're working on these port meetings. The port meetings actually began last week, in North Carolina, and this will help us get a comprehensive understanding of these fisheries, in order to improve our management efforts, and, if you're interested in more about the port meetings, there is a webpage completely dedicated to this on the council page, and so, with that, I will conclude my report, Mr. Chair, and pass it back to you, and I will also take any questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. McCawley. Are there questions for Ms. McCawley? Mr. Diaz and then Mr. Walker.

 MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. McCawley, for being here. I did have the honor of being able to go to you all's meeting, you all's last meeting, and I always learn a lot when I go to you all's meeting. You all do a lot of good work. Can you talk a little bit -- Florida asked for an EFP, is requesting an EFP, and can you give us just a short summary of that EFP, please?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I sure can, and so what we're submitting -There was a notice of funding opportunity that was out from NOAA
Fisheries, asking people to submit proposals to think about unique
ways to look at recreational discards, particularly in red snapper,
but really across the snapper grouper fishery as a whole.

 FWC submitted three proposals, and I believe they're all intended for funding, and now we're working on the exempted fishing permit component for the proposals, and so two proposals would happen in northeast Florida, which we call the hotspot area for Atlantic red snapper, and so that would be from the Florida-Georgia line down to Cape Canaveral, and then one of the proposals would be south of the hotspot, and so from Canaveral down through the Keys.

In the hotspot area, one of the proposals would allow private recreational anglers to take red snapper while they are fishing for snapper grouper species, but, ultimately, they're going to test out a fifteen-fish aggregate snapper grouper bag limit, and so then we're trying to figure out how that works, as a management tool, how it works for discards, because the intent would be, once that angler reaches the fifteen-fish snapper grouper aggregate, that they would stop bottom fishing.

One of the proposals in the hotspot fleet is private-angler based, and so that angler could be on a private boat, and they could also get on a for-hire vessel, and they would apply to our Go Outdoors Florida licensing system and be selected via lottery to participate in this program.

There would be quarterly draws, and people would also take an educational course before they go out, and then they would be reporting back on how their trip went, what they harvested on an app, and so FWC is developing a specific app for this.

There will be an experimental group and a control group each quarter, and there's also a study fleet in that hotspot area in northeast Florida. The study fleet is vessel-based, instead of angler-based, and so it would be private vessels as well as for-hire vessels. Those folks also could take red snapper, and so this would allow red snapper to be taken in all twelve months of the year, as long as you are a participant in one of these fleets.

The study fleet is also testing out that fifteen-fish snapper grouper aggregate, with the intent that, once each angler on the vessel reaches their fifteen-fish aggregate, they stop bottom fishing, and, once the boat has that limit, they would stop bottom fishing. They could continue on and fish for something else, or they could head back to the dock, et cetera, but, also, on that vessel-based component, they would also do the education course, hail-in and hail-out requirements, and they would also use that app for reporting.

There's a lot of social science components to this as well, in

that we'll be doing angler satisfaction surveys before they start testing out this fifteen-fish aggregate, and then at the end of the trip, and then we'll also be asking people, not part of the program, about how they like the current management system, which has typically been a two-day red snapper season, and so there will be data validation, and intercepts at the dock, and there will be angler incentives used as part of the program to get people to report on the app, following these trips.

Then one other component, or one other proposal, is south of this hotspot area, to look at how things are happening kind of south of the heart of the red snapper area, and so Canaveral down through the Keys, and they also -- That's angler-based, and they'll also be going through the My Outdoors Florida licensing system, in order to apply and be selected to participate in the program.

The program is intended to run for one year, with the possibility of extending it for a second year, and so we're really excited about it, and C.J. can add as well, and he's one of the PIs on one of these proposals as well.

MR. DIAZ: A follow-up on that, and discards is a very big deal in the Gulf of Mexico, and, when I hear you all talk about this EFP, I thought, you know, that might be something good -- At some point in time, to have some version of that in the Gulf of Mexico, and so, C.J., if you could keep us kind of plugged-in on how that's going, and what the benefits are of it, and so it sounds like a tremendous amount of work, if we wanted to try to take that on, I mean, whatever state would do it, and, I mean, whether it be you all or somebody else, and, I mean, it sounds like a tremendous amount of work, but the benefits -- If we could get any small gains in reducing our dead discards, it could be huge, and so I commend you all for putting that forward, and I'm excited to see how it turns out. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Dale.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: All right. Mr. Walker and then Ms. Boggs.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have two -- Well, I have several questions, but I have two that I think are most pertinent. One is why the change in course on a charter permit moratorium? I know, for a long time, they were steadfast that we will not put our charter permits on a moratorium.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy can help me remember all of these aspects, but, you know, council members change, and so we have some new

council members that are on the council that want to discuss this, but it really, I would say, came from our APs, and so multiple APs have been talking about this.

They feel like it would professionalize the fishery more, and then, also, in trying to get people to report -- You know, if you don't have limited entry, what are you going to do to the person that doesn't report if you don't have a limited-entry for-hire permit, and that was a lot of the discussion that the council had. I think the council intends to also have an AP to look at the limited entry, but, right now, the AP that they put together is focused on the reporting on SEFHIER.

MR. WALKER: All right, part two is can you explain what your private recreational fishing permit might look like? Would it be an individual, or would it be a vessel permit, and what has the response been to that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Great questions, and so, right there, there is no reporting requirement for that particular permit, and I believe the council intends to consider that after they get this up and running, but it's a tremendous effort to try to just get the permit in place, and so there are options in there for it to be angler-based or vessel-based. The preferred alternative right now is angler-based.

There's also a way for the states to get like an equivalency, I guess, or I don't want to say opt-out, but if a state -- Right now, the way that the document is written is exactly the same, their program is exactly the same, because Florida has the State Reef Fish Survey, but the other states don't have programs like that, but, if it exactly matches what is finalized in this amendment, then I think that there would be a way for the state to opt-out.

 Also, right now, there are fifty-five species in the council's snapper grouper complex, and the permit would cover all fifty-five species, and so, for example, the Florida State Reef Fish Survey only covers thirteen species, and so those two programs wouldn't match up at this point.

I think that we've heard both positive and negative things about this, and mostly people have a lot of questions about it, but the positive things that we have heard is anglers -- A lot of them are really excited to give us their information, and they feel like, hey, we've been asking for this for years, or, you know, do you want to come out on my boat, or how can I tell you this information,

and so I think that there are a number of people that are excited about the opportunity to give their data in a more meaningful, useful way, I quess.

MR. WALKER: I think the environment has changed quite a bit, as far as that goes. Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I think Andy had a comment to Ms. McCawley.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just a couple of comments, and so Jessica did a great job of explaining the rationale for the limited entry, and so, in addition to kind of reporting requirements, we have a really huge problem with snapper grouper overfishing and overfished status, and I think there's eight stocks that are overfishing, and six that are overfished, in the South Atlantic, red snapper being one of them, and that's one of the few that is actually showing upward trends, and so it's not just reporting requirements, but it's also limiting entry, because of capacity, right, to go out and harvest this resource that is limited.

In terms of the permit requirement, you know, we don't have, with the exception of Florida, commensurate state reef fish surveys, right, and so there's no sampling universe to draw from, and so the idea, right, is to stand up a sampling frame for snapper grouper permit holders that would then help to define that universe of effort, like has been done in the Gulf of Mexico with all the state reef fish surveys.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for the report, Ms. McCawley. So how did you all come up with the fifteen-fish aggregate? That seems like a lot of fish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm so glad you asked, and I can send you guys a link to the presentation and the EFP, so that you can look at them. In the EFPs, or the proposals, there is a detailed table in there, and so we did an analysis on how many fish an individual angler could take in certain months of the year, and that, at this point, ranges from between around forty-two to forty-five fish per person in the snapper grouper complex, depending on the month of the year, because, you know, some species have closed seasons, and so we were trying to get to what is a reasonable number per-person and to think about -- You know, in testing this fifteen-fish management option, how would this work, not just in Florida, but how would it work in other states.

 You might be in North Carolina, and your aggregate might be made up partly of black sea bass, or vermilion, but then, if you're in — That would be in North Carolina. In Florida, your aggregate — Maybe, in the Keys, maybe part of those fifteen fish is made up of grunts, you know, and so just trying to think about testing the system, and what is a reasonable number of fish, and maybe our proposal, our experiment here, determines that fifteen fish is too many, but trying to think of something to test that could possibly be used in all four states and to try to get away from this large number that's available right now and find a way to get people a reasonable number, and then also to stop fishing at some point, to eliminate, or reduce, those discards.

MS. BOGGS: So, to follow-up to that, so you don't feel like, with this EFP, that I can get on a boat now, and so I'm going to go target those red snapper, and those fifteen that I catch are going to be red snapper, and you don't have the fear of that, I guess?

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's confusing, and so I apologize. In two of the EFPs, you can only take two red snapper, and so the red snapper is actually separate from your -- One of the EFPs is three, and one of them is two, and so that's the maximum you can take, and so that's separate from your fifteen fish. In theory, if the council were to implement this, maybe one of those fish could be -- One of the fifteen could be a red snapper.

MS. BOGGS: That makes a lot more sense, because I was thinking maybe that would create a targeted fishery, and I wanted to make a comment to Dale. You know, we talk about discards all of the time, and some were here, and some were not, but, you know, there is one plan that this council did start working on that addressed discards for one sector, and this council chose -- Not this council, but the council body at the time chose not to move forward with that, and I just want to remind this council that there is an Amendment 42 out there that -- It would help a lot with your headboats and part of your discard problem.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. McCawley. We're going to move on to the Shrimp Committee Report and Mr. Schieble.

COMMITTEE REPORTS (CONTINUED) SHRIMP COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. SCHIEBLE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. The Shrimp Committee report from April 8, 2024, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab D, Number 1, with the movement of Agenda Item VII before Agenda Item VI and the addition of a discussion regarding certification noncompliance

under Other Business. The committee then approved the minutes, Tab D, Number 2, of the October 2023 meeting as written.

 Biological Review of the Texas Closure, Tab D, Number 4(a), Ms. Bosarge, the AP chair, reviewed the Shrimp Advisory Panel summary as it relates to the biological review of the Texas closure. She noted that much of the AP's discussion revolved around the economic benefits to the industry from the Texas closure, concluding with a motion requesting the National Marine Fisheries Service implement the Texas closure in 2024.

A committee member stated that the process of approving the Texas closure is mostly rubber-stamping based on inadequate information, instead of good economic information. He emphasized the inclusion of economic data in future presentations. Another committee member acknowledged that the AP members, and National Marine Fisheries Service staff, discussed including catch-per-unit-effort data in future presentations. He added that it was stated, during the Shrimp AP meeting, that shrimpers in Texas were making business decisions with an expectation of the Texas closure in 2024.

A committee member commented that the biological data is in conjunction with the economic data, such as larger size bins being landed, which in turn command higher prices. A committee member questioned the effectiveness of the Texas closure in the future if landings continue to decrease.

A council member inquired if there was information on the typical size bins with which shrimp imports are associated. Ms. Bosarge responded that she was not familiar with that data, but that National Marine Fisheries Service may have such information. A committee member added that a meeting in Baton Rouge will be hosted by Sea Grant and the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission at the end of April 2024 on the future of the Gulf shrimp industry and will address many of the issues faced.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to request that National Marine Fisheries Service continue with the Texas federal closure in the coming year, in conjunction with the State of Texas closure in 2024. That motion carried unanimously. Mr. Chair, we have a motion on the board.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Any questions, or comments, regarding the motion on the board? Okay. Seeing none --

DR. SCHIEBLE: Seeing none, we'll move on.

MR. GILL: Mr. Chairman, are we going to use our clickers during this time for all votes, or how is that going to proceed?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I would prefer to -- Let's see if we have any no's first.

MR. GILL: Can you say that again? Sorry. I didn't catch that.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Let's see if we have any opposition first. I would like to try to make it short and quick, if possible. Okay. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Draft Shrimp Framework Action: Modification of the Vessel Position Data Collection Program for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery, Tab D, Number 5(a), Dr. Freeman presented the draft shrimp framework action.

A committee member recommended modifying the purpose statement to account for minimizing the economic burden on National Marine Fisheries Service, not just on the industry. Dr. Walter, from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, stated that setting up a duplicative process under Alternative 3 would add costs to the agency and not achieve the purpose of minimizing costs.

He added that, in terms of hardware and software, the units installed with the early adopter program had been type-approved for other fisheries and could be programmed for the purposes of data collection in the shrimp industry. Dr. Freeman requested a committee response to the IPT's feedback to reference "only a trip" in Alternatives 2 and 3, rather than "a shrimp fishing trip".

A committee member responded that, when shrimp vessels are rigged for shrimping, the expense of switching gear would prohibit the majority of shrimp vessels from going on other types of trips. However, he would leave it to the IPT's discretion on that wording of the alternatives. He added that he was opposed to a declaration requirement for the shrimp industry.

 Dr. Freeman then requested a committee response to the Shrimp AP's motion for rewording Alternative 3. A committee member commented that the intent of the Shrimp AP's motion is primarily on the data transmission side. Another committee member noted that the language referencing a --

MR. DIAZ: That cord is smoking.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Now we have a fire?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: If you're listening on the webinar, we're having issues.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Bernie, is the webinar still on? Can we keep going or not? For those on the webinar, we had a little technical problem here with some power, and so bear with us.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We're still having difficulties with electrical issues, and we're going to take a ten-minute break, and we'll come back at 8:40.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I think the issue has been resolved. Okay. Chris, take it away.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can't remember exactly where I left off, and so I'm going to start with a little bit above where I think I left off.

A committee member commented that the Shrimp AP had discussed that the Office of Law Enforcement could still access data from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Another council member stated that comparative costs to National Marine Fisheries Service from the approaches in Alternatives 2 and 3 would come later, and the wording is focused on the flexibility of which non-OLE server receives transmitted data.

Dr. Walter stated that there are ongoing discussions about transferring VMS data collection and administration to Science and Technology, but that a potential transitional situation could have the Southeast Fisheries Science Center receive the data for a few years until such time as the handoff of VMS from OLE to Science and Technology occurs. Then Science and Technology could become the recipient and warehouse for this data, as well as VMS data, from other fisheries, removing the long-term burden on data curation from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and potentially providing future cost-savings.

Ms. Bosarge stated that the AP thinks that the data are being weaponized when it is transmitted to OLE, so data should only be transmitted to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center as scientific data, which is being done with the early adopter program. Dr. Walter stated that there would be cost implications

noted in the analyses if the data transmission and storage is restricted only to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. A committee member stated that the council could consider Science and Technology as an option, if that becomes viable in the future.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Alternative 3, to replace "a non-OLE" with "the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC)". The motion carried with one in opposition. Mr. Chair, we have a motion on the board.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, J.D. I have a substitute motion, if we could bring it up. My substitute motion is, in Alternative 3, to replace "a non-OLE server" with "the Southeast Fisheries Science Center or Office of Science and Technology". If I get a second, I can explain my rationale.

MR. GILL: I will second.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill seconds.

MR. STRELCHECK: So, first, the data that goes to OLE is not on a server that is theirs, and it is our Office of Chief Information Officers, and so that's kind of misrepresenting, obviously, where the data is going in the first place. I think the intent is, right, that the shrimp industry is concerned about it going to the Office of Law Enforcement, and so I wanted to clarify that.

Then the second component of this is it states the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and that was part of our original motion, but, to give us broader flexibility, because we have talked about, and it was mentioned in the minutes, the potential for the VMS program being moved to the Office of Science and Technology. That provides greater flexibility.

In all honesty, I think this is way overly prescriptive for the council to be getting into, and I really disagree with this approach, but I think that the intent here is that we're providing the flexibility for NMFS to decide where this data can be transmitted, with the intent that it is going to some component of our science enterprise for transfer then to the Science Center, ultimately.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Do we have any comments, or questions, for Mr. Strelcheck? Is there any opposition to the substitute

motion? The motion carries. Okay, Chris.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Moving on, Dr. Walter stated that the addition of "for the Gulf shrimp fishery" from the Shrimp AP's motion on Alternative 3 could potentially preclude the units in the early adopter program from being used, as the units are type-approved for use in other fisheries.

 A committee member stated that there is no real difference between the cellular VMS in Alternative 2 and the cellular ELB in Alternative 3, other than where the data goes and how the units are type approved. Ms. Bosarge stated that type-approval for the shrimp industry does not currently exist, which is why the Shrimp AP agrees with the language in Alternative 3 that "National-Marine-Fisheries-Service-approved ELBs would not be type-approved based on regulations at 50 CFR 600.1501".

Dr. Walter added that type-approval under the existing VMS program allows for reimbursement, and reimbursement would not exist for units under Alternative 3. He added that units type-approved for use in the early adopter program meet type-approval in other fisheries and stated that costs based on devices in the early adopter program would be used for analyses in the draft framework action.

Dr. Walter commented that one area for future discussion should focus on how a representative data collection process, which could include a random sample, will happen. He added that the discussion should consider what the data needs will be in the future, such as spatially explicit, fine-scale data particularly for interactions with species covered by the Endangered Species Act.

A committee member commented that the language "if selected by the SRD" could mean that vessels may be selected and de-selected if a randomized sample was drawn repeatedly over time. Another committee member stated that the old cellular ELB system used the same language "if selected by the SRD" and had been successful, so no changes to the language are needed.

Dr. Freeman requested a committee response to the Shrimp AP's motion on how to prioritize spending of the Fiscal Year 2024 \$850,000 congressional appropriation. Dr. Walter responded that these funds could further prop up the early adopter program and could likely double the coverage of units on shrimp vessels.

A committee member inquired if National Marine Fisheries Service administrative funds would need to be drawn out from the funding.

Dr. Walter replied that a standard rate to administer the funds would be deducted from the appropriation, but less funding would be needed for programming support than was needed from the previous \$850,000. He added that the prioritization in the Shrimp AP's motion appears to meet the intent of the congressional language.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council requests National Marine Fisheries Service adopt the following priorities for utilizing the Fiscal Year 2024 \$850,000 appropriation for ELB development and implementation: 1) Sufficient funding to ensure the Southeast Fisheries Science Center server has capacity to receive and store shrimp fishery vessel position data; 2) Develop a statistically-robust design for distributing units to a representative portion of the fleet that would be comparable to the last ten years; 3) Cover the cost of providing units and cellular service to those shrimp vessels, pursuant to the early adopter program. That motion carried with one abstention. Mr. Chair, we have a motion on the board.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay. Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So I just had a question, I guess, perhaps for us to help develop this framework action a little bit better, and try to get a better understanding of the number of vessels that would be selected to participate in the reporting, or monitoring, program, and I think it kind of pertains to the Number 2 bullet.

I was just wondering if Dr. Walter could maybe comment on the time that you guys might be able to do that, so that we could better integrate it into the document, at least as a range, a minimum and maximum, of the number of vessels that might be selected, because, right now, there's not a real clear understanding of the number of vessels that will be selected to participate in this program. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: Mr. Chair, thanks. Yes, and that will be part of the IPT process, and I think the range will be -- I mean, I think that's what the recommendation was for there, is that further consideration needs to be ranging from a sample that's about the same percentage as what the CELBs had to a full census, and I think that it's fairly straightforward to do the costing of that, and

it's just multiplying it, and I think one of the analyses that we're going to have to do is evaluate looking at the current sampling, and are we represented in those spatial and temporal areas where we've got interactions that are relatively critical to understanding the endangered species situations, and I think that's where the final-scale effort might need to then mean that — That means, if we need that, then we need a higher sample size than maybe the one-quarter of the fleet that we've got.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, and so just one follow-up. I mean, the IPT doesn't have the capability of doing this analysis, and we would be relying on the Science Center to tell us what to put in the document, and so I just wanted to be clear that we would be waiting on the center to provide that information, so that we could put at least a range in the framework action.

DR. WALTER: We have staff on the IPT team, and, if that's an analysis that -- That staff member can request, or someone, people in our center, and, I mean, I think we're fully cognizant that that's a need for the IPT to be able to integrate that, as well as the costs of the two options, and I think that's something we've always anticipated being able to provide to the IPT, and so I don't see that as a problem.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Sorry to belabor it, but just like to help us really flesh-out the document, we would need to get that as soon as possible, so at least we have a range, and so I do think it should be something that should be escalated in priority, so we can get that information to move the amendment along.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: Loud and clear, and that's why I actually recommended that it be put in the language here, that we should consider this, because, up to this point, we hadn't been talking about what the coverage would look like, and now I think it's one of the additional tasks that we will certainly provide of the IPT, and we're fully committed to be able to provide that to the IPT. Thanks.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm asking my team, and we'll see what we can find out, but there obviously has been a decline in permits, and there's been erosion because of the 3G units, you know, going away,

or not working over time, but my recollection is we were in the 400 to 500 vessels that were originally selected to report, and so it was about a third of the fleet, or maybe a little bit less than that, but we'll get some more exact numbers, and I think that's probably a really good starting point, because there was rationale as to why we selected about that number of vessels previously.

Related to -- Before we leave this topic, I guess a couple of other things that I just wanted to emphasize, and so the amendment is not going to come back to us until August, and Carrie is pointing out the importance of, obviously, filling in some details here. We talked, during committee, and I think it's going to be really important to look at a cost comparison between Alternatives 2 and 3, for both the industry and the agency.

Some gaps, obviously, that Carrie and I have talked about, right, is what units would be approved, right, and so I think we're going to have to look at the units that are part of the early adopter program, and would we think that they would meet the type-approval standards under Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 is kind of to-be-determined approval standards, and that gives us at least a cost basis for the units, as well as cellular costs, and then, you know, I was prepared, this morning, to make a motion to modify the type-approval requirements in Alternative 3.

I backed off of that, because I want some more information, but I'm very concerned about creating a duplicative system that puts the onus on the Science Center for type-approval. We want to go back and, I think, talk to our VMS program, but I think, if we could eliminate the requirement, that, you know, we're reinventing the wheel with type-approval in Alternative 3, that does affect some of the costs, and, obviously, differences that we would calculate, and so I just wanted to mention that. That's going to be something that we want to work with the IPT on for clarity.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so, in this talk, Dr. Walter, about the range of the size of the fleet that Dr. Simmons brought up, I'm assuming that the consideration of a census approach is strictly for comparative analysis, and there is no serious consideration by the center of imposing a census requirement on the fleet, and is that correct?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Go ahead, Dr. Walter.

47 DR. WALTER: Well, I think that's really what's going to be brought

before this council, in terms of what quality of information a census would get, versus the burden that would be on the fishery, but, if it turns out that the 25 percent of the fleet, or a third of the fleet, doesn't get us the coverage that we would need to have in the particular times and places, because either it's not representative or because not all vessels are part of that initial sample, and, ideally, what you would want is a refresh of that, which is sort of getting to the fact that, if you do that math that every vessel has a one-in-three chance of being selected in any given year, they're all going to eventually have to have units.

They may only be selected to turn them on in certain years, but eventually they've got to get them, and so costing that out would say that we've got to buy that many units, and so I think, really, it comes down to dollars and cents, in terms of that decision, and not the center imposing this. The center would then say, if you need this quality of information, then this is the approach that we would recommend this council to implement, and, if we can back away from that, and still get enough information, then, okay, we'll try to minimize that cost to the fishery. Thanks.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Moving on, Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A council member stated this motion relates to congressional funding and noted that the third bullet point in the motion assumes the data is going to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Dr. Freeman responded that the congressional funding language refers to NMFS and not a specific subset of the agency. Dr. Walter added that it would not be timely to bring a proposed budget for the Fiscal Year 2024 \$850,000 to the Shrimp AP.

Dr. Freeman inquired if the committee would like an update from National Marine Fisheries Service on how the \$850,000 in congressional funding for updating the shrimp data collection program was spent. The committee expressed interest in receiving that update at its August 2024 meeting, when the draft framework action is brought back to the committee.

Update on the Number of Valid and Renewable Gulf Shrimp Permits and Discussion of Management Implications, Tab D, Number 7(a), Dr. Travis, from SERO, presented on the number of valid and renewable Gulf shrimp permits and management implications as it relates to Shrimp Amendment 17B, as seen in Tab D, Number 7(a).

A committee member inquired if there is an expected target date 2 when the minimum threshold might be met. Dr. Travis responded that it would be best for the council to receive an update at its November 2024 meeting, as it would be difficult to provide an 4 expected target date at this time. Another committee member 5 inquired if the process in determining the minimum threshold of 6 7 permits in Shrimp Amendment 17B was similar to that used in determining overcapitalization in the IFQ system. 8 Dr. Freeman 9 responded that he would work with the committee member to relay that question to Dr. Travis and potentially have an answer during 10 11 Full Council.

12 13

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Freeman.

14 15

16

DR. MATT FREEMAN: Sure. I was just going to say that, if the council is interested, Dr. Travis is on the line, and he is prepared to respond to that.

17 18

19 **DR. SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Dr. Travis, can you hear us? We can't hear you. You may be self-muted.

21

22 DR. MIKE TRAVIS: It doesn't show as self-muted.

23

24 **DR. SCHIEBLE:** Bear with us a minute. We can barely hear you somewhere.

26 27

DR. TRAVIS: Can you hear me better now?

28 29

MS. BERNADINE ROY: Dr. Travis, stay tuned.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

37

DR. TRAVIS: Okay. To Bob's question, the answer is I think no, and the approach is that we've got -- At previous council meetings, with regard to looking at capacity, and overcapacity, in the IFQ program -- What we were trying to do was determine the number of vessels needed to achieve -- If you look at -- You will see that

MR. SCHIEBLE: Dr. Travis, we're calling you on the phone, please.

the models that we used were very simple models, and they were generally -- They were generally linear regression models, and we stuck with something simple because they fit very well to the data,

and there -- There really was no comparison between what was done for the capacity and overcapacity analysis for reef fish versus

43 the analysis that was done in Shrimp Amendment 17B. Does that

answer the question?

45

DR. FREEMAN: Mr. Gill is nodding yes, and so I think we're good.
I'm looking to see if there's any follow-up questions. All right.

Thank you, Dr. Travis.

1 2

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Schieble, proceed, please.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mike, for coming in on the phone for us. Next was the 2022 Gulf Shrimp Effort, Tab D, Number 4(a). Ms. Bosarge referenced the 2022 Gulf Shrimp Effort presentation from National Marine Fisheries Service, as seen in Tab D, Number 6. She noted that the Gulf shrimp industry is still in compliance for 2022, with its effort monitored in Statistical Zones 10 through 21, as it relates to red snapper bycatch. The council may consider further discussion in Full Council. At this point, Mr. Chair, I would like to pause and be able to talk about this a little bit. We kind of got cut short during the committee session regarding this topic.

During the Shrimp AP meeting, we received a full presentation, which is Tab D, Number 6 here, showing the shrimp effort from 2020, and I believe there was an 80 percent reduction in effort, and it showed, in 2021, an 87 percent reduction in effort, and so I would like to have a little conversation about the current status of the shrimp fleet itself and the reduced effort across the Gulf, and this has implications for, obviously, the red snapper ten to thirty-fathom zone, with the bycatch level, but it also has implications for the reinitiation of Section 7 Endangered Species Act stuff that we just received a couple of meetings ago, with regard to the amount of effort taking place, or lack of effort, in the shrimp fleet.

I don't see that effort rebounding any time soon in the shrimp fleet, and I would tend to guess that it's going to continue to decline for some time, and not increase, with the rate of imported shrimp coming into the country, and so, with that said, I would like to make a motion.

Back in April of 2018, the council submitted a letter to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center requesting that the Southeast Science Center incorporate a minimum target reduction threshold in the next red snapper assessment, with percentage reductions of 1 percent increments, so that the council may evaluate if another modification to the target reduction is warranted for the shrimp fishery.

In response to that letter, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center sent the council a report, on July 11, 2018, that was the impact of the reduction in shrimp effort thresholds on SEDAR 52, Gulf of Mexico red snapper catch limit projections, and the report was

very detailed.

1 2 3

Back then, it was Tab D, Number 4(b), for reference, in 2018, but I would like to request that council staff submit a similar letter to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to provide a similar report, and I don't know how to phrase this exactly, but provide a similar report back to the council with an analysis of those 1 percent threshold increments for the November 2024 council meeting. Is that a reasonable timeframe? I am looking over to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center for that.

 DR. WALTER: Our red snapper analysts are a little busy between now and then, with a small assessment that's going on, and so I would say that's an ambitious timeline, because it -- It also relies on having a fully completed model to be able to do that, and so if I could offer that probably -- I think it would be a very incomplete analysis without the final assessment model, and, since there's going to be revisions to the model that was reviewed, I think it probably would be a little premature to be able to get that analysis. Does the -- Would you have a decision point before the council that would be needed at that timeframe, or could it wait until after we finalize the SEDAR 74, and I think it's a benchmark now?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: To that point, I understand, and that makes sense, and my thought process was that you're already knee-deep in the process, and you could just simply cut-and-paste the information that's already there into a report to supply, but, if it does require a full assessment to be completed, to gather the rest of that information, I understand that, and maybe we need to adjust the deadline for that.

