1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	291 ST MEETING
4 5	FULL COUNCIL SESSION
6 7	Omni Hotel Corpus Christi, Texas
8 9	AUGUST 22-25, 2022
10 11	VOTING MEMBERS
12	Dale DiazMississippi
13	Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)Alabama
14	Susan BoggsAlabama
15	Patrick BanksLouisiana
16	Billy BroussardLouisiana
17	Jonathan DugasLouisiana
18	Phil DyskowFlorida
19	Tom FrazerFlorida
20	Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas
21	Bob GillFlorida
22 23	Michael McDermottMississippi
23	Bob Shipp
25	Joe SpragginsMississippi
26	Andy StrelcheckNMFS Greg StunzTexas
27	C.J. SweetmanFlorida
28	Troy WilliamsonTexas
29	TIOY WITHUMSON
30	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
31	Dave Donaldson
32	LCDR Lisa Motoi
33	
34	STAFF
35	John FroeschkeDeputy Director
36	Beth HagerAdministrative Officer
37	Lisa HollenseadFishery Biologist
38	Ava LasseterAnthropologist
39	Mary LevyNOAA General Counsel
40 41	Natasha Mendez-Ferrer
42	Ryan RindoneLead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
43	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
44	Charlotte SchiaffoAdministrative & Human Resources Assistant
45	Camilla ShiremanAdministrative & Communications Assistant
46	Carrie SimmonsExecutive Director
47	Carly SomersetFisheries Outreach Specialist
48	

1	OTHER PARTICIPANTS	
2	Greg AbramsPanama City	, FL
3	Tres Atkins	
4	Will Atkins	•
5	Charlie Bergmann	
6	Taylor BeyeaLGI	
7	John BlackPanama City Beach	•
8	-	•
	Randy BlankenshipNOAA	
9	Doug Boyd	
10	Eric BrazerShareholders Alli	
11	Donna Brooks	
12	Glen Brooks	
13	B.J. BurkettPanama City	•
14	Rick Burris	
15	Les Casterline	
16	Laura Chicola	
17	Ron Chicola	
18	Bubba Cochrane	•
19	Laura Faitel Cimo	
20	Jason Delacruz	FL
21	David Detlor	NOAA
22	Russell Dunn	NOAA
23	Katie Fischer	FL
24	Richard Fischer	LA
25	Troy Frady	AL
26	Benny GallawayLGI	TX
27	Jim GreenDestin	ı, FL
28	Dan Green	ı, TX
29	Tim GrinerS	SAFMC
30	Buddy GuindonGalvestor	ı, TX
31	Chris Guindon	TX
32	Martha GuyasASA	A, FL
33	Ken HaddadASA	. FL
34	Will HeymanLGI	TX
35	Scott Hickman	
36	Rachal Hisler	•
37	John Holmgren	
38	David Paul Horan	
39	Chris Horton	
40	Evan Howell	
41	Dylan Hubbard	
42	Gary JarvisDestin	
43	Michael JenningsFreeport	•
44	Matt KammannSea Grant	•
45	Mark Kelley	•
46	Bobby KellyOrange Beach	
47	David KrebsDestin	
		•
48	David Krebs, IIIDestin	1, FL

1	Jason KresseFreeport, TX
2	Brian Lewis
3	Tershara MatthewsBOEM
4	Lawrence MarinoLA
5	Michael Mixon
6 7	John O'MalleyNOAA OLE
8	Ron MoserPort Aransas, TX
9	Lance NacioLA
10	Troy NoskaTX H.D. Pappas
11	Alicia PaulPanama City Beach, FL
12	Kelia PaulPanama City Beach, FL
13	Ellen Peel
14	Sean Powers
15	Nathan PutmanLGL, TX
16	Ashford RosenbergShareholders Alliance
17	Alexis Sabine
18	Chris SchiebleLA
19	Eric SchmidtFort Myers, FL
20	Clarence Seymour
21	Duane Smith
22	Casey StreeterFL
23	Mike Sullivan
24	Christina Vaeth
25	Ted VenkerCCA
26	Kirk VosslerMatagorda, TX
27	David WalkerAL
28	John WalterSEFSC
29	Eric White
30	Johnny Williams
31	Billy Wright
32	Melissa YenchoNMFS
33	Bob ZalesPanama City, FL
34	Jim ZurbrickSteinhatchee, FL
35	
36	
37	

	TABLE OF CONTENTS
Tabl	e of Motions5
Indu	ction of New Council Members8
Call	to Order, Announcements, and Introductions9
Adop	tion of Agenda and Approval of Minutes10
Pres	entations12
	Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM12 WECAFC Presentation: Updates and Flyingfish-Dolphinfish20
Publ	ic Comment27
Elec	tion of Chair and Vice Chair11
Comm	ittee Reports
	Administrative/Budget Committee Report11
	Coral Committee Report11
	Data Collection Committee Report11
	Migratory Species Committee Report12
	Outreach and Education Committee Report
	Reef Fish Committee Report13
	Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report22
Supp	orting Agencies Update23
	South Atlantic Council Liaison23
	Texas Law Enforcement Efforts23
	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement24
	Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission25
	U.S. Coast Guard
Othe	r Business25
	Exempted Fishing Permit Discussion
Adjo	urnment25

PAGE 113: Motion to approve the final 2022 budget as written. The motion carried on page 113.

<u>PAGE 113</u>: Motion to approve the proposed revised language in Section 2.3.3 as presented. <u>The motion carried on page 114</u>.

PAGE 114: Motion to approve the proposed revised language in Section 2.6.2 as presented. The motion carried on page 114.

12 <u>PAGE 115</u>: Motion to approve the proposed revised language in Section 2.8.3(c) as presented. The motion carried on page 115.

 <u>PAGE 117</u>: Motion to make Option 3 the preferred. Option 3 is the exemption from the trip declaration requirement would apply to non-fishing trips that are completed in 120 minutes or less. The motion failed on page 122.

<u>PAGE 122</u>: Motion to direct staff to add an option to require for-hire vessel owners and/or operators to submit a trip declaration only for a trip that will be engaging in any type of fishing activity or charter trip. <u>The motion carried on page 126</u>.

PAGE 129: Motion to modify the Gulf of Mexico's Fishery Management Council's SOPPs Section 2.7.3 Ecosystem Technical Committee as follows: The Ecosystem Technical Committee consists of no more than twelve people. Membership includes three staff from NMFS, one of which is from the HMS division; the Ecosystem SSC (three members); two Standing SSC representatives; and up to four other stakeholder representatives. Members are appointed jointly by the Executive Director and Council Chair. The motion carried on page 133.

36 PAGE 139: Motion to resume work on Reef Fish Amendment 55 and include consideration of updated catch advice as recommended by the Gulf and South Atlantic SSCs. The motion carried on page $\frac{140}{1000}$.

41 PAGE 143: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 3 the preferred. The motion failed on page 154.

 $\underline{\text{PAGE } 158}$: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 4 the 45 preferred. The motion failed on page 160.

47 PAGE 160: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 3 the preferred. The motion carried on page 160.

PAGE 161: Motion to direct staff to begin development of a framework action for greater amberjack to modify commercial and recreational management measures. The motion carried on page 161.

<u>PAGE 163</u>: Motion to direct staff to begin a scoping document that will explore state management for greater amberjack for the recreational sector. <u>The motion carried on page 165</u>.

<u>PAGE 165</u>: Motion to direct staff to begin a scoping document to explore sector separation for the charter for-hire fleet for greater amberjack, triggerfish, gag grouper, and red grouper. The motion carried on page 170.

PAGE 172: Motion to approve the Framework Action: Modification of Catch Limits for Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 184.

<u>PAGE 184</u>: Motion to direct staff to develop a document that considers withholding a portion of the commercial ACL such as the recent red snapper increase in the framework action Modification of Catch Limits for Gulf Red Snapper, to be set aside for future distribution. For example, the increase could be used for the commercial fleet to account for dead discards of red snapper, to provide allocation for a future research set aside program. The motion failed on page 194.

PAGE 194: Motion to request SEFSC identify metrics for red snapper, greater amberjack, gag, and other targeted species that could indicate changes in stock health between stock assessments. These metrics could be but are not limited to: CPUE, length frequency distributions, weight distributions by region, or other information for consideration and review by the Scientific and Statistical Committee's feedback. The motion carried on page 197.

<u>PAGE 199</u>: Motion to direct staff to begin a standalone framework action for gray triggerfish commercial trip limits. The motion carried on page 199.

PAGE 200: Motion to request the GSMFC to work with the five Gulf states to compile historical landings for butterfish,

wenchman, scad, and other associated species from the midwater trawl fishery for evaluation by the SSC at a future SSC meeting. The motion carried on page 201.

<u>PAGE 204</u>: Motion that the council concurs with the SSC's motion regarding the SEDAR 72 Gulf of Mexico gag grouper operational assessment base run configuration, MSY proxy, red tide scenario, and stock status determination to use SRFS data and its consideration as BSIA. The motion carried on page 204.

 <u>PAGE 206</u>: Motion that Reef Fish Amendment 56 base catch limits using SFRS converted landings for the 1986-2005 original reference period. If subsequent allocation changes are desired, the council should develop a separate amendment with a full allocation review based on the Allocation Policy and Guidelines. The motion failed on page 215.

<u>PAGE 220</u>: Motion to reassemble the IFQ Focus Group for a second two-day meeting. The motion carried on page 220.

PAGE 224: Motion that the council and NOAA Fisheries greatly value the work of the Gulf states to develop private recreational fishing catch and effort surveys and are committed to working collaboratively with the states to improve data collection and ensure the council is using the best scientific information available for management decisions. The motion carried on page 226.

PAGE 232: Motion that, in collaboration with SERO staff, explore mechanisms to improve timeliness and efficiency of updating routine changes in catch advice using either the existing framework process or suggest changes in framework procedures that could be used to reduce the time between the completion of science and implementation of management changes. Provide an update at a future council meeting. The motion carried on page 233.

<u>PAGE 234</u>: Motion to request staff begin work on a presentation that addresses the factors that need to be considered when contemplating the need for federal conservation and management of Florida pompano. The motion carried on page 236.

<u>PAGE 256</u>: Motion to recommend approval of the Exempted Fishing Permit provided by Texas and Louisiana Sea Grants to test bycatch reduction devices. The motion carried on page 256.

- - -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at Omni Hotel in Corpus Christi, Texas on Monday morning, August 22, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Dale Diaz.

CHAIRMAN DALE DIAZ: Good morning, everyone. I want to welcome everybody to the 291st Meeting of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. I want to start off, real quick, and I want to make sure that everybody knows our newest council member, Mr. Michael McDermott, right here. If you all get a chance, talk to Mike, and introduce yourself, and get to know him a little bit.

Having mentioned that Michael is here, the first thing on the agenda is Induction of New Council Members, with Mr. Andy Strelcheck, and so Andy's flight is delayed, and it looks like he's going to be in here around mid-day, and so we're going to adjust the agenda, and we're going to handle that when Mr. Strelcheck is here. I did want to make note, also, that Dr. Frazer's flight is delayed, and so we might have to do some juggling with that also today, and there's a lot of trouble with air travel these days, and so we're going to have to adjust the agenda just a little bit to accommodate those things.

I want to recognize that we have Mr. Tim Griner from the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council with us this week. He's going to be online virtually, and, also, C.J. Sweetman is going to be online virtually, and Ms. Mara Levy, and so, with those things, we're going to go ahead and move right into committees this morning.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

INDUCTION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: What I would like to do now is I would like to circle back to the top of our agenda and go ahead and take care of that first agenda item, the Induction of Council Members, and so if Mr. McDermott and Mr. Williamson would walk to the front of the room with Mr. Strelcheck, and, Tom, if you can -- At the appropriate time, if you could read along, over your virtual microphone, and we'll handle your reappointment to the council at the same time as Mr. Williamson and Mr. McDermott. With that, Mr. Strelcheck, I will turn it over to you.

MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Apologies for delaying this, and my flight was late getting into Houston last night, and so I'm glad to be here. Each August, I have the opportunity to induct the new and existing council members onto the council, and so I've given

each of you the oath. I will read the first couple of lines, and then I'll ask that you read the oath thereafter.

(Whereupon, the oath was administered to new and returning council members.)

MR. STRELCHECK: Please join me in congratulating both the returning and new members to the council. Troy and Tom, it's great to have you back. Michael, it's great to have you with us, and, on behalf of NOAA Fisheries, we know the substantial commitment that all of you are making, in terms of spending time away from your family and your businesses, to help manage the nation's fisheries, and so we appreciate your time, and I look forward to working with you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Congratulations, gentlemen. We're glad to have everybody back on, and welcome to you, Mr. McDermott. With that out of the way, we're going to go ahead and go straight into Data Collection. We need to take just a short break, to get everything lined up for the next committee, but we are going to start Data Collection at 11:00, and we'll handle just a portion of the agenda, and we'll break for lunch, and we'll come back after that, and we'll finish Data Collection after lunch. We'll take a ten-minute break.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on August 22, 2022.)

August 24, 2022

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at Omni Hotel in Corpus Christi, Texas on Wednesday morning, August 24, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Dale Diaz.

CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Welcome to the 291st meeting of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. My name is Dale Diaz, chair of the council. If you have a cell phone or similar device, we ask that you place it on silent or vibrant mode during the meeting. Also, in order 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.

2 3 4

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

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

The membership also includes 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 comments from in-person and virtual attendees.

Anyone joining us virtually that wishes to speak during public comment should register for comments online. Virtual participants that have 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 in the hallway adjacent to the meeting room. We accept only comment, or registration, per person. A digital recording is used for the public record, and, therefore, for the purpose of voice identification, we will call on the council members that are attending virtually first. Dr. Sweetman.

DR. C.J. SWEETMAN: Mr. Sweetman.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Levy.

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

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: If council members, starting on my left, would identify themselves.

- DR. GREG STUNZ: Greg Stunz, Texas.
- MR. DAKUS GEESLIN: Dakus Geeslin, Texas.

MR. TROY WILLIAMSON: Troy Williamson, Texas.

- DR. TOM FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.
- MR. PHIL DYSKOW: Phil Dyskow, Florida.
- MR. BOB GILL: Bob Gill, Florida.
- MR. KEVIN ANSON: Kevin Anson, Alabama.
- DR. BOB SHIPP: Bob Shipp, Alabama.
- MS. SUSAN BOGGS: Susan Boggs, Alabama.
- LCDR LISA MOTOI: Lisa Motoi, Coast Guard.
- DR. JOHN WALTER: John Walter, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.
- Andy Strelcheck, NOAA Fisheries, Southeast MR. STRELCHECK: Regional Office.
- MR. J.D. DUGAS: J.D. Dugas, Louisiana.
- MR. BILLY BROUSSARD: Billy Broussard, Louisiana.
- MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE: Chris Schieble, Louisiana.
- GENERAL JOE SPRAGGINS: Joe Spraggins, Mississippi.
- MR. MICHAEL MCDERMOTT: Mike McDermott, Mississippi.
- MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.
- EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Carrie Simmons, council staff.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thanks, everybody. I did want to mention -- I mentioned yesterday that there were a few former council members in the room, and I noticed that Ms. Martha Guyas is here present. Thank you, Martha, for attending our meeting.

appreciate former council members being present.

1 2 3

We're going to move right into the agenda, and the first thing is the adoption of the agenda. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could we add, under Other Business, that we received an exempted fishing permit request from Texas Sea Grant to the Other Business item, please, and I have distributed, or we distributed, that to the council, but it's not officially under Other Business. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Mr. Chairman, if possible, I would like to ask if we could move up the election of officers, for Chair and Vice Chair, instead of 4:45 to 5:00 tomorrow afternoon, to move it to close-of-business this afternoon, because several of us have to leave early.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. So noted. Any objections to that? All right. We have an agenda, and it's been modified, and so is there a motion to approve the agenda as modified?

MR. GILL: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So moved. Is there a second? It's seconded by Dr. Frazer, and the agenda is adopted. Next is Approval of the Minutes. Are there any comments or additions to the minutes? Seeing none, is there any opposition to approving the minutes? The minutes are adopted.

 Next on the agenda, we have a couple of presentations, and the first one is an update from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management on Wind Energy Development in the Gulf of Mexico, and Ms. Matthews will be delivering that presentation for us. Ms. Matthews.

PRESENTATIONS

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

MS. TERSHARA MATTHEWS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, council. I am Tershara Matthews, the Chief of Emerging Programs in our Gulf of Mexico Regional Office. Today, I want to give you a little bit of background. I want to go through the renewable leasing process, and I definitely want to talk about the next steps in the process.

2 3 4 5

In the renewable energy process, there are four phases: planning and analysis, leasing, site assessment, and the construction and operation phase. For the Gulf of Mexico, we are in the very early stages of the process. We're at that planning and analysis.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13

We have formed an intergovernmental task force, and we've had that request for information, the call for information, we're currently at the area identification phase. When I came to the meeting in June, I mentioned those two draft wind energy They are currently still out for public comment. public comment period has been extended for an additional fifteen days, and so it now closes on September 2.

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We're also at the environmental review phase, where the draft environmental assessment is currently out for public comment as well. It ends on September 2 as well, and that comment period was also extended. After the environmental review phase and addressing and looking at the feedback that was received on those draft area identifications, we will cut out what is called the proposed sale notice, conduct that option, and then issue leases, and we're still planning to have a wind sale in 2023.

23 24 25

26

27

28 29

30 31

I just kind of want to show you more of a linear regression of the actual process. As I mentioned, we talked about that request for interest, and we had thirty-nine comments that were received on that, and that was a forty-five-day comment period, and we also have a call for information, and we utilized a lot of those major comments in that call for information to help us define those wind energy areas, along with the NOAA marine spatial planning tool.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

That was a forty-five-day comment period that ended in December of 2021, and so, as I mentioned, we're currently at that area identification phase, where we have these wind energy areas that have been defined, and I will show you those areas in just a second, but, once those areas have been defined, we can further winnow-down the areas into what we call lease sale areas, and so that information will be included in that proposed sale notice. That has a sixty-day comment period. After that proposed sale notice has been sent out and we look at those comments, we'll issue that final sale notice, and, as I mentioned, we're hoping to have an auction in 2023.

44 45 46

47

48

The process has been continuously winnowing down. with the Gulf of Mexico, and we did an RFI area that went out to 1,300 meters of water depth, and it went from the Texas-Mexico border out to the Alabama-Florida line. Now, we're currently west of the Mississippi River, out to 400 meters, and then we winnowed that down even smaller, to those wind energy areas, which are off of the coast of Texas and Louisiana.

In helping us to define those wind energy areas, we worked very closely and partnered with NOAA, as a request from the council as well, and some other NGOs that have sent us requests. In that model, there were two components to the model, the constraints component, which were pretty much no-go areas, and the no-go areas -- We had high shrimping effort in that area, and we also had a twenty-nautical-mile buffer for the menhaden fisheries, which also included a twenty-nautical-mile for migratory birds, and, also, that twenty-nautical-mile buffer helped to protect significant resource areas, and so the constraints model were pretty much no-go areas, and that's the reason why that's grayed-out, and so we still had six sub-models that remained, and you can see those six sub-models there. Those were all equally weighted, and, as you see, fisheries was equally weighted as a part of those six sub-models.

 The model -- I want to just kind of reiterate how the model gave us actually fourteen areas, and we removed one of those areas, Option B, from the table, due to DOD concerns, and so we were currently working with thirteen wind energy areas. We put forth two wind energy areas, Option I and Option M. Option I is near Galveston, and I think it's twenty-six nautical miles, and Option M is near Lake Charles, and I think it's roughly fifty-six nautical miles from Lake Charles, and so those are the two options that we currently have out for comment.

I just kind of want to remind you all that, if you want to provide feedback to us, that those are the two options that we're looking at now to have for that lease option in 2023.

This kind of just winnows it down a little closer, so you can take a closer look at what those two areas look like without the other wind energy areas, and also looking at the rationale for those recommendations, and so, in our regulations, the first thing it asks is, is there competitive interest, and do you have anyone that's interested in those particular areas, and the answer is, yes, and, if you notice the map at the bottom, it shows what the competitive interest is that we received from that call for information.

Also, those two areas that we are recommending had less national security concerns, and it was also close to points of interconnection, in Galveston, and also in Lake Charles. We

also have to look at the proximity to shore. These areas also had less than 10 percent moderate to high shrimping, and remember that we already excluded the high shrimping efforts in our constraints model. There is also enough acreage here to further divide it down into smaller lease sale areas.

Here are some of the milestones that I kind of mentioned throughout the presentation. As I mentioned, that call period closed in December of 2021. We had a fisheries summit on January 19 and 20. We held that second taskforce meeting on February 2, and, on July 20, we published those draft wind energy areas, and, as I mentioned, the comment period now closes on September 2. On July 20, we also published the draft environmental assessment, and that comment period closes on September 2 as well, and we also recently held that third taskforce meeting, on July 27 of this year.

The next steps that I kind of want to focus on today is that proposed sale notice, and so what's in that actual proposed sale notice is the area that we will actually lease, and so we can further divide that 546,000 acres that is off of Galveston and the 188,000 acres that is off of Louisiana into smaller areas, and so we can roughly look at 80,000 to 90,000 acres from the one off of Texas, and the same amount off of Louisiana.

In that proposed sale notice will also be those fiscal terms, the auction details, and the proposed lease terms. For the auction details and format, in the last sales that we've had, we've been having what's called multifactor bidding, where there are actual bidding credits that the company can get for -- Instead of a monetary award, and so those bidding credits have been in this last sale that we had.

5 percent of that has been what we call the community benefit agreement, and that can be for stakeholders, or a stakeholder group, that may be potentially impacted by that geographic area. The other 20 percent would be for workforce training and development, and so I think that is very key for the council, when we put out that proposed sale notice, which we're hoping to do in October, that you provide comments on the actual bidding credits, if that is something that you feel like your stakeholders would be interested in, as far as those bidding credits are concerned.

There is a sixty-day comment period, once that notice is out, for you all to provide comments to BOEM, and so I did want to mention that that will be the next major step in our process.

Once we receive those comments from that proposed sale notice, we'll come out with a final sale notice, and that final sale notice has to be one month, or thirty days, prior to the actual auction, and so we will assess all of the comments that are received on that final proposed sale notice, and we'll put that in the final sale notice, and those will be the actual terms for the auction, and then we'll hold the auction, and then, once that auction has been held, it takes about forty-five days, because we have to work with the Department of Justice, to make sure that everything was legal, and then we'll issue those leases to the companies.

This kind of just breaks that done, what those next steps are. After we receive comments that are currently out for the area ID, we'll put out an area identification memo, and we'll identify those lease areas, as I mentioned, in that proposed sale notice. We'll have that final EA, the final sale notice, and then the proposed auction. I will take any comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Are there any questions for Ms. Matthews? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for the presentation, Ms. Matthews. This is very intriguing to me, but something that was brought to my attention earlier this week, and I'm reading this, so that I don't get it wrong, is the marine turbine generator impacts to marine vessel radars, which we have a lot of marine activity in the Gulf, and has there been any consideration, and have you seen this report that the National Academy has put out?

MS. MATTHEWS: I haven't seen the report, but I know that we're working very closely with the Coast Guard, and so we will take that into consideration. We have bi-weekly meetings with the Coast Guard, to better understand the radars and the potential impacts, and so I will take a look at that report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ms. Matthews, for the presentation. I hope you keep coming back, every time we meet, and give us an update, and the stakeholders an update at the same time, and so thank you.

I believe that it was Slide 3, where you provided a timeline, and I've got three questions, or three possible questions, regarding that. One is I seem to recall that, in the BOEM process, there is a regular timeline and an expedited timeline,

and so Question 1 is, is this the regular timeline that we're working on? Question 2 is, if that's the case, is it possible that this follow-on of the timeline could go to the expedited version, and, Number 3, if that's true, then what are the considerations that would determine that decision?

MS. MATTHEWS: In the Gulf, we've had a lot of lessons learned, and so I wouldn't say that we want an expedited timeline, but we have done it a little faster than the Atlantic region, and also in the Pacific region, and I think that has to do with a lot of stakeholder engagement and lessons just that we've learned throughout this process, and so, currently, we are almost in year-two. The Governor of Louisiana requested the taskforce in October of 2020, and so we're here, in 2022, and we still haven't had the sale yet, and so I guess we're pretty much in the regular timeline.

The only thing that I guess would expedite that would be the President wanting us to move a little faster, which I think he's okay with the process that we're doing now, and we do have regular updates that are sent to the White House.

As far as what we're thinking about, as far as steel in the water, it normally takes about five to seven years before a turbine is actually placed into the water, and so I think we're still on that target, and so we'll have to have that sale first, and then it will be about five to seven years before a turbine would be placed in the water.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

MS. MATTHEWS: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: Tershara, it's good to see you. Thank you for being here in-person. It's really not a question for you, but just I wanted to let the council know that, really, credit to BOEM and your coordination with stakeholders and with NOAA Fisheries. I think this process, unlike other regions, has gone very smoothly, in large part because of the marine spatial planning efforts that NOAA has helped lead, with BOEM's strong support for that, and it's helped to de-conflict a lot of the issues in the early phases of the project.

NOAA Fisheries has a wind energy team that is comprised of multiple disciplines of employees, and that includes the Science Center, economists, and biologists, and we are commenting at

every step of the way, as Tershara knows, and we're providing input and feedback to the process, and so we'll continue to, obviously, monitor this closely, not only from a fisheries standpoint, but also essential fish habitat and protected resources, but I just wanted to commend BOEM for the work that's been done so far and coordination. Thank you.

MS. MATTHEWS: Thanks, Andy.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any further questions for Ms. Matthews? Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Good morning, Ms. Matthews. Can you go into the bidding credit program a little further, and possibly give us an example of what you're talking about?

MS. MATTHEWS: Yes, and so if we can look at -- I can send it to you, to the council, later, and so California recently published their proposed sale notice, and I think it actually closed on August 1, and, in that, they're asking questions, in the proposed sale notice, about bidding credits, and so there's two ways that we can actually do the bidding.

 Ascending bidding is just straight bidding, and the highest bidder actually wins. When the company comes in that has been qualified to participate in the auction, they can fill out, for the multifactor bidding, if they just want to do basically a straight bid or if they want to get credit for community benefit agreements, if they may already have an existing community benefit agreement that's in place, based on some other activity that they may have done, or they can actually apply for 20 percent of their bid to go towards workforce training and development, or that 5 percent that can go towards stakeholder or community benefit agreements.

That community benefit agreement, they can work with a stakeholder group to define how they may be potentially impacted for that geographic area, and so let's use the Gulf of Mexico as an example.

The area that's off of Galveston, if a developer comes in, and they bid one auction, and they win a portion of that Galveston area, they can work with the stakeholders that might be potentially impacted for that area, because they may no longer be able to fish there, or not get as close as they want to, or they feel like the infrastructure is causing some potential impacts to their resource, and so they can apply for -- That developer can work with a community, or stakeholder, group to

apply that credit towards that effort, and so, essentially, it could be like fisheries compensation.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Ms. Matthews, from Mississippi, I would like to thank you for keeping us informed on what's going on, and I know that we're not in the first phase, as it is for Texas and Louisiana, but we definitely are very interested in the future of this, and we thank you so much for keeping us informed and inviting us to the meeting. We appreciate it.

MS. MATTHEWS: You're welcome. Thank you. I am from Mississippi too, just to let you know.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and, Tershara, it's great to see you in person. Thanks for giving us this update, and I just really want to reiterate what a collaborative effort it's been between NOAA and BOEM to most effectively site offshore wind, and I think that's really where the important work comes, in that upfront marine spatial planning, to get all of the best the table, information possible to the science, socioeconomics, the defense, all of those things and getting that information, to be able to site wind effectively, to deconflict at the outset, so that what has now been rolled out has fairly widespread support, and I think that's a model to follow and to keep up with.

I will note that we've been involved, NOAA Fisheries, from the get-go on the taskforce, and both Andy and I serve as taskforce members, and we will continue in that capacity, and we have heard a lot of the concerns that people have brought up about offshore wind at various times, and we brought those concerns of the fishery, of protected resources, to the table, and that end result is finding a good place for wind within all of those other concerns.

We will continue with the process and commenting on the letter, talking about survey mitigation and a lot of the potential impacts that need to be understood on the environment relative to offshore wind, but we look forward to further engagement on this, and I think that it's a process that we should continue to follow, that marine spatial planning, for many different activities in the environment, and it can give us, I think, the best path forward, and we look forward to helping get offshore wind in the water. Thanks.

2

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Walter. Any further comments for Ms. Matthews, or questions? Thank you, Ms. Matthews. appreciate you coming to be with us today.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so we're going to move on. Our next presentation is from the Western Central Atlantic Fisheries

Commission, and we're going to have a presentation, and it's

going to be an Update on the Flyingfish and Dolphinfish Working

WESTERN CENTRAL ATLANTIC FISHERY COMMISSION (WECAFC)

PRESENTATION: UPDATES AND FLYINGFISH-DOLPHINFISH WORKING GROUP

MS. LAURA CIMO: Thank you so much. First of all, I want to say

thank you again for the opportunity to present at the council

Again, my name is Laura Cimo, and I work for the NOAA Fisheries Office of International Affairs, Trade, and Commerce, and I

would like to do is give the council an overview and some updates of potential interest related the Western Central

Just for those who are not familiar with WECAFC, I will just

give a very brief overview, and then I will discuss some of the

outcomes of a recent meeting of WECAFC, which concluded in late

July, and then I will share some updates that would likely be of interest to the council, and with a specific focus on flyingfish

and dolphinfish and a new working group. Then I will share some

supplemental contact information, and, if there's time, we would

WECAFC operates as a regional fisheries body under Article VI of the FAO Constitution, which means that it's not independent from

FAO, unlike other regional fishery management organizations, and

conservation, management, and development of all living marine

resources in the wider Caribbean, but this also means that its

recommendations are non-binding, and WECAFC is comprised of

thirty-four members, including the United States. Just for

those who aren't familiar, there is a map, and the area of

an advisory capacity to promote effective

My colleague, Rachel, and I really appreciate it.

Group, and that will be Ms. Cimo and Ms. O'Malley.

Atlantic Fishery Commission, or what we call WECAFC.

4 5

3

MS. MATTHEWS: Thank you.

6 7

13

14 15

16 17

meeting.

25 26 27

28

29

34

41 42 43

39 40

44 45

46 47 48 There are essentially eleven working groups under the auspices of WECAFC, and they focus on specific fisheries or species

in

issues, and each one of them has its own terms of reference, and

be happy to answer any questions.

competence are those areas highlighted in blue.

we have fisheries scientists, experts, and managers that participate in these working groups, as represented by their member countries, and we also have relevant international, regional, and sub-regional partner organizations that represent the various interests of their bodies, upon invitation.

The United States have been very active in eight of these groups, and you can see the working groups that are starred on the slide, and these include the working groups focused on Caribbean spiny lobster, although this group has not met in the last several years; queen conch; fish spawning aggregations; illegal, unreported, and unregulated, or IUU, fishing; recreational fisheries; moored fish aggregating devices, or MFADs; sharks; and fishery data and statistics.

One of the other working groups that we are interested in is the deep-sea fisheries working group, but I will note that it has not met in ten years, and, also, what I would really like to focus on, of course, in this presentation, is a new working group that was established at the meeting of the commission in 2019, which will be focusing on flyingfish and dolphinfish and other pelagic species that are not covered by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, or ICCAT.

Just for background, the commission had agreed, at its 2019 meeting, based on a U.S. recommendation, that WECAFC focus on dolphinfish. Unfortunately, given the large number of working groups in WECAFC, the decision was made just to broaden the scope of an existing group that was looking at flyingfish, and this working group, unfortunately, even though it was established, was unable to meet prior to this most recent meeting of the commission, but we are tentatively planning to meet in 2023.

The United States does plan to play a very active role in this working group, and I will be discussing it later in my presentation, and, just a quick note, we also do have a working group focused on shrimp and groundfish, but it is basically primarily on the north Brazil-Guyana shelf.

Next, I will just provide a brief overview of the most recent meeting of WECAFC and its key outcomes, and so just to note that it was held virtually, and it took place July 26 through 29, and the meeting was held under the leadership of the United States, who held the chairmanship, and just to quickly note that the United States no longer holds the chairmanship. Nicaragua was designated the new chair of WECAFC, at the July meeting.

We had seventeen members of WECAFC participate, and so we had very good representation, and the U.S. delegation, which was led by the State Department, had a broad delegation from the United States, with representation from my office, from the NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office, from the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, the Gulf Council, and the South Atlantic Council, as well as the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

I do want to just take this moment to thank Natasha Mendez, Bob Gill, and C.J. Sweetman, who participated, both in the preparation for the meeting and attended. We really appreciate their attendance and assistance, and just to note that Nancie Cummings, from our NOAA Fisheries Southeast Fisheries Science Center, also participated, in her role as chair of the WECAFC Scientific Advisory Group, and she is convener of the Fisheries Data and Statistics Working Group.

 At the meeting, the commission endorsed several important non-binding documents and recommendations that had been developed by the various working groups, with U.S. participation, and this includes a data collection reference framework, which provides guidance for standardized data collection on key species in the region, and just to note that this is based on an interim framework that was adopted at our 2019 meeting that had been refined, and information submitted by WECAFC members, pursuant to this framework, will basically feed into a regional database, which we're calling the Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Information System, and this will provide WECAFC with the minimum information needed for the monitoring of key species, stock assessments, and management decisions based on the best available science.

Just to note that the commission agreed, at its meeting, that the DCRF will be considered a living document, to be refined over time and implemented incrementally, and then to note that there was a related recommendation adopted by the commission, which endorsed the framework and strongly encouraged members to proceed with its use and recognize that further investments are going to be needed to build the national capacities of WECAFC members for data collection, reporting, and analysis.

 The commission also endorsed a regional fish spawning aggregation fishery management plan, which is focused on Nassau grouper and mutton snapper, and the United States, just to note, through the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, provided support for the development of the plan and an accompanying communication strategy, and to note that the conservation of

Nassau grouper, of course, is a U.S. priority, as a species listed as threatened under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, and it's listed in Annex 3 of the Protocol for Specially-Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Caribbean.

We also adopted an accompanying recommendation that calls for implementation of this management plan and actions to improve regional data collection and assessment. It also calls for communication outreach for the conservation of fish spawning aggregations and recommends mobilization of resources for priority research and monitoring.

The commission also adopted a recommendation aimed at helping WECAFC members combat IUU fishing, by encouraging strengthened fisheries governance, implementing measures to effectively regulate, monitor, and control and transshipment and develop mechanisms to share fisheries vessel information, consistent with any applicable domestic confidentiality requirements.

The commission endorsed a recommendation that reaffirms its commitment to implementing the regional queen conch fishery management and conservation plan, which we endorsed at our sixteenth meeting, and we agreed to update the status of the plan's implementation on an annual basis, so we can monitor progress and identify any implementation gaps.

There was also a recommendation to promote genetic research to help identify the spatial distribution of queen conch, to provide information on connectivity and traceability, and WECAFC members were strongly encouraged to participate in the genetic work, and then, finally, the working group on queen conch was encouraged to collaborate with our regional working group on IUU fishing, so we could undertake activities to combat the illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing of queen conch.

There was also several documents that were endorsed promoting the sustainable management of fishing on moored fish aggregating devices, but these, however, were adopted just on an interim basis. They include the Caribbean Regional Management Plan for MFADs and a guide for improved Monitoring of MFAD catches and improved assessment of MFAD impacts on stocks. The commission adopted a related recommendation, which charged the MFAD working group to finalize both the regional MFAD management plan and the guidance document, prior to the next commission meeting, to inform the development of any national management plans and legislation, as relevant, and to note that ICCAT will be consulted in this process.

The WECAFC Secretariat and partners were asked to support a regional assessment of the impacts and mitigation measures for MFAD fishing in the WECAFC area, and members were encouraged to promote data collection and analysis of MFAD fisheries, support the establishment of stakeholder outreach and communication campaigns, and encourage research in several key areas.

Just to note that the commission also adopted a regional plan of action for the conservation and management of sharks, which is aimed at ensuring the conservation management of sharks and their long-term sustainable use in the WECAFC area, and the plan sets out five objectives and provides a table of actions to achieve these objectives.

The commission supported WECAFC becoming a signatory to a memorandum of understanding that would establish a non-binding coordination mechanism in the wider Caribbean region towards ocean governance and ocean-based sustainable development, and the commission endorsed an exchange of letters of cooperation between WECAFC and ICCAT, and these letters will essentially provide a basis for collaborative work between the two organizations on issues of mutual interest.

Also, WECAFC adopted a comprehensive work program for 2022 through 2024, and, at the request of the United States, the work program was amended to include this first meeting of the flyingfish-dolphinfish working group and a meeting of the recreational fisheries working group.

Again, as I mentioned, we have several upcoming events that may be of interest. We have the fifth meeting of our working group on fish spawning aggregations, which will be held in late January, followed by a one-day meeting of the queen conch working group, and, as I had mentioned, we will have the first meeting of the flyingfish-dolphinfish working group at a date to be determined in 2023.

At this first meeting, the flyingfish-dolphinfish working group will essentially determine its priority areas to be addressed, develop its workplan and terms of reference, which will guide future work, and so, at this time, NOAA Fisheries is seeking input from our U.S. stakeholders on any issues, challenges, opportunities of interest, that you would like the working group to address, and so we're inviting the council to share your views for the working group to consider, either during or after this meeting.

If you have any questions, in terms of you would like more

information about the documents that I have referenced, or if you would like to know more about WECAFC, I have shared the website, and so please feel free to take a look at the documents and information, but, if you do have specific questions or comments, I encourage you to contact myself, and you have my email address above, and, also, the email address for my colleague, Rachel O'Malley, and thank you very much for your attention and interest, and, if there's time, we're happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Do we have any questions for Ms. Cimo from the group, or any comments related to dolphinfish and flyingfish? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I was, as Laura mentioned, honored to be there, along with C.J., and I got a new appreciation for what they do. I barely knew they existed, prior to going, and, despite the fact that it was a four-day Zoom meeting, it was enjoyable, but it would have been a heck of a lot more enjoyable in-person, albeit Nicaragua was probably not high on my list for enjoyment.

One of the things that struck me is their process makes our process look lightning fast, and the reason for that, of course, is that the composition is thirty-four folks, nations, but it includes people like the EU and Korea, because they have fishing interests in the region, and so you've got this amazing diversity of interest within this very broad region, and trying to bring that all together and get to an agreement on next steps, et cetera, is extraordinarily difficult.

I applaud, Laura, your work in that regard, and I look forward to, if not participating, seeing where you go, particularly on that recreational working group, and so thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Gill. Any further comments? I would encourage the council, if you have any comments related to what Ms. Cimo is seeking, related to the flyingfish-dolphinfish working group, if you could share those with the staff at some time, and that would be helpful. I am not seeing any further comments, and so thank you, Ms. Cimo, for being with us today. We appreciate it, and we appreciate your hard work. Is there any other business before the council at this point? Seeing none, we're going to break for lunch, and we will be back at 1:35, and we're going to start public comments as soon as we get back. Thank you. We'll come back at 1:35.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on August 24, 2022.)

August 24, 2022

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at Omni Hotel in Corpus Christi, Texas on Wednesday afternoon, August 24, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Dale Diaz.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, everybody. I want to call the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council meeting back to order. Before we start public testimony, we do have one of our staff members that's going to be retiring very soon, and I asked Dr. Simmons if she would say a few words. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think many of you know that Karen Hoak, our admin financial assistant, and she has spent seventeen years with the council, since 2005, and she is going to retire at the end of September, with her husband, in North Carolina.