Regardless, I would like to have the council staff submit the letter to you requesting this, and so, really, it's just a matter of putting the target date in here, but I think the ultimate goal of this would be to have a draft amendment in front of the council by next year to consider modification of that threshold, from 60 percent to whatever is determined in that report, if it's a 1 percent or 2 percent or 3 or 4 or whatever percent reduction, because I think, also, it would benefit the stock assessment for snapper, if that threshold is able to be reduced and the fishing mortality going into the assessment is lower than what it currently is expected to be based on the 60 percent threshold, and maybe that would be a positive thing.

 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Ms. Boggs and then Andy.

3 4 5

MS. BOGGS: Well, I guess I'm smarter than I thought I was, because I was going to ask the same question. Would this not be somehow incorporated into your red snapper research?

6 7

1 2

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

8 9

10

11 12

13

MR. STRELCHECK: Maybe I'm not taking of it the same way you are, Chris, and so the threshold is, obviously, something we wouldn't want the shrimp industry to exceed, right, and so they are well below it, and so are you recommending that we would increase it from 60 percent to some higher value, because the shrimp industry isn't likely to achieve it?

14 15 16

17

18

MR. SCHIEBLE: Maybe I had this backwards, but I thought that they were above the threshold currently, and then they're maintaining a status above the threshold when they fall below it, as in when it's in violation, and is that not correct?

19 20 21

22

23

24 25 MR. STRELCHECK: We're thinking about it, I think, the same way, right, and so the actual effort is what ultimately translates out of the stock assessment and into how much bycatch there is, right, and so, if the stock assessment is completed, and effort continues well below 60 percent, then they're going to model effort going forward at some sort of current, more recent levels, right?

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

If the shrimp industry rebounds, going forward, right, then they're going to continue to model it with the presumption that they're not going to hit that 60 percent threshold, and the only way that, to me, this affects, or benefits, red snapper, or our other projected resources, is if we raise that threshold from 60 percent to 80, or 90, percent, or something closer, where the shrimp industry is now, and they have the potential to bump-up against it, which I don't think is your intent.

35 36 37

38

39 40

41

42

MR. SCHIEBLE: My intent is to be able to use the last two to three years' worth of effort, which is significantly reduced, as we saw in the presentation, and it's 87 percent lower than the 2001 to 2003 average that's utilized, right, and so, in the letter that was sent before, it says, should the shrimp effort not be reduced by the outlined percentage in the areas, closures would ensue, and so I think that's the back-up.

43 44 45

46

47

If they don't meet the threshold requirement, then there is simply closures of those areas, right, and so I don't see any negatives to reducing the threshold for the benefit of either Section 7

reinitiation reductions or also the fact that the shrimp industry is not in that area as much as they used to be historically.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I'm looking at Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: The 60 percent threshold is essentially equivalent to a reduction in red snapper fishing mortality for those agezeroes and ones, right, and so changing that through a management action, when the fishery isn't close to that, has no effect. The only effect that would occur is if we changed that threshold and the industry is bumping up against it, and that would result in closures, or result in them triggering that fishing mortality threshold for red snapper, and so I'm questioning the need for it.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: So, to me, it's kind of twofold. If we reduce that threshold, it gives the shrimp industry more access, time-wise, in that depth zone, correct, and they need all the help they can get right now, as far as the amount of access to the fishery, and, second of all, I guess I don't understand then, based on what you're saying, why we even reduced the threshold, back in 2018, from 67 to 60 percent, if it's not a similar situation.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I am going to go to Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, we don't have a second for the motion yet, and I'll willing to do that, but, before I do that, I would like to suggest a friendly amendment, if we put a period after "industry" and delete the time constraint, and, given this discussion, that seems appropriate, to allow sufficient time for the Science Center to respond, and, consequently, the council to act on that information.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I agree. It probably needs at least that much help in the motion.

MR. GILL: In that case, I second the motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. The motion has been seconded. Dr. 39 Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Chris, I'm just trying to wrap my head around this a little bit. So, I mean, your ultimate intent, right, is to use the most recent data to inform the assessment, right, and then it also has implications, like you said, for some other things, but the number-one priority is to get better numbers, right, or more appropriate numbers, into the assessment, and I just want to make sure that's the goal of this.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Yes, and so that report, or I guess the presentation, showed us a reduction in effort for 2021 and 2022, but we don't have 2023 in that report yet, and so my hope would be that we would soon receive the effort update from last year, and I would expect that it would be at least somewhere close to the average of the last two years, and that's a significant drop in shrimp effort. If we're looking at an 87 percent reduction in effort in those areas, to me, that's orders of magnitude different than when we sent this letter back in 2018.

DR. FRAZER: So, I guess a follow-up, right, is, is this letter necessary to prompt the analysts to incorporate the information, or, John, are they already incorporating the most recent information?

DR. WALTER: We will incorporate the most recent information that we have available in the assessment, and I think the assessment is going to go up to 2023, and so presumably it will have effort, if we can get to that, and so it will have the current effort in it as data.

This analysis was a series of projections that changed that effort, and it basically said could we allow more shrimping, with effort, and change what was basically the limit on the amount of shrimping to protect red snapper, and it said, actually, that we could allow for more shrimping, and so that's when that analysis was done, and it's a series of projections to say how much shrimping could you allow, without harming red snapper, and we found that, actually, we could allow more than the original threshold.

 I think the intent here is can we allow further shrimping effort, and raise that amount of allowable fishing days, and still not negatively impact red snapper, and I think that's the intent, as I'm trying to interpret it, and, in that case, it would require having the final model completed, and then run projections with hypothetical shrimp effort, to say how much more could we allow, and then up to the limit that would maintain the SPR for the red snapper, and we could allow that additional shrimp effort, to allow additional opportunities, and I think, if that's how I'm interpreting it, then, yes, that's straightforward, but it would have to be after we finish the actual assessment to do that. Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

47 MR. STRELCHECK: Just briefly, the history behind this is, when we

adopted the rebuilding plan, back in the 2006 and 2007 timeframe, right, we initially set a target reduction on 67 percent for shrimp effort, and that was, I think, supposed to then get reduced down to 60 percent, and we did that. We modified that.

I'm going to vote against the motion, and my preference would be for it to be withdrawn, and that we handle this kind of offline, through some discussions and how it's going to get integrated into the stock assessment, because I think that's truly how it's going to work anyway, and that a letter is not necessary.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Any more discussion on the motion?

 MR. SCHIEBLE: So it seems to me that the letter requesting an analysis would be harmless, because, by the time the assessment gets done, you would simply be taking that information and sending it back to us, right, and so I'm not quite sure why you're requesting the motion be withdrawn, and I don't follow that.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I mean, I don't know how much work it is for 1 percent threshold increments, but you're talking potentially thirty or forty different iterations, right, and why not 5 percent, or 10 percent, and, to me, the bigger issue is, unless we're going to increase from 60 percent to something that is much closer, and commensurate, with the effort levels of the shrimp industry, this has no effect on red snapper.

When you narrow that gap between 60 percent and 87 percent, and they start bumping up against it, that's when it's going to benefit red snapper, and so I'm just not seeing a benefit to actually even doing this analysis, given that the Science Center is going to incorporate the most recent low-effort data, which informs fishing mortality in the assessment, and then it allows us to project that forward, given current effort levels.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I guess my goal with this was not necessarily regarding the red snapper assessment, even though it's interrelated with it, obviously, but the goal was to increase the available access for the shrimp industry to that depth zone, by being able to reduce the threshold of time that they're excluded, considering that the effort in the Gulf is an 87 percent reduction in the last year, and that was my goal with this, but, if this isn't going to work in this form, then I can withdraw the motion,

if that's what we would like to do, and come back with something different for our next meeting, I guess.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Maybe I'm off-base, in terms of my understanding of this, but I don't think we're excluding them at all at this point, because they're well below that effort threshold, right, and so, unless they bump up against it, we're not excluding them, or limiting them, to their access at this stage.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: I am a tad confused, Mr. Chairman. Is the maker of the motion going to withdraw it, or are we still discussing the motion?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I don't think it's been withdrawn yet.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I can withdraw it at this time, and bring it back at our next meeting, if needed.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As seconder, I agree with the withdrawal, but I would like to comment that the analysis, and I don't know if it was updated in 2018 or not, that determined agezero and one mortality on red snapper, due to the shrimp industry, is now eighteen years old, and I understand there's been subsequent research on that subject that have indicated that the mortality is considerably less than that originally estimated, and so that, if that's true, and incorporated in the assessment, then the threshold requirement would not need to be at the level it's at now, and there would be consideration, at that time, to reduce it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: As you can tell, I know way too much about red snapper and the stock assessment, and so I think what you're referring to is already incorporated into the stock assessment, Mr. Gill, and that's work that was done by LGL for looking at density-dependent fishing -- Yes, density-dependent mortality.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Schieble, proceed.

MR. SCHIEBLE: All right, and so, moving on to Remaining Items from Summary of the March 19 through 20, 2024 Shrimp Advisory Panel Meeting, Tab D, Number 4(a), Ms. Bosarge reviewed remaining items

from the March 2024 Shrimp AP meeting, as seen in Tab D, Number 4(a). A committee member concurred with the need for additional educational and marketing efforts towards seafood consumers that would further distinguish differences between Gulf shrimp and imported shrimp. Then we moved to Other Business. Mr. Gill put a request in of a discussion of the certification noncompliance. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, sir, and so I initiated that because the council has received a letter from Laura Picariello, who is on our Shrimp AP, and also a Texas Sea Grant agent, requesting the council take action relative to this issue. She is on the line, and I would ask your permission to have her address it, so that she can do it directly.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Yes, that would be fine, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Laura, are you on the line?

MS. LAURA PICARIELLO: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Laura, hold on one second, please.

MS. PICARIELLO: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you all and discuss this request, and so the shrimp industry, as we've discussed and has come up a couple of times here, you know, has had a lot of economic difficulties, and challenges, and one of the avenues that the industry is pursuing to try to address that is sustainability certifications, which have largely been pushed in the marketplace, and a lot of retailers, and food service entities, now have sustainability policies requiring these in the market, and so the request that has come up here is that, for the Certified Seafood Collaborative Responsible Fisheries Management Certification, which is one of the two certifications being pursued by the industry, carried out an assessment this past year, and there was a nonconformance raised, a noncompliance raised, with one issue that relates to federal management for the fishery, which is in relation to data associated with interactions with sawfish and manta rays.

That's, you know, again, something that has been discussed, and is coming up here pretty regularly in the council forum, and, you know, as we're aware, NOAA is reinitiating the biological opinion, and so, for these types of certifications, if there is something that is management-related associated with a concern, or a noncompliance -- Typically, if a fishery is largely considered sustainable, and there is a positive review of the assessment, but

there's something that is a red flag, like, in this case, the concern over some uncertainty right now related to sawfish or manta ray, and they will raise a nonconformance and allow for a period of time within the certification, or the life of the certification, and so it would be a five-year period to address the concern over data and better understanding of interactions with sawfish and manta rays.

The request, from the industry, in this case, is that, obviously, this is an issue that the industry can't resolve on its own, and that is a management issue that needs to be discussed through NOAA, and the council, and the council being the public forum for the fishery, and industry members, to engage, and to have dialogue on these topics, is requesting that the council acknowledge that there is a noncompliance on this certification, and their willingness to continue to talk to industry related to gathering and making publicly available information associated with interactions with manta rays and sawfish.

This is something that the council, and NOAA, are already doing through the various forums, right, and, for the Shrimp AP, we receive a protected species update at each of our March meetings, and, right now, it's particularly focused on turtle interactions, but, as the biological opinion goes forward, that is also being updated now through this process.

 The request is for the council to acknowledge and be willing to work with the industry, over the course of the next five years of the certification, to request that data through NOAA and to have dialogue, and public conversation, on the data, so that it's publicly available, and it's transparent, and there is dialogue on that data.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Do we have any questions for Ms. Picariello? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask staff to weigh-in on this request and what, if any, action the council should consider taking.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so Mr. Anson and I did discuss this, a little bit, briefly, with Dr. Walter, and I think the approach might be either to have two separate letters, one from the council and one from perhaps SERO and the Science Center, discussing this approach, and the council letter

would say something along the lines of, you know, we're moving forward with a framework action to meet the biological opinion, and the status of that, or trying to have a combined letter, because the council can't be solely responsible for the effort estimates in signing the letter, if that makes sense.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Well, I'm not on terra firma here, but I would like to move that the council prepare a letter to respond to the request for noncertification input in the shrimp industry.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: Laura, thanks for bringing this to our attention. The Science Center also has been requested to provide a letter, and primarily stating what we can, and will, provide to help the applicant meet that nonconformance, which is primarily, as you noted, giving bycatch estimates, as well as effort estimates.

One of the challenges we face in being able to give reliable and precise bycatch estimates for smalltooth sawfish, and giant manta, is that we don't have a new effort data -- An electronic effort collection program in place, and we're -- That is really one of the things that has been longstanding, through this council, in terms of we've been working on that I think since 2020, and I think now we've got a plan in place, and it looks like a timeline for final action being taken, in I think Tab -- It was one of the tabs, where there is actually a timeline, and I think we're going to get to the finish line there.

I think that's going to really be something that, if indeed we can commit to that timeframe, and then then agency can execute the rulemaking and then implementation of it, that I think we'll be able to say, with fairly good confidence, that we can assist the applicant in meeting those conditions.

If we can't get that in place, then I think we're going to only be able to give estimates of bycatch, with probably a fairly low level of confidence, and precision, because, right now, they're fairly rare-event species, and so that means that there's a high uncertainty, and we have to extrapolate to a larger spatial area if we don't have good observer data, and coverage, and good effort coverage.

Getting a new process in place is going to really allow us to move 2 forward, and I really couldn't -- Because, also, the biological opinions are -- While it's ongoing, I couldn't envision a situation 3 where the biological opinion wouldn't say that finer-scale effort, and observer coverage, is going to be a necessary condition of 5 6 meeting that, and I just don't see that not being the case, and 7 that would be supported by having electronic effort collection on 8 vessels with that finer spatial and temporal scale, and so I think 9 that's going to be necessary for the fishery to meet this challenge, and to be able to mitigate these interactions, and so 10 I think having this path forward is going to assist in us writing 11 a letter to say, yes, indeed the council is planning to move 12 forward with this timeline that will meet -- There are certain 13 timelines, in the nonconformance letter, that have to be met by 14 15 the applicant, and I think we'll say that, if indeed that happens 16 at this council, then we can implement this, and we can then 17 support what they need to conform to then get certification. 18 Thanks.

19 20

21

22

23

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Walter. Mr. Gill has a motion on the board. Do we have a second? Mr. Schieble seconded. Thank you. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

242526

MR. SCHIEBLE: Mr. Chair, this concludes the Shrimp Management Committee report.

272829

30

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schieble. We're going to move right into Data Collection. Ms. Boggs, are you ready to go?

313233

MS. BOGGS: Mr. Chair, I wasn't here, and so I'm going to let Ed do the --

34 35

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I'm sorry. I forgot. Mr. Walker.

363738

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

39 40

41

42

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Data Collection Committee report, the committee adopted the agenda and approved the minutes of the January 2024 meeting.

43 44 45

46

47

Discussion on For-hire Data Collection Program, Tab F, Number 4(a) and (b), Discussion of Fisheries Economic Data Collection, council staff provided an overview of metrics typically used to assess economic effects in fisheries management.

Economic effects to the commercial sector include changes in individual fishing quota shares and annual allocation values, exvessel revenues, producer surplus to commercial fishermen, and consumer surplus to seafood-buying consumers. For the recreational sector, metrics include changes in consumer surplus to anglers, changes in for-hire target trips, and associated changes in producer surplus to for-hire operators.

Staff noted that for-hire producer surplus is computed by subtracting variable costs, mainly fuel and labor costs, from revenues. Revenues are determined by trip fees and number of trips.

The committee asked how private angler satisfaction can be measured. Staff stated preference choice experiments are among the approaches used to estimate anglers' satisfaction. Committee members asked why fixed costs are not included in the determination of for-hire producer surplus. Staff indicated that fixed costs, which must be incurred even if trips are not taken, should not be included in trip-level estimates, such as producer surplus.

Dr. Michael Travis, from SERO, discussed the importance of revenue data in fisheries disasters determinations and allocations. Dr. Travis noted that, in the past, disaster determinations were only for commercial fisheries, and losses in other sectors were not considered. However, changes to the Magnuson-Stevens Act, under the Fisheries Resource Disaster Improvement Act, added for-hire captains and fish processors in disaster determinations.

 Dr. Travis compared the outcomes of a scenario based on the old disaster determination approach to another which includes for-hire revenue data. He noted that, for disaster determinations and the allocation of disaster funds, the commercial and for-hire sectors are both better off when the for-hire revenues are included.

Committee members asked whether disaster relief information came from self-reported data or from tax returns. Dr. Travis replied that the agency has never requested tax returns and relies on the states for this information. Dr. Travis noted that an additional administrative burden to NMFS could result if South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico for-hire economic data collection programs differ.

Dr. Liese, from the Southeast Fishery Science Center, gave a presentation on economic data and results in the Southeast for-hire fisheries. He discussed trip-level expenditure surveys, including the MRIP For-Hire Telephone Survey and a 2002 and 2003

costs and earnings add-on to FHTS. He noted that the evaluation of data from the costs and earnings survey concluded that charter fees are vital data and should be collected regularly in a standardized and statistically valid way on a per trip basis. He discussed a 2009 economic survey of the for-hire fishing sector and a 2012 charter price data collection.

Dr. Liese discussed the Southeast Fisheries Science Center's efforts to collect website charter fee data advertised on websites. Since 2002, a stratified sample of permitted commercial vessels report economic data for all logbook trips during a year. In addition, these vessels complete a supplemental annual cost survey collecting fixed costs. Dr. Liese provided an example of the standardized reports that are produced for each segment of interest (SOI). For a given segment of interest, the report provides triplevel and vessel-level information.

Dr. Liese also discussed preliminary results derived from the 2022 SEFHIER logbook data. He discussed pros and cons of data collection options for the for-hire sector, including collecting fees for all trips, a census, or a sample of trips, collecting annual economic data by conducting annual economic surveys, and administering ad-hoc voluntary economic surveys.

He noted that the economic data are not secondary to, or independent of, biological or other fishery data and reemphasized that the single most important economic variable is the charter fee. He indicated that a logbook is the right place to collect charter fee data. If data are collected only for a sample, then it would be efficient to add gallons of fuel, fuel prices, and crew size as a proxy for input prices and quantities.

Committee members stated that charter operators are looking for a minimally burdensome data collection program. The committee noted that a sample would be more desirable than a census. Committee members asked what would constitute an appropriate sample size. Dr. Liese replied that a greater sample size would correspond to tighter confidence levels.

Committee members inquired about the modalities of random sampling with electronic logbooks. Dr. Liese indicated that one option could be the use of a random number generator, and he reiterated that the most important elements to collect are charter trip fees, gallons of fuel used, fuel price, and the number of crew members.

Amendment document: Draft Options, council staff presented a draft document that considers modifications to for-hire vessel reporting

requirements in the Gulf of Mexico and reported that the IPT will continue to develop the introduction section, while the council discusses what elements will be included in the next iteration of the for-hire data collection program.

The committee provided feedback on the background section, purpose and need, and the range of alternatives within each action. Specifically, the committee requested that the IPT work to include considerations for economic data for the next version of the document.

The committee recommends and I so move, to have the IPT explore how to incorporate economic data collection into the amendment. The motion carried with no opposition.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay, and so we have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay. Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Okay, Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For next steps, the IPT will discuss the committee's recommendations on the document and continue development of the background and management actions sections of the document for committee review at a future council meeting. Additionally, future discussions regarding approaches for program validation measures will be required to finalize the amendment. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Walker. We have a question from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I just want to reiterate the last statement of that report, is that we, the council, NMFS, are going to have to come up with some way, that's a happy medium, for validation, and I don't know how that gets incorporated, but we really need to work on that, and I would like to request -- I don't know if it's possible, but can we see this document again at the June council meeting?

DR. LISA HOLLENSEAD: Yes, ma'am. We can bring back a revised version in June.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Based on the discussions of the committee, the public testimony, and my discussions with my fellow for-hire participants, I have a motion that I have submitted to Bernie, I

think, if I could bring it up.

 My motion would be to request that the Southeast Regional Office examine the possibility of randomly sampling economic data from charter-for-hire reporting system participants and report back to the council on the viability of this approach at the next council meeting. If I have a second, I will explain.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a motion on the board, and we have a second by Mr. Broussard, and let's give Mr. Walker --

MR. WALKER: So, essentially, this is just -- A lot of us have been kicking around the idea, and it seems like we have found common ground here, between the economic needs and what the charter guys are willing to, you know, support, and it revolves around this concept of can a random sampling factor be built into the reporting system, and so this is all we're asking for, is to check and see if that can actually be done, because, if it can't -- I would imagine it would, but this is just to explore that, so we can go further if it can indeed be randomly sampled on your tablet, or whatever it may be.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Walker. I do have Andy in line. Andy, did you want to speak to this, or is it something else, and then I know I have Ms. Boggs.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and, I mean, I want to speak to this, and so a friendly amendment request would be just to generalize it to "NMFS", because it involves far more than my office, and then kind of the intent of my motion, which we just passed, was really to kind of get into this and try to figure out more of the details of this, a little more specificity, which I'm fine with.

What I do want to say, and I agree that I think we're probably landing on where we want to head with the preferred, but I still think a reasonable alternative is to consider the economic data be fully collected through the logbook program, and that be an alternative, and so I just wanted to emphasize that for IPT consideration, that that should be part of the range.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Mr. Walker, are you good with this?

MR. WALKER: I'm perfectly fine with that, yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Broussard? Thank you. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, I mean, I don't understand why we need this motion, when we just passed the motion to have the IPT explore how to incorporate economic data collection into the amendment, and I don't disagree, and we heard a lot testimony yesterday that this sounds like this might be, as Andy indicated, a preferred, but I don't want to not look at the other options that might be available, or scenarios to the charter fleet, that might be acceptable as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Next, I have Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: I think my question goes to Andy. I'm kind of still iffy on some of the mechanics for the economic data. I can tell you, from some of the business models we have, the captain can't answer all the economic questions that you're talking about, and they're really just running the vessel, and so are we talking about putting these economic questions at the trip or daily level, or kind of having, even through the logbook, like a separate mechanism to push out to the person that knows that information? For example, we fill our boat up, but the captain doesn't know what we paid for gas, and if maybe you can give me some clarification on that.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I've heard those similar concerns shared, and so I don't want to speak for Captain Walker, but I guess my interpretation would be trip-level, as part of the electronic system, some sort of random selection of trips that would be occurring.

MR. WALKER: To that?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: To that.

MR. WALKER: So the price, we've been told by the economists, is the most important factor here, and, in previous SEFHIER systems, we did -- The captain of the boat, or whoever was entering the tablet, was aware of those economic numbers, and, again, this is just to examine if it's feasible to randomly sample whatever those factors may be, whether it's just -- That will be -- I know they're a negotiation, the way I see it, and, you know, this doesn't mean that twenty questions is going to be okay, but this is just, before we even get into the questions or anything, can this technically be done, with the hardware available, is really all I'm looking for exploration on here.

 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Next, I have Dr. Sweetman and then Ms. Boggs.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to Susan's point, I don't think this precludes investigation of other avenues to incorporate economic data, and I think this is just looking at a little bit of specificity for this particular issue, based on Captain Walker's feedback, and others in the for-hire sector, and I think the commercial -- I think we talked about, in committee, that the commercial sector is 20 percent randomly sampled, along those lines, and I feel like that's kind of the way that Ed is trying to approach this here, in order to just to investigate this at a broad scale, to see if it's feasible, but, again, to your point, Susan, I don't think this precludes other options from being investigated.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Next, I have Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I agree, and I just don't want to get honed-in on this and that be all we do, but, to Dr. Banks' question, the way this was set up initially, and I'm assuming -- This obligation comes down to the permit holder, okay, and so, whether you're the owner of the vessel, the captain of the vessel, but, if you own that permit, this will be your obligation to report, and so an example, for us, is it comes to me, and I do the reporting.

They send me a text that this is what we caught, and this is what we did, and so it's my responsibility to have that price for fuel and most things, and I've said this before, and I would greatly think that Captain Walker would agree with me, but most captains don't leave the port unless they know what their costs is, because they need to know how far they can run, where they can go fish, and they have to be efficient with that.

I don't want us to get hung up on that, because, like I said, it ultimately is the permit holder's responsibility for this, and so that permit holder is either going to have to provide that information to that captain or they're going to have to fill out the report themselves, and so I don't think that's a hang-up.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: So just to follow-up with that, and I'm not suggesting it's necessarily a hang-up, but what I'm asking is then, as the permit holder, because I don't have a captain's license, and I'm not running the vessel, and I do the same thing you do, and I fill out those reports when they need to be, but I'm saying maybe this

doesn't need to be at the trip or daily level, and gas doesn't change from morning to afternoon that often.

Maybe -- Well, how often are you filling your boat up, Susan? I'm filling it up maybe every other day, but so my morning gas costs, and my afternoon gas costs, didn't change. I filled the boat up, and so I'm just saying maybe that needs to go to the permit holder, but not be where the captain is reporting the catch, and streamline the process of us having to reach out and say, okay, gas changed five-cents, and here you go, and you've got to fill that out. Let them do the catch and effort, which I think was the intended purpose of SEFHIER, and the economic data got added on, and so I'm saying maybe streamline the economic data, where it's not in the actual report that's happening at the trip or day level, but put it in the logbook somehow, as maybe, okay, this week, you need to go through and summarize.

 You're right that you do need to know what your gas costs, but, if my customers aren't catching fish, I'm going to run further, and so we're not looking at necessarily I saved fifty dollars here, because I didn't go ten extra miles or whatever. Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I certainly understand Captain Walker's intent with this motion, and I think, to broaden this, and kind of to what Susan is getting at, we would want to look at this in a number of ways.

I am, of course, thinking of it from the standpoint of what's the most efficient, and effective, way that we can collect this data, what's going to create the most buy-in for the industry, what presents administrative burdens, and so bringing information like that back to the council, to me, will be helpful, and informative, as we narrow the scope of actions and alternatives for this.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Dr. Banks, you are right. The intent of this process, six or seven or eight years ago now, and I've lost count of how long we've been working on SEFHIER, was catch and effort, and the program did get derailed, or not derailed, but a lot of angst came when it was changed after it left this council's hands, and it added the economic data, and so, yes, if we go to -- If a random-sampling-type data collection is what this council ultimately decides, then, yes, it would be reported, but I would like to think it would be reported not on a monthly basis, but maybe a weekly

basis, because the intent also of this is that information is necessary for NMFS, and I don't see how, and maybe this is the question, and I don't mean to get off-track, but, you know, Andy, does that dataset really have anything to do with the catch and effort, which is what ultimately the charter-for-hire fishermen are looking to get to?

My point being is you can look at catch and effort on a daily basis, because I do think you need daily reporting, so it's realtime data collection, but how important, Andy, is that economic data going to affect the catch and effort? Do you understand what I'm asking? I mean, we've got two different parts here, the catch and effort, which is important, and we need to see what we're catching, how much effort is there.

I understand why the economic portion of it is important, but getting that real-time catch and effort seems like the most important, at least for the charter-for-hire fleet, in being able to determine seasons, lengths of seasons, those types of things.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MS. WALKER: I agree with Ms. Boggs, but that's not what the motion on the board is about. My intent, with the motion, is just to examine if this is possible to do, if we can randomly sample electronically, and nothing more. You know, it's not identifying any of what percentage that would be, or what those questions or would be or anything, and it's just to see if we can actually do this, and so I'm trying to take a small step forward, rather than wait another three months before we agree to even examine this, and so nothing more than can it be done, and then we can talk about it from there.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay, and so we're going to let Mr. Strelcheck speak to this, and then we're going to vote.

MR. STRELCHECK: Not specific to the motion, but, you know, this all comes back to what are our goals and objectives for collecting the logbook data, and, in my view, our goals, and our objectives, are all over the map, depending on who we talk to around the table right now, and the focus is really reducing the burden on industry, and creating buy-in, and less so on some of the other things that may be beneficial to the industry, like providing the adequate data for disaster assistance or improvements in the economic and social data that goes into our management plan actions and amendments, but I think we need to navigate that, and discuss that further, and I agree, and I think we should just vote this up or

down at this point, but I'm supportive of the motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Okay. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Based on Andy's comments just then, can we briefly look at the purpose and need statements again for this document?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Bernie, could you pull up the purpose and need for us, please? Okay. There is the purpose and need, as requested by Ms. Boggs. Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, as it currently reads, we have basically two purposes here, and I don't know if we can look at -- I am not asking to split the document, but that kind of goes back to the question that I just asked, Andy. You've got your first purpose, which is to improve accuracy, precision, and timeliness of landings, discards, and fishing effort, and then you have to collect social and economic information related to the operation of federally-permitted for-hire vessels, and so we've got two things going on here, two moving parts, and so that's why I'm asking the question of is the catch and effort --

I know they tie together, but do they have to run alongside, meaning can you do catch and -- Obviously, that's something we're going to explore, is you can do your catch and effort on a daily basis, if you will, and I'm not saying that's how it's going to end up, and you can do your random social and economic questions monthly, 20 percent, however that lands, but can that not still help us derive to season lengths, et cetera, for the species, through the catch and effort? I don't know if I'm being clear, but I know how, at the end, they've got to come together, for disaster and things like that.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: So I think the simple answer is yes, and it's really more of the mechanics of how it would work, and, if you're going to do a subsample, you have to expand that out, or have, you know, representation of the industry, and then it does kind of get back to -- We're very generic with the second purpose, right, to collect social and economic information, and, you know, why? Why is that important, and, you know, what is our objectives for collecting that information, and so I think we probably need to think about, and not today, and maybe come back to that in June, as we kind of continue to discuss the importance of this data, why

we're using it, and ultimately what our goals are in collecting it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: I don't know if now is the time to also have this conversation, or if maybe having some time in June might be better, but, while we're fleshing out some of the details that we've started discussing in this document, can we have a discussion about the validation methods? I'm still kind of uncertain about what we're going to be doing, and, since the VMS was a contingent in the lawsuit, I would like to have a little more discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So thank you, Dr. Banks, because I was going to make a motion that staff bring back some validation options to the council in June, and one may include VMS, but what are some other alternatives that we would have for validation, and then we can have that conversation with NMFS, start that conversation of what would be acceptable and what would not, and so do I need to make it in a more formal motion, Bernie?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: I want to let her get her wordsmithing going, but I will likely support that. I don't know which way I lean on validation just yet, but I would like to have that discussion, and I think that would be very important, and so thank you.

MS. BOGGS: To request staff bring back options for validation at the June council meeting. I don't exactly know what it needs to say, if staff wants to help me with that, or is that enough information?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Go ahead, Dr. Froeschke.

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: I guess what would be helpful, to me, is what are the bookends? What is the most complicated thing you would be willing to entertain, and what's the most simplistic thing? I mean --

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: For discussion, to request staff bring back options ranging from VMS to geofencing for consideration of validation. I don't know what falls in between there, and I don't want to limit,

but I think that's pretty broad, and it's to the most extreme to maybe not as extreme.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Go ahead, John.

DR. FROESCHKE: Well, I guess, just in terms of bookends, the simplest thing is you would do nothing, and then you would just - You know, you would be asked to fill out something, and, if you get intercepted, that would be the means of validation. Then there might be something where you hail-out, but there is no GPS tracking component, and then you would still validate by the port samplers, or whomever, and then there would be something perhaps with a hail-out and a geofence, and then there would be something with a VMS and the whole thing, and that's like something that I envisioned in my head, and others may have different ideas.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: If you will entertain a friendly -- I don't know that it's a substitution, but wordsmithing, and, if we say to request that staff bring back options to include the following, and then we can list a few, but not exclude anything else that may come up, and then we can include VMS, geofencing, boots-on-the-ground, whatever else anybody -- But just set up a list.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I think Mr. Walker was next.

MR. WALKER: So I don't disagree with the motion, and the "VMS" just blinked on and off, and I was going to say the one part -- You know, the biggest reason we're talking about this is VMS, and we lost in court, and the industry hates it, and we have feedback from the advisory panel on this that we have adopted as a range of options to look at, and, if I'm remembering it right, VMS is not one of them, and I support that. VMS has left the list, in my opinion, for numerous reasons.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Walker. Dr. Hollensead.

DR. HOLLENSEAD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just going to -- To what Captain Walker was talking about, the ad hoc AP, for validation, in their motion that they passed, gave some suggestions that they would be interested in exploring, and so they have explore trip validation options, such as effort validation button, and so that would be a button which would capture GPS coordinates of the device, and this would be required to be hit by the captain after your declaration. Then a before-trip report, and so, while seaward of a demarcation line, or some sort of georeference option,

depending on what's available, and so those are some of the things that they mentioned that they would be willing to sort of entertain, and so that's a potential starting place, and so we do have that information to go through.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Froeschke, your hand was up? No? Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: Well then can I make another friendly addition and say we add that list to this motion, those options, to start with?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, maybe to make it not so clunky, and I don't know if we have to do that, Dr. Banks, but just to request staff review -- What I'm trying to say is take the ad hoc AP's recommendations as a starting point, and I think we have to include VMS, and I know it was the contention of the lawsuit, and -- But it could be that we look at it where it's not pinging every hour, and it's -- I don't know what some of the options would be, and that's the whole point of this, is to get a suite of options, because I don't know what all options are available out there, and so I don't want to tie ourselves to something, but, if you want to just say to bring back a suite of options to include those that were recommended by the Ad Hoc Data Collection Advisory Panel, and is that enough information?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I guess I was thinking the IPT would be working on this, and bringing some of this information back to the council, and I was unsure if some of this could be worked out by the June council meeting, and I think some of the geofencing, and some of the other mechanisms that were proposed, might take a bit more time to really think through, and so what I've asked Dr. Hollensead to do is to see if we have already passed this motion from the ad hoc AP for consideration, and so she's confirming that we have not. Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Hollensead.

DR. HOLLENSEAD: You heard from Dr. Simmons already, but one thing I did want to just -- A little nuance to the conversation is, in the previous motion passed, as far as the council meeting, there was the motion to recommend the council not require the twenty-four-hour tracking, and so that was also encapsulated in that

motion for the last time, and so I just wanted to bring that up again.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you for that. I have Mr. Strelcheck and then Ms. Boggs.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think we're getting to a better-written motion here, and so I would agree with this, right, as long as it's not limiting to the recommendations of the ad hoc AP. I was actually going to raise similar questions, and so I'm glad we're talking about this, and I hear Carrie loud and clear, in terms of what maybe we can or can't bring back in June, but I think this is really important for us to discuss, and so, even if we have just preliminary information to some of the options, it would be worth discussing those at the June council meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Ms. Boggs and then Ms. Levy.

MS. BOGGS: I'm good.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Just could we make clear that this is related to the topic of validation, because now it's just -- Like it doesn't indicate what you're actually looking at, in terms of the suite of options.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you for that clarification. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I'm sorry, Mara, and I was reading it. Yes, and to request -- Validation measures, suite of validation measures, or just options, and is that good enough, Lisa? Dr. Hollensead? Okay. I don't think charter-for-hire needs to be in there, and I thought it was just the Ad Hoc Data Collection AP.

DR. HOLLENSEAD: It's charter-for-hire.

38 MS. BOGGS: It is charter-for-hire? Okay, and so that's my motion, 39 if the seconder is okay with it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I believe it was Dr. Banks, and were you the seconder? Are you good with this?

44 DR. BANKS: Yes, sir.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Is there any more discussion on the motion? Not seeing any more discussion, is there any opposition

to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. concludes Data Collection. Let's take a break, a fifteen-minute break, and come back at 10:20.

3 4 5

2

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

6 7

8 9 10 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: All right. Welcome back. We're going to go into Reef Fish, and Dr. Frazer is going to walk us through that.

REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

11 12

13

14

15

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Reef Fish Committee report, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab B, Number 1, after adding an item under Other Business to discuss Reef Fish Amendment The minutes, Tab B, Number 2, from the January 2024 meeting were approved as written.

16 17 18

19

20

21

Review of Reef Fish and Individual Fishing Quota Program Landings, Tab B, Number 4, Southeast Regional Office staff reviewed the status of reef fish, for-hire red snapper, and individual fishing quota program landings relative to catch limits, with preliminary data through 2023.

22 23 24

25

26 27 SERO noted that recreational harvest of greater amberjack would reopen on May 1, 2024, due to the recreational annual catch limit not being landed in the fall 2023 season, and the Framework Action that will modify the recreational fishing season to be open September 1 through October is not yet effective.

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

35

A committee member asked whether the precision of quota monitoring for the for-hire component merited revisiting the buffer between the component's ACL and its annual catch target, or ACT. expressed confidence in its ability to predict the for-hire red snapper season and suggested revisiting that buffer in conjunction with revising catch advice for red snapper after the next planned stock assessment.

36 37 38

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Diaz.

39 40

41

42

43

44

MR. DIAZ: Thank you. Bernie, I sent a motion over to you for the charter boat ACT, and could you pull that up, please? point, I would like to make a motion, and my motion would be to request staff to develop a document to adjust the annual catch target for the federal water charter-for-hire red snapper sector, and, if I get a second, I will give some rationale.

45 46 47

MR. SCOTT BANNON: Second.

1 2

MR. DIAZ: Okay, and so, looking at the information that was presented to us on the landings, right now, the ACT for the charter-for-hire sector is 9 percent, and so they can fish up to 91 percent of their ACL. This year, they fished up to 91 percent, and we shut them down, and it was the right thing to do, but that leaves about 287,000 pounds of fish uncaught for that sector, and, from the conversations we had earlier, during committee, I think SERO, and their staff, are doing a very good job at doing these projections.

Since we've implemented Amendment 50, and we've got these sectors separated, where the charter boats are fishing on their own sector, they haven't even come close to going over, not even one time, and, as a matter of a fact, most times, they've been towards the lower end of their ACT.

I asked Ryan, on a break yesterday, if he could just look at the ACT Control Rule and see if it would be possible to tighten up their ACT a little bit, and Ryan can correct me if I'm wrong, but he ran that through his calculations, and it looks like we could adjust their ACT, according to our control rule, down to a 5 percent buffer, and so, anyway, I think we can try to get these guys to where they can catch a few more of their fish, based on the good job that SERO is doing with their projections and the way this is being prosecuted so far, and so that is my rationale.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Diaz. Do we have any discussion? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, I will certainly support this motion, and, when this motion passes, I think I will make another motion, and then they can maybe be combined, but I don't want to disrupt this motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I support the motion as well. What we're talking about is the buffer here, and, if it's too high, which it may be, and they're staying within their ACL and ACT, then I think they should be able to catch a little more, if they're not going to overfish it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

46 MR. STRELCHECK: I support the motion, and Dale beat me to the punch, because I had a motion teed-up that not only talks about

the charter-for-hire ACT buffer, but modifications potentially to the season structure, as well as looking at the private sector accountability measures, and so we can capture those maybe in a subsequent motion, but the intent would be that those could all fall under one document.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Diaz, did you want to speak to that?

MR. DIAZ: No, but I did want to get in line and speak whenever my turn comes back up.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Gill.

 MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also support the motion, but note that the 4 percent, just to set the expectation level, for those that are here and listening, is probably not a heck of a lot of fish, right, and it's not going to have a significant influence, in terms of seasons and things like that, but, you know, I support the intent of the motion, and thank you, Dale, for offering it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I can recall when we worked on this a while back, and we had a buffer of 20 percent, and we dropped it down to 9 percent, the current buffer now, and I thought 20 percent was sort of extreme at the time, and 9 I think is still probably excessive as well, and so I would support this, also. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schieble. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I would ask staff, whenever they develop the document, to also include, in the suite of motions, to have whatever the ACT Control Rule indicates, which I think will be 5 percent, but I would also like to see an option in there that we don't even have an ACT on this sector.

It's my understanding that, if there was an overage in this sector, there would be no payback, and I think that's a viable at least alternative to consider, and anything else in between that you all think is appropriate to have us consider would be things that I would like to see, and so the last -- I do want to speak to the timing of the document, but I don't want to do that until if the motion passes. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Rindone, to that?

 MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Diaz, I think what we can do, for the zero percent option, is we can have like a sub-option, or the zero percent alternative, is we can have option under there for something like, you know, if there is an overage, then to have a payback in the following year, if that's something that you guys ultimately think should be applied, and, if you don't, then you would just flick that off, but we could at least have that discussion about that.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you. I have Ms. Boggs. Mr. Bannon.

MR. BANNON: I'm going to be in support of the motion, and I think Andy, and Susan, are kind of going to be on the same page with looking at some kind of season adjustment, because, like Mr. Schieble said, you know, the 20 percent was way too much, and 9 percent is obviously a little too high, and they should get the opportunity to fish the fish that they've been allocated, and, you know, Andy, and his folks, have done a good job of predicting that season. The challenge is it gets to the part where the season doesn't work for them, and so you may not catch those fish, and so I'm going to be in support of this, and most likely in support of the next motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So exactly, and I was going to go down the road that Andy is going, because, as we reduce the buffers, and we get more fish to catch, if you will, and then we run out of time to catch the fish, and then it's like, well, you're not catching your fish. Well, we're not given the opportunity to catch those fish, because we're hamstrung to that June 1 opening date, and, Mr. Gill, I do agree that it's not a lot of fish, but it's kind of like the same thing with the IFQ system. You may start with a little, but, as you get increases in quota, that fish grows, and so why not have it there to start growing in the future? I will support this motion, and I suspect I will support Andy's motion coming up behind that. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I am definitely in support of this motion, and one thing that Ms. Boggs just mentioned is I would love to see, somewhere down the way, and I'm not ready to word it right now, with this motion, but I would like to see something done to where we can change that start date of 1 June, that it can maybe be earlier than that, if we chose to or, you know, whatever, because

we aren't missing a lot.

1 2 3

I mean, if it's nothing but a week, and, you know, when a lot of places open up on Memorial Day Weekend, and, if you had it to where charter can go that Memorial Day Weekend, it would sure help a whole lot, because it would be a situation to where a lot of our fishermen can be able to get out, and there's a lot of people that would like to fish during that time, and so that's something -- I don't want to muddy this up, but that's something that I would like to look at in the future.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, General Spraggins. Is there any more conversation on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: The second thing that I said I wanted to address was timing, and our process takes a long time for things to happen, and I think this could be a framework amendment, which we can generally do pretty quick, and my druthers would be that we try to attack this thing in a way where it could impact the 2025 season, and so anything that the staff could do to try to get this to where it can impact the 2025 season, and, in my mind, it doesn't have to pass by January 1, and Andy could speak to this, but I would think, if this thing passes before they finish their season in 2025, I would think we could implement it, but Andy could speak to that, and see if that's possible or not, but I'm not going to put that in the form of a motion, and I'm just going to put that in the form of a request. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you for those comments. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think you're correct, Dale, and so, with your timing -- I mean, I might affect your timing, because I would like to add a few actions to this document, but let me offer my motion, and then we can have some discussion. This is going to be different than the one that I sent you, Bernie, and so I'll just verbally tell it.

The motion is to request staff develop a document to adjust the for-hire red snapper season and private red snapper accountability measures. If I get a second, I will explain my motion.

MS. BOGGS: Second.

47 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a second by Ms. Boggs.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8 9 MR. STRELCHECK: Originally, I was thinking about this as adjusting the start date of the red snapper season, and I'm trying to be intentionally a little bit more vague, because we heard some testimony yesterday about the benefits of moving the season up, and that would probably help the eastern Gulf, whereas a later season helps the western Gulf, and so I think that gives us some flexibility to decide what might be in the best interests Gulfwide for the for-hire community, and we could get some input on that.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

The second component, with regard to the private recreational red snapper accountability measures, is we had set in place state-bystate AMs, and overages that have to be paid back by each state, and the suggestion has been made, and I think it's at least worth considering, if the private ACL is not exceeded, right, whether or not states would have to pay back their individual overages, right, and so I think there's some benefits and risks to doing that approach, but I think it's at least worth discussing, exploring, at the council level, if the overall ACL for private is not being exceeded.

21 22 23

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Geeslin.

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

MR. GEESLIN: Andy, as we've kind of thought about this a little more, I'm certainly supportive of that, with the caveat that the fishery is not undergoing overfishing, and I think the states are doing a great job keeping up with their catch through the season, and the post-season adjustments, as necessary, and I think, collectively, we can pull this off, and I certainly support the motion.

31 32 33

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Ms. Boggs.

34 35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43 44

45

46

47

Andy is correct, and we heard some testimony, MS. BOGGS: yesterday, about how to adjust the for-hire season. I know the Alabama Charter Fishing Association actually does not support this, and the reason is their concern of overfishing, and they don't want to do anything that could potentially jeopardize their season, and I just wanted to make their hesitancy known, but I think, as Dale pointed out, you know, if we go to the 5 percent buffer, and the management that has been going on for the last four or five years has seemed to work, and I think we're not at great risk of doing that, but you're right, Andy, there's people here there and everywhere, and so, how the council gets to this, I don't know, but I think it's a good start that we start having a discussion, and I appreciate the motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Banks.

2 3 4

5 6

DR. BANKS: Thank you. I just wanted to echo what Ms. Boggs just I appreciate the motion, Andy, and the flexibility and consideration to the differences between the eastern and the western Gulf, and so thank you.

7 8 9

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Diaz.

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MR. DIAZ: I speak in favor of the motion that Mr. Strelcheck has put forward. I believe Mr. Strelcheck's intention is for all of this to be in one document, and that would be my only concern. If it slows down enough where we can't help the charter fishermen for the next year, it might be better to do two documents, but I will the council staff and everybody figure that stuff out, but, as far as the private recreational red snapper accountability measures, I think we need to realize the world has changed.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24

We implemented Amendment 50, and the snapper stock was in a different condition than it is today, based on the last assessment, and there is not paybacks for other sectors at this point, and so I think it's a good thing for us to have that discussion, and I look forward to discussing that, whenever we bring this document forward, if it passes. Thank you.

25 26 27

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Frazer.

28 29

30

31

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I'm not sure -- If the intention is to put these actions in the same document, I think it might in fact slow it down, but, like Dale, I will just leave it to staff to kind of figure that out.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

I do think that Andy's motion is well intended, but I think there's a lot of complexity in there, as Susan pointed out, with regard to the for-hire season, and I'm happy to look at a document that, you know, contemplates the accountability measures, but I'm pretty principled, you know, in my approach here, and there's a reason that we did Amendment 50 the way that we did, and delegated that authority to the states, with those payback provisions, to make sure, right, that they are encouraged with compliance, and, to me, that's super important, given some of the issues that we have in the rec fishery right now, and so I'll -- You know, I would like to see what comes out of there, but I will be pretty skeptical if I would support that in the long run.

45 46 47

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I have a comment and The comment would be that, given the desire for then a question. the previous motion, for that to move along as quickly as is reasonably possible, and the seeming less-contentious nature of trying to address the for-hire season, would it be something you guys would want to consider to like perhaps do those two things as a framework and then separately address the accountability measures?

9 10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Would that be something that you would want to consider, because, from a timing standpoint, it seems like -- Just from the discussions, it seems like there's some disagreement about what to do with the accountability measures, but, for the other two things, it seems like you guys are all pretty well aligned on, you know, what you ultimately would like to do, and so I'm confident that the first two things could move along quickly. Then I have a question about the seasons, once you guys have some discussion.

18 19 20

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck, to that point?

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

MR. STRELCHECK: To that point, I agree with you, Ryan, and I think this is where we would need some staff input. My concern, right, is, if we're going to reduce the buffer, and we've gotten to the point where we're estimating the season really well, we're just continuing to push from June 1 deeper into the fall, right, and so that will even be further extended if we adjust the buffer, and so it would ideally be good if we could make some changes, at the same time, to the season structure, so that both of those get implemented at once.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

MR. RINDONE: So, Mr. Chair, my question, to that, would be like what kinds of options would you be wanting us to look at? Like is there -- For instance, is there like a certain point in the year where you really don't need the for-hire season to go beyond that point, and so, when we're looking at season projections, we could basically do it in reverse.

37 38 39

40

41

42

43 44

45 46

47

Like we don't want to go beyond this point, and so how much further towards the start of the year can things go, and so, you know, maybe that pushes until like May 15, May 1, you know, whatever it might be, but we could use some sort of fixed end date, like, arbitrarily, like August 1, and I don't know if that's what you guys would want or not, but let's say that it was August 1, and then we -- You know, the season starts forward from that. Is there like a start date more than you want an end date? Like these are the kinds of the things that we would really need to be able to move this along quickly.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I have a list. Mr. Bannon.

 MR. BANNON: I just wanted to address Tom's comment, and I agree with be very, very careful about how the states manage their current amount that they're allotted, and that we -- I'm speaking as Alabama's state regulator, that we're still going to push to that target. We're going to try and be very accurate, and that's very important, because, again, we have to show people that we're being accountable, and everyone wants that, and so I want to give you the assurance, from Alabama, that that's going to be our goal.

When you look at overages, they're usually single-digit, you know, like 1 percent, or half-a-percent, over, and so that's the consideration. I'm going to pick on my friends here in Louisiana, and, you know, they've had a really long season, and they ended up closing, and they had some residual left over, and so, when you look at across the Gulf, you're not going into -- You're not exceeding the ACL for that recreational sector, and so should another state be penalized, and, again, it's a few thousand pounds, but, for Mississippi, a few thousand pounds is a lot for them, and it's a lot for us, and so I think -- I just wanted to give you the assurance, from Alabama, that we are going to always push that target, and our goal will not be to exceed that, but it just gives us a little bit of comfort, and the same thing with the concern that someone mentioned for the charter fleet of overfishing, but, if you've already said that you can fish this much, and the stock is fine, then they should get the opportunity to fish that.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bannon. Next, I have Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I agree exactly with those statements, and those are in line with what I said, or had planned to say, and I don't usually try and speak for those charter guys in my region entirely, but I think I could say that, in our part of our Florida anyway, our charter guys would like as many days as NMFS says they can fish without overfishing.

I have heard some folks from other regions say they're concerned their season is getting too long, but I think I could comfortably say that the guys in west Florida would like to be able to catch as many fish as NMFS says they can without overfishing.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Walker. Mr. Diaz and then Ms. Boggs.

MR. DIAZ: This kind of speaks to what Ryan was asking about, and what doesn't work well is, by the time we get the wave information off of the charter boat season, we're usually into late August, during that roundabout time, and, if we try to set an -- If we've got some leftover fish, and we try to set a season later in the year, with all the time constraints of getting that done, that is something that I think has not worked really well.

I'm not going to give input on the date, but, to me, the further we could get up into Wave 3, I think the better off we are to not have that problem of getting the information late in August, but anything you all can do to try alleviate that situation is where I think we should be trying to go, and I'm not going to speculate on what date that should start. Other folks can do that. Thank you.

MR. RINDONE: Okay, and we'll just -- When we're doing it, we'll come up with some start date ideas, and we'll see how deep they run into August, and, if something is pushing into September, then we'll use that as -- You know, we don't want to go with September as our absolute, and so we'll look at start dates for like, you know, May 15, May 1, April 15, and see how those -- We'll use those as starting points for the analysis, as to how that forecasts.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Moving on, Ms. Boggs, or Andy next.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, for the sake of complicating things, because we're good at that, and I think part of my frustration is we need to more thoughtful, and innovative, in terms of flexibility, right, and so just moving the start date up was not my intent, right, and I agree that there is certainly reasons why we don't want it to go too far in the fall, because of weather and things like that, but what about spring break, and what about the, you know, Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays, and should we thinking about that for the for-hire sector? Are those times of year that they want to potentially be fishing? I just encourage us not to limit our thinking, and the easiest is to start the season at a date certain, and run it until it closes, but it doesn't have to be that way.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: There's this thing out there called Amendment 42, and did I say that already? Okay, and so remember, back in the day, anybody here at the table, when it opened on April 21 and went to October 31? You know, you could explore that. I would certainly consider looking maybe into the April dates, April 21, like we

used to do, and I don't know that if helps Texas or not, because you all need it more in the fall, and so, you know -- I'm not trying to exclude Texas, and this is just kind of what came off the top of my head, was like April 21, like we used to do, and we could look at May 15, the Friday before Memorial Day, and then close it by August 15, because that's typically when the schools go back, and no one is there fishing, but I do agree with what Andy just said, and I am sensitive to other parts of the Gulf, and not necessarily just Texas, but, you know, south Florida and different areas.

As Andy says, we've got to get creative, and I don't know how we do that. You know, I just -- I just wanted to throw some ideas out there, because you all asked, but we do need to be cognizant, and, it sounds like, really, Texas would be the most affected by something, if you constrain it to the May, June, July timeframe, and maybe they need August, September, October.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay, Ms. Boggs. Thank you for those comments. I have General Spraggins next. Then Dr. Banks.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: You know, God forbid that we open our eyes and look outside the box, but, you know, is there some law that I just don't understand that we couldn't set more than -- You know, that, if Texas wanted to open theirs later, and then close later, just like we do with our states, and, you know, each one of states does that, and is there any reason why we cannot do that for the federal too, and then that would work better for every state, to be able to figure out when it's working, and, Andy, is that possible?

MR. STRELCHECK: Right now, we have a federal for-hire ACL that is specified Gulf-wide, right, and so, if you set up different season structures, you have the potential to hit that ACL before maybe a fishery gets a chance to fish, or maybe it's in-season, and so you could affect one relative to the other, and so what, conceptually, I think you're discussing would have to require separation of the for-hire catch limit, by state or by region, in order to allow them to fish on portions of the quota.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Dr. Banks.

DR. BANKS: You can take my name off the list. That was going to be my question, General Spraggins.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Any other conversation? Mr. Rindone.

47 MR. RINDONE: Just a note that, you know, the additional layers of

complexity that you guys add to how to address the season may also increase the amount of time it takes to develop the document, just by a function of you guys having to debate ultimately what it is that you want to prefer, and so if we're combining the changing the buffer and the season, ultimately.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Rindone. Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: Sorry, J.D., and I realize that I already raised my hand, but so -- I think we've talked about this before, or I've mentioned it before, and this is just a scenario, and I don't know what staff could do with it, or if the council would even entertain it, but, like I said before, if you opened a week in January, a week in February, and a week in March, we would get -- Then you opened maybe June and July, and you closed it for August and September, and then you reopened in October.

That way, each section that -- You're still fishing the ACL, different areas of the Gulf, or you just pick June, July, and October, and, I mean, I don't know, because I understand it's complicated, Andy, and we can't -- I don't want to see us start divvying up quotas, because that's where the states got kind of tied up, is who gets what, and how much, and they ultimately got to where everybody was somewhat happy, and so can we look at ideas like that?

 Like I said, maybe you look at a June and July opening, and then I don't know what the answer is, but are those some of the kinds of things that could be explored, in your mind, Andy, that would be manageable?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I'm just saying let's think outside the box here, and not just have kind of a fixed season that runs from a date certain to whenever we project it to be closed, and those options might not float to the top of the list as preferred, but we've at least explored them.

The hard part, obviously, is, when you start opening up times of year when fishing hasn't been occurring for quite some time, it's harder to project, and determine, what might be caught during those times, but that shouldn't be a limitation for us.

The other thing that I will quickly mention, because, obviously, the complexity of this action is growing as we speak, is, if we want the ACT buffer, as Dale mentioned, to move quickly, we might

want to consider a shorter-term, more simple approach, in terms of adjusting the season for 2025, you know, until we can come up with a longer-term approach that might look at some more iterations, and complexities, of the season structure, and so I just throw that out there.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Ms. Boggs, to that?

MS. BOGGS: Right, and so one of the things that I would suggest is, when you consider the opening dates, because we do it for other species, is if you could just bring it back to a January 1 start date, or a -- Well, I guess the fishing year, right now, Andy, is January 1 through December 31, but we have a hard start date of June 1, and so, if we could just eliminate that, and then that would give some flexibility, because, if you go, in this document, and you move it to May 15, as the seasons continue to get longer, it just gives flexibility, and it doesn't mean that you open on January 1, but it would give this council the flexibility, as these seasons get longer, and as we have to adjust for different areas of the Gulf, and you're not coming back to this process and having to change that start date again, and that's just a suggestion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay, and so I have Mr. Schieble and Mr. Walker, and then we're going to wrap this up and vote this up or down.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wasn't really going to make a comment on this, because I think talking about hashing out details at this point -- This doesn't seem like a good discussion until we have a document in front of us. I understand that we're trying to line certain things up, to make sure they're in the document, and my only suggestion is that we hear, from our federal for-hire fleet, a lot of times, that the state charters are able to get out there and access the fishery before them, and they don't like that sometimes, because they get the first opportunity, I guess, is the way they look at it, but, also, I would like to say that we consider access concurrently with other fisheries that are open.