I just wanted to say a few things about Karen. She has been a wonderful employee, and she has helped us do a lot of things, and I'm sure she's helped you guys with your expense reports over the years, and payment vouchers, and she's reminded us of deadlines, wrangled time sheets, leave requests, traipsed all over the Gulf of Mexico to help with SSC meetings and AP meetings and council meetings, and I hope she enjoys her retirement with her husband. She will truly be missed.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Well said, Dr. Simmons, and we hope that Karen has a wonderful retirement. I personally want to thank her for all the help she's given me over the years, and so thank you very much, Karen. All right, and so I'm going to do the Chair's statement for public testimony.

Good afternoon, everyone. 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 date of such information.

Oral or written communications provided to the council, its council 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 the public comment should sign-in at the registration kiosk located in the hallway to my left. We accept only one registration per person.

 Each speaker is allowed three minutes for their testimony. Please note the timer lights on the podium and on the webinar. It will be green for the first two minutes and yellow for the final minute of testimony. When testimony ends, at the three-minute mark, a 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 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, and please be advised that alcoholic beverages are not permitted in the meeting room.

The way we're going to do this, we do have two dignitaries that have asked to speak, and they're going to go first. After that, we're going to alternate between virtual attendees and in-person attendees, and we'll just work our way down the list, in the order that people applied, and so, having said that, first up on the list is Mr. Lawrence Marino. Mr. Marino.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. LAWRENCE MARINO: Good afternoon. My name is Larry Marino,

and I'm here on behalf of Louisiana Attorney General Jeff Landry. There's been a steady drumbeat, in some quarters, that the recreational sector is not accountable. This isn't correct, and saying it repeatedly doesn't make it so, and it's obviously not practical to count each of the recreational fish, fish-by-fish, and recreational counts are estimated, and scientifically so, at great effort and great expense. Accountability measures are imposed when necessary, and that's what accountability is.

As to Amendments 54 and 56, most speakers have pointed out that, as a result of the conversion from CHTS to FES, sector allocations must be updated accordingly. Like Amendment 53 previously, this really isn't a reallocation at all. It's a conversion of the existing allocations, so that both sides of the equation are in the same FES currency.

Without this conversion, there would be a reallocation from the recreational sector to the commercial, and so it would be preferable not to call this a reallocation at all, given the confusion that the label has created, but it's most important not to treat it as a reallocation. At some point, it may be appropriate to do an actual reallocation, but these amendments aren't that. Attorney General Landry therefore supports Alternative 3 in Action 1 in Amendment 54 and Alternative 3 in Action 2 in Amendment 56.

I would note that a few folks have given their anecdotal accounts of fishermen who couldn't find red snapper, but the science, and most of the anecdotal evidence, are that red snapper are plentiful. There could be some localized depletions here and there, but the stock is clearly healthy. Attorney General Landry therefore supports Alternative 2 in the red snapper catch limits document.

Finally, there was continued talk, some of it quite heated, regarding the IFQ program, and still there is little progress. It's unclear what benefit would be served by forcing the focus group back into a room when even the moderator says she doesn't believe that they're going to reach consensus, but they've done what the council asked, and they've identified some ideas for improving the program. The council already knew these things, and they aren't new, and there are plenty of ideas already in Amendments 36B and C and others that have been suggested over the years, including limiting permits so that they can be associated with only one account, managing permits at the account-holder level and not the account level, eliminating vessel accounts.

Whether via Amendments 36B and C or a fresh start, it's time to take some action. Putting the focus group back in a room would just delay this process for at least two more meetings, and it isn't likely to advance the process any further. There will be plenty of disagreement, but Attorney General Landry believes it's time to move forward with something. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Marino. Next up is Mr. Gary Jarvis.

MR. GARY JARVIS: I would like to introduce myself, Captain Gary Jarvis, who happens to be the mayor of the luckiest fishing village in the world. Some of you are new to the council, and new to me, and so I'm going to give you a little brief rundown of where my expertise may come from, as far as my comments that I'm about to make.

Not only am I the duly-elected mayor of our fishing community, but I'm also a professional fisherman, commercial and charter fisherman, and I'm in my forty-fourth year of exercising that profession. I'm also partners with my sons in five family seafood restaurants that sell fresh Gulf wild-caught seafood in the Destin area, and, after I sold my charter boat business in 2018, I started a new company called Boat Owners Assisted Training, and what business does is I focus on teaching boat owners, private anglers, how to operate their boats safely, good maintenance practices, and try to teach them how to operate in a manner that's going to bring pleasure and enjoyment to it, and I take them fishing.

In the process of taking them fishing, not only do I kind of show them where they ought to fish, and how they should fish, but I also teach them the things about the management process and what their contributions, as private anglers, could be to the management process and to the resource itself.

Destin was founded, in the early 1800s, by commercial fishermen. They moved from New England to come down and try to provide for their families in seine fishing, is how they started out, and, as Destin grew, and a community grew, fishing, up probably until really the 1950s, was the mainstay of that community. Now, later on, we got discovered by the rest of America, the beautiful white beaches, and people started moving to the area, and our population increased, and tourism, in the 1960s, became part of our community and part of our heritage.

One of the things, and the reason I ran for mayor, is, through all these decades and times, and I have lived there since 1978,

was I saw some things taking place that were troublesome to me as a legacy fisherman, but, more importantly, I began to worry about the heritage of our community.

We don't have historical buildings in Destin. Things were kind of built haphazard in the 70s and 80s, when we first got discovered, but the thing that never changed, and that was most important to the locals, and to the people like myself, was our fishing heritage and the founders that made our community strong and great and encouraged -- It was a warm place for people to come and live.

Everything about me involves fins and gills and fish, every aspect of my life, since 1978, and to this day, and so one of the things that I did, as mayor, is I tried to put a focus back on our fishing community, and I think I've done a pretty good job. My tour of duty is going to end on November 8, at the elections, and I have seventy-seven more days, but who is counting? I'm not going to run for reelection.

One of the things that I heard Ms. Boggs talk about was trying to bring a personal aspect to this management process, and it's almost like, when you talk about fish and allocations and management decisions, it's like an inane object, and you forget about the lives and the families and the people that are involved with all this decision-making process, and I appreciate you doing that, because that's going to be the focus of my comments, is that Destin, and our heritage, is intertwined with the health of our resources.

Most of us in Destin -- We have the largest charter fleet in North American in the harbor, and so it's real important to the community, and our city seal has a blue marlin on it, and there's a charter boat in the background catching it, and so it's real important, for the health and welfare of these resources, that it stays strong and vibrant, because we want our heritage and our businesses to stay strong and vibrant.

 We have seventy-four seafood restaurants in Destin that serve wild-caught Gulf seafood, and so, when we start talking about allocations and reallocating and who deserves what and who needs more, I just want to remind everyone that the key thing in our community is we want everyone to share the resource.

One group is not a higher class than the other, and the other group isn't important anymore, and our commercial -- We have a pretty vested commercial bandit fleet, and they rely on their portion of their allocation of fish to feed their families.

Those fish my sons rely on to provide product to their customers and our visitors that come here. Our charter fleet -- There is 160 charter boat in Destin Harbor, between state-licensed guides and federally-permitted charter boats, and those are one to two-person businesses that have to feed their families.

One of the things that I heard this council -- Because I'm talking about -- We have the most robust private boat-owning community, and we have the largest dry storage facility in the State of Florida, with over 800 boats, at Legendary Marine, and so our community revolves around fish, and so my concern, especially when I heard discussion yesterday morning, is it's almost like there's a winner-loser and we want them, and tough beans for you if we can take them type of attitude, and I really think that it's important, for a community like ours, is we take a share-the-Gulf-type approach to this and not forget all the other stakeholders in the process.

Those allocations, that we've been fishing under for decades now, have served all the stakeholders fairly well, and everyone has a piece of the pie. What I think the problem is we're struggling to find ways to remain in that box and remain in our — You know, actually remain within our means of what we have, and I think that needs to be the number-one focus of this council, because what concerns me right now is my sons' restaurants and our bandit fleet and our charter fleet —

There's not much representation for them on this council right now, and so, for those that don't have that interest, or their organization is focused on something else, that also puts a burden on those that aren't represented, as per se the commercial industry, or representatives of the charter fleet, or the representatives of the communities, and it almost puts a higher burden on you all to be even conscientious to be more fair than normal, because your decisions, your ideas, impact far beyond one sector, and it affects every single user group in the Gulf.

What I just want to encourage this council is to take a step back and put a face to some of the decisions and think about the overall impact and start applying these difficult decisions by improving the fishery managements plans that are good, and make them better, and, in the areas where we don't have -- Where we have really big challenges, that's where we focus, is on those. We focus on those challenges to those sectors, or those stakeholders, to help them acquire more access.

The gentleman before me talked about accountability. Levels of

accountability, the better you make them, the more increased access you get to any fishery. I stood before this council in 2008 and made that argument, and it worked for us, and it worked for the charter industry. Because we rose the level of accountability, now we have more access to a rebuilding fishery, and that's where I think the focus should be.

I know it's a tough decision, and it's a tough deal, to try to get seventeen people to agree on anything, but I really want to encourage you. I think -- I believe in the council process, because it has worked in the past, and I think it can continue to work in the future, but I just -- I would greatly encourage you -- In the interest of my entire community, and all the stakeholders that live where I live, I encourage you guys to take that attitude as well. Let's share the Gulf. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Jarvis. We're going to swap over to our virtual participants, and the first up is Mr. Dylan Hubbard. Captain Hubbard.

MR. DYLAN HUBBARD: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I would have liked to be there in-person, but, unfortunately, due to flight issues, I was unable to make it, but, as far as gag grouper are concerned, in my experience, this fishery is much healthier over the past three years, compared to the recent past. This is also an extremely cyclical fishery, and I strongly believe we're in an upswing of biomass numbers. I feel it's imperative for the council to ask for an immediate interim assessment.

This entire rebuilding plan and stock status determination is predicated on a stock assessment with a terminal year of 2019. This is much too far in the past to be acceptable. Please pass a motion to have a completed interim assessment at the start of 2023, and use this interim assessment to update catch advice immediately.

We are currently seeing the CPUE decrease, showing a healthy stock and improving biomass growth, plus we're seeing spatial expansion of smaller fish that are ready to enter the fishery, along with plenty of larger fish offshore in deeper waters. During a time of year we don't normally se the greatest gag grouper fishing, we are seeing it already, and, once it cools down, we are seeing the area flood with high concentrations of healthy gag grouper numbers, and we're expecting that once again this year, especially with the higher-than-expected numbers during the hottest month of the year.

1 2

As far as the SEFHIER program goes, we completely support the changes to alleviate the burden on the fishery of multiple hailouts. We support the longest time period, while not affecting the validity of our data integrity. Despite the conversations in committee, we want to improve our data collection, and we moved to a validated census-based data collection system. I do not support making this a voluntary program, and it would negate the ability of this data to be used for stock assessments.

Our fleet is already invested in this program and the hardware, and please do not harm our attempts at becoming a well-documented and accountable sub-sector of the recreational fishery with validated, calibrated, and well-vetted data that will eventually be able to be used in stock assessments to better inform this council on recreational fishing threats.

As far as amberjack, I would like to accept the reduction in catch level, but continue to hold the allocation the same, while holding buffers the same as well.

For the fall red snapper season for the federal for-hire fleet, I fully support utilizing our ACT, once we have Wave 4 data that is fully QA/QC'd, even if it's not available until late October. Even if the season was proposed to start as late as December, we would love another opportunity to fully utilize our ACT. Even though a large majority of the fleet wouldn't be able to prosecute this fishery late in the year, according to council, or committee, discussions, our fleet would be more than willing and able to have the opportunity to fully utilize our ACT.

As far as red snapper catch level increases, we appreciate the support in the red snapper catch level increase, but we feel that the Gulf-wide discussion of widespread localized depletion is of grave concern. I also wanted to talk about triggerfish and vermilion snapper, but I'm out of time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Hubbard. We appreciate it.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: In one minute or less, what are your thoughts on vermilion snapper and triggerfish?

47 MR. HUBBARD: I like how you predicated that. You have learned 48 my ways. For triggerfish, I would not support changes to the

triggerfish season. It would potentially affect its ability to reopen later in the year, and I would like to keep the opening the same.

For vermilion snapper, we would not support an increase in the bag limit. We're happy at ten fish, and we're not fully utilizing that bag limit, as the presentation described, and so I wouldn't want to see it increased.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Hubbard. All right. Next up, we have Mr. Ken Haddad, and Casey Streeter is on deck.

MR. KEN HADDAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to new council members and reappointed council members. We've been standing in front of the council arguing for defined -- Ken Haddad with American Sportfishing Association. Sorry.

We've been standing in front of the council arguing for a process for allocation for twelve years. You've been making progress, and a policy and guidelines are posted on your website. When dealing with FES conversions, or similar conversions, such as SFRS, you're not following your own guidelines, and, thus, perpetuating the same set of complications and confusion over allocation and stock ACLs and declines in stocks for each conversion. I believe that Ms. Boggs, at this meeting and others, has highlighted this confusion.

We seem to have lost sight of the fact that the data conversions are not arbitrary allocation changes, but a mathematical conversion to a new currency, and both your science council and legal counsel have stated that not converting allocation based on the converted time series of FES landings is a de facto allocation change, and I believe Emily is the one who originally described this process as a currency change, or conversion, and so logic would suggest that converting the CHTS allocation to FES-based currency is not really an allocation change, as we typically think. It just maintains the status quo in the new currency.

 If you accept the FES conversions in the stock assessments and the new stock ACLs, it should be automatic the allocation be put in the same currency, and so, if the SSC agrees that a landings time series can be converted from CHTS to FES, you just can't leave the allocation component in the same CHTS currency and move everything else to FES.

48 Because of the confusion and optics, what is happening is an

attempt to accomplish allocation changes in these conversion amendments, and you're not following your own allocation review process and not giving adequate focus on allocation alternatives and decisions and are only basing decisions on landings, and you're confusing yourselves and everybody else, and so we're not against doing allocation changes, or reviews, but we want to see it done using your own published process.

We recommend that you develop a process, similar to what Dr. Stunz was trying to do, and separate allocation reviews from the data conversion process. We believe that you should be doing this now, with at least Amendment 56, and maybe even Amendment 54, if you can include the allocation conversion in the framework action proposed by Mr. Strelcheck, or separated as a separate amendment.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ken, I'm going to ask you to go ahead and start wrapping it up, please.

MR. HADDAD: Okay. Thank you. If you continue with Amendment 54 as-is, we support the two preferred alternatives by the committee. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Haddad. We appreciate it. All right, and so, next up, we're going to go to online and Mr. Casey Streeter.

MR. CASEY STREETER: Casey Streeter, first-generation commercial fisherman, and I own several bandit boats, and I own a seafood market, as my business. You guys met the people that I represent, a lot of my fishermen, and some of the businesses, there in the June meeting.

It was a crazy meeting, and I was really disappointed with this reallocation for amberjack. I'm disappointed with the conversations on 36B and C and getting nowhere, and I'm disappointed with not wanting to do another IFQ panel, focus group, to review our IFQ.

You know, I've spoken with a lot of the members, and everyone recognizes that we have issues with our IFQ program, everybody, and nobody wants to do anything about it, and I don't understand how you can recognize a problem and not do anything to take care of it.

I mean, we hear a lot about regional depletion of red snapper, and I think we need to recognize that southwest Florida does not have an issue with red snapper. I think we need to realize that

we've been taking an overall Gulf of Mexico quota and target fishing it in a handful of areas, and they're saying regionalized depletion.

I think we can all recognize that a lot of the increases we've seen in red snapper are because of the increased landings in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. I mean, if we're seeing these regional depletions, and we're seeing less fish caught in regions, why does the allocation price continue to rise?

Why do we still not have the ability to access allocation in southwest Florida? I was told because they're easier to catch is why they're more expensive, but it seems that everyone wants to say they're not as easy to catch, but they're still expensive, and they're actually increasing, and we're getting less access in our area.

I agree a lot with Mr. Jarvis and what he said. The heritage, the importance of our fisheries for our businesses and communities and families, and we need access, in southwest Florida, that we do not have and are not receiving. I mean, we need vessel TACs, and we need regional dispersion of fish. We need limits on what our allocation costs are, so our fishermen are not getting all their profits harvested off the top. I mean, we're counting on you guys to manage our fisheries as a whole and not a single sector. We need help. We need you guys to do what you're chartered to do, just like was said yesterday.

They're tough decisions, and they're tough conversations, but they have to be had. That's how we fix our problems. I don't want to get rid of an IFQ. I want to fix it. We all recognize the shortcomings. We need this increase in southwest Florida and the eastern Gulf for our fish. We rebuilt our red snapper stocks to just discard them away, and everyone in that room that's going to speak today is a participant, just like I am, in a limited access program.

 No one is better than me, or my fishermen that you met in southwest Florida, and we're all equals in the same program. If we're wanting to get rid of fishermen, we should get rid of the 300 latent permits that haven't caught a fish since 2015. If we're worried about being overcapitalized, we're making our fishermen be high-production fishermen, where they have to catch three-times the amount of catch that they would have had to catch in the past to make the same amount of money, and that's creating the optical illusion of overcapitalization in our commercial fishery.

A lot of guys don't want to be rich. They just want to make a living and support their families and improve their lives and invest in their businesses, and we cannot do that in this current structure. Please manage our fishery to where we can have success in the future. Manage our fisheries so that fishermen have access to fish regionally and not in just a handful of areas of control.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Streeter, I'm going to ask you to start winding it up, please.

MR. STREETER: Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Streeter. We appreciate your time, and we appreciate you volunteering your time to serve on the IFQ focus group also, and so thank you. Next up, we have Mr. Lance Nacio, and, on deck, Ellen Peel.

MR. LANCE NACIO: Good afternoon. My name is Lance Nacio, and I'm the owner of Anna Marie Seafood out of Montegut, Louisiana. We have three boats, two shrimp boats and one reef fish boat. We got into the reef fish business about five years ago, and we started out bandit fishing, and we learned quick that it was difficult to make it bandit fishing, with all the snapper out in the Gulf, and so we put a longline on the boat, and we started longlining for grouper, but then that also created a problem, where we're catching two to three pounds of snapper for every pound of grouper we're catching.

One of the suggestions that we came up with was possibly a mortality discard permit for grouper fishing. I was part of the focus group, and we had a lot of really good ideas, and I didn't hear too many of them talked about today, but, you know, I'm here representing the fishermen from the second generation, post-IFQ, who don't have access to fish, and, you know, every time I get up and speak, it seems like it's harder and harder for me to secure fish, but some of the ideas that Casey had talked about -- I really support them. You know, if we want to prevent overcapitalization, or overfishing, getting rid of latent permits is one way.

Also, another way would be TAC limits. If, you know, we can only land so much fish in areas, it would spread the fishing out, and it would be more sustainable for our fishery. Another thing, also, is that, you know, it should be what Ms. Boggs was saying yesterday and, I mean, I really think we need to start throwing some ideas against the wall and see what sticks with 36B.

1 2

You know, some of the ideas we also had was income qualifiers, where, you know, if you're going to get shares, you need to be landing that fish that you're getting shares for. Another thing, also, is if there was a cap on the amount that the fish can be leased for, where's no more than 25 percent of the exvessel price of the fish, and not 75 percent, and, you know, that's about it. I'm hopeful, and, I mean, I'm on my way out, and so, no matter what I say, it really doesn't matter. Unless we can make some changes, we're going to lose a lot of fishermen in this industry.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Nacio. We have a question for you, Mr. Nacio.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: A real quick one. It won't take long. Thanks for coming all the way over here and telling us your opinion and giving us some facts to be able to work with. What is your opinion on having a second focus group meeting? Do you think that will get some issues resolved, or do you see that as not getting any further than the first one?

MR. NACIO: No, and I think that we should have a second one, and maybe have some directives that we need to meet at this second one, because, at the first one, we kind of just threw out a bunch of ideas, and we pinpointed a few of them, but, I mean, if you all gave us some sort of directive to achieve, and I'm for the slow food, and the slow foods motto is good, clean, and fair, and there's a lot about this IFQ program that's good and clean, but it's not fair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. Thank you, also, Mr. Nacio, for serving on the IFQ focus group. Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you. I appreciated your presentation, and you said a lot of things that I wanted to hear. You said one thing that I didn't quite understand. You said that, when you come here to speak, you get less allocation, and what do you mean by that?

MR. NACIO: We get less access, and so, I mean, there's no database where we can reach out to secure allocation, to lease allocation to be able to fish, and, you know, some of these people that don't want to see change, that's the people we have to lease the fish from, and so, you know, the more we speak out, it seems the less likely we are to get fish, and another thing that happens is, when we lease fish, we have to lease fish in packages, or we have to lease other fish that we won't use the

allocation for, and so, instead of being \$4.60 a pound for snapper, in some cases, we're paying \$5.00 a pound to lease 2 snapper, where -- We unload our own fish, and so we're getting 3 \$7.00 or \$7.50 a pound for our fish, but the guys who just go 4 straight to the dock -- They're getting six-bucks, and so 5 they're only making a dollar-and-a-half a pound on fish. You 6 7 know, that means you have catch three-times the amount of fish, 8 and so I can't see where that's sustainable, having to catch 9 more fish.

10 11

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I think we had another hand somewhere. Go ahead, Mr. Dugas.

12 13 14

15

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Lance, for coming. You answered one of my questions that Phil asked, but I think I understand that you don't own any red snapper?

16 17

> 18 MR. NACIO: No, I don't own any.

19

20 MR. DUGAS: Do you lease it?

21

22 MR. NACIO: I lease everything.

23

24 MR. DUGAS: I think I heard what you said, that it's become a 25 challenge to get access to it, and it's getting harder and harder, as you come to meetings. 26

27 28

MR. NACIO: Yes.

29 30

MR. DUGAS: It's something in the meeting room that is taking charge of that?

31 32

33 MR. NACIO: What's that?

34 35

36

MR. DUGAS: You say you come to the meetings, and, as you come to the meetings, it gets harder and harder to get access to fish.

37 38

39 MR. NACIO: Yes.

40 41

MR. DUGAS: So something in this room is triggering that?

42

MR. NACIO: Well, I think just people's opinions who don't want 43 44 to see change in this industry. You know, when I first started leasing fish, I was paying \$3.00 a pound, and it was very 45 available, and I only made two leases this year, and I paid 46 47 \$4.25 and \$4.60 a pound, but, I mean, I made numerous calls, and I just keep getting turned down at every turn I make, and there

is no database for us to reach out to, and so it's coming to a point where we're not going to be able to fish.

MR. DUGAS: So what is your status today? Are you still fishing today?

 MR. NACIO: Yes. We have 7,000 pounds of deepwater grouper and 1,500 pounds of snapper left to catch. We sent a boat out to work, and my nephew has been my captain for the last five years, and he just went and landed an oil field job, because we couldn't secure enough quota for the boat to make enough trips to go out.

MR. DUGAS: Okay. Thank you for your comments.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Nacio. Next up, we're going back to online, and Ellen Peel. I'm sorry. It's Eric Schmidt, and, Ms. Peel, we'll get back to you in just a minute, and so Eric Schmidt is next.

MR. ERIC SCHMIDT: Good afternoon. Eric Schmidt, charter boat and headboat operator, Fort Myers, Florida. Quickly, I recommend status quo on red snapper and absolutely no bag limit change for vermilion snapper.

 I'm respectfully going to request that the council make an amendment to the motion that you all did before lunch regarding Florida pompano. At one point in the amendment, you included African pompano and permit, but, before you voted on it, you removed it. African pompano, in our area, on the west coast of Florida, is a fishery that is prosecuted solely in federal waters.

African pompano meets the criteria for federal management, according to the Magnuson Act, for management and conservation. According to the guidelines for establishing council fishery management plans in the briefing book, it meets all ten of the requirements, especially Number 5, where the stock is important to commercial or recreational users, and Number 6, the stock is important to the nation or to the regional economy.

African pompano are caught in all five Gulf states, and four states have absolutely no regulations whatsoever on African pompano. The State of Florida has a two fish per vessel, twenty-four-inch fork length, restriction. Now, because there is no federal management, the state regulation carries over into federal waters, and that figure of two fish per vessel is not based on any science or any biological fact. It was a number

that was arbitrarily looked at and garnered by a group of stakeholders that Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation put together.

This is a petition, and there is 1,200 names here. I talked to fishermen, and I went to fishing groups, and these are customers that I have taken fishing, and these are fellow charter boat and headboat operators, and they're all from Tampa to Key West, and they all support federal management of African pompano, especially in our area.

 You have unlimited commercial harvest in federal waters, and, if you're a commercial spear fisherman, you can go out and spear 300 or 400 pounds of them, and you go to the dock. When I'm on a charter, I can only keep two, and, in the recent years, we have had an explosion in our area. I also run a sixteen-passenger headboat, on weekend trips, and, three years ago, I made one stop, and we caught sixty-four.

Now, as you continue to take fish from us, it's getting more difficult for me to put trips together, and, now, I do have trips where I have customers that went to do catch-and-release, and they will want to catch jewfish or amberjack, something big to pull on the line, but I do have customers that want to retain fish to take home to eat, and what I'm looking at on the calendar here, next year, with the potential restrictions and regulation changes, it's going to be very difficult for me to put a trip together.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Schmidt. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Eric, for coming all the way over here and giving your testimony. So your description of your issue with African pompano sounds like it's more of an issue with the state regulations, and have you discussed this issue with FWC, and what has that reaction been, in terms of your request to broaden the African pompano limit?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, and I believe it was the meeting in New Orleans, and Dr. Crabtree recommended that I go see the FWC, because, at that time, he didn't really have an appetite for just taking on African pompano, and I went to speak with them in Naples, and Commissioner Barreto and the other commissioners received a copy of the petition, and they seemed pretty apathetic. They didn't care one way or another. They deferred to staff.

At the council meeting in Fort Myers, I went to see Jessica, and

she said, as of now, with the pending lawsuit on Florida pompano, there would be no changes whatsoever to any pompano rule with the FWC, and so, when I saw that this was on the agenda, that's why I'm here, because, as slow as the process is in fisheries management, civil litigation could take years, and so, if this is something -- I am not asking you to just change the rules and at the next meeting start a framework amendment, but I'm just asking you to put African pompano and permit in the council's staff presentation, so that you all can learn about these fish. They're a federal fish, and we catch them in federal waters, and you will not catch an African pompano on the west coast of Florida in state waters.

MR. GILL: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Hi, Eric. Thanks for being here. Did I hear you correctly that you said status quo management for red snapper?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, sir.

MR. STRELCHECK: Can you explain that, because my understanding, from hearing from southwest Florida, is the red snapper are doing really well down there.

MR. SCHMIDT: Well, in this process, a lot of people tend to be pretty selfish, and they want to grab their fish and hold on to their slice of the pie. Yes, we have a very robust red snapper fishery in our area, and we have to run sixty, seventy, or eighty miles. Now, I talked to other fishermen, in other parts of the Gulf, and, okay, fine, you change, and you add fish to our quota, and maybe I get an extra fifteen days, after you're done with that, but it's really hurting the fishermen in the northern Gulf, and so I am happy with status quo, as it is right now.

We had seventy-nine days this year, and, towards the end of the season, it was kind of tough to keep people's interest going. They're gung-ho at the beginning of the season, but then you roll into August, and people are worried about getting clothes for their kid to go back to school, and they're wrapping up their summer, and so that's the other thing that I would be interested in discussing, is, if we're going to have eighty days, maybe break it up to forty days in the summer and forty days in the winter, or something to where we could spread it out.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Eric. Do you have an opinion on the charter/for-hire hail-in and hail-out, the sixty, ninety, or 120 minutes?

MR. SCHMIDT: I think it's ridiculous. That program was started by industry, and several charter fishermen came to the council, and they wanted electronic logbooks, which turned into the vessel apps now, where we report our catches, with the intent of creating catch histories, so that, down the road, we could create an IFQ program, possibly, for the charter industry.

What has happened is this process has become very convoluted along the way, and the government has now gotten involved in it, and this was supposed to be about fish reporting, and now it's turned into social science reporting, and now reporting every time I leave the dock, if I have to go -- I have to go a quarter-mile to the fuel dock, and I have to hail-out.

Now, what's going to happen here, with putting a time limit on this, is the law of unintended consequences. I have a friend that was a commercial fisherman, and they have to report three hours before they hit the dock. If you're going to be there at 7:00 p.m., you better be there at 7:00 p.m. You can come in at 8:00, but don't come in early. He came in six minutes early, and an FWC officer gave him a ticket, and so what if I take a partyboat and refuel it at the commercial shrimp dock, and I go over there, and say I have sixty minutes to go dock to dock, and there's a shrimp boat there getting 7,000 gallons of fuel.

Now, I am forty yards from the dock, but I'm not tied up. I listened to the discussions the other day, and I have to physically be tied up to the dock, and then what does constitute a dock? I wish you would just do away with it, because that was not the intent of this program.

Now, I'm the Vice Chair of the Data Collection AP, and there was a motion made that, once we passed the COLREGS line, then we make our declaration, once we're underway, but just running around the bay, going to the marina, it's really added a lot of burdens and just a lot of aggravation.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Schmidt. We appreciate it. Next up, we have Ms. Ellen Peel, and then Bob Zales is on deck, but, before we start Ms. Peel, there's been a couple of people that have signed up, and it seems like there may be a problem on

their end, or maybe on their end, but their name didn't show up, and so we are going to display the full list of people that have signed-up so far, and, if you signed-up, and you do not see your name on the list, please get with our staff.

We want to make sure that everybody gets the chance, that wants to speak can speak, and they can get with Carly, in the back. Carly is in the back, by the door. Raise your hand, Carly. If, for some reason, you don't see your name, please get with Carly. We want to make sure that everybody that tried to sign-up gets an opportunity to speak. With that, we're going to go ahead with Ms. Ellen Peel, and they will be scrolling the names as she is giving her testimony, and so go ahead, Ms. Peel.

MS. ELLEN PEEL: I am the President of the Billfish Foundation. Can you hear me speaking twice?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: It seems like there's an echo, Ms. Peel, in the background, and I'm not sure what is causing the echo, but we can hear you.

MS. PEEL: Okay. I'm the President of the Billfish Foundation, and, obviously, our concern is over depredation of billfish, tunas, and swordfish and the negative impact it's having on both charter and private recreational fishing.

My question is, in light of Dr. Cortes sharing some improvement in shark stocks, and Karyl noting that there's a decline in active commercial shark fisheries, that there is the ban on selling shark fins in states, and that's separate from finning, and that that's had a negative impact on commercial fishing, and my question is, in light of all of these, is there any reason to think the U.S. commercial shark fishery will be competitive again one day? The second part is, if they aren't, and they are not landing sharks, what is going to be the future of recreational fishing, again, charter and private? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Peel. Next up, we have Mr. Bob Zales, and, on deck, we have Dan Green.

MR. BOB ZALES, II: Bob Zales, II, representing the National Association of Charter Boat Operators, SOFA, and commercial longliners. First off, on red snapper, pretty much everybody I've talked to, especially in our area, and every professional in this room, pretty much, status quo. We don't need an increase in quota.

The thing that Eric said about forty days here and forty days

there, the guys in Panama City, the majority of them, would like to see that eighteen days in August split up to three weekends in September and October.

With all due respect to comments made about accountability, the discard mortality in the private rec fleet is out of sight. It's out of control, and there is no accountability in that fleet. How many congressmen and senators were on that letter? Every one of them that complained about MRFSS and FES, and the states may have a better system, but, right now, discards are not being counted.

We all suffer because of that discard mortality, because, as they set -- When they set ABC, it's adjusted to account for the discard mortality that's there, and so, where we couldn't catch fish up here, we're catching down fish here, because of the discarding, and so that private rec discard mortality has put me out of fish, and it's put the commercial guys out of fish, and that needs to be fixed.

I sent an email to this council and requested that we look at a vessel permit for the recreational fleet in federal waters. That is the only vessel in the Gulf of Mexico today that is not identified, and it doesn't have a permit or anything to go with it. I've got a permit, and I'm identified. The commercial guys have got a permit, and they're identified. If you fish HMS, you've got to have a permit, and so the precedent is there to set it, and you need to seriously look at it, because that would give us a decent number on how many are fishing there, number one, and then you get into a data program, and we get data, and you get a better handle on the discards.

I have talked to -- On the discard mortality, to see if the Fisheries Service can look at a way to -- The discard mortality on the rec side be taken from their quota, and discard mortality from my side, charter, be taken from my quota, and discards from the commercial will be taken from there. That would give us a few more fish, because our discard mortality is lower, and we report every day.

I do it times three trips a day, in SEFHIER, three four-hour trips, one behind the other, and I put everything in there, my discards, what I catch, the whole deal, and they know exactly what I'm doing every minute of every day. Commercial boats are the same way. Private recs, they're wide open. Nobody knows where they are, where they're going, how many, what they're doing, and so that's it. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Zales. All right. I'm not seeing any questions. Thank you for your thoughts. All right. Next up is Mr. Dan Green and, on deck, we have Christina Vaeth.

MR. DAN GREEN: Hello. I'm from Galveston, Texas, Dan Green, and I've been a charter fisherman since 2006. I first started running only offshore trips, and then I started adding statewater trips to my business. About six years ago, I felt that I needed to add another way to make money in the winter, and so I bought a commercial permit, so that I could go fish in the winter and make a paycheck.

I started out slow, only landing a few thousand pounds my first year, and, last year, I was able to catch a little over 30,000 pounds of fish, and that doesn't seem like much, but my boat is small, and it only carries about 2,000 pounds comfortably. Out of those 30,000 pounds, I would say that 95 percent of those fish were leased, and I think the ability to lease fish is vital for my business, and a lot of other people's.

I have leased fish from multiple different shareholders along the Gulf, and I have also leased fish from other guys, like myself, at the end of the year, when their market wasn't buying fish, so they wouldn't be stuck with a bunch. The ability to lease fish lets guys like me test the waters of commercial fishing without going millions into debt, and I also hope to slowly acquire shares throughout my career and one day be able to lease them to young captains like myself. That's all.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. All right. Next up, we're going to go online to Ms. Christina Vaeth. Christina.

MS. CHRISTINA VAETH: Hi. My name is Christina Vaeth, and I'm calling on behalf of an active commercial shark fisherman, and I kind of wanted to answer one of the council members' questions, and I can't remember whose, but there are shark permits available. It's just that everyone is scared to get into the business, with the threat of a national fin sale ban and no real meat market.

 State fin bans have eliminated domestic fin sales and limited access to ports to even export. HMS has tried to promote the meat market, with recipes for our sustainably-harvested sharks, but, somehow, it had to be pulled off the internet, within hours, with no explanation. For this reason alone --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Vaeth, we are having a little bit of trouble 48 hearing you. If I could get you to slow down just a little bit,

and maybe speak a little bit more clearly, and we're getting you, but it's just barely audible, and so if you would.

2 3 4

 MS. VAETH: I'm sorry. It's the speakers, I'm sure, on my computer, but I just wanted to let the council know that there are shark permits available. It's just that everyone is scared to get into the business, with the threat of a national fin sale ban and no real meat market.

State fin bans have eliminated the domestic fin sales and have limited access to the ports to even export. HMS has tried to promote the meat market, with recipes for our sustainably-harvested sharks, but, somehow, it had to be pulled off the internet, within hours, with no explanation. It is for this reason alone, marketability, that quotas are not being harvested, and the optimum yield prescribed in the fishery management plan is not being achieved.

Our market will never be straightened out until misinformation to the general public is combated, and this kind of leads me to my next comment about the sandbar stock assessment and projections. During last evening's question-and-answer, someone had asked about another assessment for sandbars, and Dr. Cortes had said something about not needing to review it that often, but, since 2017, when the last stock assessment was done, the quotas have been underharvested by, on average, 50 percent every year from 2017, and so I would question whether that would change his rebuilding projections, and have those figures been accounted for?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Vaeth. I appreciate it. Next up, we have Johnny Walker.

MR. JOHNNY WALKER: My name is Johnny Walker, and I am a -- I've been charter boat fishing for over thirty years in Galveston, and a commercial fisherman for about twenty-five years. I wanted to kind of go over -- I guess it's a story, as far as when I came into the fishery and the reason for the story is the state of the fishery when I came in it and how I see it now.

I was charter boat fishing out of Galveston, and it was in the 1990s, in 1995, and, of course, every day, I had to walk the dock, and I was at the middle of the -- I would have to walk past this boat called the Brand X, and, you know, fish on the dock all the time, and he was in the commercial fishery, Billy Wright, and he told me -- I always asked him about commercial fishing and how was the living, and he said, hey, John, come with me one day, and I will show you the ropes, and you can see

what goes.

1 2 3

I was looking for a way to make some extra money, and I was planning on going all-in on this deal, and so, the first trip I made with Billy Wright in 1995, we left one morning, and it took us two days, and he didn't have a limit. It was like 1,700 or 1,800 pounds, and, at that time, it was a derby, and, of course, you had to set your days to where you didn't finish up the second day, and, if you were 200 pounds short, you needed to get back to the dock, and so he said, John, we've got to go back to the dock, and we unloaded, and I was like, well, this ain't bad, and I said, Bill, I said, how about the price of the fish?

He said, oh, John, it's a good price. It's \$1.72, and so I'm like, okay, I can make a go of this, and so, the next year, I bought my commercial permit and a boat, the Miss Ashley, and I proceeded to probably fish through the roughest time of the fishery. It was probably the worst time you could ever get in it. In the late 1990s, the fishery was collapsing, but I busted my ass, and I fished, and I was one of the first guys out and the last guys in, just like these other guys that did it, and I knew, we knew, that something had to happen for it to become better.

In other words, the fishery was collapsing in the late 1990s, and it was getting harder, and the price was down, and it was a race to the fish. The resource was going away, and so IFQs -- There was a lot of scuttlebutt about it, and so we all started to kind of position ourselves for this IFQ. In 2002, 2003, and 2004, the referendums, and we ended up -- I was one of the guys that voted for it.

 So we voted it in, and I got this letter, and, I'm like, damn, you know, I'm going to be able to make some money with this deal okay, and, well, it just so happens that we vote it in, and the first year is good, and, boom, they slash the quota, and so Johnny Walker is over here thinking that he's going to, you know, make all this money, and it's cut in half, and so I'm sitting here jockeying, and, you know, do I stay in this thing, or do I get out of it, and what's going to happen here, but all of us were in the same boat.

The fishery was overcapitalized. With IFQs, we were going to rebuild the resource, and it was going to make it to where we could all make a little bit more money, and so the second year came in, and they cut it again. I mean, it forced us into buying permits and moving things around, and this notion that all the top guys -- If you look at all the top guys now, and I

don't know everybody, but I knew Underwood and Burnett and Guindon, and all of those guys that were top-tier back then, they're top-tier now. IFQs didn't change any of that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Walker, I would just ask you to try to start wrapping it up, please, but we're very interested in testimony, but just if you could start closing it up.

MR. WALKER: Right, and so, but with implementation of it, of course, it starts coming back, and we all were back in the fishery, and it helped us. Once the fishery started recovering, and we started getting more entrants in, and you had bigger parties coming in with quota, and we were able to lease to a bunch of these reef fish permit holders that never could catch fish before, and so reallocation -- When I hear that word -- I'm still making payments on what I got, and are my fish that may be reallocated to get that note that I'm still paying?