If amberjack season, for example, is open in September and October, we don't want to preclude the ability for the federal for-hire fleet to be able to catch snapper and amberjack on the same trips for their customers, right, and so just things like that need to be put in consideration. Finally, for the second part of this, I will say that I'm having déjà vu of the state management discussions we had back in 2018, with incorporating the federal

for-hire fleet within state management or not.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you for those comments. Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: So there's -- We could go round-and-round on all of these things that might be in this document, and I could talk to half-a-dozen right now, but the motion that's on the board I support, and I think we would talk about that after we approve the motion to talk about these things, and what they might be, and so I speak in favor of the motion and nothing else at this time.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Walker, and it reminds me of some of the things that Chris touched on too, is, in my mind, my opinion is some of these charter boats would probably prefer to be under some sort of state management. That way, the state can regulate their seasons, as the weather changes across the Gulf, but, anyway, moving on, we're going to vote this up or down. We're going to use our clickers for this one.

Before we vote, we will read the motion into the record. The motion is request staff develop a document to adjust the for-hire red snapper season and private recreational red snapper accountability measures.

| First Name | Last Name | | | |
|------------------|------------|----------|--------|---------|
| Scott | Bannon | Yes | | |
| Susan | Boggs | | No | |
| Billy | Broussard | Yes | | |
| Dale | Diaz | Yes | | |
| JD | Dugas | | | Abstain |
| Anthony | Overton | Yes | | |
| Tom | Frazer | Yes | | |
| Dakus | Geeslin | Yes | | |
| Bob | Gill | Yes | | |
| Michael | McDermott | Yes | | |
| Chris | Schieble | Yes | | |
| Joe | Spraggins | Yes | | |
| Andy | Streicheck | Yes | | |
| Kesley | Banks | Yes | | |
| CJ | Sweetman | Yes | | |
| Troy | Williamson | Yes | | |
| Ed | Walker | Yes | | |
| Results - Passed | Subtotals | Yes (15) | No (1) | Abs (1) |

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. It looks like we have fifteen yea, one no, and one abstention. The motion carries. Dr. Frazer, I think we're moving on.

DR. FRAZER: Okay, and so we're going to get into projections a little bit later, but I'm just noting that we're about one-third of the way through page 1, and I project that, if we continue at this pace, we'll finish at 6:00 tomorrow morning. Anyway, with that said, I will start.

Representatives of the five Gulf states briefed the committee on their respective 2023 fishing seasons for the private recreational component of the red snapper fishery. A committee member from Alabama replied that the combination of reef deployments within state waters, and fishing practices by state for-hire guides, may explain the disparity between the length compositions from the state for-hire landings from Florida and Alabama.

Committee members discussed the patterning of Mississippi's fishing season and the implementation of calibrations and revised catch limits. In discussing the payback provisions under Reef Fish Amendment 50, a committee member commented that a payback provision should not apply to a state if the stock as a whole did not experience overfishing in a fishing year.

NOAA General Counsel clarified that the state-specific payback provisions were developed to encourage each state to constrain its landings to its respective ACL.

Another committee member asked how long the Louisiana fishing season could be sustained at seven days per week. A committee member from Louisiana noted that effort in that state drops off following Labor Day weekend in September, and the state can pause fishing mid-season depending on the pace of landings observed. Like Florida, Louisiana measures effort at the angler level.

The committee member from Louisiana added that the transitions for Mississippi and Alabama to a LA-Creel-style survey are going well, to which committee members from Mississippi and Alabama concurred. A committee member from Texas said the models and supporting data used for projecting Texas' fishing seasons could be provided to interested parties. Presentation: 2024 Gag and Red Grouper Recreational Season Projections, Tab B, Number 5, SERO staff reviewed --

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Hold on, Dr. Frazer. General, you had a question?

1 2

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: If we could, before we get into gag grouper, I would like to bring up something about the states, if that's a possibility. Could I do that?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Yes, sir.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Okay. All right. You know, first off, I understand what happened last year, and, looking at what we had, and, you know, if you look at like Texas had like 18,642 pounds below what they had as an ACL, and Louisiana was 56,123 pounds below, and Mississippi was 17,813 above, and Alabama was 4,898 above, and Florida was 16,548 below, the total being 68,602 pounds under the ACL, is where we were at.

The Gulf quota was 4,062,804 pounds, and the landings were 3,994,202. I would like to ask, first, if it's possible, before I make a motion, Andy, and would it be possible for NMFS to give a state that went over last year, in 2023 -- Would it be possible for a one-time forgiveness of Alabama and Mississippi, because we did not, as a Gulf-wide, reach the ACL, and is that something that is possible to even entertain?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am not familiar with the forgiveness provision in our accountability measures, but I am not prepared to really respond to that at this point, General Spraggins. You and I have talked, and certainly we will review the landings data, and the information, but we do have to look back at our regulations and accountability measures that are in place at this point.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I guess what -- You know, I think Scott had his hand up, and I will hold until after him.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Bannon.

 MR. BANNON: Also, I just want to remind everybody that this season's numbers were in the calibrated number, and so the number is -- So we're all using the same currency across the Gulf, or whatever, and so it's not like the Alabama overage would be -- Or the Mississippi overage would be increased by some factor, and the 4,000 is the 4,000, because it's been calibrated.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you for that. General.

1 2

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I guess the question is, is it appropriate to make a motion to have NMFS to look at it, to be able to see if we can basically -- You know, my motion, that I was looking at, was to request NMFS to not impose paybacks for Alabama and Mississippi for overages in 2023, and that would be due to the fact that the Gulf quota was not met.

8 9

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MR. STRELCHECK: So the problem with that -- I mean, it's a request, but the regulations state otherwise, right, and so there's nothing in the regulations that tell me that I can do that, and just simply asking me to do that is outside the scope of the regulations, and so that's why I floated, in the motion passed previously, that we would then go and look at the accountability measures, going forward, and see if we can come up with a mechanism that potentially accomplishes that in the future.

18 19 20

21 22

23

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Well, once again, you know, we don't have to stay in the sandbox, and, you know, we can always look outside of it, and I don't know, and I guess is it -- I guess I'm putting the situation -- You know, Mississippi, we know we went over, all right, and we took a gamble last year.

24 25 26

27

28

29

30

31

We gambled that they would pass the new best available science, and which we thought would happen, and it did not happen, and we understand that, and we're not trying to bow out of anything, and that's not what we're after, and I don't think that Alabama is I don't want to speak for Scott and them, but I don't think they're doing it either way, but the fact is that I don't see why there should be a payback if the ACL is not met.

32 33 34

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I have Mr. Diaz and then Dr. Frazer.

35 36

37

38

39

40

41 42 MR. DIAZ: Anyway, I understand why the General is making the request, and, you know, last year, I did have hopes that that regulation would go into effect before December 31, and it does take a long time for things to work their way through the NMFS process, and I understand that, until they're approved, they're not approved, and I'm glad we passed the motion that we passed earlier today, because I made the comment earlier that the world has changed.

43 44 45

46

47

This is -- You know, Amendment 50 went into place, I think in 2018, and the situation with the stock, that we know it today, different than it was in 2018, and so, anyway, I appreciate you making the request, General, and we'll just see where it goes. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: So I guess the analogy I would use is this, in my opinion, right, and so we have rules and regulations for a purpose, and we have stop signs, you know, and, when there's a red light, you stop, and it's not just a suggestion, right, but, if you gambled, and you thought you could speed through the red light, and you didn't hit anybody, we're all good, but, if you hit somebody, we're not all good, right, and so what you didn't know, when you make that gamble, is where the other states were going to be, and, as a consequence, you jeopardized everybody's ability to fish, moving forward, and I don't think that's a responsible way to act.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Bannon, or, General, to his point?

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: You know, I understand that, and, you know, your thoughts, and I appreciate your thoughts, but I can also tell you that there's a lot of times, when you go under that red light, that you don't get charged for it, and so, you know, if you want to say that's responsible or not, but, when you take the hit that Mississippi took last year, in trying to be able to do it, and when you're sitting here, and you're a state, and you're the smallest one, and it's kind of like being one of the smallest schools in the basketball tournament, and you're a number-sixteen seed trying to figure out if you can get up anywhere in the world.

Well, we'll sitting here with the smallest amount, yet we take the biggest hit in the world, and we take a double-hit compared to anybody else, and then we're sitting here looking at it, and our anglers are saying why, because we know that it's not right, and we know that it's not correct, and so the point I'm getting at is I'm not saying that what we did was right.

I'm saying that we took a gamble, and we said that, and we're not denying that one bit, but, if Florida, or Texas, or Louisiana, or Alabama, or anybody else, had been put in the situation that Mississippi was, I would love to have seen what their state would have allowed them to have done, because, if I had taken Florida down to half of what they had last year, what would have happened to them?

The point I'm getting at is I realize that -- I worked, a long time, as a general in the Air Force, and I built myself up, and I

learned that there's times that you take a gamble. There are times that you gamble and decide whether or not this is the best thing to do. If we ever went to war, and didn't take a gamble, we would never win. You have to take a gamble every now and then. You have to be able to step up, and you have to be able to say, hey, this is what I think is going to have to work, and this is the only way that I can see it.

Now, it may come out that we have to pay the 17,000 back, right, and, if that's the case, then what will happen is it will come out of the 2024 season, right, and we'll look at that, but we understand that, but, with LA Creel happening also, and we've got MS Creel to go with it, and there's a lot of things that's going to prove this thing, that Mississippi should have never taken the cut to start with.

You know, in a court of law, we might not win, but I guarantee you that we would get a lot of people's attention, and we could take it up to a higher court, and the point I'm getting at is if we -- We're not sitting here saying that we want to do this forever, and we're not sitting here saying that -- If we had never seen a best available science voted on this by committee as the best available science, and brought to us, then we would have never taken that gamble, but that gamble was there, and so I appreciate your opinion, but I don't agree with it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I have a list. Mr. Bannon.

MR. BANNON: I think everybody knows that I'm super supportive of Mississippi and the situation that they're in. We are not excited about it, and Alabama wasn't excited about where we ended up, and I'm maybe going to reach out to the General and ask him maybe not to consider a motion, but to consider a conversation with Andy and Mara, and, you know, Andy said he would look into it, and he's been a good friend to us here lately, and I trust his word on that, that, if the legal folks in the office were able to find a way to allow some forgiveness, then we would be excited about it, and there is nobody that would cheer more for Mississippi than me, I promise, and we're working on trying to make those adjustments for Mississippi, but the -- I would have to say that I would struggle, unfortunately, General, to support a motion, based on the legalities of it, without further comment from the legal section there.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: All right. General, to that point, and then Andy to that point.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I am fine with that, and, I mean, I think that, if I had wanted to make a motion, that would have been the first thing out of my mouth, and so I think the idea was to ask, and that's the reason that I asked the question the way I did, and is it something that we should even entertain making the motion to, and that's why I asked Andy that, and I think I got that answer.

You know, the question is I would, and I would love to, and I think I agree with what Scott said, that we have had some real good conversations with Andy and NMFS, and I don't have a problem with that. I don't have a problem with that, but I just wanted, I guess, more to get it on the record than anything, if that's the way it would be put. Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I appreciate the conversation, and I'm certainly happy to talk to you further, General, about this. I guess a couple of things. You know, one is my disappointment here is I feel like now NMFS is on the hotseat, and we're in a lose-lose situation, right, whether we resolve this in your favor or we have to pay it back, based on the regulatory requirements.

You mentioned you took a gamble, right, and that's all fair, and I was calling you out on that when you were giving your presentation earlier this week, but you mentioned that, like, well, we thought that NMFS might implement by the end of the year, and I never received a phone call from you, or any of your staff, asking us where we were at with that amendment, or action, and so that's the trust, and I think conversations, we need to have when things like this arise, right, because I could have quickly given you an update of we didn't get the amendment until August 8th, or 10th, from the council, and we had to redo some of the economic analysis, and it got resubmitted to us in December, and so I could have told you, at some point in the fall, that this was not going to be implemented. I know you're making decisions about your season at that time, but having those conversations upfront I think would have avoided circumstances like this in the first place.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Geeslin and then Ms. Boggs.

MR. GEESLIN: I will go quick, and Dr. Frazer made an analogy for a traffic law, and I will make one for school lunches. You know, back home, when our school lunch kids go through the school line, some aren't able to pay, to pay for their school lunch, and they run up a debt. They run up a tab at the school. At the end of the school year, several businesses, and other folks, pool in, and

they pay off that tab.

1 2 3

If this was authorized, Texas -- Texas was under by 18,642 pounds, and I would gladly pay off your tab and give that to you, General, to get us square, and I don't know if that's authorized, but I certainly am sympathetic to the position, the tough position, that NMFS is in here, but we manage this all together, and the fish don't know the difference, and I think other states would pay your tab too, General.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Geeslin, thank you for those comments. General, to that point, and then Ms. Boggs.

 GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Thank you very much, and, Andy, we were trying to keep up with what was going on with it, and I guess the question was -- You know that we didn't make a call and try to put you on the spot and say, hey, what is your answer to this, as to whether or not it was going to get passed, but we did keep up with it, and we had staff looking into it, and they were looking into where it was sitting, and where it was going, and, once again, we knew that when we opened back up in September.

We knew that it was a shot, but we were taking a gamble, and, once again, we understand that, and we took the gamble, because we didn't have a chance to wait until November to decide whether or not we could do this, but I do appreciate your point, and were just looking at the situation, and I think more in hope than anything in the world. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Dakus, I really appreciate your analogy, because pooling together everybody's resources, and paying off that tab, and part of that tab could have been the charter-for-hire fleet, because remember, if the five states go over, then it comes off that side of the fishery, and so I hope the states will be considerate, in the future, not to have to have us pay your tab. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Banks.

 DR. BANKS: So, if I remember right, the Atlantic States have some kind of provision where you can do the payback, like Dakus just mentioned, and so maybe -- I don't know about this situation, at the moment, and I'm going to leave that to the legal, to NMFS, but, in the document that Andy has now proposed, maybe that's an action, or an alternative, that we should explore in the future,

and I won't speak to this situation, because I am not a lawyer, but I think we should explore that in the document.

I will rephrase, and so the Atlantic States have a provision that, if one state goes over, you can accept quota, to have someone else pay your tab, and so that might be something that we could put in the private rec document that Andy had suggested.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so that was my understanding of the motion that was just previously passed, that we were going to work on that, because, right now, it's statespecific paybacks. Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Schieble, and then we're moving on.

MR. SCHIEBLE: All right. This is quick, and so maybe it will make Andy feel better, but, back in 2021, we had a similar situation to this in Louisiana, where we were fishing to what we thought was the new allocation, because there was an ACL that was run through, and coming, but it did not process until the next year, and so we got notified that, in our legal updates, in the table, that we had the new ACL as our model that we were fishing to for the entire year. Going through, towards the end of the year, we had to adjust that back to the prior allocation that we had the year before, because it did not pass through, and so we ended up with a 6,918-pound overage from 2021 that carried into the 2022 season that we had to deduct off the top, for a similar situation, and so I'm just pointing out that this has happened before.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schieble, for those comments, and we'll go to Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: All right, and so, again, I actually enjoyed this conversation, and I appreciate everybody trying to find a path forward, right, and I don't want to penalize anybody unnecessarily, right, and I just understand that, you know, we have to live within the structure that we have currently, and that's all I'm saying, and I think you have to adhere to the rules that are on the books. If you want to change the rules, that's okay, right, and so that's it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Dr. Frazer, we want to proceed.

 DR. FRAZER: All right, and so I will start again at Presentation: 2024 Gag and Red Grouper Recreational Season Projections, Tab B, Number 5, SERO staff reviewed updated red grouper and gag recreational fishing season projections for 2024. The 2023 fishing year landings for both species were estimated using the federal Marine Recreational Information Program's Fishing Effort Survey (MRIP-FES) for private recreational vessels and resulted in significantly higher landings estimates compared to previous fishing years.

SERO collaborated with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and NOAA's Office of Science and Technology to review these landings and determine whether any intercepts or other data required further analysis.

 For red grouper, SERO used recent landings from 2020 to 2023, including only MRIP Waves 1 through 4 (January 1 to August 31), because the ACT is projected to be met during this time. Given the high Wave 4 (July and August) landing estimate in 2023 during the twenty-day open period (July 1-20), SERO conducted sensitivity runs with and without 2023 Wave 4 data.

Using a three-year average, which includes Wave 4 from 2023 results in a fishing season of January 1 to July 14, and then using a three-year average, which uses the 2020 to 2022 average for Wave 4 in place of the same for the 2023, it would result in a fishing season of January 1 through August 2.

Given that the red grouper recreational ACL and ACT have been exceeded in each of the last three years, NMFS plans to set the recreational season from January 1 to June 30, 2024. If the ACT is not met, NMFS may reopen the fishing season later in the year.

 Allowing the fishing season to continue beyond June 30 requires additional analysis of Wave 4 landings, which are not available until at least October 15. Thus, by constraining the initial fishing season to Waves 1 through 3 for 2024, NMFS can more confidently constrain harvest to the ACL and will have the time needed to reopen the fishery later in the year, if possible.

A committee member asked about the data units used for red grouper at present. SERO replied that MRIP-FES is still in use, consistent with the last stock assessment and subsequent catch limit modification. The next red grouper stock assessment (SEDAR 88) is exploring the use of FWC's State Reef Fish Survey, or SRFS, and will be reviewed by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) this fall.

2 3 4

For gag, the 2023 season ran from September 1 through October 18, and accountability measures require a payback of the amount of any ACL overage, unless the best scientific information available determines lesser, greater, or no overage adjustment is necessary.

5 6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

Shore landings were not used to calculate the 2023 ACL overage, given the highly uncertain shore mode catch estimates and few intercepts for gag caught from shore. To transition from MRIP-FES in 2023 to SRFS in 2024, a way to account for the 2023 overage in SRFS units is needed. A multistep conversion was discussed, which results in an estimated overage of 124,624 pounds gutted weight, in SRFS units. The 2024 unadjusted ACL, in SRFS units, is 288,000 pounds gutted weight, which is then adjusted down to 163,376 pounds gutted weight to account for the payback. will work with FWC to project the fall 2024 recreational fishing season, based on this information.

17 18 19

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: We have a few questions, Dr. Frazer. Walker.

20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

MR. WALKER: I have a couple of comments, and then I have a motion on red grouper, but I would like to just point out that, to me, and we took the MRIP numbers out of the gag, which I'm very thankful for, and I appreciate Andy, and NMFS, you know, recognizing that something wasn't right in the data, and really putting a lot of effort into trying to do the right thing, and doing the right thing, and, when it comes to gag, I still -- To me, averaging three years of MRIP estimates on red grouper still gives you an MRIP estimate.

30 31 32

33 34

35

36

37 38

To the extent possible, I certainly would have preferred more SRFS in there, and, you know, maybe I don't know all the moving parts there, but, like I said, I think three MRIP numbers averaged together is still an MRIP number, which I don't love, but the motion I would like to make, and I apologize if this is a curveball out of the blue, but a lot of our fishermen, where we live, that fish for red grouper, and you can go ahead and put that motion on the board, if you have it.

39 40 41

42

43

It would be to direct staff to start a document exploring the removal of the twenty-fathom closure for shallow-water grouper for the recreational fishery in the months of February and March in the Gulf. If I get a second, I will give you, my rationale.

44 45

46 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Do we 47 have a second?

MR. WALKER: Do you need me to repeat it? She's got it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: There's a lot of things about this that people currently have questions about, at least, and it's a pretty old rule. Looking back on it, it seems to be uncertain whether it was actually started to protect spawning gags, which are now closed anyway at that time, and this rule was eliminated in 2013, but then it was reinstated again in 2015, and now the red grouper —At the time, red grouper was open all year, and red grouper is only open for six months now, and, out of those six months, the red grouper fishermen are now constrained inside 120 feet, for two of those six months.

What's going on here is a lot of guys are -- Probably more than half the guys, and I can't really put a number on it, but a lot of people are cheating this, and there's no enforcement on it. You can still go out there and fish for other things that are open, and so I don't know that it's serving any great purpose. Commercial fishing is still open, and red grouper longlining is still open on the other side of this 120-foot line, and so I would just like to see maybe if we explore whether this rule is still needed, based on the changes that have happened in the limits on these other species.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay, Mr. Walker, and so Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I was going to ask the question if staff or someone, the Science Center, can give us a reason for this twenty-fathom closure, before making a motion, but I will just now ask for discussion, and can -- Is there a history behind this?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There have been a lot of oscillating closures, for the last twenty years or so, for the original shallow-water grouper species, which included, you know, gag, red grouper, black grouper, scamp, yellowmouth, and yellowfin groupers.

Gag closures have been a little bit different, for the most part, from that directly tied to this twenty-fathom closure, per the gag management history, and this particular one was left in place in a framework action that looked at other red grouper management measures, because the combination of having red grouper closed in February and March beyond twenty fathoms, along with the other measures, allowed for the preservation of the two-fish red grouper

bag limit, and it would -- At the time, based on the ACLs at the time, it wasn't going to result in a fishery closure, as a result of that combination of management alternatives that were in the framework action. This primarily has to do with red grouper, and not so much gag, and so gag's closures are different.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: My purpose here is just to explore if this rule is still necessarily needed, and it's not a motion to remove it, and it's just to see if it's still valid and serving the purpose that it was originally set up for, which I haven't totally identified, and it seems to kind of flip-flop back and forth, or I'm not that well aware of it, but I'm just asking to look into it and see if we still need this or not.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: So, based on what you're saying, Captain Walker, would you be amenable then to requesting staff to explore, rather than starting a document at this point, and bringing back the results of that exploration for discussion at a future council meeting?

MR. WALKER: Yes, that's a good point, and I think that would be easier than -- One step at a time, but, yes, I would be amenable to that, if you wanted to repeat that, and we could adjust the motion.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think just take out "start a document", and so to direct staff to explore.

MR. WALKER: To direct staff to remove "start a document" --

35 MR. GILL: No, to explore the removal.

MR. WALKER: Right. Explore the removal. Yes. Very good.

 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. McDermott. Good? Any more discussion on the motion? No? Okay. I will read the motion. The motion is to direct staff to explore the removal of the twenty-fathom closure for shallow-water grouper for the recreational fishery in the months of February and March in the Gulf of Mexico. I'm not seeing any opposition. I am going to ask. Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had two kinds

of things to go back to regarding gag. The first question, I guess, is my understanding is the Secretary has approved the rebuilding plan, but it has not become effective yet, and is there any updates on that?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and we're working on the final rule to implement it, and so we're getting close, and it's going through final review and clearance for publication.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Thank you, and so then my second question would be -- We've heard a lot of public feedback, and definitely from our Facebook page, about the greater amberjack season opening in May, and not having a lot of notice, and so I guess I would just volunteer that, as the Regional Office works with FWC staff on this gag recreational season, that, if we can help in any way, regarding press releases or information -- You know, the earlier we can get that, the better we can serve stakeholders, and so I would just volunteer that effort at your disposal.

 MR. STRELCHECK: I appreciate that, Carrie, and certainly we know how controversial gag is, and we want to announce something sooner rather than later. Just to be clear, with amberjack, I realize there was happiness, in terms of we're opening it, but frustration in terms of the timing, right, and, yes, the season opened and closed last August, but data, and landings, are preliminary, and they continue to kind of be updated, and adjusted, and so we want to have as kind of final landings estimates as we possibly can before we make that decision to reopen. That's why that timing is kind of when we made that decision, and certainly, in the future, if there's ways to move that up, we certainly will consider that for amberjack or other species.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Dr. Frazer.

 DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The committee discussed the MRIP-FES landings estimates and the improvements being conducted therein by NOAA Office of Science and Technology, per Dr. Richard Cody. He clarified committee questions about data estimation and management and when to make the revised estimation methodologies publicly available, once they are finalized.

 Dr. Cody reiterated that NOAA Office of Science and Technology does not support the use of landings estimates with a proportional standard error greater than 50 percent. A committee member asked about the progress made so far on the council's January 2024 request for NOAA OST to escalate the review and evaluation of the

recreational effort extrapolation methodologies between MRIP-FES and state effort programs, starting with comparisons between SRFS and MRIP-FES for gag and red grouper. Dr. Cody replied that this request was being explored by the MRIP Transition Team.

A committee member stated that a regional perspective was missing from the quality control and quality assurance process. They offered the example of catching 100,000 pounds of gag from shore as being impossible, and that a Gulf fisherman would know that. The committee member thought that additional regional experts available for review would benefit the landings estimation process.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chair, and so I would perhaps like —— In thinking about this, and kind of commenting to Dr. Cody's response when I asked about where this process was, in terms of looking at the effort extrapolation procedures, and I think he highlighted that a letter was being worked on, and this highlights that as being explored by the MRIP Transition Team, but I don't think that was necessarily the intent of what we were looking for in that motion that was unanimously passed by the council.

It was kind of at a more expedient timeline, and the MRIP Transition Team is already occurring, obviously, and so I was thinking of a little bit of a separate process to start looking at, and we had highlighted red and gag grouper, because of the ongoing issues that we have here, and so, if it's appropriate, I'm wondering if maybe Dr. Cody could clarify some of those efforts along those lines, outside of the MRIP Transition Team, Mr. Chair.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Sure thing. Dr. Cody.

 DR. RICHARD CODY: Thanks, C.J. There is a planned workshop, as I mentioned earlier, that's set up for May 14 through 16 in New Orleans, and so we have sent out -- Gregg Bray has been working with the states, and with the Office of Science and Technology, on an invite list, and, you know, as I said, that review workshop will look at -- It will mainly focus on the federal estimates, but there will be some discussion of how to integrate better with SRFS, since there is an integration component there that's important.

On the other side, I mentioned that we were developing a response to the council request, or letter, and, in that response, we basically are outlining what is already done, and possibly what enhancements we'll be looking at for -- To address the issues that

were mentioned in the previous session, and so I think that's where we are right now.

I think that there is -- There are some things that we can certainly work on, in terms of articulating the way the review process is supposed to work, relative to how weights, sample weights, can change, and then to show that, you know, we have a routine process that's in place that works on what I call mechanical flags versus, you know, visual evaluation of the data as well, and so that's where we are right now with that process, and I don't know if that addresses what you're looking for, C.J.

DR. SWEETMAN: Yes, to a certain extent, yes, and I think, if my understanding -- Now that I've learned more information, it's that, you know, you are going to be having some meetings with specific individual staffers on the FWC side of things, you know, Bev Sauls and some of her staff, to look at some of these things, and so that was kind of the information that I was hoping for, when I put forward that motion, and so I appreciate the clarification, Dr. Cody.

DR. CODY: Just to follow-up on that, C.J., there are some interactions that Bev Sauls, and others, have been having with John Foster, in Science and Technology, related to potential pilot studies, things like that, and so there may be some other work that they are involved in that I'm not fully aware of at this point, but I will get that information.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Dr. Cody, I think Mr. Diaz has a question.

MR. DIAZ: Dr. Cody, when you were speaking yesterday, I got distracted, and I didn't hear everything that you said, and it might have been the day before yesterday now, but is this particular workshop going to work on outliers? You know, I've been asking you, for years, about developing something to deal with outliers, and this is the workshop that's doing that, or is that a separate effort?

DR. CODY: That's a separate effort. Right now, we have a working group with the Southeast Science Center that works on that element of it, and that's not to say that that won't be one of the topics that's considered in the workshop that we're having with the states.

The state workshop is more focused on quality control methods, at the field level as well as at the data review stages, and data

management level, and so there are some elements there that focus on just quality steps for reviewing the data, and the work that we're doing with the Science Center focuses on methods that we can use to get more out of the data that we have already, and so it would be beyond the estimation process that would be looked at in the workshop, but that's not to say that there won't be some input from participants.

MR. DIAZ: So thank you for that, Dr. Cody, and I don't know how many times I've brought up these outliers at this meeting, and I have great dissatisfaction that it's not a high priority, and I don't blame you for that, or any one person, but, I mean, I've mentioned it over and over again, that we have outliers, and I don't know who it can't be a high priority.

In my mind, they're imaginary fish. You can't eat it, and you can't sell it, and a charter boat can't sell a trip on it, and, if the outliers get plugged into the system, it takes days away from people. It takes fishing opportunities away from people, and it penalizes states, and I don't know what else to do. I'm begging you. I'm begging NOAA, and I'm begging S&T, to make this a high priority, and why do we have to -- I've been on this council for years, and I'm fixing to roll off, and almost nothing has been done, and it's like I'm talking to deaf ears, and I know you're going to respond, but I just can't tell you how frustrated I am with this.

I'm begging you, and I'm begging somebody, to help us, and it has crushed the State of Mississippi, and it's still crushing us, and now people better listen, because it's hurting the whole Gulf. Like I told you, if one amberjack hits the dock in the State of Mississippi, it might go up to 300,000 pounds, and those are not real fish.