There's a lot involved, as far as when it comes to the fishery, when it comes to that, and there's a couple more things, as far as overfishing. I charter fished this year, and I truly believe that we do not need an increase on the quota this year. I've seen some area depletions, as far as snapper, and it's a little bit harder to catch them this year, and, also, kingfish and cobia, and that's a serious thing.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Walker. We appreciate your testimony. Next up is David Paul Horan, and he's going to be online, and on deck is going to be Mr. Charlie Bergmann. Are you there, Mr. Horan? In the interest of time, we're going to move on and come back to Mr. Horan, if we can get him, and we'll go to the next person. Mr. Bergmann, and so, if Mr. Horan is available, he'll be next. If not, Katie Fischer will be next.

MR. CHARLIE BERGMANN: That's kind of like the longest mile, walking up here. Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. I'm going to probably say a lot of things that I normally say, and I spoke a lot, I believe, to different members on the need for us, us as an industry and as science, and there needs to be surveys to address, or to monitor, the bait stocks, the bait stocks that are further offshore, and, hence, the bigger fish are further offshore. Also, monitor the sargassum in the Gulf, and that's a good indicator of the health of the fishery.

Recreational fishing, and with all due respect to the gentleman that spoke earlier, the governing bodies, the council, the agency, the different states, have no idea how many anglers are

in the states. They have an idea as to how many licenses, or permits, that were sold, but they don't know what the universe is, say for reef fish or for seatrout. They're two totally different fisheries, but all you have is a list of the licenses, and so we need to maybe pursue this idea of getting a federal angler permit, similar to what HMS has.

I would really like to see if the council could check with ASMFC and look at their striped bass program, where they have fish tags by state, different colors by state, and they have different gear types, and monitor the snap-in tags, in through the gill and out the mouth, and they snap together. This is something that may prove useful in monitoring the recreational catch.

ITQs, this has been a sore subject for a lot of folks, but the purpose and the need for the amendment was to reduce capitalization, and the only purpose of an ITQ -- I mean, there were a lot of things that happened because of it, but the only purpose of an ITQ is to reduce capitalization. Now, this council listened to the fishermen that wanted it, and it was implemented to reduce capitalization, and the problem is they reduced a little bit more, but it's doing what the management plan was designed to do. I see the red light is blinking. I don't support any increase in the red snapper catch. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Bergmann. We appreciate your testimony. Are we able to get Mr. Horan on the line? Okay, and so I'm going to try to go to somebody else, and we'll try to come back to Mr. Horan in a little while, when we get that straightened out. Katie Fischer, and then on deck is going to be Hans Guindon.

MS. KATIE FISCHER: I'm Katie Fischer from Matlacha, Florida. I'm a fish house owner, and also a vessel owner, and, first of all, I would like to express my support for the second IFQ meeting. Although I do think that it will be difficult to come to a consensus, I think that the structure of that meeting in Tampa was an excellent way for all perspectives that encompass our commercial sector to have a seat at the table. I definitely look forward to the second meeting.

I do have one recommendation, prior to the next meeting, and that would be to repopulate the crew with no shares seat with a true crew with no share, and I believe that captains and crew deserve a spot at that table, and I think their perspective would be a good thing to have, moving forward.

The second topic that I would like to talk about is sector allocation. I listened to the amberjack discussion yesterday, and, I mean, our commercial quota is whittled down to 16 percent. I mean, that is scary. We are 500, approximately 500, boats that harvest fish in the Gulf of Mexico, but we represent 325 million non-fishing Americans. When our fish is harvested and brought to the dock, it does not stop there, and it is distributed throughout our countries, to give an American choice for seafood on their dinner plate.

I think that we need to bring into the discussion some thresholds, minimum thresholds, set for these sector allocations that protect the food security of Americans. You know, this is becoming a more prevalent problem in our country, with food shortages everywhere, and I don't want it to be too late before we start protecting that. I think the majority of America deserves to have their food security protected.

As far as a red snapper increase, I do support a red snapper increase, just for the simple fact that we need more access in southwest Florida. Our fishermen, we have trouble getting access to red snapper, and it would really help our owner-operators and small-boat fleet out, and I think that's all I've got today. Thanks for taking time to hear my comments, and I will take any questions, if you all have any. If not, I will look forward to seeing you guys at the next meeting, and sorry that I couldn't make this one.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Fischer. We appreciate your comments. Next up, we're going to go -- We have a question for you, Ms. Fischer, from Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hi, Katie. I had trouble hearing what you were saying, and it was something about the focus group and a crew member?

MS. FISCHER: Originally, when you were talking about the different types of participants for this group, the seat for crew was crew with no shares, and that would be a crew member that has no shares, or does not own any shares, and that seat was not populated to reflect that, and I think that was a disservice to all the captains and crew across the Gulf that make huge sacrifices to go out and harvest the seafood, and so I would recommend that a true crew with no shares participant be repopulated in that seat, so they can have their perspective heard. They are the ones that are going out there and harvesting the fish.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Fischer. We appreciate it. We're going to try Mr. Horan at this point. Emily has got a workaround, and so go ahead.

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: No, and we're going to --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Next up, Mr. Hans Guindon. Eric White is on deck. Hans Guindon.

MR. HANS GUINDON: I'm Captain Hans Guindon, a commercial bandit and longline fisherman out of Galveston, Texas. I lease 100 percent of my quota that I catch, and I make a good living doing it. Without being able to lease fish, I wouldn't be able to make the living that I do, doing what I do. I'm also investing in shares, grouper and snapper, and I can tell you the fishery is in a decline, where we cannot support an increase in the Gulf.

It's not sustainable in our fisheries, and the fisheries can't handle it. I've been a commercial fisherman my whole life, and I've seen the fisheries get beat down to nothing in the 1990s, and I watched it build back up to a great fishery, and I'm saddened to see it headed back south again.

Unless we get the recreational sector sustainable, it will continue to decline, so no one has the fisheries. The recreational sector has overfished for decades, and it's time to stop it and make them accountable and sustainable, so future generations of all sectors can enjoy and make a living off the Gulf of Mexico.

A tagging system is a great way to make them accountable, just like the tags we use for deer hunting and turkey hunting or making them buy a permit, to at least get a number of the amount of anglers that fish in the Gulf of Mexico. You all have no clue how many there are.

 Something needs to be done, and it needs to happen now, before the fisheries is beat down to nothing, and, also, I would like to see a raise of hands of how many commercial fishermen are sitting on this council. I think that's something that is very important to make this a fair council too as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Guindon. We appreciate it.
We're going to try Mr. Horan one more time, and see if we can
accommodate him. With that, go ahead, Mr. Horan.

MR. DAVID PAUL HORAN: Thanks a lot for letting me speak today.

My name is David Paul Horan, and I'm an attorney here in Key West. I started working with the brand-new Magnuson Act in 1976, when we were setting up the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

The one thing I can tell you, for sure, is that this is not the way the Magnuson Act was supposed to work. The Magnuson Act cases that I have submitted today are my cases, with the exception of the $9^{\rm th}$ Circuit out in California, the United Cook case. In your packet of materials, all those cases, including the appeals, were mine, and I won them.

Now, the issue today is going to be on the fact that the State of Florida was not real happy when the voters of Florida voted to do away with gillnets and entanglement nets, and so, approximately five years after the constitutional amendment passed, a group of fishermen over in Collier County got together, and they said, well, we would like to go ahead and continue using our gillnets, and they got it through, and so you actually can go out, from Collier County, and you go out nine miles, and you can catch an unlimited, and underline that, unlimited amount of pompano, and you can bring them straight back into Collier County and offload them.

Now, you're going to have two documents that are in front of you, and one of them is the Florida pompano commercial landings. You will notice, in the entire Gulf coast, there is one place, and one place only, that has over 50,000 pounds of commercial landings, and that's not a coincidence. That's because it is a Florida-enforced monopoly, and so here I am in Key West, and my people cannot -- I represent the Florida Keys Commercial Fishing Association, and they cannot leave their dock and go out into the EEZ and catch pompano and come back in. They cannot. They are prohibited from doing that.

 Also, if they were an Alabama boat, nobody could touch them. They could go out there and catch unlimited amounts of pompano in the EEZ, and nobody can even -- Florida can't even board them. However, when it comes to landing them, they can't land them, because then it's a violation of the Florida pompano regulations. This is not going or supposed to work.

Now, if you look at what is going on out there, you will find that there is no United States gillnet vessels that can land over a hundred pompano from the Gulf of Mexico Exclusive Economic Zone. Now, that's important, because those pompano look to be a bycatch. You can't go out and target them. I've got a case going, right now, where the young man was out there,

and he brought in his gillnet, and, as soon as he started bringing the fish in -- By the way, if they're in a gillnet, they're dead, and so the discard is going to be total mortality, but he brought it up, and he had over a hundred pompano in the net, and, because of that, he was arrested.

I've got another client that he had like nearly a thousand pompano, and also six tons of Spanish mackerel, and they boarded him and said, well, you've got over a hundred, and so, therefore, you're under arrest, and so, to add insult to injury, they charged him with eleven undersized pompano, and how the heck would he know that he had undersized pompano in that net, because you're fishing in the mud, and the mud gets turned up by the fish on the bottom, and you don't know what's going to get into that net. That's ridiculous.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Horan, I would ask that you start to wrap up, please.

MR. HORAN: Okay. The only way this is going to work is if you go ahead and do a Gulf of Mexico pompano fishery management plan, and then you can designate the State of Florida as your enforcement, and then they can enforce it against all vessels, including other state vessels, and so that's what I'm asking for. Thank you, and I will answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Horan. I'm looking around the table, and I'm not seeing any questions at this time. Thank you. I think next up, we're going to go back in the room, and Rachal Hisler, and then Eric White is on deck.

MS. RACHAL HISLER: Good afternoon, council members. My name is Rachal Hisler, and I am from Anahuac, Texas, and I am the wife of a commercial snapper fisherman, and my father-in-law is an original allocation shareholder. We have been in the fishing industry for three generations now, and so this is absolutely a way of life for myself and my husband. We both grew up in the commercial fishing industry.

I am here because I've been living a very comfortable life, and shadows have started to creep in on the margins, and I figured out that it was my time to come here and speak with you all about what we are experiencing, as the people who are out there in the boats and catching the fish, that is ultimately ending up on the plate in a restaurant.

We lease the quota, mostly from my father-in-law, but also from other shareholders as well, the same situation as some of the

other captains who have already spoken, and so I'm not going to go over that again, but what I feel like we do is we add another layer in the economic chain that happens from the boat to the plate, and so, if you were to eliminate captains like my husband, then that is eliminating an entire class of that chain that goes on up, and so what we do is an entire lifestyle.

My husband is a fishing fanatic. When he is not out fishing for work, he comes home and he fishes for fun, and so not only is he in the commercial sector, but he's also a recreational guy. He loves fishing so much that he volunteers his time to be a captain of a high school bass fishing team, and what he does there is continue to pass on that conservation message to the next generation of the recreational side, but they also know that he's a commercial fisherman as well, and that translates.

They see that this is a person who is in both sides of the industry, who really does care about conservation and keeping this resource available as a legacy for future generations. The question that I have, being here today, since this is my first time to participate in this council, is I am seeing that there is a lot of divisions between the two perceived sides, and it feels like a lose-lose situation here, that no one is really happy with the way that things are going, and so what I would like to see is more bridge building and getting members in the council who represent people like myself and other shareholders, stakeholders, who are willing to begin building those bridges, and you have a great example of that out here, where there is a bridge that is literally being built, and you will see that it is built from starting on each side and working toward the middle. That's what these two sides have got to do, and I'm here to be a part of that process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Hisler. We appreciate it. Next up is Mr. Eric White, and on deck is Will Atkins. We're going to go ahead to Mr. Will Atkins. On deck is Brian Lewis. Mr. Atkins.

MR. WILL ATKINS: My name is Will Atkins, and I'm a second-generation commercial fisherman. I work for Hans Guindon, on the Blackjack 4, and Bubba Cochrane, on the Chelsea Anne. My family has been involved in the commercial fishing industry most of my life and now has a seafood business and restaurant in the Dallas area.

I work hard, and I save my money, and I hope to have my own commercial fishing boat and business one day. I am not looking for any handouts. Our business plan relies heavily on leased

fish. Without the leased fish, we would be in big trouble. Do not mess with the IFQ program. If it's not broke, don't fix it.

The snapper fishery is on the decline, and raising the quota is not a good idea for the time being. Something needs to be done about this very unbalanced council. I don't see many commercial representatives up there, and I hope to see this change, so that we can be represented fairly, and that's all I've got. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Atkins. Mr. Brian Lewis is next, and on deck is B.J. Burkett.

MR. BRIAN LEWIS: Good afternoon. Well, I want to take the time to tell the council how grateful I am that we're able to do these virtual meetings, and it's a positive step in the right direction.

I would like to discuss the recreational fishery, as I participate as a recreational fisherman, and I also own a commercial fishing vessel, which my son-in-law runs. As a recreational fisherman, I enjoy going out and catching fish. However, it's getting reduced, because we don't know simply what's being caught, okay, and so I've been involved in this fishery for over, what, twenty-two years now, and we've preached tag programs, and we have preached tag programs, and we have preached tag programs, and it needs to happen.

We need mandatory reporting. I have several of my friends who are willing to put whatever tool that's in the toolshed to be able to gain access and do reporting, and, if it gives them the ability to allow you fishery managers to have the correct data to manage the fisheries, and, that way, the commercial sector that, in turn, is not having their allocations removed, all on the favor of discards.

Reef fish endorsements, licenses, whatever it takes, but we need to get working on that now, and I would like to move on to the gags, because that gag cutback looming over our heads is going to be a pretty detrimental thing to us all, and so the male population of gag grouper is way down, and so I ask, why do we continue to allow the fishery to keep the male gags? Why are we not making an attempt? We have descending devices and venting tools, and so why can't we release these male gags, if that is all in the favor of increasing the male population?

I recommend the council try to work together to try to come up

with a mechanism, or a vehicle, to fix that. My commercial vessel -- Regarding gag grouper, my commercial vessel is out right now, and it's been out for -- It's day-five, and he's got three gag groupers, okay, and so, if gag grouper is so great right now, then why don't I have more on that vessel, because my vessel is very capable of catching much more.

Regarding red snapper, I'm seeing -- Everywhere we fish, they've got twenty pounds of red snapper right now, okay, and so I want to tell you something about the best science available, because us fishermen, believe it or not, in my opinion, are the best science available, and so I ask you, council, to listen to us fishermen when we tell you that we don't need increases, because -- We don't need them, okay, and, when we do need them, we ask for it, and, you know, that brings me to the triggerfish. We're still waiting patiently on the increase of the commercial limits on triggerfish, okay, and the beeliner population -- If they're so great, I can't find them anywhere, and so I would like to know where in the world they are, because I would go catch them, if somebody would tell me.

On the IFQ, the panel, I recommend that they convene again for another meeting, but, with that said, maybe some kind of a phone-in system, where we can call in and make comments, not just for public testimony, but a Q&A type of session. Remember that the IFQ --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Lewis, could you start wrapping up your comments, please?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, sir. The IFQ program is a tool in the toolshed that was used to maintain the fisheries at a sustainable level, and we have been doing that, okay, and so I don't know what the answer is to why you guys want to make changes to the IFQ program, when in fact it's working. It's doing its intended consequences, and, yes, there was unintended consequences. I was an unintended consequence, and I will share that with you, because I had a choice to make, as a businessman.

I either had to put up or shut up, okay, and I put up. I got \$300,000 that I bought IFQ with, and, unfortunately, I didn't like having to do that, but I do it. I also lease red snapper, and I'm a member of the quota bank with the Gulf Shareholders Alliance, and I'm thankful to these investors who bought these red snapper and have given us access, and so please remember that, and, if you want to put us commercial fishermen out of business, then maybe you should offer some money and buy us out.

I mean, we give all this money to all these other countries, and we can't even help our own people out. I don't want to stand -- I'm not here for welfare, and I'm not standing in a welfare line, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you, and thanks for the time. Have a great day.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. We appreciate your testimony. Next up is B.J. Burkett, and Mike Sullivan is on deck.

MR. B.J. BURKETT: My name is B.J. Burkett from Panama City, Florida. I have two dual-permitted charter boats and also a full-time commercial boat. I have eight or nine employees, and I also take about 3,000 tourists out fishing every year.

 I guess I'm going to start out -- About everything that I'm about to say takes money out of my pocket, and so I hope you all take this serious. We, the stakeholders, are your best conservationists out there. We need to see these fish, all these stocks, healthy. I mean, that makes my living, and I would love to see my kids follow in my footsteps and be able to fish, but, the way we're going, it's not going to be available for them by that time.

The stocks are dwindling in the red snapper, and we do not need an increase. You have everybody in this room is saying do not increase it, and so, if you all increase it, how do you think that's going to make us feel, when we're seeing the decline out there right now, and so think about that.

 Triggerfish, don't mess with it. Leave it alone. We don't need an increase. We're seeing a lot of small fish, and we're catching some legal fish, and don't mess with it. Just status quo.

King mackerel, it's been the worst year I've ever seen on king mackerel, and I would say give it one more year, and, if it does not drastically improve next year -- Like I say, it's going to take money out of my pocket, but you're going to need to do something about it and change some regulations.

Amberjack, I stood up here, from the beginning, and told you all that it was a mistake, going to an August opening. It has not helped anything. Put it back to January 1, or maybe even to a full closure. The amberjack stock needs a lot of help.

Gags, this is a sore subject for me, because I've stood up here four years in a row and told you all that the gag fishery needed

some help, and nothing was done. Nobody listened, and, now that the gag fishery is finally improving, and it's the best gag fishery we've seen in ten years, now you all want to do a drastic reduction, and it's just -- It's asinine, to me, of what you all are wanting to do, when we're out there every day seeing exactly what's going on, and you all are not listening. What does it take for you all to listen?

The gags, if you all want to do something, it's drastic, and do a four or five-month closure during the spawn, and that's the way to help this fishery, and not a closure during an 80 percent reduction on the commercial side and then not opening the recreational until September. If you open recreational in September, or the amount of discards in June, when everybody starts snapper fishing, would be horrible.

 I will go quick here, and dolphins and sharks, and that's my last thing. We have seen a massive amount of sharks show up, and you all have to do something about them. If you all want a fishery to manage, you might want to take care of the shark problem, and also the dolphin. Something has to be done, and you all are going to have to step up, as a council, and take charge and try to do something with it, or you all won't have a job here, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Burkett. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Mr. Chair, I hope you will indulge me for just a second. In our talking around the table about trying to think outside of the box, I have a question, and I hope that I'm going to pose this in the proper way, but so you have two dually-permitted vessels?

MR. BURKETT: Yes.

MS. BOGGS: When you purchased those vessels, were they charter/for-hire vessels, and then you decided to commercial fish with them, or vice versa, or did you buy them with the intent of --

MR. BURKETT: I started eighteen years ago, or nineteen now, and I started with a reef permit before I started chartering, and then I have slowly upgraded to larger boats, an overload charter boat, and I kept the reef permit on it, and I fished it, and then I just recently bought another charter boat, last year, and I haven't even commercial fished it this year yet, but it's got a reef permit on it, but, at the condition of the fishery in our area, I probably won't even fish it this winter. I have made my

living charter fishing, and then the commercial boat -- I bought into the IFQ program, as an investment, hoping to see it grow, and I mean, I've seen it -- There's some ups and downs.

I mean, mainly for -- My boat is a gag grouper boat, and that's what they fish for, and a few red grouper, and we lease a lot of snapper for bycatch, but he is a gag grouper fisherman, and he's one of the best at it, but it's a real slap in the face when we're seeing the improvement of this stock, and then you all want to take 80 percent of it from us, when some minor changes could have been made, two or three years ago, when we all stood up here and told you that, hey, you need to something, but now we want to drastically reduce it.

MS. BOGGS: A quick follow-up. Would it be safe to say that you look at this as an investment to keep your crews working, and so, if the red snapper season for the charter fleet is closed --

MR. BURKETT: Absolutely, and that's the whole reason that I have -- If we have a bad year charter fishing, I can still make a living commercial fishing.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Burkett.

MR. BURKETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Next up, we have Mr. Mike Sullivan, and on deck is Chris Horton.

MR. MIKE SULLIVAN: I'm Mike Sullivan, out of Panama City, Florida. I've been in the fishing industry twenty-seven years, and I own four certified charter boats, three of them being dual-permitted. I'm an IFQ holder, and I've been in the game a long time.

 I'll just kind of cut to the point. For the red snapper reallocation, I'm way against it, like so many others have said, and there's been a reduction over the last two years in red snapper, and to increase it would just increase us going to overfishing and have drastic cuts, as we had ten years ago, or however many years ago it was, and I don't want that species to wind up like the gag grouper or the king mackerel, to where you say it's great, and, four or five years later, it's closed.

I, myself, like B.J. Burkett, am mostly in the charter industry, but I have the commercial capability, so that, when it does get tough, we can do other things.

I'm going to move on to amberjack, and I would like to see a move back to January 1. Having the start in August did no good. Every year since then, the season has gotten shorter, and it's really just gone backwards, and I don't understand why it was shifted to the middle of the summer, when everything else is January 1.

I would like to see triggerfish stay status quo, a March opening, and the fish seems to be doing better, and just kind of keep riding this. Gag grouper, yes, we see it needs some help, and, yes, we catch less. Before we go to an 80 percent reduction, essentially a complete closure, because the mortality is going to be so high, I would like to see a spring closure, while they spawn.

 This sounds bad, but having it closed during the federal red snapper fishing season -- The mortality rate during it is going to be terrible, and like the fish is going to die, and more gags are caught during that time than outside of that time in our area. I see that opening it in late summer is not going to be very beneficial.

Also, for the vermilion snapper, status quo. That, as the red snapper, we don't need an increase. We don't need twenty per person, and let's not put the pressure on another species. As some of these other species close, and they're going to the rebuild thing, we're fishermen, and we're going to go after what we can, and, if you increase the vermilions to twenty per person, we're going to annihilate them, and they're going to be in bad shape. Let's stay as we are and try to rebuild, as we can, before we have nothing. That's it.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Sullivan, we appreciate it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir. Thank you, all. Thank you, council.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Next up is Chris Horton, and Jim Zurbrick is on deck.

MR. CHRIS HORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. My name is Chris Horton, and I'm the Senior Director of Fisheries Policy for the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation I want to first start by addressing this notion that recreational anglers are unaccountable. We fish within the seasons we're given, and we harvest fish within the specified size range, and within the numbers and within the creel limit that we're given, and so we're accountable to what is given to us.

In reality, it's the federal recreational harvest data program that is unaccountable to recreational anglers, and we too are frustrated with MRIP's inability to effectively estimate what we're catching, which is why anglers have been fully supportive of the development of state data collection programs. We want to help continue to improve upon those programs in any way that we can, and they are already way ahead of providing the right recreational catch information, versus what MRIP has been giving

This brings me to my next point. The progress with the MRIP transition team is about three years too late. We're disappointed that we're in the fifth year of regional management, yet we're barely any closer to understanding and reconciling the differences between MRIP and the state data collection programs than where we were when we first started with state management several years ago, five years ago.

Now we're faced with rather simple calibration ratios that will have significant negative impacts for some states, and, in light of the Great Red Snapper Count, those impacts are really unnecessary. If you compare the number of fish being removed from the fishery with the number of fish estimated by the Great Red Snapper Count, even as reduced twice now by the SSC, our rate of removals is below the rate used to generate the ACL, and they have rebuilt.

While that's a simplified way to look at how management is performing relative to the population, it suggests that we're not overfishing and have time to fix the calibrations prior to the next red snapper operational stock assessment without penalizing the states, and, finally, also, we want to touch on the reallocations, and I think Ken covered it pretty well, but I just want to reiterate that, when you have existing allocations based on catch histories, when those catch histories change to reflect the reality, based on new information, there should be some mechanism to automatically adjust those allocation percentages to match that reality. Everybody is still whole, but it's just the percentages change, based on the new information.

Then, at that point, we more than welcome the opportunity to entertain a reallocation amendment and go through the process established by the council and NOAA to fully review the latest social, economic, and biological information for that stock. That's all I have, and thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Horton. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Chris. We actually agree on some things here. Relative to your comments on addressing the needs in the recreational sector, certainly I, and the council, would welcome your thoughts, and you don't have to do it now, although I should press you on that, but your thoughts on how we might start that process, given the magnitude of what we're talking about and how we might start. That's part of the problem, and it's not the only problem, but finding that niche to begin, and, if you've got thoughts on that, and would share them, I would much appreciate it.

MR. HORTON: You're talking about improving the recreational information, or recreational catch, data?

MR. GILL: On a doable basis, because, you know, if you're going to introduce an idea that's going to take \$50 million, then that's probably not going to happen real soon, but how the council may get involved in starting to think about how can we deal with this issue. Please do provide those, if you've got them.

MR. HORTON: Well, I'll tell you what. I will get back with you on that, but I do -- We obviously want to help in any way we can. I mean, we feel like we are accountable, but it's the whole system that is not accountable to us, and so we'll happily make that better, and I think the states have already started down a great path in doing that and trying to supplement MRIP with more real-time information.

 Knowing your universe of anglers helps you understand maybe how many folks are out there fishing, but, in reality, all the states already have that information. I mean, they presented that earlier this week, in that four of the states have some sort of permit that you have to attain, and so they know who is going out there. We know our universe of anglers and the folks who are going out there, but, yes, it's something that we as a community, and certainly we at CSF, are very interested in helping with, and so thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Next up is Jim Zurbrick, and Greg Abrams is on deck.

MR. JIM ZURBRICK: Good afternoon, council. Thank you very much. This is Jim Zurbrick, and I'm a commercial fisherman, along with my wife, Patty. I'm a fish dealer here, and I have three boats besides mine that fish for me, and I'm President of

Fish For America USA.

1 2 3

Listen, and I want to talk honestly here, because, as I get older, I think it's the best policy. If I hear one more person talk about how accountable the recreational sector is -- It's making me nauseous, because, when you have less than 50 percent of compliance on all the state reef fish surveys, people actually telling you what they have, and then, when the data came out, a while back, that showed that the average recreational fisher discards eight to nine fish to keep one red snapper, and how is in that in way accountable?

 My wife and I just got home from a trip on Monday, and we had 305 red snappers, and we had three discards, and all of it can be verified by the camera system that NOAA, through Mote Laboratory, has put on my boat. Now, I don't know that the rec sector can be that accountable, all right, but a transponder --With all the technology, surely a transponder, just giving out a signal of who it is that's actually out there fishing, might help.

We cannot go ahead and do anything with a reallocation. If the FES numbers are what they are, that's what they are. We did this with red grouper, and I believe that that's going to come back to haunt this council, and we'll have to wait and see, and, in fact, it is wrong to give the rec sector any more fish, after they are responsible for 97 percent of all the discards, and this is their issue.

We are beating up our fish stocks, and I'm seeing it, and my wife and I -- You can check the records, and you know what we have, as far as snapper, and this would be a nice increase, to get the increase they're talking about, but we don't want it, because the fishery, right now, in my area, from Crystal River to Panama City, is in dire straits.

Also, we've been beating this up here, and I don't think anybody wants us to actually catch more triggerfish, because I'm thinking that the rec sector reps on the council are going to go ahead and try to use it against us, because we're not catching our quota, and so we need to go to at least twenty-five, okay, and I'm not catching triggers like we used to, but there are people that are, and we need to go to a higher limit.

Also, I'm on the focus group, as many of you know, and I welcome a next meeting, and I really do believe that we can come out with some suggestions about moving forward on the issues. I really do believe that, and I think that the system has been

great, and it's a great system, but it needs a little bit of massaging, and I want to help with that, and that's about all I've got to say. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Zurbrick, I want to thank you for volunteering your time to serve on the focus group. We appreciate you doing that for us, and so thank you for that. Next up, we have Mr. Greg Abrams, and Clarence Seymour is on deck.

MR. GREG ABRAMS: Good afternoon. I'm Greg Abrams from Panama City, commercial and restaurant owner. The gag grouper was in trouble, and we've asked for help, but, the last two years, it's really improved, and, when I found out they was going to cut 80 percent, I made my boats -- We went and got new electric motors, and we went back pole fishing, and I've got forty-something-thousand pounds, and we caught them in three months, and I'm trying to find some to lease, but I can't find none, and NMFS says there's 50 percent left out there, but I can't find any anywhere, and so I don't know what the problem is with the numbers, but the gags were big, and they said we're not catching any copper bellies. Copper bellies are normally caught by longline boats in deep water, big fish, and so that's the reason, because we don't have fifty-two boats longlining.

I suggest, and it's just taking money from us, because I bought quota, and my sons has bought quota, but close it from January to May, and everybody open up in June, recreational and commercial and for-hire, so we wouldn't have no discards.

If we have to stop live-baiting, and that's another source that we talk about, because gag is a live-bait fishery, and dead baits -- They might have 200, or 250, while they're catching their beeliners and their snappers, and that is on the gags, but don't just take 80 percent. That's not right. It's not right for people that has invested, and you've got to remember the consumer and the restaurants. We need it, and so gags are on a comeback.

Snapper, since the pandemic, recreational boats were sold over a hundred percent, and, in seven years, there's been twenty-three citations and 141 warnings to the recreational fishery, and it's on the facts, and nobody was checked during the pandemic. Everybody was running every day, every day, every day, but nobody could get on the boats and check, and it is, right now -- It needs to be just moved along. Don't touch it, and don't vote no increase. We don't want an increase.

I've been doing this for thirty-four years, and I've got a fish house, an icehouse, a retail market, and I run my trucks everywhere, and I care about my resources for my future generations. I've got two young sons and grandkids.

Triggerfish, status quo, and I've asked -- I think, at the last meeting, I asked the council to figure out why is my tilefish boats limiting out on amberjacks, every trip, and I've got three of them tile fishing and yellowedge fishing, and they're in 700 foot of water, and why has the amberjack gone to the deep? Is it because of bait? This year is the first year we've had bait, off of St. Joe and Panama City, and we catch it with a purse seine boat, and so, in commercial, we pay 3 percent of our gross. Recreational don't pay nothing, and striped bass in Maryland -- I have customers up there, and they tell me about how they do it, and we can send some people up there to find out how to do it.

In gag grouper, it would be a fine time to start in June, and get a tagging program. If we don't do something -- I'm not mad at recreational, but it's just you mash a button and go here and mash another button and the boat holds up for you, and the electronics have gotten too high tech, so that anybody can catch fish.

 If you don't do something to slow the recreational down, in five years, it's going to be a ghost out there, for everybody, and we rely on you all to do your job. Don't do special interests, and I think this council -- You only have one man for commercial representation, and that's wrong. That is not right, and I hope you all really think about this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Abrams. We appreciate it. Next up is Clarence Seymore, and Mark Kelley is on deck.

MR. CLARENCE SEYMOUR: This is Clarence Seymour, Biloxi, Mississippi, Charter Boat SYL. I'm federally-permitted, and I have a few things to get up on today. On recalibration, status quo. I pretty well think that, here in Mississippi, there's plenty of opportunity for the private angler, plus we do a lot of private angler stuff out of the for-hire season.

Secondly is the SEFHIER program, and definitely an hour-and-a-half, minimum. I am fortunate enough to have the fuel dock in my harbor, which I can move, and it may not even hail-out and see me, but I have plenty of time to get it done. As far as, also, the for-hire season, the full derby would probably be okay for next year, like a June-July derby, and maybe split up

September and October, and maybe weekends only, maybe to catch some of our football crowd that is not out playing football.

About private anglers' discards, if I seen as many discards as I've seen this year, along with the private anglers, and I'm sure their discard rate was high too, even with two to four people on a bay boat, with a troll motor, and we also, this year, had quite a bit of trouble with a couple of illegal charter boats jumping the fence and being outside the nine-mile boundary, which I think we had a couple of violations there in Mississippi, which it hasn't quite made it to the public yet.

As far as sharks go, on the council level, I know we're still dealing with HMS, and us, in Mississippi, could probably do a great help for the shark fishery, if we could take a few in here and there, and maybe start off with some low limits, with different species, and especially the sand shark.

Folks seem to really enjoy the sand sharks taste in our area, and one of the main things is, on amberjack, again, we're having a hard time with amberjack, what little bit we do get to go, in talking to some of the guys, out way past eighty or ninety miles right now, and, plus, there's not as many oil rigs left, and the live bottom is really the only thing really holding them. I guess that's all I have, if anybody has any questions about anything.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Seymour. We appreciate your testimony. Next up, we have Mark Kelley, and Martha Guyas is on deck.

MR. MARK KELLEY: My name is Mark Kelley, and I've been in the fishing business for thirty-seven years. I have two charter boats, and I'm dually-permitted, and I'm fully invested in the IFQ program. Today, we've sat here and listened, from one end of the Gulf to the other, from shareholders that would receive a pay raise due to this red snapper increase, and they're standing up here telling you no increase.

 I'm for no increase, but so are they, because of what we're seeing, and so, today, we're going to find out, or tomorrow, on the vote, when you have a "C" in front of your title, whether you really live up to the conservation end of it. The triggerfish season, I would like to see the triggerfish season stay the same, a March 1 opening, with reopening in August, if there's any more fish.

Vermilion snappers, we don't need an increase, and ten is

plenty, and the amberjack fishery -- We have stood up here for thirty years, and we've tried a lot of things, and I don't know what the answer is anymore, and I do know that, as far as the confusion of the season starting, I would like to see January 1 go back to the beginning of the year, and not necessarily the opening of the amberjack season. If it opens in August, fine, but let's do a 2022 season, or a 2023 season, to scuff some of the aggravation that it's just an interpretation thing.

The gags, I really think, and I've stood up here before, and I think we need to have a spawning closure. It would at least give a chance for it to boost the system, and I do think it's slowly coming back, and I do think the data is a little bit behind.

 The recreational industry, the recreational industry needs -- We see it growing leaps and bounds, and we would love to see it with a permit, and we would love to see them a little bit more accountable, and we would love something done about the discards.

Also, we are -- Our charter industry wants to see a button on our SEFHIER logbook program, a simple button yes or no, and dolphin predation or shark predation, and we can even go as far as putting what type of shark it is, because it's already on there, and it already has -- The ones you can't even catch are on there, and so we could provide some valuable information.

King mackerel is non-existent in Panama City. It's terrible, and I would love to know the reason why behind that, and, Lord have mercy, and I got it all in three minutes. That's amazing. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Kelley. We have a question from Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mark, for coming. To clarify, at least in my mind, what you're talking about for -- I lost my train of thought.

MR. KELLEY: I can relate to that.

MR. GILL: It gets worse. Trust me. Closure of triggerfish during the spawning -- Was it triggerfish during the spawning season?

MR. KELLEY: No, and it was gags.

MR. GILL: Gag. Thank you. Are you arguing that for, or advocating that for, within the IFQ program?

MR. KELLEY: I would love to see it in the commercial industry. You already have the recreational and the charter/for-hire closed during the gag spawn, because it's done in the first of the year, and we don't open until June 1st. The June 1st opening will be devastating. Moving to September 1, on gags, recreationally and for-hire, would be terrible, because of the fish we catch in June with the snapper. I'm afraid that we're going to do a lot of damage in June to the gag fishery, as far as mortality rate.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Kelley. Next up is Martha Guyas, followed by Kelia Paul.

MS. MARTHA GUYAS: All right. Good afternoon, everyone. First, I want to say thank you to Karen and wish her the best in her retirement, and I want to make a couple of additional comments on gag.

First, thank you for the motion to use Florida's State Reef Fish Survey data for assessment and management for gag. I know it took a lot of effort by people behind the scenes at FWC and NOAA and the Science Center and OS&T and SERO and the council to get to the point, and I am very grateful, and I just -- You know, it is a big step forward in improving the data that the council is going to be able to use to make decisions about this fishery, moving forward, and so that's all a good thing.

 Second, as you look toward setting long-term management measures for gag, I do encourage you to look at measures to protect the males. You've already heard a little bit about that in public testimony today, but, you know, given the dynamics of the fishery, and the fact that males are at 2 percent of the spawning stock biomass, you know, simply reducing F is probably not going to get us where we need to go to increase the number and the proportion of males in the population.

I also would like to express support for further exploring the process to streamline updates to catch advice, based on interim analyses that Dr. Simmons brought up earlier today, and that could allow the council to be more responsive to changes in fisheries and implement changes to catch limits, based on these interim analyses, in a more timely manner. It is worth discussing the tradeoffs, and I understand that there are some, but it seems like there are opportunities there, and so, again, thanks to staff for taking the time to think through that and

bringing it to the council.

1 2 3

Lastly, I wanted to flag something relative to the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary draft rule. As was mentioned in the Coral Committee earlier this week, the Gulf Council, the South Atlantic, FWC, and the sanctuary have this agreement called the Protocol for Cooperative Fisheries Management. It lays out basically how fishery management actions in the sanctuary are handled, and the current agreement is really old, and it's not really followed, and so part of the plan for this draft rule is to update that agreement.

Here's why I want to flag this, and so there are several aspects of the draft rule, like the definition of "traditional fishing", that hinge on how this agreement ends up being updated, and, thus, will determine the effect of the draft rule on management of council-managed fisheries in the sanctuary, and so my ask to you is that the council engage on edits to this agreement, think carefully about the implications, and consider how the public can review and weigh-in on the updated agreement before it is finalized when the final rule for the sanctuary is issued, and that's all, and thank you for your time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Guyas. Next up is Kelia Paul, followed by Chris Guindon.

 MS. KELIA PAUL: Good afternoon, council, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm going be pretty short and sweet today. As far as snapper goes, I can't tell you what happens offshore, like a lot of -- I'm sorry. My name is Kelia Paul, and I have two dually-permitted vessels out of Panama City Beach.

I can't tell you what they do offshore. I can tell you what I see at the dock, eight to ten hours, or twelve hours, a day booking trips, and you don't need an increase. Let's just leave them alone. The other piece of that is that, if this goes through, and we don't have gags in the summer, we're going to add that additional pressure on these snapper, and that's something we just can't have any more of.

The other point I wanted to make is, for amberjack and the season closure, or the season delay, we would like a little bit more of a notice. You all, I lost quite a few trips, not being able to have those this year, trips that have been booked since 2021, and so a little bit more notice on those would be great, and then the last point I wanted to make is, for the IFQ focus group and the council work on that, it's a polarized issue.

1 2

No one side is going to be happy about what happens, and the goal should be to allow the access to the public resource and make sure that everybody has equal representation. I appreciate the comments that were made by Mr. Strelcheck yesterday. Although I wasn't around during the IFQ implementation, I know that those actions that were taken are the reason that we have a commercia fishery today. However, things evolve and change, and, as that happens, we have to evolve and change too, and so I would like for you guys to take that into consideration and do some real work.

Again, I have to thank Ms. Boggs and her comments yesterday and the comments since of it's going to be something that's going to have to be really down to the nitty-gritty and done, rather than, in a couple of hours, get it done, and so I appreciate the work on that, and I would like for you guys to continue.

My only other point is the commercial electronic reporting. There was a little bit of contention on that yesterday. We definitely want it, but can we learn from SEFHIER and not overcomplicate it? It's easy right now, with the paper. Yes, we're sending it in, but that actual information is easy and simple, and let's keep it that way and not overcomplicate it, like SEFHIER, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Paul. All right. Next up, we have Chris Guindon, and Alicia Paul is on deck.