We catch amberjack in Mississippi, and I don't know the number, and I doubt it's a tenth of that, but, if they take 300,000 pounds off of that amberjack quota, that's coming from everybody, and so we've got to do something about this, and we've got to do it now, and we can't keep pushing it. It's got to make a higher priority, and I know workloads are tough, and I understand that, but I just can't understand how I can't convince you all that it's a higher priority.

DR. CODY: Let me respond to that, and there are two approaches that we've used to address exactly what you're talking about. The first is to provide some funding for an additional sample to be collected, and that has been provided for the Gulf states.

I will have to say that the states -- Not all the states have been able to take advantage of that funding, for logistics reasons, in terms of their ability to conduct additional sampling, and so there is a question there, related to sample size, that we can't address at my level, other than to provide funds to get additional samples.

That said, we do -- We have gone to great lengths to come up with standards for the presentation of our data online. We tell you that we do not support estimates above a precision level of 50 percent, and that is telling you that, if there is an outlier, with a precision level that doesn't meet that threshold, then it's not supported.

Beyond that, I don't know what we can do, except to do what we're doing with the Southeast Science Center, which is to evaluate different methods that get us more from the data that we have, and that includes multiyear averaging, which doesn't sit well with a lot of people, and other methods that resample data. Those are not easy to come by, and they're not easy to develop. There is disagreement over how might approach the you different methodologies, and what we've tried to do is come up with a decision framework, with the help of the Science Centers, to provide some methodologies that can be used beyond the estimation that we do at S&T.

I think we have been working on those exact issues that you talk about, and outliers are there, because you have characteristics, or you have behaviors, which are associated with sampling in general, and so, when you reach low sample sizes, you get that. When you infrequently encounter species in the survey, you get outliers.

We try to weight for the representation of different samples in our sample frame, and that's the way that probability surveys work, but I think there is an education component here, and there's also, you know, the fact that it is a general survey. The state surveys were brought onboard to address that very issue of precision, and so there are things that I think have been done, and they may not be as well advertised as they could be, and I understand your frustration, and it's a frustration of mine, too.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you for that answer, Dr. Cody. I appreciate it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I had Mr. Strelcheck, and I see Dr. Walter.

 MR. STRELCHECK: A couple of comments. The spending on recreational fisheries data collection is pennies on the dollar, which is unfortunate, right, and that's state and federal combined, right, and the value of these fisheries is enormous, and I think that's part of our challenge, and it's why we run into these problems with outliers and low sample sizes and a lot of other factors.

Dale, I hear your frustration, and I appreciate your frustration, and I do want to say that I feel like it's a little disingenuous to say that nothing has been done, and so I just wanted to emphasize that. I think there has been a tremendous amount of effort that's gone into trying to improve recreational statistics, and I think the reaction has been just the opposite over that time period, in that people feel like they've gotten worse over time, despite all the effort and energy and time that's being put into it, and now we're embarking, obviously, on this effort with the Inflation Reduction Act, in partnership with the states, to address two of the greatest sources of uncertainty in our recreational fisheries, which is discard estimation and effort estimation, and so the agency is not standing still.

We are definitely moving forward, and we are not satisfied with where we're at with recreational data collection, just like the states aren't satisfied, and I think there's a lot of work to be done here.

Also, keep in mind, with my recreational fisheries initiative that we passed a year ago, one of those components was looking at outliers in statistics, and we're just now getting that off the ground, and so it takes a long time for some of our work to happen here around this council table, but there's a lot of, I think, things in motion right now that ultimately will benefit our fisheries, going forward.

 MR. DIAZ: To that point, Andy, if I used the words "nothing has been", that was a poor choice of words on my part, and I think my frustration is how long it takes to get this issue resolved, and that's my frustration, and I appreciate your comments, and I appreciate Dr. Cody's comments and you all's efforts, and so I don't want you to think that I don't appreciate that. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: I really appreciate Andy saying the things that I would have said about a lot of the efforts that have been done and then the ones that are pending, and also on validating some of

these effort estimates, through some of the IRA funding that's going to use some advanced tech to validate where those effort estimates do pass muster.

One of the things that I think -- If there's frustration, I would absolutely express that there's frustration on our end, and our staff's end, when the numbers are challenging to incorporate, or unreliable, or not supported, and how we deal with that in the stock assessment continually plagues us, and I think one of the real frustrations is to get surprises, because no one likes surprises, and that is -- I kind of wish we could have not had all of the January meeting public comment, if the numbers come back much different, which they did, and so they were preliminary, and we looked into them, and they came back different, and I think that there's a lot of initiative, and energy, for people looking at things after the fact, because people are scrutinizing them, and I wonder if there's a way to harness that, by looking at those numbers before they go out.

That's where I think we had talked about some sort of -- Trying to harness that energy to review those, to check for things, and if there is a way to get some other eyes, people who know the fisheries, who know -- You heard what Captain Walker said, and there's no way that 100,000 pounds are landed from shore of gag, and, okay, and how do you know that? It's probably some, you know, on-the-water knowledge.

Can we set something like that up, like a sort of trusted panel, who gets maybe to look at them, and just say, hey, I think these might be something to look into before they go out, and they kind of keep close hold on that, because they're getting privileged information early on, but that at least allows us to kind of get that gut-check, and everyone is going to have the gut-check, once they're sent out, and let's just get it before it has to go out, and I would like to maybe think about that. Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I have General Spraggins next.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Well, first off, Dr. Cody, I do appreciate everything you've done, and I know you're trying to work hard, and I understand Dale's frustrations, and I have the same thing, okay, and I have the frustrations of not -- You know, it's been four years, I know, that we've been fighting this battle, and it's probably a little bit longer than that, and I know that we talked about a lot of these things, and these outliers, and the outliers happen, and they're there, but I think that we talked about it too, back when we -- I don't know if it was January when we made

that, but we were talking about that nothing takes priority over the other, when we were talking about the gag and the situation there, that it doesn't take priority over the other outliers that are sitting out there.

If there's outliers there, one shouldn't take priority over the other one, until one has been solved, and that's what I would like for you to look at. I don't know what it takes for you to do that, and, you know, to say that 100,000 pounds couldn't be caught, and, if you're looking at that as being an outlier, and going quicker, I don't understand why, because we know that, to Mississippi, in general, that, whenever we did the MRIP, that it would -- It was so far skewed out that it was unreal, and everybody agreed with that, but it was an outlier that you had to live with, because it was something that we were doing at the time.

 It was a program that we were under at the time, and I understand that, and this is also the program we're under with gag at the time, and so I just ask you all to look at it, and, you know, Dr. Walter, all of you just look at it.

We appreciate you, and you all have worked more with us, and I tell you that we appreciate all of you all and what you're working with us on, and we know you're trying, and we know your frustration, but it's -- Once again, it looks like the little man is getting beat up, and the big guy is getting what he wants, and, you know, that's the way it looks, whether it's right or wrong, whether it's true or not, and I don't know that answer, and I'm not throwing an accusation out there, but I'm just saying that it seems like that poor little old Mississippi gets beat up every day, but yet the others are being able to walk on and move forward and do what they need to do, and so I just wanted to tell you that I appreciate all of you. I do appreciate you, and I know that you're trying to do -- I ask you to, if there's any way, to give us more consideration.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay, General, and so we're going to go to Dr. Sweetman and Dr. Walter and wrap this up.

 DR. SWEETMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I will be really quick. Yes, please, to everything that John said, in terms of having some sort of experts, subject matter experts in these fisheries, look at these things before they're released. I think that's a fantastic idea, and it would have probably negated a lot of the issues that we were dealing with with gag and red grouper in this past iteration there, and do I don't know what that exactly looks like, but certainly I don't think -- I mean, S&T, those are the MRIP

experts, and they're not necessarily the experts in these particular fisheries that we're talking about here, and so I think some commonsense checks and balances along those lines, and do these numbers actually make sense, with people that are experts in the field of these particular fisheries' biology, ecology, landings, everything along those lines, and so I fully support everything you were talking about there, John.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Along with what C.J. said, I like that working panel group idea of regionally-informed individuals to provide essentially a layman's general overview of things we would see that a scientist might miss, you know, or not necessarily a scientist, but maybe somebody that's looking at data that's not from here, that doesn't understand the particular factor of that particular species, and that it's unlikely in what they've predicted, and so I think that's a great idea.

I would be happy to assist in the design of such a panel, with the understanding that it would be viewing classified, essentially, or preliminary data that they don't want to get out, because it's preliminary data, and so I would love to be a part of -- I like the idea, and I would love to help you get started with it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Walker, for those comments. Dr. Frazer, you can continue.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Discussion of Conservation and Management of Wenchman in the Midwater Snapper Complex, Tab B, Number 6, council staff discussed recent developments in the butterfish fishery, which has seen the fishermen, who were experiencing the issues that brought about Reef Fish Amendment 61, leave the Gulf. Thus, the stakeholders who brought the issue before the council are no longer concerned with wenchman as bycatch in the butterfish fishery. The committee recommends, and I so move, to discontinue work on Reef Fish Amendment 61. That motion carried without opposition. Mr. Chair.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

We're running up on lunch. It's 12:00, and I'm looking around the table to see how everyone feels. I know we're scheduled for an hour-and-a-half, until 1:30, and would you all like to try one

hour? Is everyone okay with that? Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I think I'm okay with that, and I was just going to ask how much do we have left here?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: A lot. There's a good amount.

MR. WALKER: A good amount?

DR. FRAZER: The most recent in-season projection says 12:00 tonight.

MR. WALKER: I'm fine with going to an hour for lunch, personally.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I'm not seeing any opposition, and everyone is fine with that, with 1:00? Let's do 1:00. Thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting recessed for lunch on April 11, 2024.)

April 11, 2024

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

- - -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at The Lodge at Gulf State Park in Gulf Shores, Alabama on Thursday afternoon, April 11, 2024, and was called to order by Vice Chairman J.D. Dugas.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: All right. We're going to proceed with where we left off with Dr. Frazer and the Reef Fish Committee.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Draft Options: Reef Fish Amendment 58: Modifications to Shallow-Water Grouper Complex Catch Limits and Management Measures, Tab B, Number 7, a committee member asked that the council consider whether to proceed with Reef Fish Amendment 58.

They recalled a council motion to not undertake any allocation discussions until the SSC has reviewed the updated MRIP-FES pilot study results and effects on landings estimates are evaluated and deemed consistent with the best scientific information available.

NOAA General Counsel clarified that, because the SSC recommended

lower ABCs for two shallow-water grouper stocks considered in the amendment, and one deepwater grouper stock is undergoing overfishing, the council has a statutory mandate to act.

Dr. Jim Nance, the SSC Chair, informed the committee about the SSC's discussions on black grouper and yellowfin grouper and the SSC's catch limit recommendations for those species. Staff noted that, because black grouper is a regional stock managed with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, the SSC's catch limit recommendations for these two species cannot be used, and the current catch limits for black grouper and yellowfin grouper will need to be maintained. Until the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils reevaluate the black grouper stock collectively, that species' catch limit and allocations must remain the same.

At the March 2023 SSC meeting, the SSC made OFL and ABC recommendations for scamp and yellowmouth grouper, separate from black grouper and yellowfin grouper. The four shallow-water grouper complex species are currently managed under a single ACL, with a commercial ACL and ACT specified to allow for the functioning of the shallow-water grouper component of the commercial grouper-tilefish IFQ program.

Because OFL and ABC were specified explicitly for scamp and yellowmouth grouper, these species can no longer be managed under a single complex with one quota, because of the possibility of overfishing occurring on scamp and yellowmouth grouper. Council staff presented revised options for the committee to consider regarding specifying status determination criteria, shallow-water grouper complex structure, catch limits, accountability measures, and IFQ share allocation.

A committee member asked which of the shallow-water grouper species is undergoing overfishing. None of the stocks within the shallow-water grouper complex are currently undergoing overfishing. However, the proposed catch limits are less than half of the recent average landings. Thus, not reducing the scamp and yellowmouth grouper catch limits is likely to result in overfishing of those species.

 Another committee member asked for clarification about whether the council could select either 30 percent or 40 percent SPR as the proxy for the fishing mortality at maximum sustainable yield (FMSY) for scamp and yellowmouth grouper. Staff asserted that the council determines the FMSY proxy. However, the SSC supported a more conservative approach of F 40 percent SPR, versus F 30 percent SPR, based on life history characteristics and contemporary

research. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center added that the council would have to make a case if it selected an FMSY proxy that did not align with its own SSC's recommendation.

A committee member inquired what the sector allocation percentages would be if using the MRIP-FES conversion factor. Another committee member stated that there is not a common data unit for the species in the complex. Scamp and yellowmouth grouper are in MRIP-FES, whereas black grouper and yellowfin grouper are in Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey, or MRFFS, data units. Because the complex is being divided, comparisons of data unit differences is problematic.

Ms. Jessica McCawley, the South Atlantic Council liaison, asked about the jurisdictional apportionment of the black grouper ACL between the councils and was told it is 47 percent to the South Atlantic and 53 percent to the Gulf.

Ms. McCawley then asked if addressing black grouper would need to be a joint amendment with the South Atlantic Council. Staff replied that, ideally, the Gulf Council would stay within its jurisdictional appointment, and in MRFSS data units, negating a need to involve the South Atlantic Council. A committee member stated that one approach to allocation could be for the Gulf Council to select the time series to inform the sector allocation, while NOAA OST works on the MRIP-FES pilot study, and NMFS could implement the sector percentages based on the years preselected by the Gulf Council. They added that work on this amendment was expected to last into 2025, given the complexity of the actions.

A committee member asked, and Dr. Jessica Stephen, from SERO, affirmed, that a fisherman could land speckled hind or warsaw grouper under their shallow-water grouper quota, so long as their deepwater grouper quota was exhausted. Another committee member stated that catch limit reductions should be shared across sectors, while not penalizing sectors that have been good stewards. Council staff replied that proportional reductions could be examined along with the discussion about sector allocation.

A committee member asked if SERO could provide additional quantitative information regarding flexibility considerations that involve shallow-water grouper and deepwater grouper, which Dr. Stephen said could be provided by Full Council. Council staff said that public testimony on the flexibility considerations would be helpful in knowing whether shallow-water grouper and deepwater grouper could be approached in two separate amendments. Lastly, another committee member stated that there may be recreational

accountability measures that the council might want to consider.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Stephen, I believe, is online, and I don't know if she has some additional information to share or not.

DR. FRAZER: I mean, I think she was going to provide some additional information. Is that right, Dr. Stephen?

 DR. JESSICA STEPHEN: Okay, and so I did find some additional information in regard to the shallow-water and deepwater flexibility measures, and we have -- The species that is mainly affected by this would be speckled hind, which is primarily landed under shallow-water grouper, instead of being landed under deepwater grouper, which is its primary category, and so 67 percent of all speckled hind are landed under shallow-water grouper.

When it comes to scamp and warsaw grouper, scamp is almost entirely harvested under shallow-water grouper, and less than 1 percent has been landed under deepwater, and, for warsaw grouper, 86 percent of the warsaw grouper are landed under their primary category of deepwater grouper, and 14 percent under the shallow-water grouper, and so my kind of takeaway from this is the species of really strong concern would be speckled hind, because it does seem to be that fishermen are landing it under its alternative share category, rather than its primary share category.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Dr. Stephen. I'm just curious on -- I mean, it's a large, relatively large, percentage of speckled hind that are landed in the shallow-water, but can you speak to the actual pounds that we're talking about?

DR. STEPHEN: Just give me one second to pull that up. In 2022, which are the numbers that I was looking at, for speckled hind, we had around 18,000 pounds landed under shallow-water grouper, and only 9,000 pounds landed under deepwater grouper.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Well, my original thought on this was to explore whether or not we needed to have those flexibility measures between the deepwater and shallow-water complexes, because, if we didn't have those, it might make our ability to manage the two complexes more simple, and so I was trying to hear some public testimony yesterday, and what I heard is -- I'm not sure there was a strong voice against doing that, but there wasn't a lot of people that spoke about it either, and maybe next time. Go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Tom. I think it's worth including the

amendment for consideration, and evaluating it, and, you know, one of the challenges, and Jessica can speak to this better than I can, is, yes, these species are being used in these different categories, but, within the system, people are moving allocation, or quota, around, in order to kind of make this work for them, right, and so I don't know --

They're kind of incentivized to eliminate one category of allocation, in order to harvest it with another category of allocation, if they have multiple accounts in the system, right, and so I don't know, by eliminating this, that we're really going to affect discards, you know, or retention of fish, or if they might just change the way in which they manage their allocation within the IFQ program as a whole, and so I just wanted to mention that, because I think that's another layer of complexity, in terms of how the fishermen actually operate within the system.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Frazer, did you want to respond to that?

DR. FRAZER: I'm just going to listen to the discussion for right now, I think.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have Ms. Boggs and then Captain Walker.

MS. BOGGS: I wonder if it would be interesting to find out what percentage of the fishermen -- Is it one fisherman that's doing this, or is it across-the-board, and everybody is kind of using this to manage their allocation, and that might be interesting to see, and we may not be able to do that, for privacy reasons, if it's just one or something, but it might be a way to look at it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Andy, to that point?

MR. STRELCHECK: I would say it's probably complicated to track, but it really pertains to those entities that have multiple accounts within the system and are able to move allocation in and out of accounts.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: So we didn't end up overfishing them, which would be the main concern, and like we did do that on gag a little bit, with the shuffling around of multiuse, and I wonder, Dr. Stephen, do you have any information, or could you get any information, on how many accounts get emptied of one species, so they can use multiuse, and then are filled back up after that? It seems, to

me, like the original intent of the rule was to help a guy out when he's out, and not necessarily to just hide it in your buddy's account for the day, use the multiuse the way you want, and then, after that's -- Or sell it, and then put your stuff back in your account, and I wonder if you could show that pattern in the statistics.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Stephen.

DR. STEPHEN: We definitely will get how many people use the multiuse, and it might be more of a manual process to then look at kind of the trend and time, if they're putting other allocation back within it, and we do know that that kind of process happens a lot with red grouper and gag grouper over time, and we've actually heard from fishermen that they do that, and I would have to look into how often that's also done with shallow-water and deepwater.

 One of the things to keep in mind is some people might be really short in allocation in one of those categories, and that's why they're landing the other species under that. We can take a dive into the data and look at the difference.

The other point that I wanted to bring up is that the price of allocation, for shallow-water and deepwater, are fairly different. Shallow-water averages around sixty-eight cents a pound, and deepwater averages around \$1.20 a pound, and so, kind of going with that, you could see why they might want to use the cheaper shallow-water grouper allocation price in order to land speckled hind under shallow-water, instead of under deepwater.

 MR. WALKER: Right, and somebody that I talked to told me that yesterday, that it was essentially cheaper to use your shallow-water grouper, since you could use it for the other one, because shallow-water, by not being caught, is really cheap quota nowadays.

DR. FRAZER: I was originally -- I'm going to look to Andy again, and I was originally going to make a motion to -- You know, again, I was trying to simplify -- I know this is going to be a very complex amendment, and I was trying to get the shallow-water and the deepwater grouper kind of separated a little bit, and you could accomplish that by kind of eliminating not all of the multiuse thing, but one -- Just the exchange between the deepwater and the shallow-water.

Maybe, rather than start a document, or something like that, maybe I can just request that staff, and Jessica, give us a little bit

of an update on what might be involved in that and what the data look like.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: I think, you know, if staff are fine with some direction, right, to explore this, putting in an action and alternative, you know, to consider this going forward in the amendment, and that would be useful. Then we can make the decision based on some analyses and informed data.

DR. FRAZER: I'm okay with that, and so do you have enough direction for that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, thank you, and I think we have plenty of direction. I would note that I think there was a bit of confusion, from my interpretation, during the public comment, regarding the different types of multiuse. I think folks were asking or, you know, talking about their multiuse between gag and red, and not really understanding some of the questions between the shallow and deep, was my interpretation of what was stated.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The next topic here is Review: February 2023 Gulf SSC Meeting Summary, Tab B, Number 8, SEDAR 85, Gulf Yellowedge Grouper, Dr. Nance reviewed the SEDAR 85 stock assessment of yellowedge grouper, which is a component of the deepwater grouper complex with snowy grouper, warsaw grouper, and speckled hind.

The model has a terminal year of 2021 and models the stock in two components bisected by the Mississippi River. Half of female yellowedge grouper reach sexual maturity by nine years old, a year after they start being selected by the fishery, can live to eighty-five years of age, and begin transitioning to male at about forty years old. Recreational landings account for less than 2 percent of total removals.

The SSC discussed challenges in recruitment modeling, which has been low since 2005. With no good fishery-independent index, recruitment is uncertain. Any strong recruitment after 2012 is not included in modeled landings.

The SSC recommended revising the FMSY proxy to F 40 percent SPR, provided advice to the data analysts about which recruitment years to inform the projection analysis, and set the OFL at 487,000

pounds gutted weight, and also reviewed and revised the OFL at 244,035 pounds gutted weight and the ABC at 183,026 pounds gutted weight for the three remaining deepwater grouper species, separate from the yellowedge grouper catch limits, using Tier 3b of the ABC Control Rule and in MRIP-FES data units.

The SSC further stated that the four deepwater grouper species could continue to be managed together under a combined catch limit. The OFL is 731,035 pounds gutted weight, and the ABC is 555,026 pounds gutted weight.

A committee member asked whether yellowedge grouper needed to be managed separately to prevent overfishing. Council staff replied that it may be necessary, but the SSC did not specifically address that. The committee thought staff should explore this possibility, considerate of the difference between the OFL and ABC, and noted the recent decline in deepwater grouper landings.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council recognizes the results of the SEDAR 85 stock assessment and the SSC's recommendations for catch limits for the deepwater grouper complex and requests staff to begin development of a document to modify the deepwater grouper catch limits accordingly. That motion carried without opposition.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

 DR. FRAZER: Okay. SEDAR 74, Gulf Red Snapper Research Track, the SSC evaluated the peer review of the SEDAR 74 research track for Gulf red snapper and provided recommendations for consideration for the next benchmark assessment, which is to start at the end of 2024.

The independent peer review did not recommend the SEDAR 74 model for further development and recommended another peer review of the next planned assessment for red snapper (SEDAR 97). For stock structure, the SSC disagreed with the peer review, and supported continued exploration of the three-region model, which was a consensus decision from the SEDAR 74 stock identification effort. Despite data limitations in the eastern Gulf and noting that several indices require mirroring, which is averaging the selectivity across the eastern and central regions and then using the subsequent value for both regions, the SSC thought the three-region model was still a better representation of the Gulf red

snapper population.

 A committee member acknowledged that there was mirroring even under the two-region model. Thus, under the three-region model, the committee member thought the uncertainty resulting from the additional mirroring therein would be greater than under the tworegion model.

Dr. Nance thought that there was utility in using the three-region approach, because it helps to demonstrate differences between the regions more explicitly. Essentially, the selectivity ultimately used is applied to the resident age and length composition in that region, and the resulting predicted harvest and biomass values are estimated. Regardless, the committee acknowledged that both the two-region and three-region models are combined to a Gulf-wide estimate, which can then be used for management. Presently, the granularity of multi-region modeling does not play into other management decisions, like sector allocations.

The SSC thought the next assessment's terms of reference need to balance prescription with flexibility, and that topical working groups should include recreational data and how to address extraneous survey data, like that from the Great Red Snapper Count. Direct participation from regional Great Red Snapper Count principal investigators is critical to considering those data.

 A committee member recounted the original disagreement amongst the stock identification panel for SEDAR 74 around whether to use a two-region or three-region approach. They thought it would be challenging to say that anyone could be more confident in an approach requiring more estimation (i.e., the three-region model versus the 2-region model).

Another committee member asked with whom the decision rests to decide whether to use the two or three-region model. Council staff clarified that the council's standard operating procedures related to SEDAR approvals state that the Council Chair and Executive Director, on behalf of the council, and based on its intent, approve the terms of reference and other SEDAR materials. So, if the council requested that red snapper be assessed using a two-region model approach, that request would be put into the final terms of reference for the next stock assessment. Council staff added that an SSC review of the proposed terms of reference for that next red snapper assessment would be held in May 2024. The committee was mixed on whether to use a two or three-region approach.

 Economic Performance of Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries, the SSC received a presentation from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center comparing the economic performances of the Gulf reef fish and South Atlantic snapper grouper fisheries and provided a financial overview of those fisheries since 2014.

The overview compared measurables between the regions and found that catch share management in the Gulf resulted in higher economic output, compared to the South Atlantic, after factoring in differences such as catch magnitude. For the IFQ program, quota was identified as the limiting factor in revenue generation, as opposed to the number of vessels. Economic indicators from the IFQ program could potentially be used as a stock health indicator.

2024 Red Grouper Interim Analysis, the SSC received a presentation on the 2024 Gulf red grouper interim analysis, without catch advice. Generally, the NMFS Bottom Longline Survey, which selects for spawning stock biomass, is stable, and the SEAMAP Summer Groundfish Trawl, which tracks age-one and age-two fish, has shown an increase, which aligns with the recent pulse in the fishery observed by the fleets.

Presentation on Reef Fish Amendment 60: Individual Fishing Quota Programmatic Distributional Issues, Tab B, Number 9, Dr. Stephen gave a presentation on Reef Fish Amendment 60, which considers alternative approaches to equitably distributing shares and annual allocations in the IFQ programs.

Dr. Stephen defined equity and discussed its distributional, procedural, recognitional, and contextual dimensions. She discussed the Gini coefficient, which is a metric used to evaluate economic inequality in a population and income or wealth distribution. Gulf commercial fisheries were highly unequal prior to the IFQ programs. The red snapper and grouper-tilefish IFQ programs have had little influence on reducing Gini coefficients over time.

IFQ shares and allocation to be distributed could include shares currently held by NMFS, shares associated with inactive accounts, shares and allocation recovered from divestment by shareholders who do not meet requirements that may be set in Reef Fish Amendment 59, and annual allocation from future quota increases. Recurring redistribution could occur for shares from inactive accounts and from accounts not meeting requirements to be set in Amendment 59.

Dr. Stephen indicated that NMFS must be informed of the death of a shareholder, but the agency is often not informed until annual

permit renewal or biannual citizenship renewal is due. Management actions addressing shares previously held by deceased shareholders must consider the type of entity holding the shares, for example the shareholder is the sole account holder, member of partnership, shareholder in a business, or the shares are held by a trust.

Dr. Stephen provided a set of questions to support committee deliberations. What is the council trying to achieve with the motion to initiate Reef Fish Amendment 60? What sources of privileges are appropriate for distribution? Who is the council trying to assist with equitable distribution? Which methods of distribution will best suit the intended stakeholders?

She discussed potential options for each question and noted that the council should consider interactions between management actions in Amendment 60 and other IFQ amendments, for example Amendment 59.

Dr. Stephen clarified, for the committee, that different accounts become inactive over time. The committee asked about changes in the pounds of quota in inactive accounts, which Dr. Stephen said will fluctuate when quotas change. Dr. Stephen will provide information about accounts without any shares later. Committee members noted that the council should describe its vision for the IFQ programs and will need to discuss and define terms such as "replacement fishermen". The committee suggested that time could be set aside to further discuss the amendment during the June 2024 council meeting.

A committee member noted the committee's intent is not to take away shares from active participants in the IFQ programs, but rather to determine distribution methods for reclaimed shares, shares held by NMFS, and annual allocation from future quota increases. The committee will need to identify the universe of beneficiaries.

SERO indicated that the South Atlantic Council used a subcommittee to address issues relative to the wreckfish IFQ program and suggested that the Gulf Council could consider a similar approach. Further discussion of Amendment 60 during Full Council could consider distribution options.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: We have a couple of hands, Dr. Frazer. Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, in listening to the presentation, and the bullet points set out here, I think

we all recall that the initial shareholders were given their shares on the basis of historical catch, and there is not an ownership of that privilege.

Reviewing what the deceased shareholder has done with his shares, transferring it to a partnership or a trust or whatever, I think is the wrong approach. Whoever is the recipient of those shares, be it a partnership or a trust or an LLC, they do not earn those shares, by virtue of a historical catch, and so I'm at a loss to determine why we're entertaining those shares being held by an entity that was not in -- Was not fishing those shares, and acquired them through a historical catch method. Any comments about that?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks, Troy, for those comments. As was mentioned in the Reef Fish Committee, my view is that this topic has been around since, what, 2011, and we've wrestled with it, and not the same members at the table necessarily, and we've not gotten anywhere, and part of the reason for that is we haven't had a well-defined idea of where we're going.