MR. CHRIS GUINDON: My name is Chris Guindon, and I'm a commercial fisherman, and I've been fishing my whole life. I'm fishing now with my brother, Hans, the captain of the Blackjack 4, out of Galveston, Texas. We took time off of the water to come here today.

 My dad has fought to protect and grow this fishery his entire life, and I want to carry that on. He has always fought for conservation and accountability, and it's something we've built our business on, and I want to have -- I don't want to have to rebuild it, this fishery, the way that my father and his generation had to.

Don't increase the red snapper quota right now. There's a problem with red snapper, and we see it every time we're on the water. We're fishing harder now to catch the same amount of red snapper that we caught a few years ago. Do the right thing and protect this resource, so it will grow and we can all benefit from it.

 My plan is to run a boat someday soon, and I'm working hard and saving my money and earning my way in. My brother and I rely on the leased fish, and so please don't mess around with our ability to lease. I am getting into this fishery because the IFQ program gives me hope and gives me some stability, so I can build a business plan that will at least last for thirty to forty years or more.

I would also like to be a member of the council someday, and I want to be a part of the solution, and I don't want to see -- I don't see enough commercial representatives, and my dad can't do it forever. Thank you for giving me the time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Guindon. We appreciate it. Next up is Alicia Paul and then Johnny Williams.

MS. ALICIA PAUL: Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. My name is Alicia Paul, from Panama City. I own two dually-permitted vessels, and I operate those myself. I would like to start today about the hailing-out for the non-fishing for the commercial. It is an overburden. I would like to see Action 3, if we take any action at all.

For me, I do spend some time holding up in the bay, and it's a forty-five-minute jog to my ice dock, and, if the dock is loaded down, I might sit there for an hour outside of it, and so an hour is not sufficient. Another option to that would be outside of the COLREGS.

I would like to see status quo for the red snapper. We can't sustain an increase right now. There's been a decline in that fishery over the last couple of years, and I don't think the stock could sustain an increase right now.

 Gag grouper, there's an 80 percent reduction, and that's a lot. I do believe that it is slowly rebuilding, and I think a September start -- That's a drastic mistake. We catch a lot of this fish in June and July, when we're harvesting those red snapper, and your mortality rate is going to be through the roof, if you wait until September.

Triggerfish, status quo, keep the size limit at fifteen inches. If you do an increase in the commercial, Alternative 2, at twenty fish, is plenty. Vermilion snapper, status quo, a tenfish bag limit, no catch limit on the commercial. Ten fish is plenty. We don't need twenty.

Amberjack, I would like to see the calendar year reset back to January. The August calendar set just -- It never made any sense, to me, from the beginning, and, really, it hasn't done anything for our fishery.

I would like to go back to the gag grouper as well, and I do support, you know, a four or five-month closure on the commercial sector, the same as the recreational. Give us all a June 1 start, and maybe that will help the rebuilding process.

 The recreational sector needs to be held accountable, and I don't know what we've got to do for that to happen, and I've heard testimony that says they are accountable, but you all really have no clue as to how many are out there. I mean, there's a lot, you all, and whether that be a tagging program or a permit on those vessels, whatever we've got to do to get a better handle on the numbers from the recreational fishermen, and that would be great.

Shark and dolphin predation, it's real, and it's a real big problem. I heard, yesterday, that there hasn't been a stock assessment on sandbar sharks in over five years, and they have no clue as to where that stock is, in five years, and it's big. It's a problem. They are not -- They're a big fish, and they're a pain in the butt, and I'm just being serious. The recreational harvest of sandbar shark would help that drastically. I think that's really all that I wanted to talk about today, and I do appreciate the time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We have a question for you, Ms. Paul. Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Alicia, for being here today, and so you touched on the SEFHIER and the hail-out, and you gave some discussion, and a thought that I had, and I haven't asked some of the others, and I should have, is, if we did something where, if you had passengers onboard, or -- Basically, if you had passengers onboard, would you -- If that was the only reason you had to hail-out, would that help, meaning, if you were going to the fuel dock -- I mean, if you just had passengers onboard, or you were leaving on a fishing trip, if those were the only two years that you had to hail out, would that help?

MS. A. PAUL: Absolutely. Absolutely. I mean, for instance, I don't personally leave to go get fuel. We're very fortunate to be able to fuel right there behind our slip, but I do leave to go get bait and ice. I do leave that marina to go unload those fish. I might land back at my marina and go the next morning to

unload those fish, in the wintertime when I fish commercially, and so it is an overburdensome process, if I have to leave once or twice, or if I have to get there and -- If I have to hail-out to get there and hail-out to get back, and, if that was not the case, where all we had to do was log-out as if we were for-hire, or we were going fishing, and that would definitely help the situation. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Paul. Next up is Mr. Johnny Williams, followed by Bobby Kelly.

MR. JOHNNY WILLIAMS: Johnny Williams, Williams Partyboats, Incorporated, Galveston, Texas, third-generation partyboat operator out of Galveston. I've been involved with the Gulf Council since 1989.

Looking back, one of the things that I would like to say, that's kind of a common denominator here, is that the science has failed us. You all have failed us. Amberjack has been under restrictions since Amendment 1, and where is amberjack right now? It's worse now than it was in 1990. King mackerel is done. We catch very, very few king mackerel anymore. Cobia, triggerfish, and look at any number of fish. The scientists have been wrong, over the years, or these fish wouldn't be in such decline.

Now we're faced with the prospect of increasing the quota on red snapper. For years, I came up here and argued that we need to be more liberal with the quota on red snapper, but, today, it's quite the antithesis. Last year, the fishing was worse than it was the year before. This year, the fishing is worse than it was last year, and now we're asking for an increase.

An increase would allow me to fish more days on the water for red snapper, and it would allow the commercial fishermen to have higher landings. These people are asking not to increase the quota. Do you think that, if somebody came up to you, and asked you if you wanted a raise, would you tell them no? Why do you think these people are doing this? It's because they're out on the water, and they see what's happening, and so you can't listen to the scientists all the time. We need to listen to the fishermen, too.

I mean, it would benefit them to raise the quota, and I've been dealing with red snapper, like I said, since 1990, and we're supposed to have the stock recovered in 2032, and that's forty-two years. We don't want to go down the path and require another forty-two years to recover it, because we messed up, and

we messed up this time, and so I don't know why everybody is pushing for this increase when nobody in the industry wants it.

I understand the Coastal Conservation Association wants it, and how is that conservation, taking a fishery that's on the decline the last few years and asking to take more fish out of the population? Maybe they need to remove the "C" out of their name, and I don't know, but, anyway, I --

I have been a proponent of an IFQ system for partyboats and charter boats for years, and I think it would be very beneficial, and let's do it. If we go down that path, and we're going to have catch records here now, and we should have them for this year, and we're going to have them again next year, and a couple of years of data should be good, and hopefully we can do something in that regard.

I suspect we're going to have a fall season for red snapper this year, because I caught my limit on my boats every trip, but a lot of boats are not doing that this year, because the fish just aren't there. Fortunately, I've got good captains and good boats, but I ask you to please reconsider.

The other thing I would like to make a comment about is that, you know, red snapper has been driving the bus here at the council, and, I mean, we've got all these other species too, but I think you all really need someone from the commercial industry on the panel here, because I went through that same situation for a number of years, and the partyboats and charter boats had no representation for a number of years, and I think it's about time that someone that has an interest in the commercial red snapper fishery gets on the council. Thank you very much, and have a great day.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Captain Williams. How far offshore are your headboats having to fish to limit out on the red snapper?

MR. WILLIAMS: This year, we've been fishing farther offshore. Generally, we would fish between about fifty and sixty-five miles out, and, last year, we were fishing, toward the end of the season, between sixty and seventy. This year, toward the end of the season, we're fishing between seventy and eighty, on a number of trips. It's a situation where the fishing close to shore is just pretty much non-existent anymore, and we're having to go farther and farther each year. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Next up is Bobby Kelly, followed by David Krebs.

MR. BOBBY KELLY: That's a tough act to follow right there, gentlemen. My name is Bobby Kelly, and I'm out of Orange Beach, Alabama, a commercial fisherman, and I own two charter boats, and, first, I want to talk about the red snapper. Emily, have you got me? We've got a graphic coming that will be beneficial.

 I just wanted to say that, if you will turn your attention to the monitors right here in front of you, our red snapper fishery is on the decline. It is overfished and experiencing overfishing, and everybody up here has said the same thing.

 In Alabama, we have great access to our officials that take care of our stuff, and so I had a text message with Director Bannon on June 6, six days into our season. After seeing the state of our red snapper fishery off the coast of Alabama, I told him -- I said, I bet you guys that, on July 4, the end of the July 4 weekend, the private recreational sector will be lucky to harvest 30 percent of their quota.

If you look on your charts right there, 43.8 percent of their fish is what they harvested in such a time. After six days, I knew that's how poor our red snapper fishery was off the coast of Alabama. Regional depletion, sure. Long-range regional depletion.

Our guys, our charter fleet, on their half-day trips, after the middle of July, they stopped fishing for red snapper, because we couldn't catch them inside of twenty miles, and so, when you've got shareholders up here that can benefit millions of dollars on an increase in TAC, and they say, hey, we don't want it, and the stock can't hold it, that's the truth. I say the same way. If I've got to lose trips to make sure that these fish don't get any worse than what they are, I'm okay with that. My fleet is okay with that. This isn't just off of Alabama. This is off the northern Gulf, and this is off of Texas, and these fish are in trouble. They need you all's help.

I want to talk about triggerfish. I do not support alternate dates, and I also request that the triggerfish trip limit for the commercial sector is increased proportional, to allow us to harvest those fish. The vermilion snapper, that is a healthy and robust fishery right now, and I ask that we go to the old saying of it's not broke, let's not fix it. All right? These fish are healthy, and there's a great population of those, and thank god, because that's what we've been targeting on our

trips, and so let's just leave that alone, leave the bag limit alone, and I'm perfectly fine with that.

As far as the amberjack fishery goes, that fishery, right now, is the most collapsed that I have ever seen it. I couldn't go out there right now and catch three amberjack that were legal. Reallocating 8 percent from the commercial sector to the private sector, that's like putting air in a flat tire. It does nothing for these fish. I support a fractional bag limit, and I support shorter seasons, whatever it takes. These fish are in the most trouble that we have.

As far as SEFHIER goes, I just ask that we use commonsense, and I know that we appreciate the help with that, and I'm at a lucky spot, where I'm at, and we don't have to move the boat to get fuel, and we get everything all in one spot, and so I guess a ninety-minute window would be best. All right.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Kelly. Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: You're out of Orange Beach, Alabama, correct?

MR. KELLY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BOGGS: How far is that fleet having to fish offshore to find red snapper right now?

MR. KELLY: Historically, we would -- I say historical, and I mean, for the last ten years, we could catch keepers inside fifteen or sixteen miles, if it got tough, and we never had to go to twenty, and, for most of the fleet, they gave up around the middle of July. I'm hard-headed, and it's taking me twenty-five, twenty-six, or twenty-eight miles, and that's just because I'm hard-headed. That's a long way, guys, and that's a lot of fuel. That's \$32,000 extra in fuel I had to spend this year that I shouldn't have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Kelly. Next up is David Krebs.

MR. DAVID KREBS: Good afternoon, council. My name is David Krebs, and I'm from Destin, Florida, and my whole life is commercial fishing. Unfortunately, I don't think anybody on this council can say the same thing. They probably can't even say that a portion of your life is commercial fishing, and that puts you at a disadvantage. How can you make a decision about something that you really have never experienced and that you have never seen firsthand?

 This room is full of stewards of the resource, the commercial industry. You've got a few tables with some sportsmen advocates, but the private angler, who used to come to these meetings, is not coming anymore.

We're missing them, and we've heard that the private angling community is accountable, and it's impossible. It's a 365-day season, interrupted by a few retention periods, and they can fish 365 days a year, and are you going to track every discard during that time? You can't do it. Help these folks fix their problem. We're not angry with them, but they can't keep fishing the way they are. We support -- I personally supported regional management, to a lot of the disgust from my industry, and they said, Dave, you're nuts, and I said, they will get their act together, they will, but they haven't.

In 2007, what did the commercial industry do that was the biggest benefit to the red snapper fishery? Anybody? They reduced the size limit. We got tired of throwing ten-to-one fish back. Twenty-five years into size limit management, what has the recreational industry done? Nothing. They're at sixteen inches, and, in a failing stock, what are you going to have more of? Discards.

As the fish that they're fishing for is getting smaller, they're going to fish longer to catch a legal fish, and that's ridiculous. That's not managing a resource. You guys have got to do a better job.

Was I offended that you didn't call the IFQ AP together, rather than forming a scoping committee? I was, because I'm chairman of the AP, and you don't like the answers, but the answers are real, and it's a limited-access program that has allowed, through direct leasing to small boats, this anomaly of, oh, we've got higher lease prices, because it's supply and demand. It's not because we're demanding it, but it's because more people are saying that I would rather lease the fish and catch it than you catch it yourself.

This old thinking about how do we modify the only fishery management success story that this council has to-date, the fact that, because we're driven by the recreational industry, and not by the participants, but to reallocate a resource from something that's completely accountable to somebody that doesn't want to take care of the fishery is absurd, and so I apologize, but we are the stewards, and it should be our legacy, and your legacy, to fix these problems. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Krebs. Next up, we have David Krebs, III.

MR. DAVID KREBS, III: Good afternoon, everyone. David Krebs, and this is my first council meeting. I will say this, that I am David Krebs, Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Air Force, almost retired, and so why am I here?

I was born and raised in Destin, Florida, and, as you can guess, I'm the son of that David Krebs, into a commercial fishing family that my grandfather started after he retired from the Air Force back in the early 1980s, and so, even as full-time Air Force pilot, I was able to be a part-time commercial fisherman, and I grew up, as a teenager, putting mangos in a box, right, and I've been a part-time recreational fisherman, all of that because I got lucky to be stationed in northwest Florida, near my hometown of Destin, and had access to that.

The recreational fishermen, I get it, and I love it, but I've also been stationed in Jacksonville, Arkansas, where there is no Gulf of Mexico to go recreational fishing, and, for me, that Gulf fish -- It had to come from a wholesale commercial fishing boat, right, and so I can see, and I have seen, throughout my life, both sides of that story.

 I will say, as I retire from the Air Force and return to the commercial fishing industry, as a third-generation commercial fisherman that, again, provides the seafood to the country, to North America, for those without immediate access to it, and my new-guy -- Again, it's my first council meeting, and I appreciate you all having me, and it's been fantastic to meet a lot of the folks that are sitting out here.

My new-guy observation, and you guys have heard this already, is that the commercial industry is not equally represented, or if at all represented, with the governing body that sits in front of us.

 As mentioned several times this afternoon, if the council approves an increase in red snapper, it becomes very apparent to everybody here, regardless of what side you're on, and, again, like was just mentioned, no one is mad, necessarily, right, but there just needs to be equal representation on both sides of the aisle, to really figure out how we can manage these resources, how we can sustainably manage these resources, and then, going forward, that --

You know what? David Krebs, IV, is four years old right now,

and, in twenty years, I want him to be able to stand here and represent the commercial industry, that, because we have sustained these fisheries over the decades, that he has a business that he can walk into as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Krebs, and thank you for your service, also. Okay. Next up is Jason Kresse, followed by Kurt Vossler. Okay. John Black, followed by Jason Kresse. John Black.

MR. JOHN BLACK: I am John Black, and I have two charter boats in Panama City Beach, Florida, and also a commercial boat. They're both federally-permitted charter boats. I applaud you for paying attention, as I've seen most of you, at most meetings, and people don't pay attention to a whole lot, but I applaud you for doing that, and I know this is absolutely your favorite time of the day, when you hear all these comments.

Anyway, a few thoughts that I had. Number one is we talk about using science to make decisions on what we're doing with these stocks, like anything else we do in this day and age. The private rec sector -- I've heard several people say that they're accountable, and I think accountability without verification is not accountability.

There is no way to verify that the information that you're getting is fact, and there are no dockside visualizations of their fish, of their trip, when they left, or when they got back, and so I realize that there are calibrations to this, and I would like to, at some point, hear how those calibrations are done that makes them -- As I believe I heard the other day, that we're 95 percent accountable, and the for-hire sector was 70 percent, if I'm correct in those numbers.

I would like to know how we came to those numbers, because, without accountability, and without the visualization of what they're telling you, all it is is a story, and so, when that affects all of us, and the entire Gulf, and the red snapper, and we're out there all the time, like many have said, and there are not the red snapper. Do not increase the red snapper. It takes money out of my pocket, like many of these other people have said, and, at one point in time, commercial fishermen and charter fishermen were not very conservative minded, and that is not today.

We are telling you to not increase these snapper. They are not out there, just like we are telling you, and sharks are out there, and they are increasing in predation, and the dolphins

are increasing in predation. I got told, by the HMS representatives the other day, that this problem was going to increase, and nothing was going to be done about it, and that's not acceptable. I'm part of this fishery, and I pay taxes to be part of this fishery, and something does need to be done about it.

I applaud the council for what you do. You do a lot of good things, and you do a lot of good work, and you have a lot of pressure on you, but something needs to be done about predation. It's simple, and we need to start gathering information on this, and just not a conference.

 I went to the conference in Gulf Shores, and I participated in that with Marcus, and I will continue to participate, but we need to get some real actionable intel on this, and we can do that. We already are reporting, and we have this little thing on our phone that I have to fill out every day, when I go fishing multiple times a day, and there's no reason that can't be on there. We've asked for this, and we've asked for this, and we've asked for this, and we've asked for this, and, without that information, what are you going on? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Black. Next up is Jason Kresse, and Kurt Vossler is on deck.

MR. JASON KRESSE: Hi. My name is Jason Kresse, and I own a commercial fishing business and a fish house out of Freeport, Texas, Captain Mark's Seafood, and I run a commercial fishing operation, Reel Time Fisheries.

 I fish 100 percent leased allocation, and I started in early 2000, working at a fish house, and, over the years of hard work, I've been able to purchase my own commercial fishing boat and work my way up to owning a fish house, all on these allocations. I have made a good living doing it, and, also, my crew does too, as well.

We are commercial fishermen, 100 percent accountability for what we catch, and the system we've got right now works, and so, when the system is not broke, don't try to fix it. I think the fishery, right now, cannot sustain an increasing quota right now, and the recreational fishermen need accountability for what they catch. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Kresse. We have a question for you.

 MS. BOGGS: Jason, thank you for coming today. This council is talking about, with the South Atlantic, putting electronic -- Or making the commercial logbooks electronic, and do you support that?

MR. KRESSE: What was that?

 MS. BOGGS: Making your commercial logbooks and putting them where they're -- Making them where they're electronic, and do you support that?

MR. KRESSE: It would make it easier.

DR. STUNZ: Okay. Up next is Kurt Vossler, and John Holmgreen is after that.

 MR. KURT VOSSLER: Hello. My name is Kurt Vossler, and I'm from Matagorda, Texas. I'm a full-time commercial fisherman, and I graduated high school in 1982 and started snapper fishing. My dad did it, and I've done it ever since, and I've watched every law, since before there was any laws, when all this started.

Like everybody has said, I see the snapper decline in the last two years, and it went down, and it went down again this year, and I'm for no increase. I just recently bought out the guy that I've been fishing for for about twenty-seven years, and I spent a lot of money, and I couldn't afford the quota, and I bought the boat, the property, the fish house, everything, and I built a business around what's going on right here, and now I've got to pay for it, and I'm fixing to be fifty-nine years old, and I would hate to see something change.

 I've got about ten different families that work for me, that make a living off of my boat, and I've got a couple of shrimp boats, and we shrimp. We're shrimping right now, and what these people about there's a shark problem, there's a bad shark problem. I sew my nets about three to five hours every day. We will come in and pick up at dark, and we'll go in and unload, and I sew until midnight, every night, for about forty-five days now. There's a problem there, bad, inshore or offshore, it don't matter.

The beeliners are healthy, and I don't see nothing wrong with them. I'm seeing more and more of them every year. The triggerfish, I would say leave them alone, and they're fine, and, like everybody else has said, we need some commercial representation on this council, for these people in this room like me, that this is all we've ever done, and you pull the rug

out from under us that we've structured our lifestyle around, with a bunch of people and families that make their living working for us, and that's something to think about. It's something to think about. All right. That's all I've got.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Vossler. Up next is Mr. Holmgreen.

MR. JOHN HOLMGREEN: Yes. Good afternoon. I'm John Holmgreen, and I'm just a regular old fisherman and angler. I feel a little lonely out here on a point this afternoon, at this point, and, well, I try to pay attention to some of the things going on in fisheries management, and I follow things online, when I can, and I take a look at too 2coolfishing and get the chatter there, and one of the things that I keep hearing leveled at recreational anglers is how we are unaccountable, and I just want to share some thoughts on that.

It's been my experience that anglers, by and large, follow the rules, when it comes to size limits and bag limits and things like that. There are always outliers, and there are always going to be some bad actors, but some of the things that you hear from some quarters seem to be trying to create a narrative that anglers are out of control and out there actively pillaging the resource, like some giant swarm of insects. I don't believe this is the case at all. Here is why.

If I understand it correctly, every state has complete angler registry of all saltwater fishermen, for anglers, in the form of a saltwater recreational license structure. Most states have gone beyond that and identified offshore, or reef fish, anglers. Further, every state has aggressive enforcement power to control a very competitive fishery. When I say very competitive fishery, I mean there is a great deal of pressure on the inshore and offshore waters of the state that I fish in, and that's the State of Texas. NOAA has access to all of that information, and so I do not understand this continued talk of anglers as being unaccountable.

Several years ago, the Gulf States stepped up their data collection programs for recreational anglers, and, from what I can tell, it has been a great success. It was achieved without a great deal of controversy, and I think that speaks to how well anglers work with the states, as opposed to federal management, and there is just a natural relationship there that seems to be totally lacking in this regulatory environment.

For my personally, I don't mind paying for a license and participating in things like iSnapper, to report what I catch,

and I think most anglers are comfortable with that, as long as those efforts go toward better management, and I think anglers trust working with the state systems to provide better management. If they had a choice, they would overwhelmingly work with states to improve our data, if that is necessary.

I don't know what the answer is, but blanket characterizations of anglers as unaccountable are just misleading. We have some incredible success stories and amazing inshore fisheries, where there is a great deal more pressure from recreational anglers, and so perhaps the best answer may be to have the states take over all management for the recreational fishery, since they clearly can work with the data, and they have produced healthy fisheries, with plenty of success. Thank you very much. Good day.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Holmgreen. Up next is Ron Moser, followed by Troy Noska.

MR. RON MOSER: Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm Ron Moser, and I'm a retired gentleman, and I worked for forty-five years in order to have the opportunity to fish for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico, and I've been doing so for twenty-some recreational years, on a recreational business.

I also am terribly disturbed about the vilification of the recreational angler. It has not been my viewpoint, or have seen, what everybody is saying here about these recreational anglers, and I would like to talk about the State of Texas, and Port Aransas, in general, which is where my knowledge is.

I can tell you that I'm just shocked that these commercial fishermen can't find red snapper. I must be the best fisherman in the world, because my experience has been more and more red snapper out there every year. However, this year, there was a problem with sharks, and it made it difficult in catching red snapper. They were there, and you could see them on your equipment, and you could catch about four or five of them, until the sharks got active, and then you had to move on.

 I think that, you know, a lot of this problem that people are alluding to, about the fact that they can't catch snapper, is a predation problem that everybody has been talking, and it's real, and I don't know what the answer is, but I can tell you that the Atlantic sharpnose shark is in great quantities on the inshore areas, and the great sandbar shark is in huge quantities offshore. We lose a number of fish, mostly just to the

sandbars, but we lose a tremendous amount of tackle to the other sharks, and we're probably catching one shark for one snapper.

 I would also like to remind everybody that, you know, our federal limit per person is two snapper. I mean, on my boat, we don't discard anything, because we fish with live bait, and we don't catch any small fish, and we don't have a discard problem. We don't turn anything back. There might be an occasional undersized fish caught in error, if some fish eats half a bait, and the small fish gets it, but the majority of recreational anglers, out at Port Aransas, fish within twenty miles of the coast, because they're in these small boats.

Now, I have a thirty-five-foot boat, and I can fish anywhere, but most of my fishing for red snapper is within twenty-miles, and I started the season catching twenty-two to twenty-six-inch fish.

Just this past week, I went out and caught twenty-two to twenty-six-inch fish, and I don't see a depletion of fish in my area, where I'm fishing, and I do see a lot of small boats out there trying to catch fish, and I don't see small boats discarding fish, and I don't know where all of that is coming from.

The other thing I would like to address is what the sector separation has done to this fishery, and this might be one of the things that you hear these boats from Florida and Alabama and Mississippi talking about that their resource is gone, and, well, one of the reasons maybe that the resource is so good in Texas is we have 22 percent of the biomass and only 6 percent of the allocation to catch the fish. How is that true?

This has been going on for years and years and years in the State of Texas, and, to add insult to injury, the Gulf Council saw fit to shut down the red snapper fishery in the State of Texas, last November 15, for forty-five days, eliminating what is a really productive and has become a huge productive red snapper fishery in the following year, in the months of December and January.

We catch fish in the twenty-eight to thirty-three-inch range, inside legal state waters, and the resource out there, from my perception, is extremely healthy, and I would encourage you to reallocate this resource, and I would encourage you to stop this mismanagement and give this to the states, and let them control the whole thing. It's a mess. The commercial fishery --

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Moser. If you would wrap it up, real

quick.

 MR. MOSER: I would be glad to. One last comment is 75 percent of the revenue going to red snapper, in the commercial industry, goes to just somebody who does nothing other than hold the resource, and that's absurd. You hear all these people here trying to make a living, and it should be in their hands and not the 25 percent. They shouldn't have to beg to go get what they need to fish. They should have access to that. The system that has been set up by this council is horrendous. I am completely for a reassessment and for state management of the resource, especially in the State of Texas. Thank you.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Moser.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Next up is Troy Noska, and on deck is Michael Mixon.

MR. TROY NOSKA: Hello. My name is Troy Noska, and I have fished for Bubba Cochrane and Johnny Walker for about fourteen years, and I definitely have fished on plenty of IFQ boats and made a living, and I think it works great. I think, with the charter fishing — I mean, for the past fifty days, we've pretty much fished every day, weather permitting, and picking around and catching snapper is definitely a little tougher this year, and I think one thing that might help it a little bit, maybe, which I really haven't heard of, is, you know, during the spawn, in June, is when the fish are pregnant, and so maybe move it over a month or something, I guess, for the spawning snappers, and that will be about the only thing I can say about helping the fishery, as far as snapper, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. Next up is Michael Mixon, followed by H.D. Pappas.

MR. MICHAEL MIXON: Good afternoon. I'm Michael Mixon, and I've been fishing the Gulf of Mexico, the Galveston area, for about twenty years, and I've leased snapper since the IFQ system has come into effect, and I was able to acquire snapper to lease, and I bought myself a boat and a permit. The system is great, and it's done a lot and supported my family, and probably four or five other families that work for me, and we've gotten to pay to lease the fish, et cetera.

As far as charter fishing goes, I've been doing charter things, the same deal, twenty years, in Galveston. The last few years, I've seen a decrease in the snapper, and I don't think you all should increase the quota, and that's all I've got to say.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Next up is H.D. Pappas, and followed by Tres Atkins.

MR. H.D. PAPPAS: Hi, and my name is H.D. I appreciate you all taking the time every day in meetings, on Wednesdays, to hear us and our comments. I work for Pappas Restaurants out of Houston, Texas. We buy fish across the Gulf, snappers and groupers and tilefish.

 The IFQ system has made it such to buy fish year-round, quality, very fresh fish, every day, virtually, and safely too, I guess, and so I'm definitely a proponent for the system, and probably status quo, I would say. I didn't want to say anything, and I've been thinking something else the last couple of years, but we buy a four to eight-pound fish, because of the cutoff of the fish, and we're seeing it being more difficult to get that, and so I do think that there is probably -- It's hard to time the science, I'm sure, but possibly a shrinking biomass in the snapper. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Pappas. Next up is Tres Atkins, followed by El Capitan Hickman.

MR. TRES ATKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and council members. Let's of new faces here, and it's been a while, and, Andy, it's good to see you in this position. I'm at a blank right now, but you're the only face I recognize, and, just for the record, I know that, at one time, you were a commercial fisherman, and so there is at least one on the panel.

My name is Tres Atkins, and I'm a commercial fisherman, as well as a charter boat operator, out of Galveston, Texas. I've been a participant in this fishery since the mid to late 1990s, and I became a permit holder in around 2004, and I had the privilege, and the honor, of being nominated by two different governors to actually sit on this council, and I made the short list twice. I wasn't selected, but I do have a good understanding of what you guys are dealing with.

I will say that don't hold it against a lot of these guys, but we really do worry, and are concerned, that the commercial voices and our input is not necessarily not taken, but we don't know that you understand where we're coming from. I mean, you're talking to a group of individuals who collectively spend more time in the Gulf of Mexico than anybody on this planet, and so they aren't scientists, and I get that.

2 3

 I mean, I went to school to study marine biology, and I didn't get a degree, but I have a passion for fishing, and not just because it puts money in my pocket. My son got up here earlier and said a few things, and his son, William Lesley, V, hopefully will get to enjoy the same fishery that we've been blessed to enjoy.

I just want to say the IFQ system, in the beginning for me, was scary. I was like a long-tailed cat in a room full of rocking chairs, because, in the early 2000s, I was new to the game, but I can tell you, the December before we implemented IFQs, I caught more fish in the month of December than I was allocated for the entire year the following year, and so I had a tough choice to make, and a lot of these guys out here had to make those same tough choices.

When we come up here, and we're a little emotional, and we seem a little agitated, I hope you can understand why we feel the way we feel, because we've invested our lives, everything we have earned, into this fishery. We are stewards of this fishery. I want my grandson to experience and benefit from the same things that I've been able to watch grow.

 I have seen this fishery at its worst, and I have seen this fishery at its best, and it's scary to say that we are not at our best right now. We aren't, and we can do better. It's not going to be easy, not easy at all. It wasn't easy to get IFQ implemented in the very beginning, but I can tell you, if you bought a share of Amazon when I entered this fishery, you could have bought it for \$2.00 a share. Today, that same share is worth a-hundred-and-thirty-four bucks, and so, for me to come to you, and ask you to give me part of your Amazon stock for \$2.00 is asinine. We have gone way past that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Atkins, can you start wrapping it up, please?

MR. T. ATKINS: Yes, sir. My idea for recreational fishermen is much in the same sense as elk hunting. I draw for elk every year, and I didn't get drawn this year, and it's just the way it goes. There is not enough elk for everybody to harvest one, and so that's all I've got to say. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Atkins. We appreciate your comments. El Capitan Hickman, and Jason Delacruz is on deck.

 MR. SCOTT HICKMAN: El Capitan Scott Hickman, in honor of my good friend, Juan Sanchez, who is no longer here, and I'm a thirty-plus-year charter/for-hire captain and a recent, very recent, IFQ shareholder, out of Galveston, Texas.

I made a joke about being El Capitan because one of the things is I am concerned about a fair, balanced council, but not only that is a council that has diversity and inclusion. There is one young lady left that serves -- Is appointed, and she was put up by her governor, and there's a bunch old white guys like me, and so we would like to see the council balanced, some more diversity and inclusion. I think that we would be better served.

I've got a lot of things to go through, real quick. Rec accountability, and we need to know how many private rec anglers are really harvesting in the Gulf. I would like to see you institute a recreational endorsement. The IFQ system is working well, and rec anglers reap many conservation benefits from this system, especially the American seafood consumer.

Half of my annual catch, on the commercial side, is shares that I own, and the other half is leased fish. It works for me, and leasing works for me. The fishery, commercial fisheries, recently, and it has been for a while, is overcapitalized again, and so is the recreational fishery. Localized depletion is real off of Galveston and many other areas that I fish.

The indices that were presented to this last SSC, dealing with red snapper, are correct that the stock is in a decline. No ACL increases, in the current and future, until we get the next American red snapper stock assessment and see what it says.

King mackerel, it crashed Gulf-wide, and I have no idea, but we're not catching them, and it went from three years ago, seeing a decrease to crashing. Let's rebuild these stocks together, and the Gulf used to be a huge success story, and we can no longer say that.

One thing is I agree with Chris Horton, when he talked about MRIP, and quit kicking the can down the road, and let's calibrate these recreational marine landings to the National Marine Fisheries Service scientific standards now, and let's get a handle on that.

Greater amberjack, if we reallocate anything to the rec side -- I've looked at some of the discard numbers, and you're looking at over a 100 percent increase in discards. Like red grouper in

Amendment 53, it gets to the conservation sections in the Magnuson Act, and it can reduce quota, long-term, for all the sectors. Discards are a problem, and, since I'm about out of time, paper logbooks don't work well, and let's get that changed for the commercial side and go with electronic logbooks, and, as far as sharks go, I do notice that they have a lot of teeth, and there's a lot of them. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Hickman. Jason Delacruz is next, and Mike Jennings is on deck.

MR. JASON DELACRUZ: Thank you very much for the opportunity, and thanks to Karen for her service. I think I've been here as long as she has now. The first thing I'm going to say is going to be pretty controversial to my commercial colleagues, which is 100 percent agree with David Krebs and what he said today. It hit the nail on the head, and it was absolutely perfect.

I was on the IFQ focus group, and I am -- I just figured out, or told, today that I am a second-generation participant, because I did not get any of my quota, and I got 238 pounds with my permit that I was fishing when this all happened, and I invested, over and over and over again, and I am in debt, in excess of seven figures, and so I think, when we talk about how this IFQ works right now, it's not fair just to simply say it's not working for everyone, because it's working for the ones who are willing to work within the standard that you guys built and put forward, and, when I say "you guys", it's the proverbial council.

You put forth a system, and said this is how it works, and we have a finance program, and this is how it works, and some people went out and did everything they were supposed to do to build themselves a real business and focused and didn't spend money in others to save money to do it the right way, and I think there is a lot of disingenuous actions that say that I'm going to help you, or we've got to fix this, and I'm not sure where I understand that it's broken at this point.

I get that some people don't like it, and, obviously, it would be great if allocation didn't cost money, but the whole point of the system was to control effort, and this is how you control effort. That's why we built an IFQ system, is to control effort.

I have heard some people talk about what are we going to do about gags, and I guess the opportunity for me to stand here and talk about gag, relating to an IFQ, we've already been through this process. In 2011, we had a 100,000-pound TAC for gag, and

I had to -- The whole point was that I could manage my fishery the way I wanted to by having fishermen who were smart guys, and myself, not go fish in areas where we catch gags, but just use the quota that we had, so we didn't have to discard those fish.

Now we're talking about potentially doing something as draconian as shutting the fishery down, and the commercial side, with an IFQ, which that was the whole point of the IFQ, and so let me fish in an area where I'm not going to catch those fish, or minimize it, because we're certainly going to catch them and interact with some of them, and that defeats the purpose of what we have this IFQ for and why it was built, and I just think everybody needs to really sit down and think about, when the people come to the podium, and they say, oh, this isn't right, and this isn't fair, and, well, some of us did exactly what we were supposed to do, and I think it's not right and fair to start talking about how we're going to carve out something to get to those people.

The whole point is to earn it and pay for it and put yourself in a position to better your business, and I don't think that's an unfair to think to ask, that everybody does the same thing. Put us all on the same playing field. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Delacruz, we have a question, but, before the question, I want to thank you for volunteering your time to serve on the IFQ focus group. We appreciate it. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for coming, Jason. Would you help me understand whether you were arguing against a gag closure during the spawning season, because of the IFQ system, and did I hear that correctly, or am I misinterpreting?

 MR. DELACRUZ: The problem is that we've already closed the Edges, and we did that back in this last time, in 2011, and the whole point was we knew kind of where those fish spawned, and we knew that was the vast majority of it, and so let's close that and do an area closure. All you're essentially going to do is I'm going to go -- We're going to go fish red grouper, like we normally do, and we don't catch a ton of gags, but we definitely catch some, and we're going to throw these fish back dead.

It's not going to fix anything, from that standpoint, and we have a massive discard problem in this fishery that has nothing to do with my sector, and it has everything to do with the recreational fishery. The numbers are insane, and we're going to talk about doing something to cause those discards again,

when an IFQ is supposed to have the flexibility to let us work within that, and, I mean, nobody is going to actively go to an area that's a heavy gag area and catch them, when they knew they've got to throw them back, because what's the point?

I mean, most of those areas are also snapper areas, in my neck of the woods, and so it doesn't make sense. It's not logical. Fishermen typically don't do that, and you would be surprised how many commercial fishermen really -- They say to me, I just can't stand throwing those fish back, and so, consequently, that's my point. If you close it, we're discarding fish, and it doesn't fix the problem. It only hides it, and that's not how you manage a fishery. You don't hide problems, and you bring them to the surface, and you deal with them in management. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Delacruz. Mike Jennings and then Jim Green.

MR. MIKE JENNINGS: Good afternoon. I want to welcome the new council members, and there are a couple of new faces here, and some familiar ones that I'm glad to see back, and I look forward to getting the opportunity to meeting some gentlemen that are new to this council, and I appreciate you all letting me talk to you today.

My name is Mike Jennings, and I'm on my third decade as a charter boat operator our of Freeport, Texas, and I've got two federally-permitted charter boats, and I am probably, without argument, the newest entrant in the reef fish commercial fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. I just recently -- This council meeting is pretty fortuitous, because I just recently bought a longtime operator out of business, less the IFQ shares themselves, but the boat, and two trailer loads of gear and you name it, and we hauled it back to Texas from Pensacola, Florida.

 We rebuilt the boat, top-side paint, bottom-side paint, running gear, and we went through the engines, and a brand-new generator, new electronics, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and I invested a lot of money, because I -- It's not something that I ever planned on doing, but I saw an opportunity that had arisen, and I worked towards expanding my business.

One of the things I was doing it for was -- I'm not backing out of the charter boat industry, but I'm -- One of the things that we do, in our industry, for the charter boats, is we're a season, and this is going to offer a little bit of extra income for me, as well as keeping my crew busy in the times of year

that they begin to struggle to pay bills or are having to branch out and do other things.

Now that I've invested all that money, I look around the Gulf Council, that I -- I mean no offense by this, but that has zero experience and zero representation, in an industry that I just invested way over six figures in, that is now talking about having the hard discussions about the IFQ program.

Although I am not a participant in the commercial fishery until recently, I've caught about 30,000 pounds of fish so far this year, and I've got more left to catch, and all the fish that I'm fishing for are leased, and I do not own any IFQ, and to start to try to dismantle something like that -- It makes a person nervous, who has just invested a bunch of money on a program that, in my opinion, has offered me an ability, finally, to step in.

I would caution the council to reach out to these people behind me, that have that working knowledge, and, if you're going to manipulate something, or work on something, or try to change something, do it for the better and not with an agenda. Just don't do it with an agenda. If you're got an agenda, then you're not going to do it right, and that's the one question, or the one ask, that I will leave you with today, and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Jennings. Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Captain Jennings, for being here today, and so you said you just purchased a commercial vessel. Before you purchased your commercial vessel, did you have your leased fish, or did you lease your fish after you purchased your vessel?