In the June meeting last year, the council adopted the goals and objectives, but, for purposes of Amendments 59 and 60, one, there isn't a vision associated with that, which we don't customarily do at the council, and I think, before we get into the nits of what ought to be, or ought not to be, included in Amendment 60, that we consider a purpose and need, and, aligned with that, I would like to initiate a discussion on the vision side of that, because, if we're able to achieve that, then that helps set where we're trying to go.

 I recognize that this is not what we've done historically in the past, and I'm not even sure that the council has ever done it, to be honest, but it would help set the path, going forward, and, as a measure of are we maintaining the vision that we set, that we're trying to achieve, for this program, and, if we're not, then we need to come back in line with that vision.

I have, in concert with several folks, tried to cobble together a strawman for this, if you will, and it's a work in progress, and it needs a lot of wordsmithing, and I was originally going to propose it as a motion, but I think -- I don't know if we're willing to spend the time this afternoon to wordsmith it and get to a conclusion on that motion, but I would like to proffer it as

a strawman on the discussion table, for which we can consider and see how the council takes that, and so, Bernie, if you would draw up the Amendment 59 and 60 verbiage that I just sent you.

Thank you for that, Bernie, and so I will read it, for the benefit of those that are not in the room. The fishery vision is a differentiated commercial fishery, including a diverse range of profitable small, medium, and large businesses and quota/allocation banks that maximizes access to and use of available IFQ shares. The process vision is a simple, automated, and transparent process that ensures IFQ shares, and allocation are equitably distributed by NMFS-defined user groups, the impacts of which are measurable and evaluated over time.

There are a number of issues that I have with this version, and we need to define some of that, for example the "equitable", and what is that, and how do we do that, but I think this gives us a starting point, you know, if you will, and it's mud on the wall, and we'll see what stays, and what doesn't, and I would encourage that we discuss the definitions of these visions, so that we can use them, and I think they would be applicable, both 59 and 60, and whether we want to use that as helping us to get to where we want to go, and that would, in turn, help us define the purpose and need for the current document, Amendment 60. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also have visited with some folks around the table, Bob, and, as you recall, I proposed a fairly -- Well, I proposed a motion that we reclaim all the deceased shareholders' shares, and, in talking to various folks around the table, that was a methodology that they didn't agree with, because they didn't feel like it was fair to the shareholders, whether they were initial or had come in later.

What they were proposing, or what we came up with, was a transfer -- Doing away with the IFQ share program and going to an allocation -- A public auction, if you will, of the commercial allocation each year, and giving the shareholders a transfer credit, based on the current market value of those shares, be it an average of the best available price during the previous year, or whatever it is, but they could use that credit in the auction, but that would give -- Rather than folks holding shares, you have an opportunity for people to come in and buy at a public auction that would be administered by an independent third-party.

It would not only be fairer, I think, than the current shareholder

methodology, but it would also generate income for uses in the fishery, and it may all go to the general fund, but, eventually, it would come back, and the public would benefit from the revenue, and so that would be an alternative to what you're proposing here, Bob, which seems, to me, to be just kind of a continuation of where we are now.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I have Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: First, thanks, Bob, for putting forth the vision statement, and I agree that I think we could spend guite a bit of the afternoon wordsmithing it, and all of us around the table have different ideas, but I did want to comment about the first portion, the fishery vision, because I think this emerged last year, when we were talking about the goals and objectives for the program, right, and the idea of this overcapitalization, and that, you know, shares are intended to reduce, or eliminate, overcapitalization, but we also were putting value in the diversity that we have in our fishery, in terms of small, medium, and largescale businesses.

To me, I think this is reflective of those conversations, and it also, to me, is kind of reflective of what we talked about with our equity and environmental justice strategy and the importance that we place on individuals that are participating in this fishery and the access that they would achieve.

In terms of Troy's comments, I think my concern, Troy, with what you're suggesting is that you're proposing something that, to me, is very contrary to the goals and objectives that we spent quite a bit of time hashing out last year, and that we're now moving forward with Amendments 59 and 60 to address, and so a proposal like you have is sweeping change, and you believe, I think, that that's needed, and I think that would be highly disruptive, and something that probably is not necessary, and that we can make sweeping changes within the program, to improve it and benefit all stakeholders involved.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If there's crickets, let me express what I think -- Where we are today and where we go with this. What I think I would like to see is, okay, and this may not be the right wording, and we do have to wordsmith it, et cetera, but, conceptually, the council buys in, or doesn't buy in, to what we have here, that can be then formalized, the next time we revisit 59 and 60.

It's more of kind of a thumbs-up, or thumbs-down, or, hey, you're close, but why don't we do this, modify it slightly, just kind of mesh it into something that says, yes, we can utilize that the next time we come here, or no we can't, and so we, if you will, put this off, in terms of accepting it, and that's why I took it off the motion mode, because I don't think we're ready for that, but whether or not it's in the direction the council wants to go, expresses the sentiment, roughly, of what the council thinks is

off the motion mode, because I don't think we're ready for that, but whether or not it's in the direction the council wants to go, expresses the sentiment, roughly, of what the council thinks is appropriate, and, if not, then, okay, is it modifiable? It would prep it, if you will, for the next time it comes up at council, and that's my thought on the outcome of what we have on the screen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: So, before I get to you, Mr. Williamson, I think what I hear is you're asking the council, and the staff, to revisit this the next time that 59 or 60 comes up in a meeting, and it's just as simple as that, and we'll revisit it, and we'll work -- Maybe remove, or edit, some of it, and we'll just keep it on the radar?

MR. GILL: No, a little more than that, and I'm thinking the next time that it gets discussed, considered, and formalized, and motioned, to acceptance or rejection. This time, it's the broader, hey, are we going in the right direction, do we have what we want, and maybe we need to modify it a little bit today, but, ultimately, whatever we do with it now becomes the baseline for what's utilized, with an eye towards accepting it in a motion and incorporating it into the documents.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, sir. Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, to Andy's comment about sweeping change, I think that's what we were intending to do here. We were to try to improve the program to address the issues that we hear every time we have public comment. Folks get up, and they say they're not able to acquire allocation, that the shareholders are, true or false, blackballing them, or whatever, and we've heard it for years now.

It doesn't seem, to me, that the shareholder concept, although it has a lot of advantages for management, seems to be working for the new entrants, the new groups coming in, and so, you know, for that reason, perhaps a fresh approach, like an auction of the allocation, needs to be considered, and so, you know, I would --

I don't know whether it's the appropriate time or not for a motion

to include, in the progress of Amendment 60, but I would make a motion that the staff include, in the development of Amendment 60, a method to equitably reclaim the shares and to distribute them, the commercial allocation, through a public auction, to be administered by an independent third party.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Is there a second to the motion?

10 MR. GEESLIN: I will second.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: All right. I will pause, and I'm moving a 13 little quickly. We'll get the motion correctly on the board. Mr. 14 Williamson, is this --

MR. WILLIAMSON: No, and it was a method to equitably reclaim the shares.

19 MR. STRELCHECK: The shares or all shares?

MR. WILLIAMSON: To distribute the commercial allocation in a public auction, to be administered by an independent third party.

DR. BANKS: Andy wants to know if you want "the shares" or "all shares".

27 MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm sorry. It would be to reclaim all shares.

29 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Is that your motion, Mr. Williamson?

31 MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Do we have a second for Mr. Williamson's motion? Mr. Geeslin seconds. Is there discussion? Mr. Gill.

 MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I disagree with Mr. Williamson's premise, and my recollection of the many years of discussion of this was, or is, that the system we have is working well, and it's not working perfectly, and there is no perfect system, and it does need adjustments, and tweaks, to improve it, and no system works perfectly, and I understand that, but the objectives that we had for 59 and 60 was to modify it, and not to completely overhaul it, and so I think the premise for this motion is in error, and not that supported in the many discussions that we've had, and I will not support the motion.

47 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Strelcheck.

2 MM 3 th 4 ma 5 th 6 in 7 ha 8 th

MR. STRELCHECK: I will not support the motion as well. I see this as contrary to Goal 3 that we passed last year, which is to maintain flexible fishing options and economic stability within the IFQ program, and I think this would create economic instability, and I also see an auction system -- Granted, we haven't talked about it how it would be designed, but usually they're designed as to going to the highest bidder, and that is contrary to improving opportunities for participation in the program, and, as Mr. Gill indicated, I think this goes far more toward overhauling the program than what we've discussed to this point, relative to improvements to the program.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I disagree with the motion, on the same grounds as Mr. Gill and Mr. Strelcheck.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One more point. Auctions, as Andy mentioned, go to the highest bidder, and so this appeals to those that have the funds, and it disadvantages those that don't, and the whole discussion, thus far, is how we get new entrants into the fishery, and the little guy doesn't have the funds to compete against the big guy, and so this just shifts everything to those with the greatest resources to be able to purchase those shares, and so it goes exactly against what we've been talking about and trying to accomplish in the Goal 1 that we established back in June.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Bannon.

MR. BANNON: Troy, I think you and I have discussed it before, and I struggle with a small number of people owning a public, you know, entity here, which is fish, and how to do that, and so I guess my question is, and I think it's kind of going around the room, is is this the right place for this, and it's a pretty -- Man, it's a complicated issue, and I think I would disagree with Andy a little bit about what he said about putting things at a disadvantage, but I do agree with Bob that auctions can be a challenge, because people have money win auctions, and so there has to be some equitable way to figure out how to move these shares to make them available to other entrants.

This is a super complicated issue, and so I'm supportive, in theory, of what it is, and I think we've got to do something with

that, and I'm not scared of making sweeping change. I think sometimes we have to make sweeping change, and I think we have to — We talked earlier about getting outside the box, but I think most of the IFQ system works really well. I mean, it's — Man, what an accurate system, and what an accountability system, and it works really well for a handful of folks, and I do have a little concern, and, Troy, that's my thoughts, and I'm not sure if this is the right spot for it, but I would be open to some further discussion down the road.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Williamson. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I would like to ask for a roll call vote.

 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Is there any more discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we're going to use our clickers. Okay. I will read the motion. The motion is to include, in the development of Amendment 60, a method to equitably reclaim all shares and to distribute the commercial allocation through a public auction to be administered by an independent third party. We're ready to vote.

| First Name | Last Name | | | |
|------------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Scott | Bannon | | No | |
| Susan | Boggs | | No | |
| Billy | Broussard | | No | |
| Dale | Diaz | | No | |
| JD | Dugas | | | Abstain |
| Anthony | Overton | Yes | | |
| Tom | Frazer | | No | |
| Dakus | Geeslin | Yes | | |
| Bob | Gill | | No | |
| Michael | McDermott | | No | |
| Chris | Schieble | | No | |
| Joe | Spraggins | | No | |
| Andy | Streicheck | | No | |
| Kesley | Banks | | | Abstain |
| CJ | Sweetman | | No | |
| Troy | Williamson | Yes | | |
| Ed | Walker | | No | |
| Results - Failed | Subtotals | Yes (3) | No (12) | Abs (2) |

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: The motion fails three yes, twelve no, two abstentions. Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to let all of you know that I am not leaving in a huff, and I have a plane to catch. Well, maybe a little huff.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Okay. Bernie, I have a motion, if you could bring it up, please. While we're waiting on the motion, as we were discussing in committee, I had suggested that we put together a draft purpose and need and a list of actions that could be included in this amendment, and so we've taken a first stab at doing that, and so that's the content of my motion. Not that one. The one after that one.

All right, and I will read it, and certainly we can wordsmith, if needed, but it's to approve the following purpose and need and list of actions for inclusion in Amendment 60. Purpose: The purpose of this action is to increase access and opportunities to Gulf of Mexico IFQ programs by equitably distributing IFQ shares, and allocation held by NMFS and reclaimed from inactive accounts or accounts not meeting certain eligibility requirements. The need for this action is to address access barriers creating inequities in the Gulf of Mexico IFQ fisheries. Actions -- We just listed them more as kind of the content of actions, giving staff flexibility, but what shares to redistribute (reclaimed, inactive, other); what allocation to redistribute (quota increases, other); redistribution methods; eligibility criteria for receiving shares and allocation); and an appeals process, and so if I have a second, then --

MR. GILL: Second.

 MR. STRELCHECK: I've largely explained that reasoning, and the rationale, but I think the key here is that we're focused on not taking shares away from people, as much as using the inactive shares that NMFS has, as well as any inactive allocation, and anything else that's reclaimed through other mechanisms, and then coming up with equitable ways to redistribute that to IFQ program participants, and the amendment would form the framework of how we go about doing that, and so I will leave it at that.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I had, independently from Andy, and in concert with folks in the industry, generated a purpose and need that is almost identical to this, and it's different wording, but the exact same concept, and virtually the

same actions, and so I support the motion.

1 2 3

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Is there any other discussion on the motion? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I think all IFQ issues does need a roll call vote, as contentious as it is, and a lot of people not sitting in the room today, and they can see what's happening, or what happened.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Yes, and that's fine. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I think this is a good start, and I'm certainly going to support it. The only thing that I'm thinking about, Andy, and, I mean, we can wordsmith this down the road, and we don't have to do it today, but just thinking a little bit about the focus is specifically on the fishermen, you know, and I kind of get that, right, but there's also the issue of trying to be considerate of the resource, right, that we're trying to manage, and so I don't think that's quite in here, but, ultimately, we can get there, and I'm good with this.

 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Any other discussion on the motion? Okay. Not seeing any, we're going to vote with our clickers. I will read it into the record. Motion to approve the following purpose and need and list of actions for inclusion in Amendment 60. Purpose: The purpose of this action is to increase access and opportunities to Gulf of Mexico IFQ programs by equitably distributing IFQ shares, and allocation held by NMFS and reclaimed from inactive accounts or accounts not meeting certain eligibility requirements. Need: The need for this action is to address access barriers creating inequities in the Gulf of Mexico IFQ fisheries. Actions: 1) What shares to redistribute (reclaimed, inactive, other); 2) What allocation to redistribute (quota increases, other); 3) Redistribution methods; 4) Eligibility criteria for receiving shares and allocation); 5) Appeals process.

| B9.2 To approve the following purpose and need and list of actions for inclusion in Amendment 60: Purpose, Need, Actions | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------|--------|---------|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| Scott | Bannon | Yes | | | | |
| Susan | Boggs | Yes | | | | |
| Billy | Broussard | Yes | | | | |
| Dale | Diaz | Yes | | | | |
| JD | Dugas | | | Abstain | | |
| Anthony | Overton | Yes | | | | |
| Tom | Frazer | Yes | | | | |
| Dakus | Geeslin | Yes | | | | |
| Bob | Gill | Yes | | | | |
| Michael | McDermott | Yes | | | | |
| Chris | Schieble | Yes | | | | |
| Joe | Spraggins | Yes | | | | |
| Andy | Streicheck | Yes | | | | |
| Kesley | Banks | Yes | | | | |
| CJ | Sweetman | Yes | | | | |
| Troy | Williamson | | | | | |
| Ed | Walker | Yes | | | | |
| Results - Passed | Subtotals | Yes (15) | No (0) | Abs (1) | | |

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. The motion passes with fifteen yes, zero no, one abstention, and one absent. Okay. Dr. Frazer, moving on.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Other Business, Reef Fish Amendment 53, a committee member discussed the legal proceedings regarding the Reef Fish Amendment 53 and the three aspects of that final rule which were remanded to NMFS for further clarification.

The committee member stated that the council should consider revisiting Amendment 53, in preparation for the court decisions and the results of the next red grouper assessment (SEDAR 88) stock assessment. NOAA General Counsel replied that there is nothing specifically to fix in Amendment 53, based on the court decision. Rather, NMFS needs to further clarify or support certain decisions related to approval of the amendment and promulgation of the final rule. Staff added that, without the results of the red grouper stock assessment and the SSC's review of that assessment, they lacked the data necessary to frame out the actions to be taken in the document. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a question from Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. Not so much as question, and so, when I did

my briefing on the litigation, I didn't get into a bunch of details in the decision, and I'm not going to do that now, but given, you know, some statements, during public testimony, about what the court decided, I feel like I should read, or let you know, the portion in which the court decided that the remand without vacating the rule was appropriate, as it regards to the economic analysis.

There're only two sentences there, and the court remanded without vacating the rule, saying there would appear to be a strong possibility that the Fisheries Service can differentiate between the two economic analyses. In technical areas, further explanation, with sufficient support from studies, may adequately inform the court of the Fisheries Service's reasoning.

I just wanted to make it clear that there's a clear opportunity for the Fisheries Service to go back and provide further explanation. The court did not hold that one economic analysis was appropriate, and one was, quote, inappropriate, and the court basically said that they looked like they were in conflict, and that the court needed further information.

CLOSED SESSION REPORT

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Ms. Levy, thank you for that update. We're going to move down our list here and go into the closed session report by Mr. Anson, and I will read it.

Closed Session Report, April 8, 2024, Mr. Anson, Council Chair. Selection of Reef Fish, Shrimp and Ad Hoc Commercial Red Snapper and Grouper-Tilefish IFQ Program Advisory Panel members, the Full Council was convened to review applicants for the Reef Fish, Shrimp and Ad Hoc Commercial Red Snapper and Grouper-Tilefish IFQ Program Advisory Panels. The council discussed the applicants and made preliminary appointments for each advisory panel. Appointees will be announced at the June 2024 council meeting in Houston, Texas, after completion of background checks for fishery violations.

Selection of 2023 Law Enforcement Officer/Team of the Year, the council reviewed the nomination information and recommendations received from the Law Enforcement Technical Committee. The council selected the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Northwest Offshore Patrol Vessel (OPV) Team for the 2023 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. The team will be honored at the November 2024 council meeting in St. Petersburg, Florida. This concludes my report. We're going to continue moving down the list to Mackerel. Mr. Geeslin.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE REPORT

2 3 4

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Mackerel Committee report, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab C, Number 1, and approved the minutes from the October 2023 meeting, Tab C, Number 2, as written.

Coastal Migratory Pelagic Landings, Tab C, Number 4, Mr. Frank Helies, from NMFS SERO, reviewed the recent coastal migratory pelagic (CMP) landings for the Gulf migratory groups of cobia, king mackerel, and Spanish mackerel. A committee member inquired about the geographic distribution of cobia landings. Dr. Mike Larkin, also from SERO, reported that 70 percent come from Florida's west coast, with 10 percent from Alabama, 10 percent from Mississippi, 10 percent from Louisiana, and 1 percent from Texas.

Moving right along, CMP Special Engagement Session Summary, Tab C, Number 5, council staff presented the results of the CMP special engagement session that was held with the CMP Advisory Panel. This session was held as a part of the council's broader CMP communications strategy that aims to gather stakeholder feedback on king mackerel, Spanish mackerel, and cobia that will shape future council management considerations for these species.

Staff summarized the themes that emerged from the session, including changes in abundance, location, fishing behavior, and ecological factors influencing each CMP species. The committee suggested that staff hold special engagement sessions with each AP that has relevant CMP experience. The committee also suggested that data be gathered on respondents' length of experience in the fishery, because it may influence their perception of the stocks.

A committee member asked whether respondents to the CMP communications effort would be continuously engaged, as their feedback is considered by scientists and managers. Council staff indicated that they planned to update participants on the effort of the management actions, as management actions are considered and scientific information on the stocks becomes available, by sending the results of this effort to those that participated. Staff also plan to encourage respondents to participate in the development of future management actions resulting from the effort.

The committee then inquired about what science currently exists to groundtruth what is being heard from fishermen and whether the science could be influenced by this engagement effort. Numerous

studies are tracking CMP species but may not be examining changes in migratory behaviors. Stock assessments for all three CMP species have been completed in recent years, and subsequent assessments are scheduled for the coming years.

Moving right along, CMP Advisory Panel Recommendations, Tab B, Number 6, Mr. Martin Fisher, the CMP AP Chair, summarized the CMP AP meeting. A committee member questioned Dr. John Walter, from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, about the possibility of creating a shark working group. Dr. Walter responded that, while it hasn't been established yet, it's an option the Southeast will Fisheries Science Center consider, potentially collaboration with the council. He also mentioned ongoing predation studies. Several committee members highlighted the availability of grant programs, like those under NOAA Sea Grant, which support such studies.

Draft Framework Amendment 14: Modifications to Gulf Migratory Group Spanish Mackerel Catch Limits and Accountability Measures, Tab C, Number 6, council staff reviewed the document that considers modifying the catch limits and accountability measures for Gulf Spanish mackerel, based on the recent SEDAR 81 stock assessment and the council's SSC's revised catch limit recommendations.

SEDAR 81 transitioned the recreational catch and effort data to the Marine Recreational Information Program's Fishing Effort Survey (MRIP-FES) and determined the stock was healthy as of 2021.

The SSC recommended an overfishing limit (OFL) of 12.074 million pounds whole weight and an acceptable biological catch (ABC) of 9.63 million pounds whole weight. An alternative using the council's Annual Catch Limit (ACL) and the Annual Catch Target (ACT) Control Rule would result in an ACL of 8.667 million pounds whole weight, reduced from the ABC by 10 percent, based on historical landings and fishery performance. Though recent landings have not exceeded the proposed catch limits, there is a possibility an overage of the ACL in the future remains.

 The committee discussed Action 1, which would modify catch limits for Spanish mackerel. The committee noted that Alternative 1, no action, is not a viable option and that the action alternatives are a reduction from current allowable harvest limits. The committee considered Alternative 2, that would set the ACL equal to the ABC at 9.63 million pounds. Alternative 3 would apply the ACL/ACT Control Rule and reduce the ACL by 10 percent relative to Alternative 2.

 A committee member expressed support for Alternative 3 given some concerns about recent declines in Spanish mackerel that may not have been captured in the stock assessment. Another committee member expressed reluctance to support Alternative 3, considering it overly cautious, and preferred Alternative 2. The committee recommends, and I so move, to make Alternative 2 the preferred Alternative in Action 1.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Geeslin. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, whoever wrote this report did an excellent job of letting me down easy, right, rather than saying my motion crashed and burned that I expressed support. I thank whoever wrote that, but, no, I'm fine, obviously, with the preferred alternative as it stands, and so thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The committee then reviewed Action 2, which considers modification of the Spanish mackerel accountability measures. The intent of this action is to consider an alternative that may provide more flexibility in the management and application of AMs, noting that in-season AMs can be difficult to apply, given the timing of, and uncertainty in, the landings data.

 The committee discussed the desire to avoid seasonal closures, while meeting its conservation responsibilities. The committee further discussed that seasonal closures may disproportionately affect some regions of the Gulf, given the migratory nature of Spanish mackerel, and that a closure would affect both sectors.

A committee member indicated that Alternative 2 would be more manageable than an in-season closure accountability measure, and beneficial for the fishery, by allowing more time to adjust to any planned seasonal closures. The committee recommends, and I so move, to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative in Action 2.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have another committee motion on the board. Any discussion on the motion? Okay. Not seeing any, any opposition to the motion? Not seeing any, the motion carries. Mr. Geeslin.

 MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Next, the committee discussed a potential action to reduce the recreational bag limits of Spanish mackerel. The aim of this action would be to reduce the harvest rate and corresponding likelihood of exceeding the catch limit. The Committee also discussed that few anglers likely retain the current fifteen-fish bag limit. A committee member recommended a ten-fish bag limit, and staff noted that it could be considered as part of a range of reasonable alternatives. The committee recommends, and I so move, to add an Action to Framework Amendment 14 looking at bag limits.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. There's another committee motion on the board. Any discussion on the motion? Not seeing any, any opposition to the motion? Not seeing any, the motion carries. Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Gulf Migratory Group King Mackerel Management Discussion, Tab C, Number 7, Dr. Larkin presented historical landings of Gulf migratory group king mackerel (Gulf king mackerel). Council staff summarized the current management status and provided some discussion points for consideration, including changes to catch limits, recreational bag limits, and fishing seasons to improve the management of king mackerel.

A committee member thought reducing the recreational bag limit from three to two per person would likely meet little opposition from the fishing community. Another member concurred, suggesting that a reduction could also create a perception among fishermen that steps are being taken to replenish the stock. Council staff added that, since few anglers catch more than one kingfish per person per trip, a decrease in the bag limit would probably be acceptable but may not have much effect on reducing harvest or the associated fishing mortality.

 A committee member pointed out that lowering the ACL might not be an effective approach if environmental factors are the main cause for the perceived decline in the stock. Others agreed, suggesting that bag limits and seasonal closures could be more effective measures.

Further, a committee member observed that king mackerel tend to fluctuate cyclically and may simply be experiencing such a cyclic downturn. The committee member also highlighted experience from studies showing a significant presence of juvenile king mackerel in shrimp culls, suggesting this as a potential source of mortality to the stock.

1 2

A committee member then suggested a tiered management system, where certain landing thresholds would trigger adjustments in the catch limit. They noted that, while such measures might not have an immediate impact, they aim to ensure the system is flexible enough to adapt to future changes.

Another committee member suggested that the current estimates for discard mortality might be lower than the actual rates. Dr. Walter expressed doubt that this is the primary cause of the stock's decline. He also mentioned the potential presence of hyperstability in the stock, indicating potential zones where fishing mortality exceeds healthy levels for stock sustainability.

The committee discussed potential spawning closures for king mackerel. The committee noted that king mackerel spawn in the summer, and the impact of closures would likely affect Texas and Louisiana more than Florida, raising concerns about the fairness of the proposed measures.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Walter.

22 23

DR. WALTER: I guess a minor point, and just that the current estimates for discard mortality rates might be lower than the actual ones, and perhaps we say, "the ones used in the stock assessment might be lower than the actual rates", just so that we know what is implied by "current". Someone could think "current" means what's currently going on in the fishery, which is the hope. Thanks.

MR. RINDONE: Okay. We can make that change.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Thank you, Dr. Walter. I have Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, the first sentence on page 4, and it says, "A committee member pointed out that lowering the ACL might be an effective approach". Dakus read "might not" and so is what is on my screen not correct?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: I guess the question is for staff at this point, and we had made the motion to consider looking at reductions in catch limits, and so I'm just curious, in terms of guidance to staff and next steps for this action to be developed.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Not really from my perspective, and, I mean, what kind of reductions in catches are you looking at? Do you want to use some of the recent historical landings that I presented, or do you want to use something else, and is that all you want to consider, and so, if we could have a little discussion, I think that would be helpful, and then, also, where is this in the priority, which we'll talk about at the end, but I do think just an indication on that would be helpful, with everything else we have going on.

MR. STRELCHECK: So, during committee, I was hearing mixed sentiment for whether we should proceed, or not proceed, and, obviously, we have a motion recommending we do something. In that light, or vein, you know, I would agree with Ms. Simmons, and I think looking at kind of recent levels of landings, and trying to lower the catch limit commensurate with that, given the decline, would be one action, and then we did hear quite a bit of support, during public testimony, for consideration of a bag limit adjustment on the recreational side, and so I would be open, obviously, to looking at the bag limit again.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I would agree with that. I think we should examine the viability of a bag limit adjustment and if it's going to have any impact at all, and that would be a good thing to have more information on what proposed gain we might get out of that, for further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: As part of the range of alternatives for the catch limits, would you want to entertain things that may result in a predicted seasonal closure, or early closure? I mean, just thinking on one hand, if you don't reduce the landings sufficient that it requires some change in the fishing behavior, it may not accomplish much, except for, if it is a cyclical thing, and then you get a bunch of king mackerel that show back up, and now you have a problem.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I think it would be important at least to know exactly where that threshold is, so we try and work around it, and maybe get close, but knowing the limit of where we're risking a closure would be a good thing.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I would agree with that as well, and I recognize that there might be some differential impacts that we need to look at, based on geography. The other thing, which I mentioned during committee, is thinking about this from a dynamic standpoint, and so, if we do see a rebound in the stock, you know, what maybe is, you know, built in that we could start working our way up, in terms of increasing those catch limits again, and so I guess I will have to put my head together with my team, and get back to you on that, but we would love to, obviously, explore some of those ideas as well, so we don't have to be back at this table adjusting catch limits when things get better.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Simmons.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think that's helpful. I think we have some direction that we could start working on, and so perhaps we can get a little bit of feedback on priority now of this, and it looks like we're looking at potentially two actions, and so it could be perhaps straightforward.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Remaining Items from CMP AP Meeting, Tab C, Number 6(c), Mr. Fisher covered all the CMP AP items earlier. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Geeslin. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Would this be a good time to address that issue that I discussed with you earlier, or would you prefer to wait?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I have your item on the list to do, but it's not now. I didn't forget about it.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, sir.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I am moving down the list. Next is going to be the Supporting Agencies Updates, Alabama Law Enforcement Efforts, and Major Downey.

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATES
ALABAMA LAW ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

 MAJOR JASON DOWNEY: Good afternoon. All right. Well, I'm Jason Downey, the Chief of Enforcement for Alabama Marine Resources. I'm going to give you a brief update on Alabama's JEA program for 2023 and 2024.

Alabama's JEA agreement runs from August 24 to August 23, each year, and this year, we received \$406,408, which is a little lower than last year, due to the removal of the SEFHIER program. \$160,000 was spent on direct purchases, which included two law enforcement vehicles, two outboard motors, and a fendering system for our eight-meter patrol vessel. \$65,000 was spent on training and other indirect costs.

Our priorities this year are the same as last year, minus the SEFHIER. This slide here shows our priorities and the amount of money allocated for each priority. In Alabama, we allow our officers to work overtime to fulfill the JEA contract, and so these will be patrol hours worked on top of their forty-hours-per-week of state time. For turtle excluder devices, we have a total of 614 patrol hours, and it's broken down by offshore patrols and nearshore patrols and dockside patrols.

For recreational reef fish, we have 300 offshore patrol hours. The IFQ quota, the individual fishing quota, is 300 dockside patrol hours, and IUU is eighty-one shore patrol hours. Marine mammal is 225 patrol hours, broken down to nearshore and dockside patrols, and, for general CMP and HMS, we have 265 patrol hours, broken down to offshore, dockside, and outreach hours.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Downey, we have a question from Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could you go back a slide, please? My question is, is that a typical distribution of how you distribute your JEA priorities, recognizing that they change by no SEFHIER or SEFHIER, and I understand that, but, generally, is this kind of representative of what a typical year might be?

MAJOR DOWNEY: For us in Alabama, yes, but every state is different, their priorities. They may be the same priorities, but they may have more hours toward a priority, and like, if you look at our IUU hours, we don't have very many, and we don't have as much as say Texas or Florida.

MR. GILL: Yes, and I'm talking for Alabama, and so this is a typical, representative kind of give-and-take.

MAJOR DOWNEY: Yes.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

MAJOR DOWNEY: Yes. So far this year, officers have worked a total of 1,143 hours of JEA patrols, more than 328 commercial anglers inspected, 361 recreational anglers inspected, twenty-four charter/headboats inspected, and these numbers are going to drastically increase over the next few months, as activity increases.

 One of the topics of discussion this year, amongst the Gulf states, has been the use of FADs. In Alabama, we don't feel like this is a huge problem, but we do come across these from time to time, when we're out on patrol. Here, we have two FADs that were found while on patrol in Mobile Bay. One of them is just a piece of lattice work framed in PVC, and the other is just a plastic flowerpot with a float inside, and so these types of FADs tend to appear when the tripletail start showing up in Mobile Bay.

We don't have any laws in Alabama pertaining specifically to FADs, and so we consider this criminal littering, and so, if someone is caught deploying them, they will be cited for that.

One of the best ways we've found to combat this issue is through our outreach programs. Our outreach events are a great way for these officers to interact with the public and answer the many questions they might have. We participate in around fifteen outreach events a year, not counting the presence at the many fishing tournaments in our area.

We give out tons of educational materials at these events, both state and federal information. This year, we're putting a little more emphasis on educating the recreational boaters on the marine mammal interactions. We have focused a lot of attention, in the past, on the dolphin tour industry, but we realize that there are a lot of marine mammal interactions between recreational boaters and the personal watercrafts.

Another issue we're focusing on this year is the illegal charters. This would be the state-licensed charter boats who venture out beyond the state waters and target the reef fish. This is a common issue across the Gulf states, and we're working with other agencies, through the Illegal Charter Taskforce, to come up with ways to combat this problem. Have you got a question?

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Are you catching any illegal charter guys?

1 2

MAJOR DOWNEY: So, we're checking a lot of these inshore guys out there, that are close to federal waters, but we haven't caught any in federal waters. We do get phone calls, periodically, that it's happening, it's happening, but we don't get any specifics on who is doing it, when they're doing it, and so that would help a lot, if the phone calls had a little more information, but I think our presence out there has shown to help.

MR. WALKER: (Mr. Walker's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MAJOR DOWNEY: I can go the next slide, but that's the end of my presentation, if anybody has any more questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for being here, Major Downey. I have a question and a comment, and so I'm surprised to see the patrol hours, and the outreach hours, on CMP and HMS, and is that common for you all?

MAJOR DOWNEY: Those outreach hours, it has to fall somewhere on this, for us to put the hours in, but we do outreach for -- When we're at outreach events, we cover all these topics, and it just happens, with the JEA, the way it's written up, it has to fall somewhere, and that's where we put it.

MS. BOGGS: Then the other thing was I saw some of the officers at the Wharf Boat Show, and that's the first time that I had seen the Fish Rules ruler that I believe that one of your officers created, and that's pretty --

MAJOR DOWNEY: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Bannon.

MR. BANNON: Do you know how much that dang ruler costs? That's the most expensive giveaway we have, but I do want to -- The one thing on the charter stuff, like Mr. Walker pointed out, is those are extremely difficult cases to make. The Coast Guard, our folks at Marine Resources, and the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement have been working jointly, across all the states, to do this, and they did some great operations, and, as a matter of a fact, I want to recognize Officer Glen Carnegie, who I think was like officer of the year, or something like that, under that program, because -- It was very well-deserved, because of the cooperation, and the sharing of information, and trying to address that issue, not just

like, hey, we're just going to go out there and make a show, and, I mean, they tried to use intel, intel-driven patrols, to highlight the areas, and there's a lot of water, and there's a lot of boats, and so I just want to commend the taskforce, and I can't -- Did it have a name?

MAJOR DOWNEY: (Major Downey's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. BANNON: The illegal charter taskforce, and so they put tremendous effort into it, and I think you're going to see more of that in the future, and so we are excited about that, and, as I always tell folks, if somebody is doing something illegal, rat them out.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: All right. Thank you. Do we have any more questions? Okay. Thank you. Thank you for being here. Okay. We're going to move on to the NOAA OLE and Mr. Walia.

NOAA OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

MR. MATT WALIA: Thanks, everyone. I know we're at the end of the day, and I'm Matt Walia, the Compliance Liaison. My apologies that the screen is off, but, while we're waiting for it to get pulled up, I'm just going to note that we're in between our council reports, and the quarter just ended eleven days ago, and so that one is not done, but I'm going to give you updates on some current stuff we're working on, and our latest council report, from October to December, is in the briefing book, and so I encourage you to check that out, and you can look in more detail.

On this slide, what I wanted to note is we've had some vacancies, in the past, in the Gulf of Mexico, as far as our enforcement officers, and we've actually been able to hire, and so, where you see them circled, in Harlingen, League City, and Houston, St. Pete, and Fort Myers, they're now all hired, and so we're fully staffed, as far as officers in the Gulf of Mexico. It put us at fourteen right now, and it has helped. We've been able to get more of a presence, work on joint patrols, work with JEA as well, and so everyone is in some form of training right now, but they are formally hired in the Gulf of Mexico right now.

Some of the stuff that we are focusing on is involving the sanctuaries recently. Down in the Keys, in the Keys Sanctuary, we continue to get a high volume of referrals, and those come from the state officers, as well as sanctuary staff, and you see where it's usually areas to be avoided, with larger ships running through

the sanctuary, and groundings, which take a lot of time to do assessments and get outcomes on, and it's pretty time and labor intensive. Then a lot of prohibited fishing and gear use in the Keys.

One thing that I did want to highlight though is we have a story that we put out in February regarding a mutilated sawfish. Right now, as you may know, it's bad news down there, and there's a lot of sawfish strandings going on, a lot of finfish in trouble, and a lot of folks are trying to work to figure out what's going on. This happened at the same time, and we had reports of a stranded sawfish that was in trouble.

Our officers came on scene in the morning, and, when they came on the scene in the morning, it was dead with the rostrum cut off, like this picture, and so we have a story out, and we're offering a \$20,000 reward for folks that may have any info to help lead to conviction on this, and I'm just reiterating that, and a reminder that it's unlawful to possess any parts of these species, even if they're dead, and to not have that.

I will note that NOAA is doing an emergency response team, and we have these cards, so, if stakeholders in Florida need them, I'm sure we can get it out, and it has the reporting 800 sawfish number, and I can get that in folks' hands, if you guys need it.

The Flower Gardens, we've been engaged recently too, and we've had a couple of recent cases on commercial fishermen that have been fishing inside the Flower Gardens, and there seems to be a reeducation and outreach that we're doing, and it was back in 2021 that they expanded the area, and so it's not new. We did a lot of outreach, and the sanctuary did, but we're still coming across people that are not quite aware of it, and so just a reminder that no anchoring is allowed.

You can hook-and-line in the area, and that includes bandit reels, but no longline is allowed in there. The sanctuary does have mooring buoys, and so we're trying to get this out to the public. We're working with sanctuary staff, and the Coast Guard has been very helpful. We've been going on flyovers with them, over the area too, and I was actually able to -- That picture on there, I just developed a flyer, and I just got it printed last week, and so we're looking to get this out to the field, and to sanctuary staff to pass out too, so we can get that in folks' hands.

There's a barcode, and, if you scan on here, it will go to all the closure areas, so you can put those corners into your plotter, and

you're good to go, and, from that assistance, another thing that we have going on is we're working with some fishing events, for outreach, and a lot of the sanctuaries, nationwide, are doing some events, coming up in June, and they're going to be holding some fishing clinics.

We have some spots going out of the Flower Gardens, and it's primarily veterans and military families, and so we're going to be doing outreach, and we'll get our officers onboard and out fishing, and I'm trying to replicate that in the Keys. They're doing a trip down there as well, but that's a good time to get awareness out there, of what we do and how to do it out there.

Observer program safety, which continues to be a high priority nationwide and divisionally. What we do, with our officers, is we go over and train the observers, and we teach them how to prevent, when it comes to sexual assault and harassment, job impediment, and any observer coverage, and so folks are taking observers when they need to, as well as fishery violations they may see, and I want to put a reminder here that this letter, on the page, is a notice that came out about a year ago.

It's a notice to all owners and operators that are mandated to take observers, to remind them of their requirements. We've had some issues in the past, but it essentially runs through prevention, response, and reporting requirements for fishing vessel owner, if they encounter a sexual harassment scenario, and so, essentially, if the owner does know something has happened, and they hear it from their captain, they need to terminate that trip, order their captain to come back into port, and, when they do come back into port, they are also required to report it to the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard Investigative Services, and that's a notice nationwide that's out there.

Unpermitted charters, we just talked about this, and, as Mr. Bannon noted, the Gulf Coast Illegal Taskforce is great, and we've been working with that, and we're looking to expand on that with our folks and state partners. We go to captain's meetings, and that picture is we've gone to some with state partners, with FWC, where it's mostly state-permitted folks. Some are dual, and they may go over the lines, and we're there to answer those federal questions.

We do outreach as well. Myself, I was down in the Florida Keys a little while ago, with one of our officers, and we worked from Islamorada down to Key West, stopping at all different local marinas and trying to talk with folks and remind them of what the requirements are, everything from vessel ID, sea turtle gear, what

do you know on the water, what have you got to say, and it gives us an opportunity to talk to folks and figure out what's going on in their neck of the woods, and we make our presence known.

I talked about our new hires, and we have a new hire down in Fort Myers, and we've been getting out and doing a lot more patrols by ourselves, doing joint ones with JEA, and I've been working with Major Downey and his officers, and we're working with the Coast Guard, and that's been real successful, and, from some of that, we've had some recent outcomes that I want to announce, working with our Office of General Enforcement.

You mentioned some penalties, and we've had about three recent ones around \$20,000, civil penalties that were assessed, and you see the range here, and we've got some current -- Some active investigations underway, and we continue to do that throughout the Gulf, and so that is some recent efforts, and we recognize and continue to work on the issue of charters.

Outreach is a major component too, and we want to make sure that people see us out there, and they know what we're doing, what to do, how to do it the right way, and those top pictures may not be familiar. In Florida, they host a yearly outreach event, hold in conjunction with FWC, at their MarineQuest and ScienceFest with USF.

We had an exhibit with one of our patrol boats, and it was great, and I think there was over 13,000 people that came on the public day. They had a school day, and there were about 1,600 kids that came, and I got to educate and deputize a lot of junior agents. I told them how to not feed dolphins, how to treat wildlife out there, and there are some pretty smart kids out there, and they know their stuff, and so that was cool to see.

We do try going to other events, and that lower-left picture is a conference that I was at in Tampa, and it's surprising, and there was a lot of folks involved with the Gulf of Mexico, that work in science, that did not know what a descender device was, and so I had to explain, to a lot of them, what it is and how to work it, and so we got word out with that.

The middle picture, we've been doing a lot of outreach with sea turtles, to remind folks that fill in holes when they're at the beach, especially with tourists and families coming down, to not hurt sea turtle hatchlings when they come, and the shark make picture that you see on there -- It's been a zero-retention ban for shortfin make for over a year or so now, commercial and

recreational, and we're still seeing that happen, at times, and so it's just another reminder, and HMS put out a Fishery Bulletin as well, but to remind folks that you cannot retain and bring those back in and sell them.

Partnerships, I can't speak enough of that, and you saw our first slide, with our staffing and where we are, and we are fully staffed in the Gulf, but, still, fourteen EOs is not a lot, from Texas all the way over and down to the Keys, and so we rely on these partnerships. I do want to give credit to Officer Carnegie, that's in here, and our relationship we have with Alabama. It works really well, and we're able to do a lot of joint ops and patrols together.

The upper-left picture, the shrimp picture, is from joint ops with federal and state partners that we've had, and the lower-left is doing a SIMP patrol, over in the Port of Mobile, and so we've done a lot of those efforts recently, ramping up too and working with Alabama Marine Resource folks, watching seafood that's coming in, figuring out the point of origin, and is it wild-caught, or is it aquaculture, and do you have the right paperwork, and is it getting imported in right?

That other picture too is we've even had shipments of shrimp coming into New Orleans that looked kind of questionable, from Ecuador, and the importer is based here in Mobile, and so our folks came over, and worked with Alabama, and we tracked everything, and it ended up being okay, but we watching that traced seafood, and trying to make sure that everything is coming in the way it should be.

Another thing with partnerships is we continue to do trainings. Those pictures on the right is our officer in Florida working with FWC officers, where we held essentially an IFQ workshop, and we taught newer officers how the IFQ program works, how to conduct an offload, what to expect, how to work with industry, and then we put it into practice, and they actually went, and they did inspections, and so it was good to have hands-on training and getting to work with the officers.

Some recent targeted operations, and I just mentioned all the Seafood Import Monitoring Program and seafood coming in that has revolved around that, and the Port of Panama City is kind of similar, with a JEA referral, and we did a combination of trainings and working with the ports and inspecting the containers.

Down in Texas, we've been doing a lot of ports of entry over the

time, and it's becoming more common, working with Customs, Texas Parks and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Customs and Border Patrol, and you see, in this picture, that everyone does what they can in their jurisdiction. We work on the fisheries side, for seafood coming in, and Fish and Wildlife tracked down some snakeskin boots, in that picture on the left, and all sorts of exotic goods coming in, and the state was able to find some oysters that were coming in illegally under their purview, and so it's a good example of all of us working together and getting the job done.

This is just a reminder too, and we always put this number up, and so, if someone does have info to report, and you want to get this out to the industry, the captains, and you can call, and you can leave this anonymously, or you can give your info, and we can give you a callback. We always monitor this line. We have someone rotate on it. If you give us something, we will try to act on it, and, if you do request a number, we can get back to you and let you know where we are, and so we encourage that, to help conserve the resource. I think, with that, I will take if there's any questions. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a couple of questions. Mr. Gill.

 MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Matt, for coming down and updating us, and thank you for all that you do. What I didn't see there, and perhaps I missed it, was I'm assuming that you all coordinate with the Coast Guard quite closely, and perhaps specific operations, perhaps just general coordination, but would you talk to that a little bit, about things like lanchas off of Texas and other areas in which you may participate together?

MR. WALIA: Sure, and the lanchas are a little bit of a different story. That's the purview of the Coast Guard, and that's their - What they go after. Usually what happens, in that case, is they will intercept a lancha, and they will bring the folks back to shore, confiscate the boat and gear, and notify us, but then, I would say, usually most people are expatriated back across the border, but then the gear is confiscated, and, currently, some folks in Pascagoula are looking into it, and they're trying to figure some stuff out with the gear, of how it's used, where it's from, and so, in that way, NOAA is involved.

Obviously, with the Coast Guard, yes, we do -- I mean, in the sanctuary, we've been working here local out of Sector Mobile, where we'll do fly-alongs with them, and our officer here has gone

along with them, to build relationships, and we can go over different closure areas in the Gulf, observe if boat are out there, and then do follow-up interviews afterwards. They do a lot of shrimp boardings when they're offshore, and you saw the Coast Guard report yesterday, and so we work with them on shrimp referrals, for TEDs and BRD violations, but, yes, we'll do joint ops with them all the time, on the Atlantic Coast and Caribbean, and it's just those happen to be the couple that I highlighted just this time, but absolutely, yes, and they're an integral partner.

MR. GILL: Thank you, sir.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you. First off, I just wondered, and do they let you ride in the jet, too?

MR. WALIA: Not me. I want to go, but they let this guy out, and I've got to figure out how to get over there.

MR. WALKER: Because we have issues with the Steamboat Lumps Marine Sanctuary out there, and it's 130 miles from shore, and so we understand the extreme difficulties in monitoring that, and I just wondered -- A flyby in a jet would save everybody a lot of time, and I didn't know if that was anything that you guys had access to or not, but is there somewhere that we can get more details on these cases that you listed, between \$5,700 and \$20,000 in the charter thing, because I always run into a brick wall when I try and --

 You know, there's a guy at my marina, that I was told, by our local enforcement guy, that we finally got that guy that's been flipping his nose at us, and everybody hates him, and he's busted for undersized fish a lot, but they finally got him on the offshore charters, that we've all reported him for, and that was it, and nobody has any details on it, and I understand that these cases take a while, and, if it's a big case, it may take a while, but so none of these have I ever actually gotten legitimate proof that they got any of these charter guys that we've all been turning in and complaining about for a long time, and can I access that information anywhere?

MR. WALIA: Yes, absolutely, and so there's -- I can provide the site to you later, but our Office of General Counsel -- They have a webpage, where they actually have their charging information, and so you can -- As they update their sheets -- And I incorporate that into our council reports, at the end of it, and so, if you

look at it, in the council report, it's all in there, but, when we work with General Counsel, and they issue a Notice of Violation Assessment, a NOVA, that becomes public after that.

It will list the subject, the amount, what the violation is, and so all of that is publicly available, and it's a matter of it becoming adjudicated, you know, the final outcome, but we do -- I know, in the past, I've done a story on outreach, and we try to promote it, and we're probably going to do a similar one leading up to the federal for-hire season, where we can highlight recent actions, and kind of similar to this, but put into a story what we've done, where we've worked, and here's some outcomes, and so I can make folks aware of it.

MR. WALKER: That would be great, because I think what we're all -- I say "we all", but a lot of us for-hire guys are just waiting for a guy that we can just put on blast, and say, look, this is what happens when you get caught doing illegal charters, and, as far as I know, we don't have anything like that, that we can put out there and essentially threaten these guys that are doing it, to deter them from doing it, especially if it had huge fines on it as well, and it would be a helpful deterrent, if I could share that.

MR. WALIA: I will get with you after the meeting. Absolutely. I appreciate it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. I'm not seeing any other questions. Thank you for your presentation.

MR. WALIA: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: We're going to move down the list to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and Mr. Donaldson.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know it's finally the time where I get to give my presentation, and everybody has been waiting with bated breath, and so rest assured that it is here.

I just wanted to update the council on some of our IRA activities. I mentioned, at the last meeting, we're putting together some workshops, and the steering committee has been established, and it is meeting regularly. A facilitator has been selected for both of the workshops, and the proposed date for the effort validation workshop is June 4th through 6th, and the proposed date for the

discard workshop is July 30th through August 1st, and we're still working on the locations, but they will be, more than likely, either New Orleans or St. Pete, but hopefully those will be figured out soon, and we'll get the information out.

Kind of a new development, under IRA, is at-sea sampling, and we're working expanding coverage to the western Gulf of Mexico, focusing on the for-hire fishery and reef fish species, working with Texas and Louisiana. They've developed statements of work and budgets, and work is scheduled to begin being conducted in January of next year, through December of 2026.

As was discussed during the state red snapper reports, we're continuing with the recreational fishing effort pilot, and it's a one-year pilot to test the LA Creel effort survey in Mississippi and Alabama. As reported, work continues, and is going well, and we're beginning the planning of, between the Gulf States and staff, to conduct the estimates, so we can start evaluating those, and we're actually having a meeting later this month, with Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, to develop the program and to begin developing those estimates, and, once the estimates are developed, we'll -- The analysis will be conducted to compare and contrast the various effort estimates. As I reported in the past, this presents a unique opportunity to examine the differences between the state and federal recreational surveys.

 As Andy talked about during the Shrimp Committee, we are -- We, in conjunction with Sea Grant, are planning a Southeast Shrimp Strategy and Planning Meeting, and it's scheduled for April $30^{\rm th}$ through May $1^{\rm st}$ in Baton Rouge.

The first day will be a variety of different presentations, and talking about the trade updates, a market buyer panel, and then the USDA and NOAA Fisheries are going to be providing presentations on the work that they're doing, in terms of the shrimp fishery, and then the second day is kind of where the rubber meets the road, and we're going to have breakout sessions to prioritize, and identify, actions for industry, the agency, and Sea Grant. I will mention that the meeting is quite large, and the meeting is invite-only.

Then the last -- I don't have it here, but I just wanted to mention that some of you know that Ron Lukens, who was a long-term employee of the commission, passed away last October, and I participated in an eternal reef dedication for him in Sarasota last month, and his wife, as well as members of our artificial reef subcommittee, participated in it, and there is plans to deploy similar reefs,

reef balls, in the other four states, and so his ashes will be distributed throughout the Gulf of Mexico, and so I just wanted to let folks know, and, with that, I will take any questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Donaldson. We have a question from Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Dave, for that. I'm sorry to hear about Ron. I knew he was in bad shape, but I'm always sorry to hear the endpoint. I was just going to comment that I like your new form, using these fancy PowerPoint slides, better than your old form, when we didn't have them, and so keep it up, if you would.

MR. DONALDSON: I appreciate that, and I would agree with you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I feel I'm missing something, like an interpretive dance. Maybe not a question for Dave, but more for Alabama and Mississippi, and, with the LA Creel expansion to your states, the sampling universe you're using -- Is that people that -- Did you essentially institute a reef fish permit, or are you using the universe that is essentially signed up for Snapper Check and Mississippi Tails 'n Scales?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Burris.

MR. RICK BURRIS: Thank you, and so Mississippi did -- We did implement a recreational offshore landing permit, similar to Louisiana, and it started in February, and I think, right now, we have about a thousand of those permits issued. It's a free permit, and we have about a thousand so far, and we expect to be anywhere between 5,000 and 8,000.

MR. STRELCHECK: So, you're seeing it, obviously, grow over time.

MR. BURRIS: Yes, and, once snapper season opens, it should grow considerably.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Bannon.

MR. BANNON: I tell a lot of stories, but I don't want to tell a lie, and so I don't know if we're using our reef fish endorsement database or our saltwater license database. Dave, I don't know if you remember which one.

 MR. DONALDSON: I don't, off the top of my head.

MR. BANNON: But I can get that. I will get that information, and Kevin had to get offline for another call.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Any other questions for Mr. Donaldson? Not seeing any, we're going to move along, and Dr. Simmons is going to walk us through a Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities.

COUNCIL PLANNING AND PRIMARY ACTIVITIES

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, in an effort to make our PowerPoint presentation much shiner next time, we're going to try to do an interactive web tool, but, until then, you're stuck with Tab R, Number 6.

MR. DONALDSON: I thought you were going to say interpretative dance.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: No, and that's above my paygrade. All right, and so I will try to focus on June, since that's our next meeting, and so we did try to add some text in here, but you have to right-click on it, and it's kind of a pain, and so that's why we're going to try the web-based tool.

Focusing on June, we're planning to bring the for-hire data collection document back, and so SEFHIER 2.0. I don't think we're going to be able to take final action on the Spanish mackerel catch limits in June, and we'll have to think about probably pushing that at least until August, and so we'll see if we can bring a draft back with taking a look at the bag limits, as well as your preferreds for the other actions.

Gag framework management measures, that's something you postponed, and so that's from a previous meeting. For Reef Fish 60, IFQ distribution, we heard you would like to have some more agenda time, and so we'll work with the Chair and Vice Chair to see if we can do that. We had planned to bring, I think, a draft of Reef Fish 59, IFQ permit requirements, and we are not planning to bring back anything for the shallow-water grouper catch levels for the next meeting, but bring something back, that's a little bit more comprehensive, for the August meeting.

You have decided to postpone work on the midwater snapper complex, and so you will not see that in June, and then you will not see the framework action for shrimp until August, and so, Mr. Chair,

I will see if there's any questions.

1 2 3

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Any questions for Dr. Simmons? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: It sounds, to me, like a light agenda in June, no?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I don't think so. We have the sanctuary folks wanting to come talk to us about wahoo, and we have at least a half-a-day of IFQ discussion, from what I can tell, and so I don't think it will be light, but I will certainly be working with the Chair and Vice Chair and let you know as soon as possible.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a couple of questions. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Carrie. We have, obviously, a lot of fairly complex, long-term actions that we're working on, that I know are time-consuming, and we talked today about the red snapper framework, and you also were asking for advice on kind of where mackerel fits in, and so I would love to hear from you, given this schedule, and midwater falling off, what you think the capacity is for staff to work on those actions and the timing of those.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I will give a shot, and no promises, as you took our fishery biologist, and we're trying to hire another one, and so, that being said, I think my understanding is the king mackerel framework action is a higher priority, just because we are concerned about the stock, and I think we have a little bit of time, based on the fact that the red snapper effort is likely not going to take place until next year, and so we'll try to do something for August, for that, I would anticipate, and try to bring something back for king mackerel in June, would be my understanding of priority, but jump in if you have a different idea.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't, and I think we need to certainly talk to —— I need to talk to my team, and get a good handle on kind of workload, and you may have said this, and so, with Reef Fish 60, would we at least bring some actions, and alternatives, back in June, for some discussion? Would that be worthwhile, just to help with the August meeting?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: That was not my understanding, but I'm going to look at Dr. Diagne, and I thought we were going to try to continue to work on .

DR. ASSANE DIAGNE: Yes, and the initial plan was to work on 59, but, given that, as a council, I mean, you have a draft purpose and need, and, you know, the general, quote, unquote, categories of actions, if that is what the council is looking to see in June, we'll just have to talk with the other members of the IPT, and, as you said -- I mean, it's the same people that's doing it, right, 59 and 60, et cetera, but, if that is what the council would like to see, we are going to make every effort to at least bring something to support your discussions.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: To that point, I mean, these are, obviously, complicated amendments, and I agree about the kind of alternating back and forth, and I'm just -- I'm concerned when we wait four months, or five months, between meetings, right, to give staff direction, and then we're reacting, and that maybe it could benefit the process if we -- If we don't ask staff to bring back a full amendment, but just a kind of initial rough-cut of the actions, and the alternatives, so that we can weigh-in, and then that provides better guidance for the August discussion, and so that was my suggestion, but I recognize that we would have to find time on the agenda to make that happen.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Let's chat after this meeting, after you talk with your team, and let's get back together. Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Moving down the list, next up is the Federal Charter Vessel ID Marking Requirements. Mr. Strelcheck.

OTHER BUSINESS FEDERAL CHARTER VESSEL ID MARKING REQUIREMENTS

MR. STRELCHECK: During the Law Enforcement report, Matt alluded to law enforcement doing some outreach, and one of the requirements that's been in existence, since I believe it was Amendment 1, is numbering requirements on vessels, and they have to be -- Excuse me. For-hire vessels, and they have to be a certain size, depending on the size of the vessel, and we've been messaging, obviously, the need to, obviously, meet these requirements, and there has been certainly some pushback by industry, but I think they've brought up a reasonable concern, and so, for those that

aren't familiar, the letters have to be at least eighteen inches in height for vessels over sixty-five feet, ten inches in height for vessels over twenty-five feet, and three inches in height for vessels twenty-five feet long or less.