MR. JENNINGS: I appreciate that question. You know, I was coming in off a commercial trip, and it just so happened there in the last council meeting, and I got just close enough, coming in, to catch probably the last two-thirds of the public comment, on my phone, and there were some comments made by some people on that that really confused me, because I heard some -- Like I made the comment today about spending a lot of money to get into the fishery, but there were some comments made about, well, I've got all this invested in a boat and docks and et cetera, et cetera, and I can't get any fish.

I just had to shake my head at that, and absolutely I secured that allocation first, and I was not going to go out there and

spend all this money and have no idea where I was going to get my access from, and so, when someone makes a comment that they've spent all this money and can't get the fish, well, maybe they did, and I'm not arguing with that, but I would argue with the fact that going into something like a relationship on a leap of faith is probably sometimes successful, but making business decisions on a leap of faith is not something that sounds very business savvy, but, yes, ma'am, I secured my allocation first, and then I decided to make that investment, and, when I saw the opportunity, I took it, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We've got another question for you. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Mike, I've just got a quick question for you. Since you're familiar, obviously, with that Freeport-Galveston area, where we're hearing about localized depletions and that sort of thing, particularly up in that region, and I'm wondering about that, and what I'm wondering is, well, now, especially since you're commercial fishing as well, is that -- Is the fleet -- Is the charter fleet and the commercial fleet, with five-dollar-plus gas or diesel, or whatever you're buying, and is that -- Are you fishing closer inshore this year than you did last year?

 MR. JENNINGS: No, and we're seeing the same thing there, in that Galveston-Houston-Freeport metroplex, and, I mean, they're growing together, to the point you can't tell the difference between one port and the other, but, yes, we're seeing that. We probably -- By the end of the snapper season, we had pushed our daily fishing ten miles beyond what we were doing last year, to get the job done, and commercial fishing -- I mean, it's a little different thing, and I'm not under a time crunch, per se, and so we are definitely traveling outside of anything that we have commercial fished.

For me, it's twofold. I'm not going to commercial fish something that I need to take my customers to on a day trip. It doesn't make sense for me to work over a set of fish that I need for one side of my business just to cover another side, but, yes, we're seeing the localized depletion, just like everybody else is, and we're seeing some spots that I would traditionally fished, and that I looked at early in June, that just basically had no fish on them.

I mean, we hurt them last October, with that extra season, and they just didn't come back. They didn't move back in there, and so it's -- There are some areas in the Gulf they still have some really good fishing, yes, and that's right out here, about four days ago, and so, with the areas that have low effort,

absolutely the fishing is good. The areas with high effort, where most of these people, recreational and charter, et cetera, are fishing, like Houston, Texas, the largest city in the United States, and do you know how many recreational fishermen there are, and they're all fishing.

5 6 7

8

9

10

2 3

4

If I get in a boat and drive down here off of Port Aransas, Texas, I can't do that in a thirty-foot center console on a day trip, but they're depleting that resource in and around that harbor, and they're working out of it, and we're seeing the same thing, and so thank you.

11 12 13

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Jennings.

14 15

MR. JENNINGS: Yes, sir.

16 17

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Jim Green and then Eric Brazer.

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. JIM GREEN: First, I want to apologize, and I should have known not to ask Scott Hickman to sign me up on there, and so that won't happen again. Captain Jim Green, President of the Destin Charter Boat Association and President of the Charter Fishermen's Association. We welcome the new council members, and we look forward to working together with you for the betterment of the Gulf fisheries.

25 26 27

28 29

30

31

32

33

On modifying the for-hire trip declarations, DCBA and CFA support Option 2, ninety minutes of the non-fishing trips. On amberjack, both organizations support Action 1, Alternative 2 and Action 2, Alternative 1. It's our belief that more measures should be taken to provide this fishery with an adequate opportunity to rebuild. We feel that measures should be taken to provide a longer season, which would produce more angling opportunity and reduce discards from incidental catches.

34 35 36

37

38

We would like to see explored a thirty-six to forty-inch minimum size limit, a fractional bag limit of one fish per two people, and a vessel limit of six or less, limited by the fractional bag limit.

39 40 41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

In SEDAR 70, and some of its supporting papers, it shows a thirty-four-inch fish has equal to, or less than, a 50 percent chance of sexual maturity, along with possible issues of the quality of the eggs produced. In multiple attempts to rebuild this fishery, we must at least give these amberjacks a chance to spawn before they're harvested. It's time to get serious and make some bigger changes to this management, so that the rebuilding can be successful.

When it comes to red snapper, DCBA and CFA have great concerns on increasing allocation. The Red Snapper Count was sent back to the SSC multiple times, and increasing each time, which has the air of political pressure, rather than science, and we're seeing localized depletion from Texas to Florida. We have Alabama charter boats buying FWC licenses to fish in Florida state waters.

 Longline trawl surveys have been depleted over the last multiple years, and our catch levels are reducing, and so, you know, all things are pointing to a retraction in the fishery, and we should put the brakes on this.

Calibrating the state data -- It's a bit disingenuous to say that you are accountable in the system you're given when, for the last year, all we've heard is a way of delaying calibration. Even if you make the state data the best available science, it still has to be calibrated, and so that's why people are saying that the private recs are not accountable. It's not a shot at the anglers, but it's a shot at who is managing this and trying to delay something that's been part of the plan since the discussions of Amendment 50. Let's put the brakes on and wait for the next assessment and move forward, and we want Action 1, Alternative 1.

When it comes to the sharks, I'm not sure if we're trying to rebuild the fishery back to the Jurassic period or the Cretaceous period, but there's got to be a more modern threshold. I mean, we have protected an apex predator for decades now, and, on top of that, they're on top of the food chain.

Only other sharks eat them, and there's been an explosion of recruitment, especially in the sandbar shark. They're acting more brazen, because of population densities, and we're seeing more aggression out of them, especially on top of the water, eating fish that are floating, or that you haven't even got in the boat yet, and so I would like to ask that we use -- That we change that management, to where we're seeing -- That we get more updates quicker, to reflect what we're seeing on the water, because they are -- You know, when you protect a predator, it's going to compound. Every recruitment compounds on top of it, and so that's all I have for you today.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Green.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Next up is Eric Brazer, followed by Bubba Cochrane.

MR. ERIC BRAZER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm Eric Brazer, Deputy Director of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance. Thank you for the chance to speak today. First and foremost, Mike, I want to welcome you to the table. We appreciate you being here, and we look forward to working with you.

 Let's start with red snapper. You've got commercial and charter fishermen from all over the Gulf, and everywhere in this room, by the way, that are saying that there's a problem with red snapper. You've got a longline index that supports these observations, yet you're looking at increasing the quota. The Shareholder Alliance is asking you to please do not increase the quota at this time.

You've got an amberjack stock that's overfished and experiencing overfishing for longer than many of those young guys have been alive, and that's crazy, yet you're looking at reallocating the stock to the recreational sector, which actually reduces the OFL.

You've got a gag biomass that's in such poor shape, according to the last stock assessment, that it supposedly needs an 80 percent cut to get back on track, yet you were considering, albeit briefly, reallocation to the recreational sector.

You've got chronic red snapper de facto reallocations taking place between the Gulf states, de facto reallocation away from the charter sector to the private angler sector, and de facto reallocation away from the commercial sector to the recreational sector, and you've got three layers of de facto reallocations taking place now, yet these haven't been done in accordance with any of the allocation policies.

You've got an IFQ system that, in many aspects, appears to be working well, and those are the words of the National Academy of Sciences, and those are not my words, yet you're forcing debates about changing the rules of the program that are just pitting commercial fishermen against commercial fishermen.

You have a recreational sector that, by the nature of the management plan that you have given them, and not the fault of the individual angler, but, by the nature of the management plan, they are discarding millions and millions of pounds of

dead fish every year, yet you're taking actions that knowingly increase those dead discards.

You are stakeholder body that is charged with managing these fisheries, but you do not look like the fisheries you represent. We are frustrated, and you probably got that, over the course of the day, loud and clear. We are frustrated at the lack of adequate commercial representation at this table, and we know this is not your fault, and our anger is not aimed at you, and please don't take it that way.

Somehow, this train has gotten off track, and the resource deserves better, and so do the fishermen, and not just the commercial fishermen, but all fishermen deserve better. We think you can do better, and we challenge you to do better, and we want to help you do better, but you need to want to do better. I want to close out by saying, Karen, if you can hear us, wherever you are, thank you for your years of service. I appreciate the time, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. We have a question for you from Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Eric. I've got a one-track question going today, and so does the alliance have a position on the proposal to close triggers during the spawning season within the IFQ system?

MR. BRAZER: Do you mean gags and not triggers?

MR. GILL: Sorry. Thank you.

MR. BRAZER: A formal position, no, but I think, informally, if what Jason Delacruz says is true, that this is actually going to just turn this catch into discards, then we have a -- I imagine we would have a problem, or a concern, supporting something that would intentionally increase discards. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Next up is Bubba Cochrane, followed by Richard Fischer.

MR. BUBBA COCHRANE: My name is Bubba Cochrane, and I'm from Galveston, Texas, commercial fisherman. The red snapper IFQ is working, and it's made fishing for red snapper safer and more profitable than it was back in the derby days.

There is also a clear path for new entrants to enter the fishery, through leasing allocation or buying shares, and I own

and operate my own boat, and I catch 100 percent of my own allocation every year, and I know several captains that lease snapper allocation and make a good living. Lease price is just another expense for them, like fuel, bait, and ice. These captains depend on leasing red snapper to make a living.

I can't think of anything that would improve the system that is already working so well, and I hope this council will consider not just the folks that are complaining about it not working for them, but some of the people who came here today that are working the system to their advantage and happy with it.

On raising the red snapper quota, from what I have seen and heard from other fishermen now, it's not the time to increase the red snapper quota. I'm not seeing as many fish as I have in the past, and I worry that an increase could hurt the stocks, at this time.

I think some of the -- The only two recreational people that are here kind of questioned our ability to catch the red snapper, and I'm not saying that I can't catch red snapper, and I'm not saying that I'm not catching red snapper, but it is just a little more difficult than it has been in the last couple of years, and, if there is an increase, I will catch them, and I don't want to send them to Florida, and it's okay, and I don't want them to try to give us a break and say, well, send them to us, and we'll catch them, and it's not an issue. It's just definitely, obviously, been declining over the past couple of years.

Council makeup, like everyone else, I would like to see more commercial representation on the council, and I think it's only fair that there should be equal representation for all sectors and not just recreational. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Cochrane. Next up is Richard Fischer, followed by Billy Wright.

 MR. RICHARD FISCHER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. I would like to welcome our new council member, as well as welcome back the rest of you all. Thank you all for allowing me to speak. Richard Fischer, representing the Louisiana Charter Boat Association.

First of all, I would like to start on the logbook time requirements, and I would like to thank Mr. Dyskow, as well as Mr. Dugas, for your comments yesterday on the logbook program, which were very needed and very accurate. As for the window

itself, it doesn't really matter what you all do. This whole program, and trying to make cosmetic changes to this program, it's like putting a band-aid on a torn ACL, for a lot of guys out there who are having app problems, and the app is not working, and there are tons of other problems as well. We would support the highest change, but, whatever you all do, it's kind of immaterial, we feel like.

I will go ahead and briefly talk about amberjack. It came up a couple of times, the amberjack season for the recreational, earlier today, and it's very important to the western Gulf that we do not have a January 1 opening, because, if you open it up January 1, as we saw about five, six, seven years ago, they all get caught in the eastern Gulf before the western Gulf has the chance to get out there, and so it's very important, for the western Gulf, that we at least do not open it up in the first couple of months of the season, but, if other parts of the Gulf want to open it up, that kind of gives me the perfect segue into what I did want to spend at least a minute or so talking about here, which is let's reopen the conversation on state or regional management.

I'm actually very happy to say that I'm not the first person to bring that up, about we should expand state or regional management to the rest of the recreational sector, and I would like to thank Mr. Holmgren, as well as Mr. Moser, for their comments earlier.

You all could help me with what would be the best way to go about doing it, and I don't know if it would be bringing back the portions of Amendment 50 that have to do with charter, and it's a passed amendment, and I don't know if you could even bring it back, or if you have to start over, but, even if you did have to start over, there's a whole lot of copying and pasting that you could do, and you wouldn't have to start from scratch.

This, of course, was passed back in April of 2019, and you would have to fill out the 2020 and 2021 years anyway, with those data years, due to COVID, because that's not a true representation of what the yearly catches should be, and so I think we just go back to that document, and let's reopen that conversation, and that would be something that the charter very much wants to do, and I do want to reiterate that we don't want to force it to anybody.

47 If other states go back to their constituencies and ask their 48 charter sectors if they would like to go ahead and not have

state management, that's cool. We only want those among us who want it to have the ability to go ahead and have it, and so I would respectfully ask that you all go back to your constituencies and find out if that's something that your state would like.

The last point that I will make is I would really like it if the council put more attention into localized depletion, as well as localized abundance, and that's kind of the elephant in the room that we're hearing constantly, and it makes complete sense that, if you've got extreme pressure from certain parts of the Gulf, and captains and fishermen from those parts of the Gulf come here to speak, they're going to experience different things than captains and fishermen from areas of the Gulf that have not experienced that localized depletion, and so I would just like to see a little bit more thought put into that, and that's all the comments that I have for you all. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Fischer. We have a couple of questions for you. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Hi, Richard. Thanks for being here. It's good to see you. You led with a statement about lots of problems with SEFHIER, and you mentioned the app not working, and I know we're, obviously, talking about declarations, and can you expand upon your statement, in terms of those problems?

MR. FISCHER: I have talked to several captains that have had the inability for the apps to work correctly, that they've had several problems with cellular service, and they have had several problems with satellite service, as it pertains to putting their boat in a shed at night, and we have also had several other captains that have had permitting problems, as it pertains to SEFHIER.

Essentially, they're being told they can't renew their permit, because they didn't have a logbook attached to their vessel, even at a time before the program was mandatory, and so that is a catastrophic potentially problem to a lot of our guys, if this is an asset that is worth multi tens of thousands of dollars, wherever we are in the market right now, and they're potentially in a situation where they might be able to renew it, and so there are many, many issues that we have seen. Now, for the most part, guys are complying, and so they're kicking and screaming, but they are complying, but there have been a lot of problems around the edges with the program.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

1 2

MS. BOGGS: So that was my question, and so, to follow-up, based on the comments that you just made, and I don't know if it's appropriate, but I would certainly like to -- Being that I'm part of the charter fleet, I would certainly like to know specifics, because some of those issues sound -- They shouldn't be there, and I would also be interested to know -- Have they reached out to anyone, and is the contact information that Dr. Masi has provided --

Are they getting the help that they need to resolve these issues, and are they able to get in touch with the permits, and, I mean, I will get with you after the meeting, and you can give them my phone number, but I would certainly love to talk to them, because, being part of the charter fleet, I mean, I'm pretty partial to making sure that everyone is having these —That's not my job, and I understand, Andy, but it's important to me to know that we're getting the buy-in from these fishermen, and, if I can be of any assistance, I would like to do that.

MR. FISCHER: Yes, and, in some cases, yes, they have gotten the help they've asked for. In many other cases, they have not. I spoke to one captain who said that he tried to call NOAA Fisheries more than twenty times, and he was on hold more than a half-hour each time, and it just kind of reached a point where he reached out to me, as well as the president of our association, and said, guys, can you all handle this for me, and we -- You know, we passed it up the flagpole, and we had some of those conversations at ICAST, actually, and we're still waiting on a response on that, and so, in some cases, yes, but, in many more cases, they have not received that help.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Richard, you and I know one another, and we've talked many times on the phone, and you have my email, and so, if you ever have problems like that in the future, reach out to me. We are happy to take care of that, and I think you're going to find that our customer service is probably a lot better than what you're hearing about, and there might be just some miscommunication problems. Thanks.

MR. FISCHER: All right. I will be sending you some emails. Thank you, Andy. Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Thanks, everyone.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. All right. Next up is Billy Wright, followed by David Walker.

 MR. BILLY WRIGHT: My name is Billy Wright, Sr. I'm a commercial fisherman from Galveston, and I've been in the commercial fishing industry my entire life, and my son, Little Bill, is a commercial fisherman, following in my footsteps, and he had to go fishing this week, and I got to come here and speak to everybody.

I have been in the IFQ fishery since day-one, and I have earned my way into the fishery, and my son is now earning his way, too. He relies on the IFQ shareholders to lease his allocation for his business plan, but he's also investing some money and revenue into buying shares as well. He's buying his way into the system, and he is not trying to change the rules of the system to accommodate him. Don't disrupt this program and impact the young guys, who are buying their way into the fishery.

I also want to speak on red snapper. I've been a red snapper fisherman during the derby days, and I've seen red snapper at their lowest point and at their highest point, and we're no longer at the highest point, heading down off of Texas as well, and it sounds like that's the case in other parts of the Gulf, too. I'm here to tell you, as a commercial fisherman, not to raise the quota at this time.

Finally, I see a lot of recreational faces at the table that are pushing for more quota and pushing for a change in the commercial management, and I don't see a lot of commercial representation up there, and that's a problem, and I hope the National Marine Fisheries Service recognizes this problem and can do something to balance the group of the Gulf Council back out a little bit fairer for everybody concerned.

The IFQ system in place has driven the fishermen, and the fish, in the right direction in the past decade, and I am here to tell you that firsthand, and please don't change the direction in which we're heading. The fish, and the fishermen, have been doing well in the past, since 2007, when you implemented this system, and we really don't see any need to tinker with things that are pushing the fish, and the fishermen, in a good place. Thank you for my chance to speak today.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: David Walker, followed by Troy Frady. 48

MR. DAVID WALKER: Good afternoon. I'm David Walker from Alabama, commercial fisherman, and my son, John Walker, is also a commercial fisherman. I started fishing recreationally, my first time, when I was twelve years old, and that was forty-seven years ago, and so I've been on the water, and I have witnessed a lot of fishing, and I would like to say that I've seen snapper in good shape, and I have seen snapper in bad shape. I can tell you, right now, that snapper is in bad shape.

My dad used to have a lot of jokes about everything is big in Texas, and I can tell you, from what I've heard today, that everything is big in Texas about staying status quo in the quota. I don't support an increase in the quota at this time, and the stock can't handle it. Some people might think, in the short-term, it might be good, but I'm afraid, four or five years down the road, we're going to be looking at 30 or 40 percent cuts.

The commercial and charter fishermen are accountable, and we have permits, real-time reporting, and constant monitoring, and, if we don't have those things, we can't fish. It needs to be the same for the recreational fishermen.

I can remember, being a member of the council, I used to have a lot of people from the private anglers that would come up and ask me, well, why can't we have fish tags, and I would say, well, you can, and speak to your leadership, and we would be happy to work with this council to find solutions that might help.

I would just like to mention that the original red snapper IFQ ad hoc panel did a great job at developing the profiles. The council made some changes that industry didn't want, and didn't ask for. However, there are no major problems in the IFQ program, and it's been a huge success. There are major problems with the balance of the council, and the nation needs a fair and balanced representation.

I'm going to go to amberjack just a little bit, and Alternative 2, and I think there should be no reallocation. A lot of folks — The commercial was a thirty-six-inch size limit, and recreational was a twenty-eight-inch size limit, and so we're not on a level playing field. As an example, I could catch amberjack that were thirty-five-and-seven-eighths inches long, but we couldn't keep them, because they weren't legal, and folks behind us could pull up and catch those fish, and so I am not supporting any kind of reallocation. Thank you for your time, and thank you for all that you do.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Walker, and, David, I want to thank you for volunteering your time to be on the IFQ focus group. We appreciate it. Troy Frady is next, followed by Buddy Guindon.

 MR. TROY FRADY: Troy Frady, charter boat captain, Orange Beach, Alabama. New members, welcome. I'm happy to have you onboard. The biggest thing that I would like to say is I would like to see the science integrated into management more quickly. Doing so will allow the council to react more timely, whether that information is good or bad, but still a fast decision is better than a delayed decision.

You have heard several people up here talk about the fishery off of Alabama, and I am not going to sit here and tell you that it's wonderful, because it's not. I can show you a timeline of when I feel like it collapsed out of Orange Beach, Alabama. If you look at the timeline back to 2000, the State of Alabama reporting is 2021, and, the first six days of the season, the State of Alabama reported that private recreational anglers caught 468,000 pounds, or right about that number, and then it took them 118 days to catch the remaining 650,000 pounds.

Being a banker by trade, before I became a fisherman, that ain't right. Liars figure, but the figures don't lie. To me, and, Dr. Porch, you talked about indices of abundance. At that point, after six days, we saw indices of depletion, and so, looking forward -- I am not complaining about how many fish are out there, or I'm not going to tell you there is no fish. There are fish out there, but we've had the roughest year we've ever had out of Orange Beach, in the twenty years I've been doing this, and it's been absolutely tough.

 I've seen a world-class fishery, in the past five years, depleted, to where we're having to go forty, fifty, sixty miles offshore, and not just twenty, and not just thirty, but this year was the worst I've ever seen. The red snapper won't even bite within twenty miles now, and, if you do catch one, he's going to be a smart fish, and then the sharks are going to eat him, and so where we do we go from here?

A lot of people have different ideas, and they're saying don't do this and don't do that, but I believe that calibration is the first step to get us to where we need to be to find out what we're actually catching.

If you're catching 300,000 pounds a year, or 600,000 pounds a

year, instead of bumping the quota, and continuing to add more fuel to the fire, and you're unable to catch your quota, why not cut that quota back to what you're actually catching and see where you're going from there? The Great Red Snapper Count, as great as it was, it's not putting fish on the table. The rate of exchange is still yet to be identified on those fish further offshore and how long it takes them to replenish those reefs, because that has not happened.

I believe, as a businessman, we should be managing to optimum economic yield and not just optimum yield. For me, and my business, a lot of the customers that I take fishing are at least going to catch a fish, and they're not there for a limit, but, this year here, we're running two six-hour trips a day, most days, which that's my business, is a family business, and it's made it real hard for those people to even catch a single fish for supper.

I would like to see fish, or this fishery, managed to a point to where we had some five and six-pound fish to catch. I would even go to a one-fish bag limit on red snapper, if I had to, but I want this fishery to start trending toward to where we have some decent-sized fish for the people to catch and not just having to catch nothing, and, like I said, this is the worst year, and you can look at all of our electronic logbook entries, and you can see what all the charter boats in Alabama have been reporting.

Where we were out there in the first two weeks of June, we were catching decent sized, sixteen-and-a-half-inch, or seventeen-inch, fish, and now we're at the point to where you can't even catch a legal fish.

I took five game wardens the other day fishing, from all over this country, and not all over, but five game wardens, and we caught three red snappers, and two of them were fourteen and fifteen inches, and we caught one sixteen-and-a-half inches, and we couldn't keep them, but we were trying to catch triggerfish, and the triggerfish -- We haven't caught a legal triggerfish in a couple of weeks, and so the triggerfish -- There's a lot of small triggerfish, and so, when I talk about the optimum yield, if we manage this fishery by asking our constituents, our fishermen, what size fish would be good for you, and how long of a season would be good for you, and is a thirty-day season too short, and is a forty-five-day season just right, and a seventy-nine-day season, and a 200 and 124-day season for the private recs, and is that the right answer?

 I think you all need to have some dialogue, to actually sit down and have some hard decisions of where you want this fishery to be, and I appreciate your time, but I think that's where I would like to see it, is where I can have all summer long to be able to catch just a couple of fish that are legal sized that are not fifteen-and-three-quarter inches, and so, if I confused anybody, I'm sorry, but thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Frady. All right. Next up is Mr. Buddy Guindon, and our last speaker will be Mr. Ted Venker.

MR. BUDDY GUINDON: This is Buddy Guindon, Katie's Seafood, Galveston, Texas. I want to thank Andy for repeating what David Walker, the only commercial red snapper fisherman that has ever sat on the Gulf Council, said many times, and why don't you CCA pogies work on your own fishery and leave the IFQ system, the only one that's working, alone.

That brings us to state management. Let's think. Five years ago, we started state management, and now you have people at the podium saying you've destroyed the fishery, because of your state management, and let's just look at one state, Texas, using an antiquated data collection system for redfish and trout, and it doesn't check private marinas or private homes. They sit at public docks and take data.

It's not working. It's working for them, because they figured out they had such a low quota that they had to figure out a way not to count fish, and so that seems to be working for them, and you have to realize that the only thing that has changed in this fishery, in the last five years, is state management, and why is all these folks that make a living off of red snapper, and I would like to have another four or five million pounds worth to catch, but the stock can't take it.

 I've done this my whole life, and I watched us go through these all these management changes with your three-year-old data that you want to manage fisheries on, and you have anecdotal information, right now, that is coming from fishermen that are on the water, and that should be considered somewhat scientific, and we're not in here saying give us a quota increase, and I could understand your skepticism then, but we're saying please don't give us any more fish, because the stock can't handle it.

The states need to get their crap in order and get iSnapper, and I think there's a few states that are doing a really good job of getting a tag, and something in people's hands, and 50 percent reporting is not acceptable. You have to do a better job.

You've had five years, and it's going to cost some money, but you're making plenty of money off of selling those licenses and keeping the fishery open for your tackle and outboard motor manufacturers and boat manufacturers, and the tackle sales people that donate a percentage of their catch to the CCA, so you can continue this drive to put commercial fishermen out of business.

I don't know if anybody knows the history of the CCA, but it used to be called the GCCA, and one of their stated goals was the elimination of commercial fishing in the Gulf of Mexico. Then they changed it to CCA, because they wanted to eliminate commercial fishing in the United States, is the only thing that I can think of. Thanks for your time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Guindon. Mr. Guindon, we have a question for you.

MS. BOGGS: I'm afraid to ask, but so what is the state of the stock, the red snapper stock? I mean, what are you seeing?

MR. B. GUINDON: Well, I don't fish as much as my children do anymore, but I do fish, and what I am seeing with my children, and all the folks that work for me at the fish market, is that the time it takes them to make a trip, with given the same amount of fish, has been taking longer and longer and longer, over the last three-and-a-half to four years.

 When I go out on my own boat, which is a commercial fishing boat also, and I take experience riders out to see how things are done, and I was fishing seventy and eighty miles this year, when thirty to fifty, with an experienced guy like me, has fished my entire life, and we have more locations, down right off of Port Aransas here, than most people have off of their whole state, and so it's in bad, bad shape, compared to what it was five years ago, or four years ago, and it's not good.

I didn't think they could do it, and I know they were trying to reduce the amount of fish in the Gulf, so that they could have a longer season, and I didn't think they could do it, but they actually managed to do it off the State of Texas, where all the biomass is. Thanks for the question. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Buddy, for your testimony. Given you've been a participant since the start of the IFQ program, and I've heard a lot of testimony today about either status quo

or modest changes to the program, and I'm curious. In your opinion, are there things that you feel like could be improved with the program, and what would those be?

MR. B. GUINDON: Definitely. We could have a better loan program, so that young people could actually buy in. I mean, what you're looking at, and what happened, and why you have so many people without quota, is they're new entrants, and they came into the fishery knowing the rules, and we raised the red grouper quota up through the roof, and we gave them encouragement. They could buy cheap quota and get out there and fish, and they were making a little bit of money.

Then we slammed it down about 80 percent and cut off their access to fish, and now they had to go after snapper and deepwater grouper and tilefish, anything they can get their hands on to fill in, and it's not there. What we have is an overcapitalized fishery, and we've got too many fishermen trying to catch too little fish.

Management things, like we did for you -- We came to this podium, when you said we're going to raise the red grouper way up over your head, and we asked you not to. You did it anyway, so that the private recreational anglers wouldn't have a closed season, and now where are we? We have driven the red grouper down into the ground, and so thank you for your question, and I hope that answered it.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Ted Venker.

MR. TED VENKER: Good afternoon. My name is Ted Venker, and I'm with the Coastal Conservation Association. I'm sorry to be the last speaker of the day, and this is a terrible spot to be in, and I wish I had something really earth-shaking to close on, and I don't. I would like to thank Buddy for the colorful inaccurate history of CCA. I appreciate that.

I have two things to comment on. The first is this accountability issue, and it clearly seems to be the trendy topic of the day, and I would only point out that, once upon a time, MRIP was regarded as the best recreational survey in the world, and each of the Gulf states have taken steps that have only improved upon it. The problem with MRIP was trying to use it to do in-season monitoring to the pound, which it was never designed to.

Now, with state management, this council gets a report, every meeting, from the states on recreational landings for red

snapper, and they're able to use that data to do in-season monitoring and close their seasons when the quota is caught. All the states have a licensing system, and they know their universe of saltwater anglers. The angling sector, today, is probably more accountable than it has ever been, and the data is more timely than it has ever been, plus the potential is there for the states to continue improving those systems and standardizing them.

On top of that, the sector lobbied for, and got, regulations requiring descending devices, to address the bycatch mortality, and, ironically, had to overcome opposition from the NOAA Regional Administrator at the time to get that requirement done.

The angling sector is improving its accountability and living up to its responsibilities to take better care of the resource every day, and that goes against the narrative that we've heard today, but that's where we are, and the rec sector is entirely willing to keep improving those efforts with the states, and we are not opposed to calibration. We are unsure about being calibrated to a system that was never intended to measure us to a pound, the way it's been applied.

The last thing I would like to comment on is a little bit off the beaten path, which might be a nice change of pace, and I would encourage the council to look into tracking the impact of dude trips, and so these catch share experience trips, that we know so little bit about.

There is more and more talk out there about these trips, which would seem to indicate that there is possibly a significant amount of quota moving under the radar in the commercial sector to the charter sector to the recreational sector, and no one seems to know how much.

I think it's possible, when you hear people say that there's no quota to lease, or that leasing prices are too high for a commercial enterprise to make a profit, that that could be a shift of those shares, via these dude trips.

 In a fishery where allocation and economic values are always a source of intense debate, getting a clear picture of that allocation that might be shifting on these trips could give this council some information to base some forward-looking decisions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Venker. All right. Bernie, we had one person that was online virtually that we never could

get, and did they ever show back up virtually? Okay. Thanks, folks out in the audience, for your public testimony today. We appreciate it.

4 5

We're going to have one item up for council business this evening, and then we'll close our day out, and so General Spraggins had asked that we handle the election of Chair and Vice Chair today. Mr. Donaldson usually leads that discussion. Are you prepared to do that, Mr. Donaldson?

MR. DONALDSON: I am, Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Take it away.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, and so I will open the floor for nominations for Chairman. Mr. Gill.

20 MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Donaldson. I nominate our current 21 Chair, Dale Diaz.

MS. BOGGS: Second.

MR. DONALDSON: We have a second by Susan. Any other nominations?

MS. BOGGS: I make a motion we close the nominations.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Folks, we're having a hard time hearing up here. If you could please take your conversations out in the hall, we would appreciate it. All right. Dave, can you try to let everybody know where we're at? I want to make sure everybody understands what we're doing here. Go ahead, Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Mr. Chair, it's certainly your prerogative, but, as I recall, most of the nominations and voting that we do is done in closed session, and it doesn't mean that it has to apply for this certain circumstance, but it might help with the noise.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Not for Chair and Vice Chair. We do that in open session. It's usually at the end of a meeting, when there's not many folks here, and so that's the only difference. Let's make sure that everybody knows where we're at, Mr. Donaldson, because of the noise in the room, please.

47 MR. DONALDSON: Yes, sir. Currently, we have a nomination and a second for Dale Diaz for Chairman of the council, and Susan made

1	the motion to close nominations, correct?
2	
3 4	MS. BOGGS: I did.
5	MR. DONALDSON: J.D.
6	
7 8	MR. DUGAS: Second.
9	MR. DONALDSON: All right. With that, congratulations, Mr.
10	Diaz. You are Chairman yet again.
11	
12 13	CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Donaldson. Thank you, council.
14	MR. DONALDSON: All right. I will now open the floor for
15	nominations for Vice Chair.
16	
17	GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I would like to nominate Greg Stunz.
18	
19	UNIDENTIFIED: Second.
20	MD DONALDGOM. Go cond loss
21 22	MR. DONALDSON: Second by
23	MS. BOGGS: I make a motion that we close the nominations.
24	MD. DOGGS. I make a motion that we close the nominations.
25	MR. DONALDSON: Congratulations. That may have been the easiest
26	election of officers that I have ever been through, and I
27	enjoyed it. Thank you.
28	
29	CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We will start up at 8:00 in the morning, and so
30	we will start Full Council at 8:00 in the morning. Thank you.
31	(77)
32 33	(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on August 24, 2022.)
33 34	
35	
36	August 25, 2022
37	Tagase 20, 2022
38	THURSDAY MORNING SESSION
39	
40	
41	
42	The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management
43	Council reconvened at Omni Hotel in Corpus Christi, Texas on
44	Thursday morning, August 25, 2022, and was called to order by
45	Chairman Dale Diaz.
46	

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, everyone. Welcome back to the last day of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council meeting.

47

48

going to jump right into our committee reports, and the first committee report up today is Administrative/Budget. Just for everybody's information, we're going to follow the agenda just as it's written all the way down today. Lastly, there are some conversations going on in the back, and there's a bad echo in this room, and so if you all please could take your conversations out in the hall. Thank you. Mr. Dyskow.

COMMITTEE REPORTS ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first item on the agenda today is the Admin and Budget Committee Report, as of August 22, 2022. The committee adopted the agenda, Tab G, Number 1, as written and approved the minutes, Tab G, Number 2, of the April 2022 meeting as written.

Review of Final 2022 Funded Budget and Activities, Tab G, Number 4, staff presented Tab G, Number 4. A committee member asked about the position of funding relative to expenditures for the total award to-date. Staff shared the figures for funding to-date and stated that the total carryover from 2020 and 2021 was \$695,000, after taking all subcontracted obligations into account. Another committee member asked if the contracted figure for 2022 included any funds earmarked for the NMFS Southeast Regional Office. Staff clarified that it does not. The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council approve the final 2022 budget as written. Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. Mr. Dyskow.

 MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Review and Discuss Proposed Modifications to Council's SOPPs, Tab G, Number 5, in response to discussions held during closed session in June 2022, and to clarify unclear verbiage, staff proposed specific language updates to three sections of the SOPPs.

In Section 2.3.3, Officers, staff clarified that the verbiage in the last sentence "Alternate representatives (designee or principal) do not assume these offices" was intended to refer to the offices of Council Chair and Vice Chair, not to committee positions.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council approve the proposed revised language in Section 2.3.3 as

presented. Alternate representatives (designee or principal) do not assume these offices the offices of Council Chair or Council Vice Chair, but may participate as members of committees and act as a committee chair or committee vice chair. Mr. Chairman.

4 5 6

7

8

2

3

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Dyskow, and so we have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. Mr. Dyskow.

9 10 11

12

13

14 15

16

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Under Section 2.6, Advisory Panels (APs)/Fishing Industry Advisory Committees (FIACs), in Section 2.6.2, Members and Chair, staff offered two alternative edits to the language in the last paragraph, which details the actions that the council might take in the event that a fishing violation was discovered to have been committed by a potential or existing AP member.

17 18 19

20

21 22

23

24

Committee members asked for clarification of the existing process as to when violations are currently checked and expressed a desire to not encumber the existing process. Staff responded that the proposed changes in this section do not alter the existing fishing violation check process, but speak to the potential actions of the council after a violation is discovered and provide the most flexibility.

252627

28 29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42

43

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council approve the proposed revised language in Section 2.6.2 as The presence of a fishing violation is an important aspect in consideration of an AP appointment. The council has determined: 1) Applicable fishing violations include violations of federally-managed species in either state or federal waters, regardless of the penalty, for example written civil criminal conviction warning, fine, and so 2) Individuals are ineligible to serve on an AP within three years of the final finding of liability through adjudication, settlement, or default. A finding of liability is final after any applicable appeal period expires; and, 3) Vessel owners shall not automatically be held responsible for violations by a crew member when the owner is not present. If an individual who is currently serving on an AP is found to have a fishing violation meets the preceding criteria, subsequent to that appointment, the decision to maintain or remove the individual from the AP is at the council's discretion. Mr. Chair.

44 45 46

47

48

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Dyskow. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries. Mr.

Dyskow.

 MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In Section 2.8.3, Standing Committees, alternative proposed language in this section referenced the composition of the Gulf SEDAR Committee. In addition to adding the chair of the Sustainable Fisheries Committee to this body, there was a consideration to remove the Red Drum Committee Chair.

A Committee member motioned to remove the Red Drum chair from the SEDAR Committee, because the Red Drum Committee meets infrequently. Another committee member spoke in support of retaining the current membership, with the addition of the Sustainable Fisheries Committee Chair, because of the importance of red drum in certain regions, and offered a substitute motion.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council approve the proposed revised language in Section 2.6.2 as presented. The Gulf SEDAR Committee is comprised of the Council Chair and the Coastal Migratory Pelagics chair, Red Drum chair, and Sustainable Fisheries chair, and the Reef Fish Management Committee chair. This committee reviews and advises on SEDAR stock assessment priorities. We need to vote on that, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries. Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Mr. Chair, that concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Dyskow, for efficiently leading us through that committee report. Next up, we have the Coral Committee and Dr. Frazer.

CORAL COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Coral Committee Report, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab N, Number 1, and approved the minutes, Tab N, Number 2, from the June 2022 meeting as written.

Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Proposed Rule, Tab N, Number 4, Ms. Sarah Fangman, the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Superintendent, provided an overview of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Restoration Blueprint proposed rule, which pulls from all alternatives included in the 2019 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The proposed changes

include an expansion of sanctuary boundaries and new regulations, some of which are sanctuary-wide, and others related to specific marine zones.

A committee member asked about the update to the definition of traditional fishing and suggested further considering regional historical fishing practices. Ms. Fangman mentioned that the sanctuary is working with partner agencies on updating the definition of traditional fishing.

Another committee member requested additional information on the merger and/or removal of existing Sanctuary Preservation Areas, or SPAs. Ms. Fangman responded that two SPAs are being removed, as they are no longer considered in need of additional management measures. Ms. Fangman noted that several of the SPAs share similar biological features that allow for monitoring and comparative observation and evaluation of the effectiveness of management practices.

The council has received a comment period extension until February 2023, and council staff are in the process of convening the council's Coral, Shrimp, Spiny Lobster, Reef Fish, and Coastal Migratory Pelagics Advisory Panels. A summary of those AP recommendations will be provided at a future meeting.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Comments on Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Proposed Rule, Tab N, Number 5, Dr. C.J. Sweetman provided an update on the FWC's plans to submit comments in response to the proposed rule. The commission, like the council, has been granted a comment period extension and will gather public input at two of their upcoming commission meetings.

FWC staff also plan to meet with various stakeholder groups and organizations, in an effort to gather feedback on the proposed rule. Of particular interest is feedback on ecosystem changes, including water quality issues and coral loss due to disease and bleaching. Specific comments will be provided at the next council meeting. Dr. Sweetman noted that the agency is taking the lead in fisheries management in state waters and is working with the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils and the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary staff to update the existing Protocol for Cooperative Fisheries Management.

Other Business, the committee chair asked Ms. Fangman if there have been any reports of a diadema antillarum, or long-spine sea urchin, die-off in the Florida Keys, similar to what is being reported in other parts of the Caribbean. Ms. Fangman replied

that, at this time, there are no reports of a significant diadema mortality event in the Florida Keys region and that efforts to repopulate the diadema population after the die-off thirty years ago are still moving forward. Ms. Fangman recognized the ecological importance of sea urchins as grazers in coral reef ecosystems, not only in the Florida Keys, but the Caribbean more broadly. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. Seeing no comments about the Coral Committee around the table, we're going to move on to the next committee report, Data Collection, and Ms. Boggs.

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Data Collection Committee report from August 22, 2022, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab F, Number 1, and approved the minutes of the June 2022 meeting as amended, Tab F, Number 2.

Abbreviated Framework Action to Modify For-Hire Trip Declaration Requirements, Tab F, Numbers 4(a) and (b), council staff presented rationale for the framework action and reviewed the document options. Several committee members questioned the purpose for collecting hail-out information for non-fishing trips.

 Some alternative suggestions proposed by the committee included changing the regulatory language to create a fishing trip definition, making hailing-out for non-fishing activities voluntary, and development of an exemption form. Southeast Regional Office staff cautioned that too broad an exemption could potentially create a law enforcement loophole. They maintained that striking a balance between reducing reporting burden, while meeting the data integrity goals of the program, was the most beneficial.

NOAA General Counsel added that integrating a time period consideration within the current program regulatory language was feasible and would not require any additional reporting by the fishermen (i.e. filling out an exemption form).

The committee recommends, and I so move, to make Option 3 the preferred. Option 3 is the exemption from the trip declaration requirement would apply to non-fishing trips that are completed in 120-minutes or less. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I briefly mentioned this during Reef Fish, or during Data Collection, and I'm sorry, and I'm just wondering, and I knew we're fairly far along in the document, but, currently, this would allow a charter boat operator to not provide a declaration at all, and just go and make a trip, leaving their dock, within a time limit.

I am just wondering -- I guess I have some concerns about, you know, there is no kind of stopwatch there, and it's kind of on good faith that the captain is going to be back in 120 minutes, and so there's that part of it, and then there's -- I'm a little concerned about how the data would be analyzed, relative to the sampling program that is currently conducted, as I understand it, regarding documentation of vessels that are not at their dock when being sampled, if you will, or sites being sampled by the SEFHIER dockside samplers, and so I'm just wondering, maybe Dr. Porch or Andy, if you have any comments, if there's been any discussions that staff have had as to how those trips might be handled, where, again, samplers arrive at the sites and they check the vessels that are supposed to be there, or listed there, per their site register, you know, how those vessels not being present at the dock could be accounted for, or are being accounted for, in the current survey.

 I'm just -- I don't want to get into a situation where there's an estimation, or adjustment factor, applied to those trips that are not at the dock, and there's no accounting for where they are and what their status us, because no declaration has been provided, at least to indicate that, yes, the vessel is out, but it's not fishing, and it will be back in whatever number of minutes that we choose here.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck, to that point?

 MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I can't speak to all the details of the sampling, and I'm not involved in that directly. What I can say is that, since the committee discussion, there's been certainly a lot of conversation around the time requirement, versus defining this more broadly, with regard to fishing, or charter activity, as the threshold for declaring a trip, and so I know that Susan has shared some ideas, and I know that J.D. had mentioned that as well, and I think that might be the broader solution to this that avoids some of the concerns that you mentioned about the time requirements.

You ultimately will have vessels then moving around without, you know, having to declare, but, as long as they're declaring those

fishing trips, or charter trips, that are going offshore, for offshore activity, that's really the key, in my view, to what we need, in terms of data validation.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not sure of the proper procedure here, but I would like to make a motion, and I don't know if it's a substitute motion or not.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, Mr. Dugas, is the substitute motion directly related to the current abbreviated framework document that we're working on, or is it a different topic?

18 MR. DUGAS: In my mind, it is this document, yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Then it's a substitute motion.

22 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Proceed, Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I sent the motion to Bernie, if she can pull it up, please.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead and read your motion into the record, and we'll see if we get a second, Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: To eliminate all trip declaration requirements for federally-permitted for-hire vessels in the SEFHIER program when participating in non-fishing activities.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a motion, and is there a second to the motion?

MR. DYSKOW: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: It's seconded by Mr. Dyskow. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: This is just, I guess, more of a clarification, for me, on how this actually would work, and so a vessel leaves its home dock, and it goes to the fuel dock, within the marina or within approximate to its home port, and, if it doesn't hailout, or declare a trip declaration, the VMS, or the cellular, tracking is still operating during that time period, right, and so enforcement will have access to the data, whether it's GPS or

cellular, for the position of where that boat went, regardless of it declaring a trip, and is that correct, or am I wrong there?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: You are correct, but they will only have that information real-time, if it's a satellite VMS. If it's an archival GPS, then, once it gets out of cellphone range, we will not have that information until the boat returns to the dock.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck, you had your hand up, if you want to make your comment.

MR. STRELCHECK: Mara was having problems unmuting, and so I wanted to flag that she wanted to speak, Mara Levy.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. Well, you've kind of already passed the point, and so it's up to you whether you want to circle back, but this really isn't a proper substitute. You have the main motion to make something a preferred, and a proper substitute would be to make a different preferred, but, again, you've already gone past that, and so I will defer to you on how particularly you want to follow the procedure. Thank you.

 $\tt CHAIRMAN\ DIAZ:\ I\ had\ a\ little\ bit\ of\ trouble\ hearing\ Ms.\ Levy,$ and Dr. Simmons is going to talk for just a minute and help clarify some of this.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Ms. Levy, what you're saying is, if this motion were to pass, it would be creating potentially a different document, in order to modify the regulations to achieve different hail-out requirements for non-fishing activities, based on what is currently in the regulations?

MS. LEVY: I'm not sure it would require a different document, but it's clearly not even an alternative here. The beginning motion was to make one of the alternatives you already have preferred, and so a proper substitute would be to make a different one a preferred and not to come up with something that's not even an alternative and adopting it. All I'm saying is that it's not really a proper substitute, but, since you're already on it, I'm going to defer to you about how you want to handle it, if you want to move forward, if you want to correct the situation, and however you want to do it, and I just want to point that out, because we've had discussions about Roberts

Rules and things like that. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, Ms. Levy, if Mr. Dugas and the seconder wanted to add this to the document, add an alternative that would address this to the document, that would be following the rules, correct?

MS. LEVY: I think after you would vote up or down the motion to make one of the current alternatives the preferred, right, and then you could have a motion to add another alternative. It's a little bit different type of alternative, but I don't know, and we would have to think about how it fits into the document.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: A technical question. Could Mr. Dugas, I guess, amend his substitute motion to read to add an Option 4 to the document to eliminate all trip declaration requirements and make it the preferred?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I believe he could do that, if he wished. Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: I'm okay with that, Chris, but I have a question as well. Should we table the document and then bring this motion up?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think you could vote the current committee motion up or down, and then, if you were willing, we could come back to your motion, and that might be cleaner, or you could do what you just mentioned earlier, or Mr. Schieble did, to add it to the document as a preferred, but that might be too much, without seeing the analysis and all that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: So I'm going to ask to follow Carrie's lead, or Chris's lead on this, to put this motion as -- I think it's Option d in the document.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so you want to change the wording to your substitute motion? Is that what you're saying, Mr. Dugas?

46 MR. DUGAS: I want to do whatever is easiest for staff to get 47 this in the document, or kill the document, and this is the 48 preferred. Whatever we need to do, I'm following you all's lead.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. We're going to go to Ms. Boggs, and we want to make sure we handle this appropriately. Ms. Boggs.

4 5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

Well, I'm going to put my two-cents' worth in here. MS. BOGGS: I think we need to vote on a committee motion, because that is an option, and then, if J.D. wants to make a motion to add an option, then we vote on that, and so now we have options. Even though that may be the preferred, that does not preclude the council from coming back and choosing a different preferred, but, to me, because you're adding an option, I think you need to vote on the original motion and then add -- Just do a motion to add an option. That's my opinion.

14

15

16

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

17 18

19

MR. DUGAS: I think so, and so we would vote on the original motion to make it a preferred or not, and then I would like to add my motion in the document.

20 21

22 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: At this point, would you be willing to withdraw 23 your substitute?

24

25 MR. DUGAS: Yes, sir.

26 27

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Is the seconder okay with that?

28 29

MR. DYSKOW: Yes.

30 31

32

33 34

35

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So the substitute is withdrawn. We're going to vote on the original motion. The original motion is the exemption from the trip declaration requirement would apply to non-fishing trips that are completed in 120 minutes or less. I'm going to ask for a show of hands. All in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand. Mr. Sweetman.

36 37 38

DR. SWEETMAN: Yes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. All opposed to the motion, signify 41 by raising your hand. The motion failed three to twelve. 42 Dugas.

43

44 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to make a MR. DUGAS: 45 motion.

46

47 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so the substitute motion is to 48 add an Option 4 -- Some of the crafting has been done, Mr.

Dugas, and so, if you don't agree with it, please say. To add an Option 4 and make it the preferred. Option 4 is to eliminate all trip declaration requirements for federally-permitted for-hire vessels in the SEFHIER program when participating in non-fishing activities. We have a new motion on the board, and is there any discussion on -- Is there a second for the motion?

MR. DYSKOW: I would second the motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: It's seconded by Mr. Dyskow. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Williamson.

 MR. WILLIAMSON: Just as a matter of a question, if a vessel goes out and does not hail-out, and it comes back in with a load of fish to the dock, and he sells it, is there a reporting, a penalty, for not hailing out at that point in time, and is there a record? Is there someone looking at this? I guess that's to you, Andy.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I would certainly -- I would look to law enforcement, in terms of the penalties, but they would be out of compliance with the regulations, and, if they, obviously, had an enforcement officer at the dock, or we flagged, for enforcement, that a trip has occurred without complying with the program, there could be an enforcement action that is pursued, yes.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any further discussion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess two comments. One is I think this creates a substantial loophole in the program, because we're saying, when participating in non-fishing activities, and I think it would be helpful to also include charter activities, regardless of fishing activity, because we have vessels that will go offshore for a variety of purposes, and it would be hard to distinguish whether or not that trip is just not declaring because they are doing that non-fishing activity or they're actually fishing, but didn't report to us.

 The other comment that I will make is we're recommending this as a preferred, and we have zero analysis. We have zero information to base our decision on this at this point, and so I would discourage making this a preferred alternative in the document at this point.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: Well, so, with Andy's comments, I have a motion, which is very similar to this, and I am not asking to make it a preferred, and so I'm guessing then that we should vote on this motion, and then I make my motion, because I was just going to add an option, but not as a preferred, but I am ready to make either a substitute motion or a motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: That would be your decision, Ms. Boggs. I don't know what your motion is, and so --

MS. BOGGS: All right. Well, then I will make a substitute motion. The motion is to direct staff to add an option to require for-hire vessel owners and/or operators to submit a trip declaration only for a trip that will be engaging in any type of fishing activity or charter trip.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So we have a substitute motion. Is there a second for the substitute motion?

MR. ANSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: It's seconded by Mr. Anson. Any discussion on the substitute? Bernie, can you get it just a little bit bigger? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: The rationale is, number one, it takes some of the language that's currently in the document specifying who would be required, but then, as Andy pointed out, charter trip -- Because I think that's important, because, if you have customers onboard, and you're a charter boat, most people are going to make the assumption that you're fishing, even though you might be on a dolphin cruise, or a sunset cruise, and so I think it is important to include that last -- Those last two words, "charter trip". Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Just for clarification, Susan, as you fill these out, there is a designation, or selection, you can make that indicates that it's a charter trip, but not a fishing charter trip, correct, currently?

43 MS. BOGGS: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

47 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm okay with Ms. Boggs' 48 motion, and it's worded a little different from mine, and it

adds charter trip, for the agency, and I'm fine with that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Dugas. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I am supportive of the intent of both of these motions, but I really have a question for Andy, because I just want to make sure -- You mentioned the loophole that could still be in, at this point, with Option 4, J.D.'s, but does Susan's tighten that up then, at this point, so it's fixed? I don't want to have an unintended consequence here where we're not capturing a trip, and there's this problem down the line, and I'm for the intent of both of these, but I'm just trying to get where we need to be.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think this does address my concern, and I certainly want this to go back to staff and law enforcement and provide some analysis and ensure that there's not other unintended consequences, but I think this tightens it up, yes.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. J.D., is it your intent to withdraw your motion?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: The way that's going to work is this is a substitute motion. If the substitute motion passes, the original motion just goes away, and this is substituting the original motion.

MR. DYSKOW: I understand. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I am not seeing any further hands up around the table, and so I'm going to ask for a show of hands for all those -- I'm going to read the motion into the record, first, so everybody knows what we're voting on. To direct staff to add an option to require for-hire vessel owners and/or operators to submit a trip declaration only for a trip that will be engaging in any type of fishing activity or charter trip. Mr. Dyskow.

 MR. DYSKOW: Sorry to beat this to death, but I think the one key difference between the two is we are asking, under J.D.'s motion, that we make this the preferred, and are we also asking, in the substitute motion, that we make it the preferred?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: That is not in the motion at this time. What's

going to happen, if this is added to the document, is staff is going to have to go back and rework the document and do some analyzation of the document, and we'll see the document again, probably at the next meeting, and then we could either pick this as a preferred now, or we could pick it as a preferred after we get some of the items in the document analyzed. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: To this, the reason I did not make this as a preferred is because we don't have the analysis, and we don't have any feedback from law enforcement, and it may be that we come back to the next meeting and that they offer some suggestions that might make this a better motion, or we have a different motion, but, since we would have the opportunity to come back at a later meeting and pick a different preferred, I just felt like it was important to get the feedback on this motion before going for a preferred. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I am not seeing any further hands up, and so we're going to vote on this motion. All in favor, signify by raising your hand; all opposed, like sign. The motion carries. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Draft Options Joint Amendment to Require Electronic Reporting for Commercial Logbooks, Tab F, Number 5(a) through (d), council staff presented an update on the development of a joint amendment to modify the commercial coastal logbook program. This modification would allow for the submission of logbook data through an electronic platform.

The committee had no edits, after reviewing the draft purpose and need statement. The Southeast Fishery Science Center has proposed using the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program eTRIPS software as an electronic data submission platform and integrate the current paper form into ACCSP's database.

 Mr. Geoff White of ACCSP explained that, to retain standardization between data collection programs throughout the eastern United States, that data fields remain largely static, to achieve the goals for numerous contributing partners. This is the rationale for modifying some of the existing data fields used in the logbook program.

Several committee members expressed concern that substantial changes to the program could create burden on commercial fishermen. The committee reviewed a spreadsheet detailing changes to program data fields. The committee suggested revising the spreadsheet to indicate which data fields would be

additions and which were modifications to existing reporting requirements, to better assess any potential inconveniences incurred on program participants.

A committee member stated that a previous pilot study to examine the utility of electronic submission in the commercial coastal logbook program in the Gulf of Mexico had been completed some time ago, but the results had not been published. He continued that any future study regarding electronic submission of commercial data needs to be published in a timelier manner.

Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff indicated that the final pilot program report had been published, and that report would be disseminated to the group. Mr. White also stated that electronic submission through eTRIPS had been vetted and used in the Northeast. Dr. Julie Brown, from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, added that, while eTRIPS was currently being proposed as a software reporting program, VESL could also be an option in the future. She continued that VESL would still transmit through ACCSP's database, and, therefore, the same modifications to the data fields would apply.

Council staff informed the committee that the council's Reef Fish and Coastal Migratory Pelagic Advisory Panels will be convened in the fall and presented an update on the proposed program modifications. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: The last part of that committee meeting was talking about the committees that would look at this commercial logbook program, and I had some thoughts about -- Do we need to convene probably the Red Snapper and Grouper-Tilefish APs, and possibly the Data Collection AP, but, specifically, our two IFQ user groups, because they are the ones that will be using the program?

I realize that we have commercial fishermen on the Reef Fish AP, but, since this is a commercial fishery issue, it would seem, to me, that you would convene those two APs that are going to be the most users of this program.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we had the IFQ AP on -- We knew the council wanted us to do that. I think what's not quite clear is the duplication of the reporting, because there are different reporting requirements

for the IFQ program, and so we need to work through that a little bit with the Regional Office staff, before we convene them, to better understand how this program will mesh with that program, but we do have that on our list of things to do, and we can add the Data Collection Committee as well. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any further items to come before the Data Collection Committee? Seeing none, we're going to move on through our agenda. Next up is Migratory Species and Dr. Frazer.

MIGRATORY SPECIES COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Migratory Species Committee report, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab M, Number 1, as written and approved the minutes, Tab M, Number 2, of the June 2021 meeting as written.

Presentations on Migratory Species Shark Assessment and Management Strategies, Tab M, Number 4(a) and 4(b) Dr. Enric Cortes, from the Southeast Fishery Science Center, provided a presentation on stock status, abundance trends, and fishery mortality trajectories for several managed shark stocks within the Gulf of Mexico.

Ms. Karyl Brewster-Geisz, Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Division, also presented an update on recent Atlantic shark fishery management measures. Dr Cortes stated that several shark stocks have trended sustainably, and others have exhibited modest increases in abundance Gulf-wide. Ms. Brewster-Geisz added that a report to Congress on dolphin and shark interactions had been finalized and would be disseminated to the council.

The presenters were asked why the number of directed and incidental commercial shark permits had declined in recent years. Ms. Brewster-Geisz provided several possible explanations for this observation, including economic feasibility, the implementation of fin bans in some states, and retention limits. The presenters were asked why the large coastal shark trip limit was increased from forty-five to fifty-five individuals. Ms. Brewster-Geisz responded that trip limits had been adjusted to increase the probability of harvesting the large coastal shark quota.

Further discussion focused on the perceived disconnect between shark stock assessment results and fishermen testimony indicating shark populations were rapidly increasing, resulting in occurrences of depredation. Dr. Cortes stated results of stock assessments lag several years, and it is likely fishermen are observing increases not captured by completed assessments.

Ms. Brewster-Geisz suggested that fishermen participate in studies and share information on fishing techniques that could mitigate depredation. Council staff suggested that staff from HMS participate on the Ecosystem Technical Committee, to provide insights in the development of a fishery ecosystem plan, and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center indicated staff resources would be available to that end.

A committee member inquired how NOAA Fisheries regionally managed species within the Gulf, east and west. Ms. Brewster-Geisz responded that some stocks are managed regionally, to achieve desired season lengths for various portions of the Gulf. These regional allocations are informed though public comment, scoping efforts, and historical landings.

Other Business, Dr. Greg Stunz provided an update on modification of 2022 North and South Atlantic swordfish quotas. This fishery is managed with a commercial carryover provision. A rule was recently published allowing for an extra seventy-five million metric tons of harvest available until the end of 2022. The quota will reset January 1, 2023. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, if we back up, before Other Business, where we were talking about the Ecosystem Technical Committee, and I have sent a motion to the council staff, and it pertains to where our council staff suggested that HMS participate in our ETC, and so, anyway, if staff could bring that motion up, please. I left part of it out, Bernie, but I will tell you the first part. I'm sorry.

 It should start with the motion to modify the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's SOPPs, Section 2.7.3, Ecosystem Technical Committee, as follows, and then the language that we would be changing is the Ecosystem Technical Committee consists of no more than twelve people. Membership includes two staff from NMFS, the Ecosystem SSC, three members, two Standing SSC representatives, one HMS staff member, and up to four other stakeholder representatives. Members are appointed jointly by the Executive Director and the Council Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs, if I understand your motion, the only

difference between what we currently have and what you're proposing is to add one HMS staff member.

3 4

MS. BOGGS: That is correct.

motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

5 6

2

7 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

46 47 48

45

MR. STRELCHECK: Just a technicality that that HMS staff member is a NMFS staff member as well, and so the two staff members you identify from NMFS would not preclude a third then NMFS staff member that's representing HMS, correct, and that's your intent?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So we have a motion. Is there a second to the

motion? It's seconded by Dr. Frazer. Any discussion on the

MS. BOGGS: Well, the intent is to have someone from HMS on this committee, in addition to what we currently have, and so, if we need to specify that it includes three staff from NMFS, of which one is HMS?

I mean, this might be fine, but, yes, I just MR. STRELCHECK: was clarifying that it wouldn't be one NMFS HMS staff member and one non-NMFS HMS staff member, and it would be two NMFS, plus an HMS staff member.

MS. BOGGS: That is correct, because I believe that's -- My understanding is what staff is looking for is to make sure we have an HMS representative on this committee.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: It's actually on something else, and so I will wait until the motion is --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Dr. Stunz and then Dr. Porch. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Back to the report, and I didn't catch this, Susan, but that last part about swordfish -- That's seventy-five metric tons and not million metric tons. Sorry. It doesn't have to do with the motions at-hand or anything we're talking about, but I just want to make sure, in that report, that that's clarified.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. Just for further clarification, what are you looking for in the HMS staff member? Are we talking about somebody from the HMS management group, or are we talking about somebody who is an HMS scientist?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was thinking scientist, and we have a lot of scientists from our Ecosystem Standing SSC, but we could certainly chat some more about it, but, you know, the idea is that we work on some of these shark interactions with our fisheries, through an FEI and a module, or however we end up working through this ecosystem fisheries plan, and we get some assistance with that, and so we can think about that a little bit more, if we have to identify that right now.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I'm not seeing any further discussion, and so is there any opposition -- Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. I mean, I would suggest, for clarity, changing the way that Susan talked about -- Meaning let's make it clear who the NMFS staff members are and that are you want one of them to be HMS, and so three NMFS staff members, because, when we look at this in a vacuum in the SOPPs, we want to know what you meant and not have to go back to the minutes and figure it out.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Okay, and so I will amend the motion. The Ecosystem Technical Committee consist of no more than -- Membership includes three staff from NMFS, one of which is an HMS scientist.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: HMS expertise, or however Dr. Porch thinks it best to put in there, or one from the HMS Division? How about that?

MS. BOGGS: It sounds good to me. One from the HMS Division, or "staff member", and does that work?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a little bit, I guess, concerned that we're calling out one specific expertise, but we're not considering calling out the others, for example protected species or habitat or something, and so is the presumption, Susan, that the other area is going to be taken as part of the Ecosystem SSC, and, if not, then why is HMS more important than they, from an ecosystem perspective?

48 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

1 2

 MS. BOGGS: Mr. Gill, I was just trying to help the staff get what they felt like they needed on this technical committee, as we talk about the ecosystem, and sharks have been such an issue in the Gulf, and I understand, or -- I mean, I understand why they would want someone there to talk with them about this. The intent is not to take anything away from the Ecosystem SSC, and then you have other representatives that we can choose for more of, and so I'm just trying to -- The council had mentioned, in the committee, that they would like to see this happen, and this is the only way that I knew we could help them with that, is the fact that we would have to change the SOPPs.

I suppose you could have left it, as Andy was pointing out, with two staff from NMFS, and then they would just have to say, hey, we want one from HMS, but this just kind of helps designate that they would like to see that as part of this committee.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead.

DR. LISA HOLLENSEAD: Mr. Gill, just a thought, and, for example, bringing in somebody from that HMS Division, and you had mentioned Habitat, for example, and so HMS species still have to have a designation for EFH, for example, and so somebody working at that division should have some knowledge that that's a requirement, whereas potentially those two other staff members from NMFS could also be somebody from the Habitat Division, or something like that, that has a better regional knowledge, maybe, than somebody from HMS.

 I think what staff is trying to do here is allow for the inclusion of a division that is, frankly, used to working through the Atlantic seaboard and in through the Gulf, to get their perspective on some things, and I think that's what we were trying to do with this group.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Any further discussion on the motion? All right. I'm going to read the motion in, and we're going to vote on it. Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: I don't -- I must have not put my hand down. Thank you. I don't have anything further.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: That's okay, Ms. Levy. So the motion is to modify the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's SOPPs, Section 2.7.3, Ecosystem Technical Committee, as follows: The Ecosystem Technical Committee consists of no more than twelve people. Membership includes three staff from National Marine

Fisheries Service, to include one from HMS Division, the Ecosystem SSC (three members), two Standing SSC representatives, and up to four other stakeholder representatives. Members are appointed jointly by the Executive Director and Council Chair. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? One in opposition, and the motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I believe my report is concluded, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Sorry, and I thought we had dispensed with that motion, but, going back to that last Other Business there, just to make sure that that's an extra seventy-five metric tons of harvest and not million metric. Whatever that number would come to, but it's not that much, and so I just wanted to make --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Got it. Thank you.

DR. STUNZ: I might have said that, but that's accurate in the report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Stunz, for that correction. All right. Seeing no further business -- Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to point out, again, that I think I understand that the shark species are managed east and west, regionally, and maybe it's a question, and maybe it's just a comment, but I don't believe we're managing cobia this way, or any migratory species, and so I will ask Andy why we can't do the same thing for migratory species, or am I not understanding this?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck, to that point?

MR. STRELCHECK: I can't speak to the specifics of shark management and why the decisions are made and what the science tells you and how that may or may not be applicable to us, and I would say that, in terms of regionalizing management for migratory, or even non-migratory, species, it needs to be based on the science and the impacts of fishing mortality in one area and the transit, or movement, of those fish to or from those areas to other areas, and we manage a lot of our stocks Gulfwide, simply because the genetics indicate they are Gulf-wide species, as well as the science-informed decision-making that indicates that that's appropriate, but it doesn't preclude us from pursuing regional management if the science tells us that

we could.

1 2

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. All right. Seeing no further business from the Migratory Species Committee, we're going to press on. Next up, we have the Education and Outreach Committee Report and Dr. Stunz.

OUTREACH AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Outreach and Education Committee report for August 22, 2022, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab O, Number 1, and approved the minutes of the January 2022 meeting with the correction of a typo, Tab O, Number 2.

Communications Plan to Promote Return of Shrimp Fleet Effort Data, Tab O, Number 4, staff presented the communication plan developed by the Outreach and Education Technical Committee during its August 2022 meeting to increase return rates for SD cards containing shrimp vessel position data, which are used to generate effort estimates for the shrimp industry.

The plan suggests using a combination of several outreach methods of increasing targeted mailings, increasing in-person interactions, and development and deployment of print and multimedia materials.

The committee suggested that NOAA Fisheries focus on methods to improve the fleet's compliance before it institutes punitive measures. The committee also suggested that, rather than focus on mail-out efforts, NOAA rely more on verbal communication with individual fishermen to enhance compliance. Southeast Fishery Science Center staff explained that the shrimping community is already accustomed to interacting with NOAA Fisheries via mail and has reservations that phone calls from the agency may not be well received.

The committee concurred that in-person interactions are most effective. However, since the shrimp fleet is at-sea for long periods of time, it's hard to guarantee such interactions. The committee further agreed that print and multimedia materials should point out that shrimp effort data has been, and will continue to be, used to preserve historical access to shrimping grounds when marine spatial issues, such as wind energy, aquaculture, and artificial reef areas are sited.

Staff will send a letter to NOAA Fisheries outlining the communications suggestions made by the Outreach and Education Technical Committee and the council, as well as offer support

and feedback during the development stage prior to the next mailing anticipated to occur in January 2023.

2 3 4

Draft Media Guidelines, Tab O, Number 5, staff reviewed a draft of the media guidelines that will be added to the larger suite of council communications guidelines. The guidelines outline the roles of staff and council members when responding to media inquiries on behalf of the council. The committee cautioned that, regardless of the intention of individual council members, the media may take what council members say and use it as it pleases.

Members of the council that also work for a state agency noted that their role is especially nuanced and that it's difficult to separate whether they are speaking as a council member or on behalf of their state and their role at that state agency. Finally, it was emphasized that council members should freely discuss opinions and consider different angles to each issue while deliberating at the council table.

 Remaining Items on the August 2022 Outreach and Education Technical Committee Report, Tab O, Number 6, the only remaining item from the Outreach and Education Technical Committee report was a presentation it received on the Return 'Em Right program, which is a project that aims to reduce release mortality due to barotrauma and encourage the best fishing practices to keep released fish alive. To date, 155 federally-permitted for-hire captains and 9,455 private recreational anglers have completed the learning module and received descending gear to reduce barotrauma mortality. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Stunz. Is there any further discussion on any items before the Education and Outreach Committee? Seeing none, we're going to move on down our agenda, and we're going to move right into the Reef Fish Committee report. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Hold on and let me get a printed copy, real quick, from the staff.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: If folks want to take a break -- We're ahead of schedule, and let's take a ten-minute break and get some coffee, and we'll come back at 9:15.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, everyone. We're going to go ahead and 48 kick off the Reef Fish report. Dr. Frazer, are you ready to go?

1 2

REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Reef Fish Committee report, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab B, Number 1, and the minutes from the June 2022 meeting were approved as written.

Review of Reef Fish, CMP, and IFQ Landings, Federal For-Hire Red Snapper Landings, and Status of Revised Recreational Red Snapper Calibration Ratios, Tab B, Numbers 4(a) through (d), Ms. Kelli O'Donnell, from NMFS Southeast Regional Office, reviewed preliminary 2021 and 2022 commercial and recreational reef fish and coastal migratory pelagics landings and those for reef fish managed in individual fishing quota, or IFQ, programs.

A committee member asked whether the landings data for greater amberjack would be available in time to reopen the recreational fishing season before the end of the calendar year. SERO replied that the recreational landings data through MRIP Wave 3 (May and June) are available. However, more critical to any reopening before the end of the year would be the data from Wave 4 (July and August), which not available until mid-October, and Wave 5 (September and October), which are not available until mid-December. SERO also noted that it may be possible to explore reopening the recreational fishing season for red grouper once the data from Wave 4 (July and August) are available.

A committee member asked about for-hire landings of red snapper in the first five months of the year, when federally-permitted for-hire vessels are not allowed to harvest red snapper. SERO said that those for-hire vessels are state-permitted, and not federally-permitted, headboats fishing in state waters.

Dr. Richard Cody, from the NOAA Office of Science and Technology (OST), briefed the committee on the proceedings of the MRIP Transition Team and to calibrate state surveys to the MRIP data currency. Dr. Cody recalled the February 2022 workshop to address the various differences and necessary improvements to the state recreational surveys for red snapper, which provided timelines for deliverables from the states and NOAA OST.

The intention was for red snapper (SEDAR 74) and the research needed to successfully complete an independent review of the final calibration methodology for the surveys to occur simultaneously, allowing the incorporation of the calibration ratio for the operational assessment, which is scheduled to

follow the research track and generate management advice.

Dr. Cody remarked that a goal of the transition team is to reconcile differences between the surveys, such that calibration options expand to include more sophisticated approaches that include composite estimation, which at present is not possible, due to large differences between the state and federal survey estimates. Dr. Cody added that he expects the finalized plan from the transition team to be made publicly available soon.

A committee member asked for clarification about the current status of the transition plan, which is essentially status quo with regard to the current calibration ratios for the state-specific red snapper annual catch limits, or ACLs. Dr. Cody confirmed this, but noted that the transition team and states continue to collaborate to work to find improvements to the calibrations and added that this work was ongoing and arduous.

Another committee member asked about the value added for the Council in receiving regular updates on the proceedings of the transition team. Dr. Cody replied that he thought it would be important to continue to communicate the progress being made back to the state directors and other interested parties and that the resolution of any communication shortfalls should be a priority for the transition team.

A committee member asked about the progress made by the transition team to incorporate edits to the transition plan provided by the state cooperators. Dr. Cody replied that he thought the transition team did a decent job of incorporating those edits.

Gulf and South Atlantic SSC Review and Recommendations for Southeastern U.S. Yellowtail Snapper -- Mr. Strelcheck.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Frazer, hold on a second. We have a question. Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: I wanted to go back to earlier in the report about the red snapper headboat landings, just for clarification, and I'm still trying to find the regulations, but recall, with sector separation, we have for-hire landings, which include landings from federal for-hire vessels, and then the private landings include private anglers, but also state for-hire vessels.

In this instance, we have some headboats in Texas that are federally-permitted during certain times of the year, but then

move their permit off the vessel and fish in state waters during other times of the year, and, based on the regulations, and, unfortunately, I need to find them, those landings would count toward the for-hire sector's portion of the quota, because they were federally-permitted at some point during the fishing year, and so that's why you're seeing the unusual landings in January and February on our reports.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: Mr. Strelcheck, I do have a question, because I thought it had been determined that, if you held a federal reef fish permit, you could not fish in both fisheries. I mean, you can fish state waters if federal waters are open, but you couldn't pull your permits. I mean, I thought this discussion was had a while back, that that would not be allowed, because it's like double-dipping.

 MR. STRELCHECK: Well, that's what I'm saying. It's not double-dipping, in the sense that it is going toward the for-hire portion of the quota at that point, but I see where you're coming from, in terms of they're able to fish both state and federal waters.

 MS. BOGGS: I bring this up because we had a captain in Orange Beach that came to me, because he was ticketed, because he was doing that very thing, and he was told that he can't -- You have to declare. It's kind of like in the Headboat Collaborative. You had to declare that you were either in or you were out, and, if that's not the case, and that may not be something for this council, but I would certainly like law enforcement to take a look at that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Okay. The Gulf and South Atlantic SSC Review and Recommendations for the Southeastern U.S. Yellowtail Snapper, Tab B, Number 5(a) through (c), Dr. Jim Nance, Chair of the Scientific and Statistical Committee, summarized the joint review of the SEDAR 64 interim analysis for southeastern U.S. yellowtail snapper by the Gulf and South Atlantic SSCs.

The SSCs found yellowtail snapper to be healthy and not experiencing overfishing, made catch limit recommendations, and provided guidance on the next stock assessment for yellowtail snapper, which is not likely to start until 2027. The SSCs determined that the interim analysis satisfied the prescribed terms of reference.

2 3

The SSCs recommended catch levels commensurate with a maximum sustainable yield proxy of the fishing mortality at a 30 percent spawning potential ratio for the overfishing limit and a P^* of 0.375 for the acceptable biological catch, using annual yields as outlined in the table below.

A Committee member expressed disappointment in the narrow buffers between the OFL and ABC and remarked that this characterization of scientific uncertainty was unreasonable, given the data. They thought that the SSC should have further considered scientific uncertainty and debated a larger buffer as a result. The committee member also thought that the constant catch scenarios should have been explored further.

Dr. Nance replied that since the SSCs' review was of an interim analysis, which only updated fishery-dependent landings data, that it was most appropriate to maintain the P* method that was used during the previous review of the SEDAR 64 stock assessment for determining the ABC from the OFL. Mr. Rindone.

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Thank you, and I just wanted to clarify why these right-most columns are still in this table, the 90 percent at 30 percent SPR and the 75 percent, and it's because, in the past, the South Atlantic Council has explored those for setting the ACL respective to the ABC, and I wanted you guys to have these values in front of you, because, as these discussions take place, agreeing on a total ACL for the stock that will then be allocated between the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils will be something that the councils will have to decide upon, and so that's why these values are left in there, because they will likely be talking about it again in the future.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks, Ryan, for pointing that out. All right, and so let's see where we are at. All right. Council staff reminded the committee that it had previously tabled Reef Fish Amendment 55, which is being developed concurrently with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council as Snapper Grouper Amendment 44, since the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils jointly manage yellowtail snapper.

This joint amendment could be restarted, and consideration given therein to the SSCs' updated catch advice. Upon review of the motions report, staff identified that the document was not tabled, as previously thought. Thus, a slight modification to the motion is suggested.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to, and this is the

modification, to resume work on Reef Fish Amendment 55 and include consideration of updated catch advice, as recommended by the Gulf and South Atlantic SSCs. The motion carried without opposition. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Review of State-Specific Private Angling Red Snapper Landings and Reef Fish Directed Effort, Tab B, Numbers 6(a) through (e), council representatives from the five Gulf States reviewed their 2022 private angling seasons for red snapper and compared them to their 2021 fishing seasons.

The states also characterized the fishing effort in their states specific to reef fish or offshore angling effort, as applicable, including available data on compliance with that state's licensing requirements. These enforcement data indicate better than 90 percent compliance, at present, with licensing regulations, and are expected to be included in future state-specific reports to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission on state licensing data beginning in 2023.

A committee member asked about the June private vessel landings in Florida and the uncertainty in those estimates, particularly for 2021, which showed more uncertainty about the June landings estimate compared to other years.

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) replied that FWC was working with MRIP on landings estimation and acknowledged greater uncertainty about the June 2021 estimated private vessel landings from Florida. SERO asked whether FWC would adjust the remaining days of its 2022 fishing season based on the estimated landings from July 2022, when available. FWC replied that it would monitor those landings and make any adjustments to the 2022 season, as appropriate.

A committee member asked about licensing for state and federally-permitted for-hire vessels and whether anglers had to have individual fishing licenses on those for-hire vessels. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department replied that individual anglers on for-hire vessels were required to be individually licensed.

A committee member asked when it would be possible to generate Gulf-wide estimates of landings. The Southeast Fisheries

Science Center replied that the states have varied survey programs for species like red snapper that are not currently directly comparable, and this is the impetus for the work between the states and the MRIP Transition Team and its calibration efforts. The state representatives expressed a willingness to present the same standardized data outputs for private angling landings of red snapper at council meetings in the future. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you. Just, I guess, a point of clarification on the end of the first paragraph, or the last sentence in the first paragraph, and, the way I read that, it indicates the states would be providing enforcement data related to compliance of licensing regulations and giving that to the commission, and I think it's just the actual licensing information, and so just we might need some clarification there.

MR. RINDONE: Yes, and that was how I had meant that to be understood, was that it was the licensing information, including the delineations for things like the state-specific permits for offshore angling or reef fish angling. As far as the enforcement side of it is concerned, we had a broader discussion about having some kind of a routine presentation of the private angling landings and whatnot, and perhaps the compliance part of that, with the licensing, maybe that's something we can do like once annually.

I personally don't believe that it's necessary to make that part of the routine, every council meeting, presentation, but maybe just like a once-a-year thing, and so, if you guys feel differently, I would like to hear what you think.

MR. ANSON: I understand, but I just -- Generally, the states provide the actual licenses that are sold, in like a table form and such, and so, again, I just -- I kind of read it as we would also be providing a breakdown, or a compliance report, relative to the enforcement checks that are conducted within each state, and I wasn't under the impression that we would be providing a compliance report, or data, in addition to the license information.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay.

4 DR. FRAZER: Dr. Sweetman might have his hand up, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Sweetman.

48 DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A point of clarification

for one of the sentences, as it relates to FWC, where it says that FWC replied that it would monitor those landings and make any adjustments to the 2022 season, as appropriate, and I don't believe that's exactly what I stated. I believe I said that we would continue to monitor our landings, but our current plan was to continue on with the season as announced. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Thank you. We will make that correction. Any other discussion? Seeing none, Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Okay. Public Hearing Draft Amendment 54: Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Catch Limits and Sector Allocations, and other Rebuilding Plan Modifications. Tab B, Number 7, council staff presented Public Hearing Draft Amendment 54 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan, which considers modifications to sector allocations and catch limits in response to the results of the SEDAR 70 stock assessment. Staff reviewed the components that may be included in an allocation review and identified their location in Amendment 54.

A committee member suggested that future amendments that consider reallocation should address the conversion from MRIP-CHTS units to MRIP-FES units separate from an action that addresses the sector allocation.

The committee discussed the catch limit and sector allocation alternatives presented in Action 1. Some committee members noted that the alternatives were based on a time series of historical landings for each sector and used to calculate percentages of landings harvested by each sector over representative time series.

The committee also discussed that the current allocation is based on a reference period from 1981 through 2004 that was established in 2008 and is presented as Alternative 3 in Action 1. Some committee members advocated for a longer time series being used to inform sector allocations, while others stated that a more recent time series was preferable, given the changes to the fishery over time.