The complaint has largely been for that middle-range of vessels, the twenty-five to sixty-five feet, and ten-inch tall letters, on a twenty-five-foot vessel, takes up half the boat, right, and so I've talked to law enforcement, the head of law enforcement, Manny Antonaras, and he's certainly amenable to looking into this. I forwarded this to Carrie, and shared this information, and I wanted to bring it to your attention, because we have gotten some calls from captains, expressing their frustration about it, and I think it's worth revising, but I would like to get some law enforcement input, and so my thought would be that we could provide this before the Law Enforcement AP, and have them weigh-in, and then we could consider their input thereafter.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I think that would be outstanding, because, as a vessel that falls in that range, those letters are unreasonable to ask me to put on my boat. I have them, but they're absurdly large, and really unnecessary, but it's in the rule, and so you have to do that, and so I would greatly appreciate an opportunity to discuss finding what's acceptable to law enforcement and maybe getting us some more reasonably-sized lettering for our commercial, small commercial, vessels.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: So, do we have a schedule for when the Law Enforcement AP typically meets? Are they scheduled to meet anytime soon?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: They typically meet with the Gulf States Commission, and it's the same time, in the spring and the fall, but I think, for the spring, we just had the virtual meeting, and so I think the next one would be scheduled for like the second week in October, or something like that, the second or third week in October, but we talked about, if there needed to be an interim meeting, like just a virtual call, if you thought that it rose to that, but I wasn't sure where we landed.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I think there's frustration around this. Is there urgency? Probably not, and, I mean, I think, as you pointed out, it could probably be handled with a virtual call, if

you wanted to set something up, or wait until October, but I did want to kind of get it in the queue for consideration, and then I think, if we did make changes, it could be hopefully kind of a simple, expedited action that we would work on.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We're going to move on to Mr. Diaz, and you had some concern regarding BOEM?

DISCUSSION OF GREEN HYDROGEN PRODUCTION

MR. DIAZ: Yes. Thank you. Bernie, can you pull up that slide that we were talking about? If you all can remember, yesterday, I asked the question of the presenter, who gave us the presentation yesterday, about this slide, and some minor edits were made to the lease instrument in the PSN to allow lessees to propose green hydrogen production as an energy product of offshore wind generation, and two core areas were adjusted. I'm not sure what that means.

The reason I'm bringing this up is this caught me by surprise, and I've talked to several council members this morning, and nobody has heard anything about green hydrogen until this slide come up, and, when I asked that question, they told me that it was in the prior iteration, and I don't know what that means, but I haven't known about it until this meeting, and so, you know, we've been having presentations on offshore wind, and I think we've been acting very responsible with offshore wind, and we've been mostly concerned with where they site these things, and BOEM has been great about working with us, and I like the process and all, but green hydrogen is a whole different thing.

IF green hydrogen is part of the equation, we should be asking different questions, and so I don't know enough about this topic to talk very intelligently, and I probably know enough just to be dangerous, but you can produce hydrogen from regular water, okay, and, if it's done on land, with conventional sources, it's just hydrogen, but, if you use a renewable source, it's called green hydrogen, and so, in the Northeast, where we've already got some offshore wind projects, the states in the Northeast have mandated that utilities in those states have to buy the power generated by those offshore wind.

From an article that I read last night online, that's not happening in the Gulf, and there's no mandate that the state utilities buy those powers, and so it's probably very appealing to do green hydrogen in the Gulf of Mexico, and I think we probably should expect that a lot of these ventures will probably do that, and so

I'm kind of rambling, and I know it's late in the day, and I apologize for that, but, a long time ago, and Dave, or some of the other folks that has been around a while can help me, but there was some proposed LNG projects in the Gulf of Mexico.

At that time, we thought the U.S. was going to be an importer of LNG, and, to re-gasify the liquid LNG, there were ways that they would suck water out of the Gulf to warm it up, and so it was open-loop systems and closed-loop systems, and we were very concerned about the open-loop systems that used a massive amount of water, because you could have larvae that get into these systems and don't make it, and I can't remember the numbers, but the numbers were a huge amount of larvae that was impacted by this, and I think this may have the potential for something like that, but we haven't asked the questions.

I think we need to, today, figure out a way to do something, where we get some answers, and there's the comment period, from what I understand from the presentation, that ends on May 15, and we don't even have another meeting between now and then, and we don't know how much water they're going to use, and we have no idea. You know, does the desalination process put waste back in the water? How many larvae is liable to be impacted? Are there any pollutions from the cleaning processes that's going to have to be done? I mean, the questions just go on and on and on.

I would like to see if other council members are concerned, and, if you all are, help me come up with a way that we can do something to react to this in a responsible way. I mean, I think it's our job to look out for things that impact the living marine resources of the Gulf.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think this is a valid point, and I will kind of express a little -- I mean, I think BOEM has been very responsive in providing updates to the council, but I will express a little bit of frustration with providing them the materials at the last minute, and it puts us in an awkward position, where we are not prepared, especially when we're seeing potential new information, or changes that we have not seen in the past, and so I can certainly work with them, and try to do a better job at that, which I have, but I will try to keep doing that, and so that was one thing.

The other thing I can do is reach back out to them immediately and try to get more information on this, and they have answered the

councils in writing that they could not answer during the meeting, and I have distributed that to the council as well, and so I could start with that, and then, if other council members want to weighin on other things you would like me to do, and we can go from there.

MR. DIAZ: From my perspective, I would like that, Dr. Simmons, but I would not like this May 15 deadline to pass without us making some comments that we've got some real concerns, because I don't think we're commenting on wind projects, but we're commenting on something that has the potential to use a massive amount of water out in the Gulf of Mexico, at multiple locations, and we have no idea what the impacts would be, and so I will shut up for a minute, and see if other people have ideas. If they don't, I will try to throw something out there.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so my interpretation of this, which could be jaded, coming from Louisiana, right, and all the things that go on over there, but it was to allow the lessees to propose green hydrogen production in there, and so the areas, the call areas, that were previously available for leasing -- There was only one small section that was actually leased out of all of that the last time, and so what I think they're doing here is trying to make this a little bit more favorable, or palatable, to the industry, to potentially lease the second round of this, in Gulf 2, whatever they call it, those areas, but that doesn't necessarily mean that's what's going to happen over there.

It gives them the potential for that, right, but they may still be putting in facilities that are just wind energy only, with electricity piped inshore to produce hydrogen inshore, and I don't really know, and it could be offshore, and it would make sense to me, and I understand the concerns.

We have multiple LNG projects taking place in Louisiana right now, but they're all taking place within state waters, right, and they're actually on land, but they utilize some water entrainment for whatever, cooling purposes or whatever they do with it, but it's for LNG export, and not import, is what that's for, and we've had many reviews, and we were able to provide comment on that stuff, and I think, in this process, we'll probably get another update, at the next meeting, from these guys, where we could ask more questions, but you're right, and the deadline for comments, on at least this part, is due in May, but I don't think it's going to dictate what they actually are able to do within those lease

areas. My interpretation of what we saw is that it just gives an extra option here, right? That's just my opinion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have a list. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I agree with Dale. I mean, this is the first time that I really saw any of this, and I think, because you have to have comments in a relatively short order, one of the comments might be, you know, next time they give us a presentation, what is the magnitude of, you know, hydrogen production that they're talking about, and how much water might be involved, and that will help us, I think, better understand what types of impacts we might want to consider and provide feedback going down the road.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Freeman.

DR. FREEMAN: Thank you, and so I just wanted to add to Mr. Diaz's comment. As you all know, the Shrimp AP met, just about two weeks ago, and they receive a BOEM presentation regularly, and it's one of the industry groups that is highly involved in providing feedback, and I am a bit disappointed to share with the council that this was not relayed to the Shrimp AP, and I think that was a missed opportunity, where the AP could have provided additional feedback to the council, should a letter, with comments, be provided.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Go ahead, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so my question is for Dr. Walter, being on the taskforce, but also whether the Science Center can provide any guidance on this for us, and, secondly, whether the Science Center intends to comment on it directly.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Walter.

 DR. WALTER: Well, I'm glad that we got an extension on our presentation for the taskforce, because developments seem to happen fairly rapidly in the offshore, in whatever arena that we are now, and so, yes, absolutely, we're going to comment on this in our taskforce, and I think it's concerning, for two reasons. One is because we did the marine spatial planning specifically for offshore wind, and green hydrogen is a different thing, that I'm not very familiar with as well, and I'm really just scrambling to learn about it, and I think you might do that planning, and siting, differently, if it had different impacts on our trust resources.

Leasing, with the option for something else, when you plan for a

particular activity, is problematic, and I think we'll probably comment on that, and then the other aspect of it is that the time that we're able to consider something like this is really short, particularly because I think many of us, staff who have worked on LNG considerations for many years, and there were substantial concerns related to impingement for many of our species.

I think both are those are going to -- We'll comment on, and that we really need more information about this, and a greater understanding of the process for how the lease for wind also gives -- What it gives relative to opportunities for green hydrogen for the lessee, and so, yes, this is a new development that's also been a bit of a surprise to us. Thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: So it sounds like several folks are concerned, and we're late in the day, on the last day, and so I don't want to drag this out, and is it possible for us to leave this, Dr. Simmons, where, when you make your contact, if you see there's some things that are concerning, based on what you've heard from the council members today, that we would give the Chair the authority to write a letter for the comment period, to just note that we have some concerns, and we would like further information, and a chance to dig into it more, or something to that effect?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I would feel comfortable working with the Chair and Vice Chair to do that, yes.

MR. DIAZ: Does that require a motion?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think we've had enough discussion, and I think I'm okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: One other thought is John and I have a monthly call with the Director for BOEM in the Gulf of Mexico, Jim Kendall, and it may be appropriate to invite Carrie, and council staff, to participate in one of those calls, going forward, to give you a platform to share some of your concerns with regard to fisheries issues, and so we'll think about that, and talk to the staff that we usually coordinate with on those calls, and we'll let you know, but certainly we'll share some of these concerns that we're hearing today during our comments at the taskforce meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Next up on the list is the MSA Data

Confidentiality Proposed Rulemaking, and NOAA Fisheries staff is online. Mr. Wiedoff.

MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT (MSA) DATA CONFIDENTIALITY PROPOSED RULEMAKING

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Just a little bit of background, if I could, and so this came out, and I think it was sent out in a press release, as, you know, a notice of the proposed rulemaking, like March 8 or something like that, and then the deadline, I believe, is like coming right up, and it's at the end of the month, and so that's why we're trying to squeeze it in under Other Business today.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay, Mr. Wiedoff.

 MR. BRETT ALGER: My name is Brett Alger, and I work for the Office of Science and Technology at NOAA Fisheries Headquarters. Today, I'm representing the agency, on behalf of both sort of a small group of folks that have been working on this effort at Headquarters, in addition to a much larger sort of advisory group that's comprised of staff from all of our Regional Offices, all of our Science Centers, and a number of national programs, and so what I'm going to be presenting to you is kind of very comprehensive of across a lot of issues, a lot of programs, across the agency.

The first thing that I want to start with is sort of why are we doing this rulemaking, what is it all about, why now, and the Magnuson-Stevens Act has a number of provisions in it, and, specifically, one of them is protection of confidential information, and, in the statute, it provides that the Secretary, and this is the key term, shall, by regulation, prescribe procedures that may be necessary to preserve the confidentiality of information, and the point there is this is not being done by choice, or by discretion, and this is a mandate that comes from the statute itself.

That said, there are a number of elements to how we manage confidential information that are out-of-date. The relevant regulations were last updated in the early 1990s, and we have the NOAA Administrative Order 216 that was last updated in the mid-1990s, and then there's been a number of additional updates to the statute, from 1996 to 2006, and then, in 2015, there were amendments to the Moratorium Protection Act.

Lastly, there is clearly new ways of collecting data nowadays, in

terms of camera-based electronic monitoring, electronic reporting programs, and, you know, the agency, in partnership with councils and states and the fishery industry, and a whole host of other partners, you know, share and disseminate different data products in different ways, for different reasons, and so this is also an opportunity to kind of look under the hood and potentially streamline some of those procedures as we move forward.

The last point that I want to make, here on this slide, is that, you know, we sort of -- We believe that a lot of what we're doing, and undertaking in this rulemaking effort, is really just bringing the regulations up-to-speed with how we operate today, and we don't see this as an effort that is wholesale changing a number of things, and it's not taking some amount of data and moving it to the other side of the line and, you know, broadcasting it anywhere, and we see this as an effort that's largely just recognizing what we do in practice today across all of our fisheries, all of our regions, and just bringing the regulations kind of up-to-speed, if you will.

In the rulemaking, I would break it down into sort of two broad categories. The first would be different technical and sort of procedural elements, and so I mentioned, a moment ago, the previous statutes that made amendments to -- The actions that made amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and one, in particular, is that it changed the wording of "confidential statistics" to "confidential information". That word change seems small, but it's, you know, quite important.

Then, also, that, you know, information that's submitted to the Secretary -- You know, it applies to state agencies, to marine commissions, and others, and, you know, it's not just the physical NOAA Fisheries, and we have these partner organizations that are sort of under that umbrella of information that's being collected by the agency.

The rulemaking sets out a procedure for improving, you know, how we manage confidential information, things like MOUs, data-sharing agreements, the rule of three, and those types of things are kind of set forth in the rulemaking. There are a number of exceptions in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, with respect to disclosing information, and one example here would be that, you know, councils can access confidential information, and so the rule talks a little bit about that, and then, lastly, you know, we're making some updates for how states, or observer service providers, or EM service providers, can collect confidential information.

In addition to, you know, some of these sorts of technical changes, we're also -- We already have a number of terms, and definitions, which exist in regulation today, but they have often, you know, had a little bit of uncertainty. There's been kind of, you know, not quite an understanding of maybe specifically what a term may mean, and those are really important terms, and I will go through these quickly, but the rule is basically providing the agency's definition of how we define some of these pieces of information, and so providing a definition of what confidential information is, defining the "business of any person", in quotes, and protecting that information from aggregate or summary-form disclosures.

There are a number of elements within the limited-access program exception that are being defined, and then it clarifies who can submit a written authorization for the release of confidential information, and so the example there would be like, if you're the vessel owner, and you want to release your information to an outside third party, it offers a little bit more certainty in that process and who is responsible for putting that written request in for authorizing the release of that data.

Let's start by, you know, defining what is confidential information, and it's broken into two components. The first one is any observer information is considered confidential, and so data collected by observers, data collected by camera-based EM systems, but then the much broader suite of data, and they're going to be any information that's required, and that's the key word there, is required to be submitted to the Secretary, a state agency, or a commission, and so that's going to be logbooks, and that's going to be VMS, and that's landings, and that's the whole suite of data that's potentially required to be submitted to the agency.

The inverse here would be, you know, what about information that's voluntarily collected, right, and there is lots of research projects that go on, and sometimes you might have logbook requirements, but you might collect a few other pieces of data. Information that's collected voluntarily would not be considered confidential under these definitions.

Moving down, you know, what is not confidential information, and so, to address the amendments in the Moratorium Protection Act, information that is collected under sort of agreements between the United States and specific RFMOs, such as fishing effort, catch information, and other forms of vessel-specific information that we need to provide to those RFMOs to satisfy those sharing obligations, and that information would not be considered

confidential, nor would information collected by the agency under the Magnuson Act regarding specifically foreign vessels.

The next kind of layer down is, you know, what is not confidential information, and so the slide in front of you here basically goes into, you know, we deploy observers across our different fisheries, largely under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, but, of course, fisheries are out and operating, and observers are on vessels collecting information, and they're recording interactions with species protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and sometimes the Endangered Species Act, and so the rulemaking goes into -- To sort of bifurcate that, you know, under the MMPA, there is very specific provisions that information must be provided for the public decision-making process, and so that's going to be information like the date, the time, the location of interactions, the type of species, the fishing practices, and those are pieces of information that would be treated as not confidential, so they can be made available through those public processes, such as a TRT.

However, the Endangered Species Act does not have provisions regarding the public use of information, unlike the MMPA, and so the rule talks about how we would continue to treat interactions with ESA-listed species as confidential information.

I mentioned, a moment ago, you know, some definitions under the LAP exception, and so the rule goes into defining these very specific terms, which have largely been used for setting up limited access programs, setting up catch share fisheries, and so, you know, due to maybe how those have been set up in the past, people have -- Industry groups, councils, and others, have raised issues, or questions, about what do these very specific terms mean, and so the rule does that.

It defines a limited-access program to mean a program that allocates specific fishing privileges, such as a total portion of catch, a certain amount of fishing effort, or say specific access to a fishing area, and it defines that word "determination", which means a decision that is specific to a person or exclusive fishing privileges that are sought or held under a limited-access program, and so, you know, sought being, you know, as the program is being developed, obviously, there is processes for fishermen to sort if, you know, demonstrate their participation, and history, in the fishery, and so that would be an example of when you're seeking the development of a limited-access program.

These decisions are -- You know, they could be any number of

things, like allocations, approval or denial of a lease or a sale of those fishing privileges, or indices and adjustments, and then the last definition is required to be submitted.

That is interpreted such that the exception here applies at the level of confidential information that the agency has used, or intends to use, for a regulatory determination, and so a quick example there would be like, if the agency uses vessel landings, for a given three-year period, for, you know, determining allocations, the aggregated catch across those three years would be subject to disclosure.

However, you know, a vessel's yearly, or monthly, or trip-by-trip landings, would not be subject to the exception, because that information wasn't necessarily used to make the very specific determination at that three-year level.

Digging a little deeper into the written authorization exception, I mentioned that, you know, there is an exception in Magnuson that allows the agency to disclose confidential information when the Secretary, and I'm reading the quote there, when the Secretary has obtained written authorization from the person submitting such information to release it to persons for reasons not otherwise provided here, and so you are the person that has the responsibility to release that information, and you submit, you know, a request to the agency, and that's on you to determine, you know, who specifically you would want that information to be shared with.

If you go down to the second bullet though, that really starts to get into specifically observer information, and so you may put in a request to say that I want my logbook data, my landings data, et cetera, et cetera, but, specifically with respect to observer information, the rule clarifies that observer information is submitted by the person who is subject to the observer coverage requirement.

In other words, that's saying that an EM service provider is providing the observer services, but they're not necessarily the one that has the authority to release the information, and that release has to come from the person that is responsible for the observer coverage requirement in the first place.

The last part here is, you know, how does the proposed rule address aggregate and summary release of information, and the very kind of bedrock part of this component is defining the business of any person, and so the agency may, you know, aggregate, or summarize,

confidential information, and then release it publicly, but not if -- You know, if directly, or indirectly, it discloses the identity or business or any person, and so the proposed rule defines aggregate or summary form to explicitly address the business of any person, meaning, you know, the financial and operational information that is collected, and we see this change as providing, you know, broader protection for fishery information that is submitted through say logbooks or collected through observers and electronic monitoring programs.

Lastly, I want to spend just a quick moment on this slide, because it has raised a number of questions, through doing these briefings and other conversations, and so there's a part of the rule that talks about how the agency will undertake, you know, developing, or improving, our internal control procedures, and the three elements that you see in front of you we see as sort of core to that effort.

The first being, you know, developing data aggregation standards, and a lot of you have probably heard about the rule of three, and, you know, how do you aggregate data together to make it releasable, and we want to make -- You know, we want to make our decision-making more consistent in that arena, so that, you know, a stock assessment scientist in one Science Center is sort of evaluating sort of data requests, or data disclosure, the same, or similar, way as maybe a stock assessment scientist in another region, as an example.

The next layer down would be, you know, how do third parties access confidential information, and so I see this as sort of like organization-to-organization data sharing, you know, between councils, commissions, contractors, et cetera, and then the third part I would say is more specific to like the individual boat owner, the individual -- You know, the permit holder, in terms of how do we improve, you know, data access for vessel owners and operators and things like that.

You know, the example there would be, you know, as ocean planning is occurring, and, of course, you know, windfarm, wind placement, is a big issue. You know, fishermen are going to want to have their own data, so that they can, you know, use it as they see fit, as those ocean planning conversations go along, and so each of these three elements -- I just want to kind of pause to state that we're not necessarily promoting the idea of like uprooting, and completely overhauling and changing, a lot of how we operate.

We see this as trying to perfect and make tweaks, and updates, to

specific MOUs, where appropriate, revisiting how fishermen access their data in each region, and trying to make improvements to that, you know, creating consistency in the rule of three, and these, to me, are all sort of at the margins, in a sense, of trying to make some improvements. I don't want people to feel like what you see on your slide here, and what's in the rule, is it's some completely new thing that the agency is undertaking. We want to make some streamlining efforts to all of it.

I want to thank you for your time, and I know that this has all kind of been put together, you know, and put on agendas in the council meetings in a -- Not a rushed way, but in a hurried way, I would say, and the comments can be received through Thursday, April 25. The link, that you see on the screen, actually takes you to the regulation, or to be able to provide comments, and, at the bottom, you see an email address, if you want to send questions.

I will just say, really quickly, just because we've received some questions at some of these other briefings, from other councils, that I think is very pertinent to yours, and any other councils that we present to, and just a couple of things.

You know, we got a question around, you know, what would be the impact, or the workload, on councils, and executive directors, moving forward, and, in the short-term, you know, councils, and directors, may need to review, and update, relevant MOUs and datasharing agreements, but, in the long-term, we expect this to establish a more efficient process and reduce the overall burdens to the councils and other partners.

We received a lot of questions around will this make it easier for fishermen to access their own data, and yes. Yes, period. We expect to improve our policies, and our technical systems, so that fishermen, you know, can request, and access, their information, and maybe the last one I will say is that, you know, what is expected from updating these internal control procedures, that last slide I hit on, and I just want to reinforce that we see this as, you know, leveraging what's in place now, reviewing it, you know, taking into account how well it works, and how well it doesn't work, and trying to streamline a lot of that, moving forward, and so, with that, I will stop, and I will answer what questions I can. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Alger. Do we have any questions on the presentation? Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Alger. A real question, and, to use a specific example, you mentioned the rule of three in there, and can you expand, or hypothesize, on how you would see that potentially impacting the way that data is handled from the menhaden industry, and so the rule of three applies, because there's only two major industries, or businesses, within that fishery, and do you anticipate any changes to how that's being handled?

MR. ALGER: Well, what I would say -- Well, one, I don't want to dive too deep into very like fisheries-specific questions, and I understand the question you're asking here, and how I would answer that is there are a number of instances, around the country, where quota shares, permit holding, you know, fishery operations, are condensed into what would be less than three owners, or less than three vessels, or things of that nature, and we're well aware of those types of things, and I think this exercise will reveal that there are going to be edge cases where, based on how the fishery is prosecuted, and how it's permitted, and how quotas are addressed, the status quo is going to stay the same.

I think where we're probably going to find most of our improvements are in fisheries where there's a lot of permit holders, and there's a lot of information being collected across a lot of data collection programs, and there's probably some ways to more streamline those sort of broader, you know, fishery operations, if you will, but your point is spot-on, and it's something that, you know, we take very seriously, and I think we would have a very, you know, public, and transparent, dialogue about how any of these changes would impact, you know, different fisheries, once we get to that point in this process.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. We have more question from Ms. Levy.

 MS. LEVY: It's not really a question, but just to Chris's question, and so just keep in mind that these changes, and the confidentiality provisions, apply to things that are required to be submitted under the Magnuson Act, and so, for your particular question, right, we don't manage menhaden, and so that information is not required to be submitted under the Magnuson Act, or the Magnuson Act regulations, and so these rules that they're talking about are not going to apply to that, per se, and I think that's why we don't want to get into fisheries-specific questions, and it's going to depend on what you manage, right, and what you require people to submit.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Schieble.

MR. ALGER: (Mr. Alger's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. LEVY: Sorry, but what did you say?

MR. ALGER: I just showed my own personal ignorance on how the menhaden fishery is managed, and I don't have all the particulars, but you're right. Some of the fisheries managed by states wouldn't necessarily be impacted by this rulemaking.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: We don't need to go into depth here, but so all the data is handled by your office, and not the states. They send in their daily fishing logs, and it's handled by NOAA, and, to request that information, it's fully confidential, and it comes from your offices, and that's what I was getting at, and it's not necessarily the management of the fishery, particularly, and it's the management of the data.

MS. LEVY: We don't have to get into now, but, I mean, there are -- These rules that apply, they're implementing the Magnuson Act confidentiality provisions. There may be data that comes into the agency from outside of the Magnuson Act that may be, quote, not releasable under FOIA, like for other reasons, right, because it's confidential business information, but I'm just -- Those are two separate things, and so I just wanted to be clear that these rules are being implemented under the Magnuson Act provisions, and so that's what they apply to.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Levy, and thank you, Mr. Alger. Okay. There is nothing left on the agenda. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief. I originally intended to add this to the Other Business, and I have a motion that I had prepared, and I would like to just raise it to the attention of the council, and see if there's any appetite for considering it at the June meeting, and that is the briefing book.

As you know, the input to the briefing book was abnormally slow for this meeting, and it's a perennial problem, and it's been around forever, I believe, and this is not a slap at council staff, because it's mostly related to inputs that come from outside of staff into the briefing book, but the net result, considering what the council's responsibilities are, is that a late arrival, say a Sunday night arrival, and then discussion on Monday or Tuesday, says we don't have adequate time to consider the issue at-hand,

much less make a good decision on it, and so it impacts how we perform our responsibilities, and, ultimately, the shareholders.

There are solutions to them, and the solutions are not necessarily well-received by everybody, and my motion was going to propose one, but I wanted to see if the council had appetite to discuss this in more detail at the June meeting, and perhaps take action to consider a solution, because there are times, and it happened back in -- I don't remember, but 2009, or 2010, but gag -- We had a timeline on gag, and it was a complicated deal, and we got the information late on Sunday night, and we had to make a decision on Tuesday, and it's totally unacceptable.

Even though it didn't have any major impact this time, it could, and I think, just thinking proactively, there are things we can do, if we choose to do them, and it might be a little painful for some folks, and it would have some consequences, but, if there is an appetite on the council to do so, I would be happy to have that conversation at the June meeting, unless you want to discuss it now, but I'm thinking just a consideration for June. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Schieble.

22 23

MR. SCHIEBLE: To that point, Mr. Gill, I had similar concerns, because I just had come from the Shrimp AP meeting, and some things were late there as well, but I realize -- At least to me, I attributed it to the fact that the council staff are short-staffed right now, and they've had two folks leave, and I am correct in this, recently, and so I kind of just attributed it to that, but anyway.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To that point, and so, again, I don't view this as a council staff fundamental problem. This time, on Saturday morning, when I checked, there was four items on the agenda that were not in the briefing book, and, you know, every time we've talked about this in the past -- The last time I was on the council, you know, it was workload, and it was short-staffed, and that's always an issue, and one solution to that is, okay, we go to four council meetings, instead of five, right, and have the same amount of time in each meeting, and it's not a good solution.

That's a problem that is probably never going to get solved, and I'm thinking there's other things that we can do, and we can talk about it, if the council desires, and we can think about it, and

we can talk about it come June.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes.

social then, right, Dakus?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Any other comments? Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I just have a question, and did I hear this right,

the other day, the next meeting is our 300th meeting, and is that

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: I think we can discuss it in June, Mr. Gill,

and I don't think it was the staff, and I think it was the staff waiting on other entities to provide documentation, and so I think

we can discuss that in June. I have Mr. Geeslin and Dr. Frazer.

with you, but some of that material -- Our council staff are

compiling a lot of that, and some of that is incumbent upon those

that are providing those materials. You know, case-in-point, our

state red snapper rec updates, and Ryan provides a date, and most of us are going to get them to him on that date, and some of us

are going to go beyond that date, and so that's a shared

MR. GILL: Absolutely, Dakus, and I think that's the bulk of the

MR. RINDONE: I am going to congratulate Mr. Schieble on being the

DR. FRAZER: I don't think Bob is trying to point the fingers at

anybody, and I think we're always trying to talk about how to

improve efficiencies, and this just falls in that lingo a little, and we can talk a little bit of time to talk about it, and that

issue. It's the input to staff, and it is not the staff itself.

responsibility, as our staff compiles all that effort.

So that means our host has to have one hell of

J.D., to that point, Mr. Gill, I completely agree

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

correct?

MR. SCHIEBLE:

MR. GEESLIN:

first one.

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21 22

23 24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31 32

33 34

35 36

37 38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45 47

46 VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Me too. Mr. Strelcheck.

would be all right by me.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Louisiana, baby.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Dr. Frazer.

MR. GEESLIN: We all met your deadline, Ryan.

MR. STRELCHECK: I certainly have some ownership with dropping the gag and red grouper presentation not even on Saturday, and it was Monday afternoon, right, and so I will accept that as a critique. One of the things that I've been thinking about as well is just how we operate and work within a council meeting, and how we could become more effective, in terms of decisions and dialogue and discussion, and, you know, we do get a lot of presentations, and sometimes those take a lot of time, and I'm wondering, you know, if there's some suggestions that we could talk about as well in June, about how those presentations are structured, kind of key decision points, stopping points during presentations, to make sure there's adequate time for dialogue, so that we can use that information to the best possible way, and so, anyway, just a suggestion.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUGAS: Okay. Thank you for that. All right. With that, the only thing I have on my list is the June meeting in Houston, Texas, at the Omni Houston Hotel. Thank you, staff, and thank you, council members. Safe travels, and we'll see you in Houston. We're adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned on April 11, 2024.)