NMFS staff reminded the committee that retaining the current sector allocation percentages would result in a de facto reallocation to the commercial sector. NMFS staff further clarified that sector-specific information on size selectivity and discard rates between sectors was incorporated in the catch advice and results in modest differences in the OFL and ABC among the alternatives in Action 1. With respect to the fishing mortality and the rebuilding timeline, the alternatives are

considered equivalent.

1 2 3

The Committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 3 the preferred. Alternative 3 is revise the allocation between the recreational and commercial sectors using MRIP-FES adjusted average landings during the years 1981 through 2004. The allocations for greater amberjack are 84 percent recreational and 16 percent commercial. Revise the OFL and ABC as recommended by the SSC based on SEDAR 70 (2020). Set the total stock ACL equal to the ABC. That motion carried nine to four with four abstentions. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So there was a lot of discussion, during Reef Fish, about recent data versus older data, and these years that have been chosen for this -- I believe, and I've done a lot of research, and my head is spinning, but, in 1993, because this includes 1981 to 2004, but, prior to 1993, was there not an issue with the identification of greater amberjack and lesser amberjack and banded rudderfish, in that they were all kind of lumped together, and so, if we're looking at data that's going to be more true to the amberjack species, would we not be better off to look at 1993 forward?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I reiterated a number of points in committee, and I'm not going to repeat those here. What I would ask is I think it would be beneficial for the council to discuss this alternative and the rationale, because I felt like there was very limited rationale during the committee discussion, in terms of why this was being selected as the preferred, with the primary rationale being this is the same time series that was used previously, and this is the conversion to MRIP-FES, but that's only one of many factors that we need to be discussing and considering, in terms of allocation, and so I would encourage the council to improve the justification for the recommended alternative.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Then, also, the 73/27 split didn't start until, I believe, 2013, and so it's like we're comparing apples to oranges, and I understand that historical data is good, but, to bring it even further, I think you look at 2013 forward, because those are the current -- That's the current allocation that

we're in now, and, again, it's just -- That's more, to me, comparing apples to apples, if you're going to start looking at the data. It's like we're picking and choosing what is going to be better for whatever user group is wanting to -- This is going to sound harsh, and I'm not pointing fingers, but, you know, we're -- We, and, when I say we, the charter fleet, the recreational anglers, the commercial anglers, all of us, we always try to pick and choose, and, well, if we do this, this is going to be better for me, but that's an injustice to this fishery that we're here to manage.

Again, you know, 1993, you have an issue prior to that with identification, and then the allocations went in, the current allocations, in 2013, and so that's my rationale for really not wanting to support this. I think we need to go back and look at some different alternatives, and I'm not prepared to make a motion, but I'm just trying to have discussion right now.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Froeschke.

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Just to clarify, the current allocation was put in place in Amendment 30A in 2008, and it's been 73/27 since then.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Froeschke. Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think I'm going to vote in opposition to this motion. FWC, ultimately, was in favor of Alternative 3 as the preferred, for many reasons that was voiced in public comment yesterday. I think sector reallocation should be done in a separate process in general, and, specific to greater amberjack, the council has done numerous management changes to the recreational sector, and none of it seems to have worked.

Alternative 3 here seeks to reallocate the maximum amount to the recreational sector, and so, while I've heard a lot of people saying that reallocation should be done in a separate process, ultimately, Alternative 3 is the most extreme of these reallocation scenarios.

I think, at the end of the day, FWC would probably be okay with Alternative 4, and the data used in Alternative 4 is certainly more recent than Alternative 3, and the amount we are reallocating is somewhat of a midway point between Alternative 3 and Alternative 2. Ultimately, our goal here is to try and rebuild this fishery, which the council has had a hard time doing, for many years, and I think Alternative 4 is more aligned

with that goal.

However, I would certainly like to hear more from the public on Amendment 54, and I have a question for staff. Do we have an update, as far as timing and location for the greater amberjack public hearings? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons, can you speak to that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so we are planning a public hearing in Galveston, Texas; Kenner, Louisiana; Orange Beach, Alabama; St. Pete/Madeira, Florida, and I don't think we have that one completely worked out yet; and Marathon, Florida. Then I think one to two virtual meetings, or just one virtual meeting, and then we're also going to put notices regarding providing comments on the Fishbrain app and Fish Rules app, and we have to get these done before the October council meeting, so you can take final action. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Simmons. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I've heard some comments, and so I'm to offer a substitute motion. That would be, in Action 1, to make Alternative 5 the preferred.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a substitute, in Action 1, to make Alternative 5 the preferred. It's seconded by Mr. Banks. Is there any discussion on the substitute motion? Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I will just briefly go over it, and Andy had brought some points up during Reef Fish, earlier in the week, and Susan has certainly made some comments here at that time, as well as today, but, you know, everybody talks about this as being a reallocation, and it's just an adjustment, based on data inputs.

The data inputs have changed, and portions of those between the recreational and the commercial have changed, based on the data, and Alternative 5 accounts for that a little bit more, as far as at least what the fishery is like currently today, based on management changes that have been made over the more recent time period. A 1993 start date kind of takes away some of those issues related to identification, and so that's my rationale for selecting this, for providing this as an option.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Anson. I have a few people. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Kevin, I hear you, and I'm not going to support it though. I still support the original Alternative 3, but I did want to comment related to that, what you just said, and also what C.J. mentioned a few minutes ago, and, later, in a few minutes, you're going to hear about separating the allocation from the actual conversions that you talked about a little bit, and we could do it here as well.

The only reason I didn't do it here is because we were far along, and we are close to going out to public comment, and I didn't want to slow this one down, and so I prefer the original motion here, but, in the future, I think we should separate that out, but not slow down what we have going on here, and, also, the reason I'm not too concerned here about either one of these motions is we are going out for preferred, and we are going to hear a lot of public comment, and we'll have an opportunity to do what Andy was mentioning about build the record around whatever motions are selected, or whatever alternatives are selected, and so there's still some time, but, at this point, I favor the original motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm still going to support the original motion, but I have two questions, and Dr. Stunz touched a little bit on it, and that is should we go through a full allocation document, is the first question, and the second question I think is for Ryan, and I think you mentioned something about the other alternatives beside 3, and he mentioned something about a de facto, and I wanted to see if he can touch on that a little bit.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Can you restate your question for Ryan, please?

MR. DUGAS: I don't recall exactly what you said, Ryan, but you touched a little bit on some of these alternatives would result in a de facto.

MR. RINDONE: Yes, and so, if we don't change the current allocation that was set using CHTS-equivalent data currency, then it results in a de facto reallocation to the commercial sector, because FES acknowledges a greater than previously calculated and estimated historical recreational catch and effort.

What it's saying is that, back in time, there were more recreational landings, with more recreational effort, under FES than what CHTS had estimated, and it's under CHTS that we have

made the current sector allocation, and so, if you keep the current one, it in fact gives additional fish -- It de facto reallocates to the commercial sector. If you guys applied -- What is it, and is it Alternative 2 or 3 that applies FES to the current years?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: 2.

 MR. RINDONE: 2, and so, Bernie, can you bring up Alternative 2, just to demonstrate it? Alternative 2 would maintain the 73 percent recreational and 27 percent commercial, and then it would apply -- Then it would use FES to monitor the stock, and so, if you scroll down then, Alternative 3 looks at it from 1981 to 2004, and, John, is this the years that were originally used?

All right, and so 1981 to 2004 is the time period that was originally used to determine the allocation under CHTS, and so, if you apply FES to this, you get a new allocation of 84 percent recreational and 16 percent commercial, and so what it is -- Essentially, it's an 11 percent shift in allocation, and so it's saying that 11 percent more should have been historically allocated to the recreational sector, if we had used FES back then, using the same time series as your reference period. Does that all make sense? If you use the -- If you retain the same time series that was used before, but apply FES, then you get Alternative 3.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas, in response to your first question, the council can decide how allocation issues are decided, and it's up to the council's purview. I will just make the point that, on this document, we're under a timeline, and so we were notified in January of this year, I believe it is, and so, anyway, we're under a timeline, and we have to get this document finished in fairly short order, but it's still the council purview on how to handle it, and so, moving on, Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: To exactly that point, and that's why -- In the future, of things to come, I'm going to recommend that we split this out, in the gag discussion coming up, but not doing it here, simply because we've got a fishery with a lot of issues, and we need to move this forward, and I don't -- You know, I didn't feel like we had time to really do all of that in this amendment, is why I thought it should go forward, and so, anyway, I just wanted to make sure I'm clear on that, so when it comes up later.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a substitute motion on the board. Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. Not directly to the motion, but, in terms of the discussion that's happening, I do want to point out that any decision, whether you keep the status quo allocations or you change the percentages based on just substituting in the FES data, there are allocation decisions.

You are changing the relative catch limits for each sector. One may be more aligning with what we know now the recreational sector has harvested, but it does have a real effect on the commercial sector, and so to characterize this as not an allocation is not correct, and the reason I'm emphasizing that is because there are certain legal requirements, in terms of allocating fishing overall harvest things, and we have to make sure that whatever you are recommending to the agency discusses those requirements and indicates how it complies, not only with National Standard 4, but, in particular, with greater amberjack and gag, you have the provision of the Act that says that, to the extent that rebuilding plans are necessary, and that reduce overall harvest in the fishery, that you have to allocate, taking into consideration the economic impact of the harvest restriction on the fishery participants in each sector.

You have to fairly and equitably distribute those among the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors, and so we really need to be, you know, thinking about how we are justifying, or explaining, the decision that you're going to make, and it also goes to Greg's point.

I mean, you can decide to separate them, but they're not really separate, and so, even if you were to prepare a document that did not have allocation alternatives, we are going to have to recognize that keeping the status quo percentage and just updating the numbers is a shift in allocation, and you are still going to have to explain how that's appropriate, given the legal standards. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you for that clarification, Ms. Levy. Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: I have a question, to make sure I understood. I agree, Greg, we need -- If we can, we need to separate allocation, because this is a very contentious issue, and it affects a lot of people in very different ways, and so, with that, I would like to offer a second substitute motion, and that is, in Action 1, to make Alternative 2 the preferred.

The rationale is, yes, it's de facto reallocating, but it leaves

the percentages the same until this council can effectively look at the numbers, you know, look at the year dates. I mean, I would really like to see 2008 to 2019, with the current 73/27 percent, because I think you need to look at what is it doing to what we currently have now, in FES, and then we look at reallocating, and so, to me, this is the cleanest way to do it. You keep your allocations the same, and that just, to me, makes more sense.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a second substitute motion. In Action 1, to make Alternative 2 the preferred. Is there a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Gill. Any discussion on the second substitute? Seeing no discussion, we're going to go ahead and vote.

16 MR. GILL: A roll call vote, please, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We'll have a roll call vote. Dr. 19 Simmons.

21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Shipp.

23 DR. SHIPP: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Banks.

31 MR. BANKS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dyskow.

39 MR. DYSKOW: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Strelcheck.

47 MR. STRELCHECK: Abstain.

```
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Ms. Boggs.
 1
 2
 3
    MS. BOGGS: Yes.
 4
 5
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. McDermott.
 6
7
    MR. MCDERMOTT: No.
 8
9
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Williamson.
10
11
    MR. WILLIAMSON: No.
12
13
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Broussard.
14
15
    MR. BROUSSARD: No.
16
17
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Geeslin.
18
19
    MR. GEESLIN: No.
20
21
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Burris.
22
23
    MR. RICK BURRIS: Yes.
24
25
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Sweetman.
26
27
    DR. SWEETMAN: Yes.
28
29
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Frazer.
30
31
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
32
33
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Gill.
34
35
    MR. GILL: Yes.
36
37
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: The motion failed six to nine with
38
    one abstention.
39
40
    CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so that brings us to the first
41
    substitute motion. Bernie, can you pull that up,
                                                              where
42
    everybody can see it, whenever you get finished with your
              The first substitute is, in Action 1, to make
43
    typing?
44
    Alternative 5 the preferred.
45
```

46 MR. GILL: I am going to ask for a roll call vote, Mr. Chairman. 47

48 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We'll do a roll call vote on this one. Dr.

Simmons. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Dr. Frazer. DR. FRAZER: No. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Anson.** MR. ANSON: Yes. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Burris.** MR. BURRIS: Yes. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Ms. Boggs. MS. BOGGS: No. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Dr. Sweetman. DR. SWEETMAN: Yes. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Geeslin.** MR. GEESLIN: No. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Gill.** MR. GILL: Yes. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Williamson.** MR. WILLIAMSON: No. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Dr. Stunz. DR. STUNZ: No. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Mr. Dyskow. MR. DYSKOW: No. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Banks.**

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. McDermott.

MR. BANKS: Yes.

MR. MCDERMOTT: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Shipp.

DR. SHIPP: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Broussard.

MR. BROUSSARD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Strelcheck.

13 MR. STRELCHECK: Abstain.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: The motion failed six to nine with one abstention.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. So we'll wait until the original motion gets back on the board. Is there any discussion on the original motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am going to go back to my comments earlier, and I think it's important that we have a discussion, either now or at the next meeting, for justification of this alternative, because I expect that it will pass, and some things that I think need to be discussed is the appropriateness of using this given the problems with species identification for the commercial sector in the early years, the utility of using an older versus newer time series, which is part of any allocation review, in terms of justification, and this also provides the lowest ABC and ACL to the fishery, and, from an economic standpoint, the lowest net economic benefit, and so, looking at the analysis, this is certainly not, in my view, the strongest alternative to be selecting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Something we haven't addressed, and we heard it in public testimony yesterday, and not just for amberjack, but I think we have to start looking at for every species, is the discards by sector, because I was looking at the last two SEDAR reports, and it's like 200 percent, and we need to get a handle on discards as well, and I will not support this motion.

```
2
    CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Any further discussion on the motion?
 3
    Mr. Gill.
 4
    MR. GILL: No discussion, Mr. Chairman, but I just request a
 5
 6
    roll call vote.
7
    CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We're ready to vote, and so we have a
8
9
    request for a roll call vote. Dr. Simmons.
10
11
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Boggs.
12
13
    MS. BOGGS: No.
14
15
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Burris.
16
17
    MR. BURRIS: No.
18
19
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dugas.
20
21
    MR. DUGAS: Yes.
22
```

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Abstain.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Frazer.

1 DR. FRAZER: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Broussard.

9 MR. BROUSSARD: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Williamson.

13 MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Shipp.

17 DR. SHIPP: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Sweetman.

21 DR. SWEETMAN: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. McDermott.

MR. MCDERMOTT: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: The motion failed seven to eight with one abstention. Two abstentions.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: The motion failed seven to eight with two abstentions. Okay, and so I think where this leaves us is we have the document without a preferred, and that is acceptable, but we're ready to go out to public hearing.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Okay. Please check your vote again. Ms. Boggs was a no, Mr. Burris was a no, Mr. Dugas was a yes, Mr. Gill was a no, Mr. Anson no, Mr. Banks no, Mr. Strelcheck abstained, Dr. Stunz yes, Geeslin yes, Dr. Frazer no, Mr. Dyskow yes, Broussard no, Williamson yes, Dr. Shipp yes, Dr Sweetman no, and Mr. McDermott yes. Is that correct?

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. The motion fails. At this point, we're going out to public hearing without a preferred. we will bring this amendment back up at the next meeting, after hearing public comments. Did you have a comment, Dr. Simmons?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, and, I mean, just because of the tight timeline we're under, I mean, we had planned to slate

this document for final action in October, and we're really hustling to get all these public hearings in, and virtual meetings, before October, so that we can try to meet the April 2023 deadline that the Regional Office sent us, which is to develop and implement a rebuilding plan in two years. I understand this is a difficult amendment, but we would really like to go out to public hearings with a preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I was thinking about muddying the waters, and I know it's complicated to do, but adding another alternative, but we would have to get the analysis back before we could even look at it as a preferred, and I don't know that it's a viable option, but I'm willing to throw it out there if --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Just, again, for clarification, I realize that we're going to scramble to get the public hearings in, and, if we go out without a preferred, it really kind of complicates things, because, in October, we would have to go final and make our preferred selection at that time, but I just -- As Carrie pointed out, and I think everybody needs to know that, but I do think this is a fairly contentious issue, and this in fact may be how we roll this one.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead, Ryan.

MR. RINDONE: Just to review the timeline with you guys, in April of 2021, the council received notification from the agency that amberjack was overfished and undergoing overfishing, which means, by April of 2023, we need to have implemented a revision to the rebuilding plan that ends overfishing and works to rebuild the stock, and so that would mean that going final at the October meeting is kind of the last chance to be on time for that, and, even then, it's going to require Andy's shop to go to pretty much wide-open throttle through the NEPA process immediately upon receipt of the transmittal from staff.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I am looking around the table. If anybody has got any thoughts, this is the time. If not, we're moving on.

MS. BOGGS: I mean, Ryan, if I offer another suggestion, how difficult would that be to get it in -- I mean, we wouldn't see it until October though, would we?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead, Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think Dr. Froeschke has his hand up too, but, if it's within the range, I think we could add it, perhaps, before we take it out to public hearings. If it's completely outside this range, we certainly need to put it on the table for discussion at this meeting, if you are continuing to take final action and consider it in October. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, let's go for it. I would like to make a motion to add an alternative to revise the allocation between the recreational and commercial sectors using MRIP-FES adjusted average landings during the years 2008 through 2019. The allocations for greater amberjack are 73 percent recreational and 27 percent commercial. Revise the OFL and ABC as recommended by the SSC, based on SEDAR 70 (2020). Set the total stock ACL equal to the ABC.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, just for our understanding, Ms. Boggs, is the difference there the years, the time period, and is that the difference, is the time period?

 MS. BOGGS: Right, and so now we're using a time period after we were better identifying the jacks that is within the current allocation of 73 percent/27 percent went into effect, and that's using the most recent data.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Would we have to ask the Science Center to rerun the projections for this?

 MR. RINDONE: So potentially, but we're going to have to double-check the percentages based on the time series. We might need just a couple of minutes, Mr. Chair. We can discern the percentages here, but we can't discern the yields. We need the Science Center to rerun the projections, based on those allocation percentages, in order to get the yields.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: I can dig up the numbers. I mean, just in general, while I'm doing that, it might be worth having the discussion that this entire period was within the timeframe

where you have an established allocation, and the IFQ and things, and, in other documents, we haven't gone that route, for those reasons. I mean, essentially, what you would expect is that, since you have an allocation in place during that entire period, you would just reinforce the allocation that you already have.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I do believe this would cause quite a bit more workload, should this motion pass, and we can try to accommodate it as best as possible before it goes out to public hearings, but I do believe this would trigger us going back to the Science Center with yield stream projections, and then the SSC, and then integration into the document, but I'm looking at Dr. Froeschke to make sure I'm understanding that correctly.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I may have overcomplicated it, and would it be easier if I just say to maintain the sector allocations, and then we use those years, and we take out the revise, because, the allocations, you're not really revising them, and I didn't think about that, and I was doing this on the fly, but, if I did maintain the sector allocations of 73 percent recreational and 27 percent commercial, and using landings during the years 2008 to 2019, does that make it more -- I mean, like I said, I was doing this on the fly and just trying to -- The intent of this motion is to keep the allocations the way they are, but look at the most recent data, which, again, 2008 is when the allocations went into effect, and it's after we got the identification of the jacks, but then you're looking at more recent years, and you're not taking --

 I mean, to me, that just made more sense, and maybe I didn't propose the motion correctly, and so I would certainly take some help from staff, but that was the intent of what I was trying to do here, and to use the OFL and ABC as recommended by the SSC. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so I have Dr. Froeschke, and then we're going to have Mr. Strelcheck, Mr. Rindone, and Mr. Gill.

DR. FROESCHKE: So we're going to pull up the numbers and make the calculation, for everyone's information, but, in general, this is what I would expect, and so, that time period, you have a 73/27 allocation, based on CHTS, and so, assuming that both

fisheries were constrained to their ACLs, that's about what you would expect.

2 3 4

5

6 7

8 9

When you convert those CHTS landings to FES, as we've done in the assessment, now those landings are going to have that increased catch rate, and so I would expect that you would get something more akin to the 84/16, because that's the approach that was used in Alternative 3, and so I don't think that -- I think, if we did that, it's not going to be the 73/27. 73/27, you could just select Alternative 2 as the preferred, but we'll get the calculations for you here momentarily.

11 12 13

10

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

14 15

MS. BOGGS: Mr. Chair, with that, I would like to withdraw my motion.

16 17 18

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so Ms. Boggs wants to withdraw her motion. Mr. Anson.

19 20 21

MR. ANSON: In light of the timeline that we're under, and with the issue of sending it out to the public, to public hearings, I quess I will offer Alternative 4 as the preferred.

23 24 25

26 27

28

29

22

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I have a motion from Mr. Anson to offer Alternative 4 as the preferred. Is there a second to that It's seconded by Mr. Banks. We'll wait a minute, while that motion gets on the board, so everybody can see what those percentages are. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Anson, can you provide some rationale?

30 31 32

33 34 MR. ANSON: The rationale would be the issue of the potential misidentification, and so you're taking 1993 forward, and that would be, I quess, the benefit, compared to what we currently have for the 73/27.

35 36 37

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Anson. Any further discussion on the motion? All right. Seeing no further discussion, Mr. Gill.

38 39

40 MR. GILL: Request a roll call vote, Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: A roll call. Dr. Simmons. 43

44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Dyskow.

45

46 MR. DYSKOW: No.

47

48 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Gill.

1		
2 3	MR. GILL: Yes.	
3 4 5	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Broussard.
6 7	MR. BROUSSARD: Yes.	
8 9	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Burris.
10 11	MR. BURRIS: Yes.	
12 13	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Geeslin.
14 15	MR. GEESLIN: No.	
16 17	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Dr. Frazer.
18 19	DR. FRAZER: Yes.	
20 21	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Dr. Shipp.
22 23	DR. SHIPP: No.	
24 25	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Williamson.
26 27	MR. WILLIAMSON: No.	
28 29	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Banks.
30 31	MR. BANKS: Yes.	
32 33	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. McDermott.
34 35	MR. MCDERMOTT: No.	
36 37	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Dr. Stunz.
38 39	DR. STUNZ: No.	
40	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Anson.
41 42 43	MR. ANSON: Yes.	
43 44 45	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Strelcheck.
	MR. STRELCHECK: Abstain.	
	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Ms. Boggs.
		159

MS. BOGGS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dugas.

10 MR. DUGAS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: The motion failed seven to eight with two abstentions.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: Dr. Lasseter just looked at the calculations for the motion that Ms. Boggs was discussing, and so the recreational would be 83.2 percent, and the commercial would be 16.8 percent, based on the 2008 through 2019 time series.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Froeschke. Okay. So we've kind of been through everything, and it appears, to me, that we're going out to public hearing without a preferred, and so we will go out to public hearing, and we'll hear what the public has to say, and we'll take their input into consideration, and, at the next meeting, we will do our best to pick a preferred for this document, and so, seeing no further discussion, Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: The committee discussed the alternatives in Action 2, which sets sector-specific annual catch targets, or ACTs. The committee agreed that setting conservative buffers to account for additional management uncertainty was warranted for greater amberjack.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2, to make Alternative 3 the preferred. Alternative 3 is apply the ACL/ACT Control Rule for the years 2016 through 2019 to revise the buffer between the ACL and ACT for each sector. The recreational buffer is 17 percent, and the commercial buffer is 7 percent. The motion carried without opposition. Mr. Chair.

43 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a committee motion. Is 44 there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is 45 there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the 46 motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Council staff will take the document out to public

hearings and will notice for final action at the next council meeting in October 2022. A committee member noted that the emergency rule is effective for 180 days and recommended revisiting current management measures that may be necessary to constrain landings to the future catch levels.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to begin development of a framework action for greater amberjack to modify commercial and recreational management measures. That motion carried without opposition. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries with zero in opposition. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: We talked, in committee, about possibly addition direction to staff on the framework action, and there was several ideas mentioned, and we heard some comments during public testimony, and so I was curious if there's any other input from the council that you would like to provide the planning team for the development of the framework action.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Any guidance in regard to the framework action from the council? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I don't know if this applies to this, and I didn't bring it up at committee, and this is just a generality, actually, with FES, and I have an issue with like what we just discussed, because you are de facto reallocating, and, somehow, I would like to have some conversation, and I don't know if it's with the Science Center or OST or who it might be, but my intent with amberjack was to try to -- Because of the socioeconomic impacts, more specifically to the commercial sector, with amberjack, it seems, to me, like we would look at ways where we can incorporate the FES, but leave the commercial alone, and my point is we know how many fish the commercial sector is catching.

We know that, on average, they caught 453,813 pounds of fish, and that number doesn't change. The number that is changing is the number for the recreational and charter fleet, because their numbers are changing because of the way that we're — The data is changing, the way we're collecting the data, the way we're manipulating the data and looking at the data, and it seems, to me, like there would be a way that, yes, maybe if we look at a full-blown reallocation, and we look at it and we say, okay, well, this is what they caught, and leave them alone, or give

them a percentage, but, here, we're taking almost a third, or two-thirds, of what they catch away, and their numbers are known numbers, and it's just -- That's why the charter fleet is trying to go to the data collection system and we're working so hard.

I know that the states are working through the state management, and everybody is trying to get their data, but, until we do, it seems -- It's hard for me to penalize the sector that has been complying, or has been collecting, is the more better appropriate way to say that, and we know what they catch, and I don't know how we make that mesh, but it seems like they're getting penalized, and I'm not saying that there might not be some adjustments, and don't get me wrong, but I think there needs to be a better way that we look at this. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I am not speaking to any specific sector when I make these comments, but what we basically had with red grouper, and gag, and amberjack is we got -- Our ACLs are declining, and so it's not possible for any sector to maintain where they're at, and what the council is left with is trying to pick the best of a lot of bad choices, and I think that's where we have a lot of struggle around the table, is there really are no good choices.

The stocks are in decline, and every sector in amberjack is forced to take the hit, because the ACLs are being reduced so drastically, and so there's just no way around that, and so, Ms. Boggs, to that point.

MS. BOGGS: Right, and, to that point, it's like with vermilion snapper, and we had an eightfold increase with FES on the recreational side, and that's just asinine, in my mind, and that's my point. I understand the decline, and that's why I'm saying, yes, we may need to look at declining the commercial sector too, but they're the ones that are taking the brunt of this hit, and, actually, the recreational side is, in essence, kind of gaining fish, which seems really, pardon the express, bass-ackwards, because, I mean, it just -- Those are just my comments, and thank you for taking the time to listen.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: Just to follow-up a little bit on the comments, when we went through this document, if you look in the text in Chapter 2, Action 1, the FES equivalent of the total ACL is 2.93 million pounds. The 2023 values for the total ACL, depending on the allocations and things, but you're talking around 600,000 pounds, 650,000, something like that, and so, if you calculate

that, you're looking at about an 80 percent decrease across-the-board, and so, I mean, both sectors are -- Depending on how you do that, but, I mean, are anticipating major reductions.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you for clarifying that for us, Dr. Froeschke. We appreciate it. Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we go back and forth, round and round, because of allocations, apparently, and, the more I learn, sitting at this table, and I keep saying this, and it doesn't matter if you're recreational or commercial, but the western Gulf biomass is much stronger than the eastern Gulf, and I think we need to start thinking about that, and I'm not trying to be rude, or look down at our friends to the east, but we need to start preparing for that. To me, if we would take that path, things would be easier for us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Well, to that point, I would agree with J.D. in that regard, and so I sent a motion to staff, and I was going to make it at the end of Reef Fish, but I guess this is the time, based on the discussion and the comments, and so if staff could bring that motion up, please.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Would you like to read your motion into the record, Mr. Banks?

MR. BANKS: So my motion would be to instruct staff to begin a scoping document that will explore state management for greater amberjack for the recreational sector. If I get a second, I can give you some rationale.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Just for a point of clarification, the motion on the board is worded slightly different than the way you phrased your motion, and so I want to make sure that we get it correct before I ask for a second. You mentioned a scoping document, and the motion on the board doesn't have that language in it.

MR. BANKS: To direct staff to begin a scoping document that will explore state management of greater amberjack for the recreational sector.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Thank you, Mr. Banks. Is that the way you would like it?

47 MR. BANKS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. It's seconded by Mr. Burris. Can you give us some rationale, Mr. Banks?

MR. BANKS: Sure. To some of the points that J.D. just made, that we feel like, in Louisiana, we've got some good biomass of these fish, and we don't see the issues oftentimes, and not just with greater amberjack, but with a lot of situations, that we do in other parts of the Gulf, and it just seems to make sense that amberjack is a good option to explore for state management.

 The reason why I chose to do a scoping document is because that helps us at least look at a problem, take some of this information out to the public, and get some feedback on things like is sector separation needed to move this forward or not, and so I think it will -- The scoping document process will bring us back some information, bring us back some ideas from the public, and help us further develop the idea into an actual amendment.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Banks. Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Patrick, would it be a good idea to add other species to your motion, so we don't have to go through this over and over, because we're going to have the same discussion on some other species.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Banks.

 MR. BANKS: Well, to that point, it's a valid point, Mr. Dyskow, and I actually considered that. I considered throwing triggerfish in there as well, but triggerfish -- We have such a small amount of fish to deal with in triggerfish that I just didn't feel like it was worth that lift, and to complicate things at this time, and that was my rationale for not including other species.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so I've got a couple of people on the list. Mr. Dugas.

 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, by accomplishing something like this, I just want to point out that this would help the eastern Gulf, the fishermen in the eastern Gulf, that want to move their season back to January, and us folks in the western Gulf, that prefer it in the summer months, and this is a perfect example, and it would help everyone. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Dugas. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Patrick, I support your motion, and I've certainly been saying, around this council for a long time, that amberjack is the poster-child for regional management, for a variety of reasons, as you guys just pointed out, but I also wanted just to remind the council that there is an amberjack count study going on that I certainly hope we all are aware of.

It's not getting the attention, obviously, that the snapper count did, for various reasons, and Dr. Powers is leading that, but I just wanted to say that will play into this as well, because we'll start getting a lot more data, particularly as it's regionally-based and that sort of thing, and so it's a while -- Of course, it would take us a while to get through this process, but, at about the same time, I think you'll start having information that will help develop a regional plan.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: A point of order. I mean, I certainly think I would support at least investigation of this topic, but didn't we already have a motion on the board that we were discussing? I think this kind of deviates from the previous motion that we didn't dispense of.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I believe you already voted on that motion. Mr. Chair, is that -- Bernie, did we vote on the other framework action for greater amberjack for the commercial and recreational management measures? Yes. Okay.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Is there further discussion for the motion that's on the board? Seeing none, I'm going to ask for a show of hands. I'm going to read the motion into the record, and then we'll vote. Direct staff to begin a scoping document that will explore state management for greater amberjack for the recreational sector. I'm going to ask for a show of hands. All in favor of the motion, please signify by raising your hand. C.J.

DR. SWEETMAN: I'm a yes.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. **The motion carries sixteen to zero.** Ms. 42 Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I would like to make a motion to direct staff to begin a scoping document to explore sector separation for the charter/for-hire fleet for greater amberjack, triggerfish, gag grouper, and red grouper and vermilion snapper.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We have a motion, and we'll wait until it gets a little bigger, where I can actually read it. All right. Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Just a point of clarification for vermilion snapper. We do not have a sector allocation for vermilion snapper, and so we would need to establish a sector allocation and then establish, after that --

MS. BOGGS: That's fine. Remove vermilion snapper. I mean, I just -- Look, if we're going down this path, let's get going.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so you're asking to remove vermilion. Okay. It's been removed, and so the motion is to direct staff to begin a scoping document for sector separation for the charter/for-hire fleet for greater amberjack, triggerfish, gag grouper, and red grouper. Is there a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Strelcheck. Is there discussion? Well, Ms. Boggs, can you provide some rationale?

MS. BOGGS: Do you really want me to?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Absolutely.

MS. BOGGS: Well, you know, we go around this table, and everybody is pointing fingers, and they want this, and they want that, and, you know, we're like children sitting around this table. Four or five years ago, we had a proven plan for the headboat fleet, and we went through a two-year pilot program, and it was exemplary, and this council was like, nope, we can't do that, and then we come to red snapper, and we've got to have our red snapper for the states, and so we give the states the red snapper, and then we give the states -- Now it looks like we're going to give them amberjack.

The charter/for-hire fleet has worked -- They worked for, what, eight years to get electronic logbooks, and they have done everything they can to help out, in my opinion, the recreational sector, and they're saying take us out, and you all go do whatever you want with the rest. We have the track record, and we've always been good stewards of the fish, and they have asked for this before, but this council, they don't -- This council is so divided, and, no, it's not so divided, but it's so one-sided now.

It seems to me like it's very biased, and so, if we can do this for the states, why can't we do this for the charter fleet? Yes, I went a step further, Patrick, and I went ahead and

included all the species, because we're having a problem with all of these species, but I want to go one step further.

2 3 4

Everybody talks about they don't like catch shares, and everybody that fishes is in a catch share. If you go buy your fishing license, you get to catch two red snapper during the red snapper season, and you get to catch one amberjack during the amberjack season, and you get to catch one triggerfish, on the days that triggerfish are open, and you're in a catch share, whether you like it or not, and everybody that fishes is in a catch share, and so we need to get past that, just like we need to get past the recreational fishermen and their allocations and their catches.

 We're in a catch share, and I don't care how you look at it, and we're in a catch share, but it seems like, if you're going to do this for the states, you would give the courtesy for the charter fleet to explore it for themselves as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR STRELCHECK: So I want to first say that I appreciate Ms. Boggs' passion on this, and I saw reluctance to second the motion, and I seconded the motion, and I agree with a lot of what Ms. Boggs says, and I think this is, right now, a very divided council, and we're struggling to compromise.

We have a lot of challenges before us, and we need some innovative solutions, and we need to be looking at things that either have worked in the past, and I view red snapper sector separation as something has that worked, and something that is reasonable to explore, as well as a lot of new, different, innovative tools beyond what's been put on the board with the last couple of motions, and so I certainly encourage the council to explore this.

 This is just a scoping document, and this is information for us to consider, and ultimately bring back to us for consideration, as we look for those innovative tools to help manage the problems we're having in our fisheries. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a question, and does this include headboats?

MS. BOGGS: Well, since this council doesn't seem to want to

approve Amendment 42, then I would say, yes, ma'am.

2 3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think we're okay, now that we understand that's included. I guess my only other comment was we are going to really have to think out of the box to look at this, because we have a historical landings time series issue with our units right now, and greater amberjack is in FES, and we just got a stock assessment. Gray triggerfish is in CHTS. Gag grouper, I believe, is now going to go forth in the State Reef Fish Survey, and red grouper is in FES, and so we're going to have to look at a different process, perhaps, of trying to come up with potential sector separation for these species, based on the ongoing issues with the units that we have for these species of measure in the recreational sector.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Any further discussion? Mr. Dugas.

majority of the anglers in the State of Louisiana would not be

in support of this, and I feel that I am going to have to vote

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Any further discussion? Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Well, I certainly agree with what J.D. just said,

that we've heard, time and time again, from our charter fleet

that they don't want to be separated. However, I'm going to support this motion, simply because it is just a scoping

document, and it will explore some of these possibilities for

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I am not seeing any other hands for

comments or questions or discussion. A roll call vote.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Banks.

14 15

16

17

20

18 19

MS. BOGGS: Would you like me to make four separate motions?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

no against this motion. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's my belief that the

(Mr. Banks' response is not audible on the

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: No, ma'am. I'm just bringing it

21 up.

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31 32

33 34 35

36 37 38

39 40

> 41 42 43

> 44

45

46 47

48 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Anson.**

us. Thanks.

MR. BANKS:

recording.)

Simmons.

1		
2	MR. ANSON: Yes.	
3	100	
4	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Geeslin.
5		
6	MR. GEESLIN: Yes.	
7		
8	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Dr. Shipp.
9		
10	DR. SHIPP: Yes.	
11 12	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr Burris
13	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS.	MI. Dullis.
14	MR. BURRIS: Yes.	
15	100.	
16	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Williamson.
17		
18	MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes.	
19		
20	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Dr. Sweetman.
21		
22	DR. SWEETMAN: No.	
23	EVECUMENT DIDECTOR CIMONS.	D. E
24 25	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Dr. Frazer.
26	DR. FRAZER: Yes.	
27	DI. FIRADIN. 105.	
28	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Dugas.
29		
30	MR. DUGAS: No.	
31		
32	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Dr. Stunz.
33		
34	DR. STUNZ: No.	
35		M D 1
36 37	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Broussard.
38	MR. BROUSSARD: Yes.	
39	FIR. BROUSSARD. 165.	
40	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. McDermott.
41		111, 110201
42	MR. MCDERMOTT: No.	
43		
44	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Strelcheck.
45		
46	MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.	
47		M 0'13
48	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:	Mr. Gill.
		169

MR. GILL: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Ms. Boggs.

6 MS. BOGGS: Absolutely.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Eleven to five, the motion carried, with one abstention, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Simmons. All right. Looking around, I'm not seeing any hands up, and I'm not hearing any discussion. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: It's looking like some of our council members might need to use the facilities. Would you consider a five-minute break for that purpose, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Yes, I would, and so it's 10:37. Let's take a short break, and let's come back at 10:45. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we're going to start back up with the Reef Fish Committee report, where we left off. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We'll pick up on page 5, Final Action on Modification of Catch Limits for Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper, Tab B, Numbers 8(a) through (c), council staff reviewed the options in the draft framework action to modify catch limits for red snapper, following the review of an updated catch analysis by the council's SSC.

 The council transmitted two previous framework actions, one to revise red snapper catch limits and one to calibrate catch limits for Gulf state survey quota monitoring. These framework actions are currently in the end of the public comment period prior to rulemaking. If this draft framework action is ultimately implemented, its proposed regulations would take the place of those previously submitted by the council but not yet implemented.

Council staff also reviewed public comments received, and SERO staff reviewed the codified text of the proposed regulations.

The council's current preferred alternative would use the SSC's OFL and ABC recommendations of 18.91 million pounds whole weight and 16.31 million pounds whole weight, respectively, set the total stock ACL equal to the ABC, and retain all existing sector allocations and sector-specific ACL and ACT percentages.

Committee members discussed differences in observations of red snapper abundance and catch per unit effort off their respective states. A committee member noted that the absolute abundance surveys recognized a larger biomass of red snapper throughout the Gulf, particularly on uncharacterized bottom, or UCB. They asked about the sorts of measures that should be considered to account for reports of smaller length compositions of recent landings and also noted concerns regarding localized depletion.

The committee member thought it was prudent to consider metrics for evaluating red snapper and other fisheries, moving forward, to better understand the effects of management changes on these stocks. Another committee member asked whether it was appropriate for the council to identify such metrics, proffering the SSC as the body to identify the appropriate indicators to monitor. Other committee members agreed.

A committee member pointed to the conversion of the 85.6 million age-two-and-older red snapper from the analysis reviewed by the SSC, which is equivalent to over 600 million pounds whole weight of red snapper, based on recent estimates of average weights from the commercial and recreational fleets, relative to the council's current preferred alternative that would set the total ACL at 16.31 million pounds whole weight, with the ACL equal to the ABC.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center added that most of the red snapper stock exists over uncharacterized bottom and that red snapper demonstrate strong site fidelity, meaning that the fish do not rapidly replenish distant reefs that may have been subject to heavy fishing pressure.

A committee member stated that the absolute abundance studies were snapshots in time and that it would be important to understand how those estimates may change with time. They further posed questions about connectivity between nearshore and offshore areas, assumptions about stock productivity, and possible changes to stock status determination criteria based on the new data.

A committee member noted that the Department of Commerce has not yet implemented the proposed calibration ratios and asked

whether it was appropriate to apply those within this framework action. Council and Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff noted that the calibration ratios previously submitted to the Department of Commerce are already recognized as being consistent with the best scientific information available, or BSIA, and as such, are necessary to include in this framework action with respect to their effects on the state-specific ACLs for private anglers.

Not doing so would mean that the proposed catch limits in this framework action would not be consistent with BSIA. If new data result in future revisions to those calibration ratios, then the council can initiate work on a new framework action to update those calibration ratios.

 A committee member asked whether it would be prudent to delay action on this framework action to update the ACLs until the Secretary of Commerce decides on the previously-submitted framework action on calibration ratios. SERO proposed modifying the language used in describing the effects of the calibration ratios to denote those calibrations as proposed and pending implementation.

A committee member asked about the timeline for implementation of proposed regulations. SERO noted the language in the calibrations framework action that recommends implementation of those calibrations to the catch limits on January 1, 2023, and adding that the calibration framework action would be submitted for implementation in time to meet that January 1, 2023, implementation date.

 The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend the council approve the Framework Action: Modification of Catch Limits for Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried without opposition. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I came to this meeting, my thoughts were that I would concur with the increase. What surprised me was the volume and the spatial extent of the testimony yesterday, and, incorporated with the storm clouds on

the horizon of red snapper, it gave me pause.

The other aspect that plays here, in my mind, is that the commercial and charter sector are concerned about localized depletion, and apparently the recreational sector doesn't see that problem as strongly, and that might be the small number of fish in the recreational sector versus the large number of fish on the commercial sector, but, albeit not relative to the assessment, but this smacks of the red grouper problem, that what we might be looking at here is we're all over the curve, headed down, and we're getting into the red grouper situation, and so I'm going to oppose this motion, and I request a roll call vote, when we do.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so this requires a roll call vote. Any further discussion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks for the comments, Bob, and I'm still figuring out how I'm going to vote for this, but, from my standpoint, what we heard yesterday was very concerning, and I realize it's a subset of our constituents and fleet, but it was a fairly strong, consistent voice, and I recognize that there is potentially areas in the Gulf that are doing much better than others and that there are areas where localized depletion is occurring.

I go back to my comments about evaluating the success, or lack thereof, of management actions and having metrics that we can be looking at beyond what we'll get in the future, in terms of stock assessments, and I think we need to keep that in mind and work with the SSC on those metrics, going forward, regardless of how this vote comes out.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. I've got Dr. Stunz and then Mr. Anson.

DR. STUNZ: Bob, I hear both you and Andy, but I still support this motion that we move forward with the increase. I mean, we heard that, but, also, you know, we've got to rely on, you know, the best science available, given all the things that are input into the SSC and other measures that we use to generate our science, if there's evidence clearly that the fish are there to support this increase, and so I support this motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: That's essentially what I was going to say, is that, you know, this has gone through rather exhaustive review by the

SSC, and the Great Red Snapper Count information has helped kind of allay any of the concerns that they may have had, relative to the increase, and so I will be in support of the motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Greg. I agree, and that's where I started from, that it's the best science available, and the increase isn't all that much, but then it comes down to we always have this lag from the science, versus where we are today, and we can't answer that question, right, but we just went through this on red grouper, and so I'm thinking that caution is warranted, and that's why I'm going to not support the motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: To that point, Dr. Stunz?

DR. STUNZ: Yes, to that point, Bob, and I certainly agree that caution is warranted too, especially seeing and hearing what we've been seeing, even in this meeting, but I also think that the fishery can handle it, even if this overage -- We're going to be getting those reports over and over again, and, if that is consistent, then, you know, that might change our minds to do something, but, right now, I think that it certainly can handle that.

 I also am a little concerned about the way the dynamics of the fishery might have happened this year, and we're talking about very expensive fuel, and there's probably a lot more fishing effort nearshore, where clearly you can have these patterns that we're seeing happening that may not happen in other years, and so, just beyond simple catch rates, there's a lot of dynamics going on, and I still think this is an opportunity to increase access to this fishery by increasing the catch limit.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Anson and then Mr. Williamson.

 MR. ANSON: Speaking to those dynamics, besides fuel costs, at least in Alabama, those trips, and that effort, and the comments related to localized depletion are more associated with the artificial structures off of Alabama, and most of the fish from the Great Red Snapper Count are associated, in the eastern Gulf, with the uncharacterized bottom, and so they're kind of insulated from effort, or catch, and so the people are just going to those areas where the fish are concentrated, and that's where they're seeing the greatest reduction.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON: You know, we're charged with using the best available science, but you can't disregard the number of people that stood up here yesterday and said we don't want an increase, because we're seeing the stock diminishing. Those were, you the majority of them, commercial quys, commercial fishermen, but there was a fair number of recreational folks who stood up and said they were seeing a lot of fish, and you can't disregard their testimony either.

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2

5

6

7

8

I guess we put some of this in our back pocket and see how it turns out, and maybe anecdotal evidence should be factored into some of our decisions, and I agree that there is a gap between science and what we come up with, and hopefully we have an interim analysis coming out pretty soon that will answer some of these questions, and I'm going to vote in favor of it, for the motion, but I was really impressed by the public comment yesterday. That's all I have.

18 19 20

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Porch.

21 22

23

24 25

I just wanted to remind the council that certainly DR. PORCH: some members of the SSC had reservations about that, because it is the largest quota we've ever had, and, just looking at the history of the fishery, and the fact that, at one time, I think, by everybody's standards, it was pretty heavily depleted.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35 36

37

Having said that, raising the quota for one year is not likely to collapse the stock. I mean, it could be that it continues to decline, but we're also continuing our fishery-independent surveys, both visual surveys that have been expanded partnership with states and also our longline survey that occurs over the uncharacterized bottom, and so we can easily update that, and, in fact, we have a survey out now, and so we can update that in time for -- Well, right after the fishing season is -- The next year's fishing season is prosecuted, and then we can tell you what the status of the stock is from that. Then we have the assessment coming on the heels of that.

38 39 40

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Rindone.

41 42

43 44 45 MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to provide a point of clarification that, when the council passes catch limits, the last year of catch limits that are included in that -- Those are in effect until changed by future management action, and so this wouldn't be for one year. This would be until changed.

47 48

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

1 2 3

MS. BOGGS: So, yes, I believe, yesterday, we heard from forty commercial/charter/for-hire, and I recall two private recreational anglers, and maybe two or three lobbying groups, the CCA and ASA, and they all stick out in my mind, but, in my mind, this is a chance for the council to be a little proactive.

I understand that we're supposed to give, or provide, the best socioeconomic benefits, and that's one of our charges, but, at the same time, when you have that many people that come to the podium and say, hey, this isn't looking good, and we need to do something, that seems to be like saying maybe we need to hold back on this increase, and maybe we don't need to just jump in there just yet, and see what it does next year.

I have said this before, and I don't know if I've said it at the council table, but, I mean, this council is reactionary, and this would not -- This would be reactionary, I guess, in the opposite way. Oh, we've got more fish, and let's give it to the fishermen, but then, if we get ourselves in trouble with this, then we're going to be reactionary, and, oh, hurry up and take it away.

 I was looking at vermilion snapper last night, and we did this for two years, and then we did this, and amberjack, and, my gosh, how many times have we knee-jerk reacted to amberjack? I appreciate the council, a couple of years, several years, ago, when we were trying to change the fishing year, and it hadn't even been a year, and I appreciate the fact that the council took that into account, and we let that go for a couple of years, and we got the stock assessment, and, okay, now we've given it some time, and we see that it hasn't worked, and so I think we need to be a little more cautionary than reactionary when we make our decisions at this council table. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: DR. Frazer.

 DR. FRAZER: I really appreciate the discussion on this particular issue, and I do agree, particularly with Andy, that the comments that were provided yesterday, as part of public testimony, are a reason for concern, but I also don't think that this is necessarily a reactionary path, right, and so we've worked on this for several years now, and have gone through a lot of work with the SSC, and it is based on the best scientific information available.

I think we should continue to go down that path, and I do agree

with Clay that, you know, a slight increase, 10 percent or so, is not likely to damage the fishery in the long-term, but what I would also ask, and it came up in the discussion with the committee, was to ask more of our SSC, right, and, I mean, we get catch advice with an OFL and an ABC, but I really want to know what data would tell us that we've trended in the wrong direction, or we probably didn't make a good decision, and those are things like catch per unit effort that would validate some of the claims that were made in public comment from the commercial sector, like information from the for-hire sector, and I would like to see some more specific data coming from the states on those same measures. I would like to look at the sizes of the fishes, et cetera.

One of the benefits of the state management program is that data are available in real-time. I can see it, and I can make a decision, and I am a little concerned about local depletion as well.

 I think the states have the prerogative to fix that. If there's local depletion in their area, they know exactly what to do, and the concern isn't for the state. The concern is whether or not there is connectivity between localized depletion in that state and other states, and I don't believe that we're scientifically there yet to be able to look at the connectivity in that regard, but we do have information that would allow us to correct a bad decision, if we did make one, and so the onus is going to go back to our SSC and the state representatives who provide the data to bring it to this council, so that we can actually look at it and make an informed decision, moving forward, and so I will support the motion for now, but we're definitely going to revisit this and monitor it closely as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Geeslin.

 MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I certainly value and appreciate the feedback that we heard yesterday during the public testimony, and it almost seemed like we had the tale of two camps, for those that are experiencing localized depletion and those that are somehow able to find abundant red snapper.

On Monday afternoon, I shared with the committee and council that the average size of fish that we have observed in Texas, throughout the federal-water season, was about 6.6 pounds, and, now, looking back, and I didn't share this with the council then, but I think it's a good piece of information, during that state-water season that we maintained from January 1 to May 31, I shared that we had -- Our estimated landings were about 35,000

pounds. The average size of those fish was 15.6 pounds, and so I think that goes to speak to not only the recovery of the stock, but the robust biomass within our western Gulf, and it probably further demonstrates the need for more regionalized management within this fishery, and, for all those reasons, I'm going to support the motion as it is.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, sir. All right. I am not seeing any more hands around the table. Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: Sorry to not move us on, but I guess that I wanted to reiterate a few points. A 6 percent increase is not going to decimate this stock, and I recognize that. If the stock is on the decline, it's on the decline now, with the lower catch limit, and it will just exacerbate the potential decline, unless we have good recruitment pushing into the fishery, and so I agree with Tom's comments and his support of the comments that I made during committee about metrics.

 One question that I was interested in asking the states, because it kind of comes down to for-hire and commercial, at least those that attended our meeting largely in opposition to an increase, but the private sector wanting this increase, and we have seen longer and longer seasons with the states, and so, you know, at what point is there kind of a saturation of kind of the satisfaction with a long enough fishing season, and is that benefit, or risk, worth that increasing catch limit, and my expectation is Alabama and Mississippi, staring in the face of calibration, will say that we can take every pound we need, right, or can get, but I'm curious if the state directors could comment, or respond, to that question, because I think it's an important thing, in terms of how we're looking at this.

It's not just a catch limit increase, but it extends the days, and it extends your quotas, and so we're really trying to make sure that this is a stock that is conserved and maintained, but also benefit from the socioeconomics of the fishery.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I will start. You know, the quota that we have in Louisiana right now has certainly been satisfied, and we're able to -- You know, our fishery can fish those pounds, and our season typically lasts through Labor Day, Memorial Day to Labor Day, and that seems to be what the fishery wants.

There's always a push to try to get to Labor Day, and so the poundage we have right now typically gets us there, and so I

would say that we're in a very, very good spot, but I certainly don't want to say that we wouldn't like to have some extra pounds, because it provides some opportunity to fishermen later on in the year, and so we always want to maximize access, and certainly the economy, down along places like Grand Isle, do better when seasons are open, and so not everybody out there is a die-hard hunter, like I am, and not everybody out there wants to go to every football game, and so there are a lot of folks who still want to fish, even in the fall, and so, while I do think that we have enough poundage right now, and we have our private recreational angling community satisfied with where we are, I don't think that that statement should be taken as more is -- That we don't need any more, because I think the economy will always be happy to be stimulated by fisheries along the coast.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to echo what Patrick just said. Maybe things are different in Louisiana, and, you know, we're faced with weather challenges early in the year, and we like to have an extended summer, especially for the marina owners, and it helps the marina owners, going into the fall, you know, selling fuel, bait, ice, all those good things, and so maybe it's different in our state, but we see we can utilize this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: J.D., you are right, and it is different for every region, and we heard someone testify yesterday that Destin has an 800-racked facility, where they store the boats, and the people -- They come to fish. In Orange Beach, I mean, we've got boats everywhere, and we've got one marina that I think is building their fourth shed to store boats.

 Legendary Marine, the one in Destin, they're coming to Gulf Shores, and they're building a facility, and the interesting thing, to me, and I'm going to throw a rock, is everyone from Louisiana comes to Orange Beach to fish, and so your pressure is -- Do you see my point?

People -- It's -- I have a captain, or, excuse me, not a captain, but a private recreational angler that comes to our marina every year, and he pays me a transient fee so that he can fish out of Orange Beach and catch fish, and then he goes home, and he's very specific. It comes to fish the state season, is what he comes to do. He comes on Thursday, and he fishes Friday

and Saturday, and he leaves on Sunday, and then he goes to Florida, so he can fish the Florida season.

These boats are mobile and portable, and so you're right, and, yes, it does help the marinas, and my husband and I are marina owners, and so it is important for me for the recreational fishermen to have access, because I sell them a lot of fuel, but we can go round and round and round this table, Dale, and I'm sorry, and everybody is going to have their own scenario, and that is the whole purpose of why we're looking at ideas with these species, to do something different, because you're right that it's not the same for everybody.

I'm going to throw it out there one more time, and the headboats had a great program that solves a lot of this, and I think the council needs to look at it in general for all the fishermen, and not just the headboats, and not just the charter boats, because not everybody fishes the same. Not everyone goes to the football games and goes to the hunting camp.

I agree with Patrick, and that's why we have to become creative at this council table, and I don't think it means dividing everybody. I think it means coming up with a comprehensive plan that everyone can benefit from, and we can also protect the fish as we do that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. I have Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Well, I just wanted to comment for the perspective here from Texas, and I am not speaking for my state agency here, but I think this overage right here would put us right where we need to be, in terms of -- I think probably many of you have seen -- You know, my phone used to ring probably once a day, if not more, on complaints about red snapper, and my phone doesn't ring any more at all, and so I feel like kind of what you're saying, Patrick, is we're getting where we need to be, but I just don't think we're quite there.

I also want to comment, and I would suspect this would be similar for Louisiana, because of the way the fisheries work here, is, Susan, we don't have that issue. It's not as easy, in this region, to do the shifting, like you're talking about, and so, like you're saying, it's just another example of how we have all these regional differences, but what -- We just published a paper, recently, looking at, in Texas, no matter really what the season is, you're going to catch about the same amount of fish, because I don't know if that's the desire, or the demand, or the willingness to fish, or whatever you want to call it, with

football and hunting and all that, and, if you compress it down into a short time period, well, it gets caught then. If you extend it, it's roughly the same amount that gets captured.

Now, it is a little bit different, but the point being they do other things, if the weather is bad or whatever, and so all I'm saying is that Texas has a unique perspective, I think, and this would give us the little bit more fish we need to get the seasons right in the sweet spot, and I don't think that it will be as big of an issue in this region.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Mr. Anson, and then we're going to start wrapping this up, and we've had some good discussion. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Just to kind of bring it back to the motion and the comment that Greg spoke of for Texas, although he doesn't represent the fisheries management agency for Texas, is that getting a point where the anglers are satisfied, and as far as having access and opportunity, and, you know, we -- I mentioned, several times over the last year, based on the quota that we have, using Snapper Check for monitoring, and for those pounds, we are very close, based on the biology, how many fish that are off there, again using our annual abundance survey that Dr. Powers maintains, based on what the population can withstand, when you include the other sectors and those fish that are being harvested by those sectors, and then matching that up with the demand in the fishery.

 Our information has said that, you know, you get up to 800,000 pounds or so and you get to that situation where folks start thinking about other things to do, and, you know, it's really the focus and the demand is really in that summertime period, for the most part, and there are, of course, others that want to fish at other times of the year, that fish all year, but we do have a finite resource, and so we have to make decisions related to, you know, providing access to that resource based on the availability.

We use science to determine that, and, again, I would just go back and mention that there's a pretty exhaustive amount of science that has been collected related to red snapper, and it's been reviewed by our SSC, to give us the ABC and help us in deciding how to best use those pounds, and so, anyway, I just wanted to say those things. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Anson. I do see Dr. Sweetman's hand was up. Did you want to comment, Dr. Sweetman?

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would just like to respond to Andy and his question there, and so, yes, Florida --We're trying to maximize access to all parts of the state, and we would always like to offer more days, as we continue to get requests to lengthen our private recreational season, but, obviously, having said that, we'll continue to monitor our landings and ensure that will stay under the quota, whatever that may be, as we go through this vote. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Sweetman. Mr. Burris.

MR. BURRIS: Just to speak for Mississippi, and I'm going to echo what all the other states have said, but what we're going for, and what we've got in the past several years, is the Memorial Day to Labor Day season, and anything after that is — There's not a whole lot of effort, but, as the Director pointed out a few days ago, we're looking at getting less than 3,000 pounds, and so it's really insignificant on Mississippi's end, as far as an increase.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Burris. All right. We've had a lot of good discussion, and so we're going to go ahead and vote on this motion. This is a roll call vote. I'm going to read it into the record, and then Dr. Simmons will do the roll call vote.

 The motion is to approve the Framework Action Modification to Catch Limits for Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Williamson.

40 MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dyskow.

48 MR. DYSKOW: Yes.

```
1
 2
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Gill.
 3
 4
    MR. GILL: No.
 5
 6
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. McDermott.
 7
 8
    MR. MCDERMOTT: Yes.
9
10
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dugas.
11
12
    MR. DUGAS: Yes.
13
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Frazer.
14
15
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
16
17
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Broussard.
18
19
20
    MR. BROUSSARD: Yes.
21
22
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Burris.
23
24
    MR. BURRIS: Yes.
25
26
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Anson.
27
28
    MR. ANSON: Yes.
29
30
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Strelcheck.
31
32
    MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.
33
34
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Shipp.
35
36
    DR. SHIPP: Yes.
37
38
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Banks.
39
    MR. BANKS: (Mr. Banks's response is not audible on the
40
41
    recording.)
42
43
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Geeslin.
44
45
    MR. GEESLIN: Yes.
46
```

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Sweetman.

```
1
   DR. SWEETMAN: Yes.
```

2 3

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Stunz.

4

5 DR. STUNZ: Yes.

6 7

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Diaz.

8

9 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Yes.

10

11 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: The motion carried fifteen to two. Mr. Chair.

12

13

14 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Mr. Dugas.

15

16 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to make a 17 motion.

18 19

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Proceed.

20 21

MR. DIAZ: I sent the motion in to staff.

22 23

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: You are welcome to make a motion, Mr. Dugas, if you're ready. Is it pertaining to this part of the committee report? Okay. Go ahead.

25 26 27

28

29

30

31

32

24

MR. DUGAS: My motion reads to direct the commercial portion of recent red snapper increase in the Framework Action Modifications of Catch Limits for Gulf Red Snapper to be set aside for future distribution. For example, the increase could be used for the commercial fleet to account for high discards of red snapper, to provide allocation for a future research setaside program, and to mitigate localized depletion.

33 34 35

36

37

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a motion. Is there a second to the motion? There is a second for discussion by Mr. Williamson. Would you like to provide some rationale, Mr. Dugas?

38 39 40

41

42

43

44 45 MR. DUGAS: For the last fifteen or twenty minutes or so, we talked about public comment yesterday, and there's a lot of concerns about these localized depletion areas and discards, and this could be an opportunity for the grouper longliners, for their discards, and I think this is a good way to move, and maybe I'm not completely correct in the path, but, from what I heard at public testimony yesterday, this could be beneficial.

46 47 48

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: The motion pertains to the action that we just voted up and took final action on, and so I don't think it's — I think it's out of order and irrelevant at this point, given the decision we just made.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I think Mr. Strelcheck is correct, Mr. Dugas. We just passed that amendment to move that document forward, and the breakouts were in that document, and so I think we have to start a new amendment to look at this, and maybe somebody else could help me. I see Mara's hand is up. Mara, did you have some comments?

MS. LEVY: Yes, and, to that point, yes, you would need to start some type of new council action that, you know, would modify how the commercial sector quota is used, or distributed, and you can't just direct it to happen.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Levy. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: This is quick, and so would this not be something that we might consider when we have the three-day discussion with the commercial fishery and the IFQ programs?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: J.D., this is an interesting concept, and I would certainly support this in general, and, now, if that needs to be a framework amendment, or a real amendment, a full amendment, I'm not real sure, but so clearly we heard a lot of -- The commercial fleet particularly did not want extra fish, and I am not -- I am still a little bit puzzled of why that is, and I would also be a little curious to know how that increased fish affects lease price and that kind of thing, because I'm suspecting that could possibly be what it is as well, but, in addition, if the conservation-minded nature of some of those comments were where they wanted to go with this, we've heard a lot of discussion from fleets that are catching a lot of discards, and this is -- We have struggled with, well, how do we get fish to those -- Those fish are going to be caught no matter what, and so how could we get fish to those fleets that needed to reduced that discard, and that's certainly a very clear conservation measure which could become of the extra fish that we have.

If we need to move this forward, in terms of a framework action or something for overages, or a future overage like that, when the fleet doesn't want those fish, there is certainly beneficial aspects, and I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, and not to continue to belabor the point here, but Bob Gill and I have been discussing, and others, and we've been sort of pushing this idea on this committee and these research set-asides.

The real problem with that, Bob, of course, is, well, where do you get quota for the research set-aside, and to do those kind of measures, whatever they might be in the future, and I don't - Who knows what those are, but this might be a mechanism, if we're hearing from the fleet that they don't want the fish, and there are creative things we can do in a framework like that to utilize those without impacting the resource.

I don't have any good ideas of what that might be right now, but, you know, it's a way to use -- There's a lot of options for that, if they're not asking for the fish, is my point.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas, with your motion, it doesn't appear like we can do anything with the motion that's on the board, and so, I mean, I think you could withdraw the motion, or you could modify the motion to try to do what you want to do, and it's your pleasure.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I would ask staff to assist me in what verbiage is needed to move forward, whether it's an amendment or whatever they feel is sufficient. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Dr. Simmons, can you help Mr. Dugas?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we would just want to direct staff to develop a document, and we'll figure out what kind of document, after we start looking at it, that considers the commercial portion, or considers withholding, excuse me, a portion of the commercial red snapper --

MR. RINDONE: So withholding a portion of the commercial ACL increase from the recent -- We would look at the difference, right, and the difference would be from the 15.4 to the 16.31, and we would account for the commercial sector having 51 percent, and that comes to 464,000 pounds, and so withholding a portion of the commercial ACL from the recent red snapper increase in the framework action, blah, blah, to be set aside for --

 This is the part I think where it gets kind of squirrely, because, depending on what actually it's being used for, it dictates whether this is simply a framework action, like

essentially establishing like an ACT, and so it automatically reserves this portion, this 464,000 pounds, for some other activity, but, if that's to be done through something like research set-aside program, then creating that program is more plan amendment territory.

If it's just establishing it as kind of like a reserve, that's not really used for anything, and so like a de facto mitigation for localized depletion or high discards, as Mr. Dugas was trying to get to, then having that additional buffer there would facilitate that, I guess, but that could be done through a framework action.

 What it's used for, what the purpose is, dictates what kind of document we're talking about, and, if it's an RSA, it's a plan amendment. If it's the other two things, creating an ACT would functionally do that, and we could that via a framework action, and so I guess maybe it's beneficial for you guys to have some additional discussion about what purposes you do want to consider. Otherwise, we could be looking at multiple documents.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons, and then I want to check and see if the language is where you want it, Mr. Dugas. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One more suggestion. A portion of the commercial ACL, such as the recent red snapper increase.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so, Mr. Dugas, can you read over the motion and see if you like where it's at, if you've got anything you want to change, and I'm developing a list of hands. Right now, I have Mr. Banks, Dr. Frazer, and Mr. Williamson and Mr. Strelcheck. Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you. I will re-read the motion, but I would offer any more assistance, if staff would like to input more. To direct staff to develop a document that considers withholding a portion of the commercial ACL, such as the recent red snapper increase in the Framework Action Modification of Catch Limits for Gulf Red Snapper, to be set aside for future distribution. For example, the increase could be used for the commercial fleet to account for high discards of red snapper, to provide allocation for a future research set-aside program, and to mitigate localized depletion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Is the seconder okay with those changes? Who was the seconder? Mr. Williamson, are you okay with those changes?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I'm going to start working down my list. Dr. Stunz.

 DR. STUNZ: I think you got to me already, Dale. I don't have anything. Well, I do now that you -- I guess I would just -- I completely agree with this and the spirit of where we're going here, but I just want to make sure that it's a little bit openended, in the sense that who knows what we might think to use this for, and I don't want to tie us to -- Those examples there are all good, in my opinion, but there might be something in the future that we're not thinking about now, and so I don't think that does -- I don't think that ties us to just those few things there, but the point is that it's used in the commercial side, for some benefit to that sector.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Stunz. Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Just a question, mainly I guess for staff. I mean, we've got Amendment 36 out there, and can we -- Is this something, this idea, that we can fold into that document? I mean, I know we would have to make sure that the idea meets with the purpose and need of that document, and the goals of the document, but is that a better way to go about it, rather than starting a whole new amendment?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am going to look back at Dr. Lasseter, but I believe there was some setaside discussion and consideration in Amendment 36C, but I don't believe it's very far along, and I don't believe we have anything in there regarding a research set-aside program, and so, if she could speak a little bit more on that, that could help us, I think.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Lasseter.

DR. LASSETER: Thank you. That is correct. In 36C, there are the outlines of actions that would allow you to specify the threshold of quota above which would be set aside. In that document, it's put into a quota bank, and then there is subsequent sub-actions for you to determine what to do with that quota, and there is not any discussion of a research set-aside, and that's correct.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Lasseter. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to go back and think about how we got to this point, and, as Mara pointed out, we just, and Andy as well, we just kind of finalized one action, right, and so, in my mind, I understand why you would want to move something like this forward.

You know, the problem is, in my mind, the way that it's written, is it essentially says we're going to look at one sector to deal with a discard problem, right, and the reality is the discards run across the sectors, and the responsibility to deal with the discard issues also runs across those sectors.

 You know, when I'm thinking about this, I'm going, okay, if we're going to have some additional quota, can we use that, straight off the top, to deal with a problem, and it doesn't have to be the commercial sector's problem, and it might be the recreational sector's problem, too. The fact of the matter is it's a fishery-wide problem.

The way that the motion is written, it takes from one group, all right, in an action that we've already finalized, and potentially would take that quota increase away from them, but, as Patrick pointed out, we're trying to deal with some of those issues in parts of 36, Amendment 36, and so I appreciate the spirit of the motion, right, but I'm not inclined to support it at this time, J.D., in large part because it's the last day of a meeting, right, and this is a really, really serious thing to be thinking about, and I think I would just like it to be a little more well-thought-out and not wordsmithed on a Thursday afternoon to do it, and so, at this time, I just can't support it, but I understand and appreciate what motivated it. I just want to do it the right way.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON: You know, I agree with a lot of what Tom said. I think it's a great example of thinking out of the box, and I seconded it for that purpose, and I continue to have that feeling. I guess it's too late in the game today to start working on this, and we need to have a little more thought process into it, but certainly we need to develop some program that researches the discard problem for both sectors, and so, rather than beating this horse to death, I will stop there.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Williamson. Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: Two things, and they've kind of already been spoken, but, moving forward, if you recommend an ACL increase, we will implement that sometime in 2023, and so, if this moves forward, we would pull back quota, ultimately, at a later date, and I feel like this is a recurring problem, where we're missing opportunities, as a council, to potentially make changes like this, when we have quota increases, and it would have been great to have gotten a motion like this early on in the process, when we were considering an increase, and try to factor that into the decision-making.

With that said, I won't reiterate some other points, but I would ask that -- We have a second IFQ focus group meeting coming up, and I would see it as beneficial to also take this idea to the focus group, if it passes, for discussion and input back to the council.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Tom, in large measure, and, before I discuss that, I would like to clarify Dr. Stunz's comment. The commercial industry's testimony yesterday was not that they didn't want the quota. They thought it was bad for the stock, and so, in a sense, this is punitive for saying, no, we ought not increase the quota, but, in addition to that, I would argue that the rationale for why this is a good thing, where the increases could be used, are equally applicable to the recreational sector as they are to the commercial sector. In that sense, I find it difficult to find this being fair and equitable, and I have a difficult time in trying to separate it from a punitive action, and so I oppose the motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Gill. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Dr. Frazer said a lot of the things that I would have said, and probably not so eloquently, but I still think, if there is a way that we can set aside some time to discuss the commercial IFQ programs, and maybe incorporate this into the discussion, and I don't think the commercial fleet would have so much -- I don't think they would have really any angst about some type of set-aside, but I would argue that it doesn't need to be for these reasons, but it needs to be for all the reasons that we hear, those new entrants having problems accessing the fish.

Again, I think this is a conversation that doesn't need to be happening on Thursday afternoon, like most have said, and I do think it needs to be a conversation that we have where we bring

this council, the Reef Fish Committee, together to have a hard discussion about what we think -- What we think the IFQ program should look like, with the input from those people that participate, and try to come with a formal plan, and possibly incorporate some of these ideas, but I will not support this motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. I have three people left, and then I think we're going to call this for a vote. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you. I agree with Dr. Frazer's comments about some of the aspects of this, when you look at the examples that are provided, is that there's some crossover, if you will, into other sectors, and so, you know, whether this singles them out, or we need to look at including these types of examples in those other sectors, is another discussion, I guess, but I'm not going to be too supportive of the motion right now, as it sits, because one of the things that is provided in the examples, the last item, the mitigation localized depletion, that is -- That could be the result of both sectors, and so this would just look at the commercial sector, specifically, to try to mitigate for localized depletion that could be brought on by both sectors.

 Then, J.D., I would, I guess, make a suggestion that if you would remove that, because, if it's listed here, it will show up in the document, and I think it's just going to get too muddy to try to figure out that, but the other suggestion is that you replace "high", the word "high" in front of "discards" with "dead", and just have it specific to dead discards, and have that be addressed through a deduction. Thank you.

 ${\bf CHAIRMAN\ DIAZ}\colon$ Okay, and so I have Dr. Sweetman and then Ms. Levy.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm also going to vote in opposition to this motion, and I agree, also, with a lot of what Dr. Frazer said. Just yesterday, we discussed the formation of an RSA working group, and part of their objective is to try and figure out the goals of an RSA program and to see how such a program would be administered, if there is even the capacity to do so, and so, in addition to some of the reasons that have already been stated, and what I just said, I'm going to vote in opposition. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas, you're pointing at the screen, and did you have anything that you wanted to say relative to the motion on the board?

MR. DUGAS: Yes, sir. I was going to take Kevin's recommendation to change the wording. I missed some of the first part, Kevin, but I did hear you say to remove --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I think Kevin's suggestion was to remove "mitigation localized depletion" at the end of the sentence and to change the word "high discards" to "dead discards", and I think the "dead discards" has already been changed. Are you satisfied with that? Mr. Williamson, as the seconder, are you satisfied?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. I don't know exactly what the intent is, in terms of what you would include in such a document, either if you approve this motion or you move forward with this after more discussion at another meeting, but I just wanted to caution against limiting whatever happens in this document to the withholding portion.

I think, if you're going to withhold, you know, available quota, or catch limit, pounds, that you need to decide what you're going to do with it, and, I mean, I just point to 36A, which, you know, took back some of the IFQ shares from the inactive accounts, and the idea was to figure out what to do with that later, in 36B, and 36B has been, you know, not going anywhere for a while, and so, if you just think about, you know, what you would do with whatever you would consider withholding in the same action, I think that would be extremely helpful for people. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Levy. All right, and so I'm going to read the motion, and then we're going to go ahead and vote on this. It's to direct staff to develop a document that considers withholding a portion of the commercial ACL, such as the recent red snapper increase, in the Framework Action Modifications of Catch Limits for Gulf Red Snapper, to be set aside for future distribution. For example, the increase could be used for the commercial fleet to account for dead discards of red snapper and to provide allocation for a future research set-aside program.

MR. GILL: A roll call vote, please, Mr. Chairman.

48 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: A roll call vote has been requested. Dr.

```
1
    Simmons.
 2
 3
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think Mr.
    Gill is really trying to push us to get that electronic voting
 4
    in here for you guys today. You're making your point. All
 5
 6
    right. Mr. Burris.
 7
8
    MR. BURRIS: Yes.
9
10
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Frazer.
11
12
    DR. FRAZER: No.
13
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Sweetman.
14
15
16
    DR. SWEETMAN: No.
17
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. McDermott.
18
19
20
    MR. MCDERMOTT: Yes.
21
22
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Stunz.
23
    DR. STUNZ: Yes.
24
25
26
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Broussard.
27
28
    MR. BROUSSARD: No.
29
30
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Dr. Shipp.
31
32
    DR. SHIPP: Yes.
33
34
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Anson.
35
    MR. ANSON: Yes.
36
37
38
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Geeslin.
39
```

MR. GEESLIN: Yes 41

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Gill. 43

MR. GILL: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: No.

MR. DYSKOW: Yes.

6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Williamson.

MR.

 $MR.\ WILLIAMSON: \ \ \mbox{No.}$

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Banks.

12 MR. BANKS: No.

14 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Strelcheck.

16 MR. STRELCHECK: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Mr. Dugas.

20 MR. DUGAS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: It's eight to eight. Mr. Chair, 23 would you like to vote?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: The chairman votes no.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: The motion failed.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Any further discussion at this point in the Reef Fish document? We've got about ten minutes before our scheduled lunch break. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I think I want to make one more motion relative to this section, if that's okay with you, and I just sent it to Meetings.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

DR. FRAZER: Let's get it pulled up on the board, but it has to do with the discussion earlier about additional information to evaluate the health of the red snapper stock. All right. The motion is to request the Southeast Fisheries Science Center identify metrics for red snapper, greater amberjack, gag, and other targeted species that could indicate changes in stock health status between stock assessments. These metrics could be, but are not limited to, catch per unit effort, length frequency distributions, weight distribution by region, or other information for consideration or review by the SSC's feedback.

2 3

4

5

It's giving a fair amount of latitude to our scientific bodies, both the Science Center and perhaps the SSC, to think about what we might use to look at, again, the health, or the status, or the stock, to accompany these interim assessments that are based solely on these index values.

6 7 8

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a motion on the board. Is there a second to the motion?

9

MR. STRELCHECK: Second.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: It's seconded by Mr. Strelcheck. All right. I'm going to read the motion one more time, and then we'll open it up for discussion. Request the Southeast Fisheries Science Center identify metrics for red snapper, greater amberjack, gag, and other targeted species that could indicate changes in stock health status between stock assessments. These metrics could CPUE, be, not limited but are to, length frequency distributions, weight distribution by region, information for consideration or review by the Scientific and Statistical Committee's feedback. Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Gill.

232425

26

27

MR. GILL: I would really rather hear from Dr. Porch before I speak, but a question for Tom. This smacks, to me, almost identically of the IA approach, and I'm having a problem trying to translate what the difference is.

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

DR. FRAZER: Yes, and, again, when I think back to the interim analyses and kind of the evolution of thought, right, and so I think, originally, these were intended to be very quick, you know, responses to the need for information, right, and we would just simply update things based on the index values, and there are relatively few indices that are used for that purpose, the bottom longline survey, for example, and I would argue that that bottom longline survey recent trends, right, are largely driven by information coming from one region, the northern Gulf, but I think there's other information that is available to our scientific bodies, right, including our SSC and this council, that might allow us a more granular look at what's going on in the fishery.

42 43 44

45

46 47

48

I mean, these are traditional fisheries type of statistics that should be available from all of our state agencies, perhaps as part of the updates, and some of the states have used that information. You know, I want to know if catch per unit effort is declining, and I want to know if the size of the fish are,

over the course of the season, whatever it is, whether it's five days, ten days, forty-five days, or all the way past Labor Day.

That helps me to start thinking a little bit more about if the decision we made to allocate more fish, right, is the right one, in the face of all of the public comment that we heard before, and I want to bring all of that information to bear on our decision-making.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. Mr. Rindone and then Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Gill, one example where this might come in handy that would be outside of the interim analysis could be for cobia. For cobia, we only have two indices that are used to inform the stock assessment, and they're both fishery-dependent, and that's the commercial landings and the headboat landings, and so -- This is postulating, and the Science Center would have to investigate this, but it might be possible to examine say the length frequency from the commercial landings and the CPUE from the headboat landings to have some idea of how things are trending.

Now, it's not going to necessarily give us the ability to change catch limits or anything like that, but it could inform the council that, if things -- If average size of fish is getting a little bit larger, and catch rates are increasing a little bit, and just have some idea of maybe the management changes are having an effect, or maybe they're not, and, ultimately, some of these things could then be used to feed into the management strategy evaluations and things like that, to help the council make better decisions, based on the performance of the stock against the management decisions that have been made in the past.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I seconded the motion, and I'm certainly supportive of it, based on my comments during committee. I think we all agree that it would be good to have more real-time information and data, especially between stock assessments, being more nimble, and, as Tom has pointed out, we have multiple areas with really validation and information, and not only information from public testimony, but some of these metrics and trends that allow us to potentially be more responsive, rather than playing catch-up and being reactive, or, for that matter, being proactive, when things are heading in the right direction.

48 Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. I would say that we certainly can do that, look at identifying the appropriate metrics in between assessments for various species. I can say already, for some of them, like red snapper with gag, it would be our fishery-independent surveys, and they are clearly the least subject to bias, and they are direct measures of trends in abundance, as opposed to something like length composition, which can be a function of the different abundance of age classes, size classes, but also how fishermen change their fishing behavior, and that's hard to disentangle apart from a stock assessment, but the short answer is, yes, we can do that, and we recognize, for things like amberjack and some other species, we might not have the same quality of fishery-independent surveys as we do for gag, red snapper, and red grouper.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Porch. Mr. Anson.

 MR. ANSON: I think the discussion, since I raised my hand, has answered my question, but I will bring it up anyways, and that is just to make sure that it is clear, Dr. Frazer, in your motion, that it is from any of the sources that the agency would have available, and so it would be fishery-independent as well as fishery-dependent, and then the recommendation, or the comments, from the Science Center, and eventually the SSC, would help drive as to which one would be a better, or maybe a combination of both, for certain species, but I certainly want to make sure that, at least at the very outset, we have the ability to get sources of information from the fishery-dependent as well as fishery-independent.

DR. FRAZER: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I am not seeing any further hands up. We're going to vote on this motion. Is there any opposition to this motion? Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Sorry. I did not mean to have my hand up. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: That's okay. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. On our agenda, we had planned to break during the middle of Reef Fish, and I don't really like breaking in the middle of a committee, but there's just no way we would finish Reef Fish before we took a reasonable lunchtime, and so we're going to take our regular lunchbreak.

2

We're going to break, and we'll be back at 1:30. We're going to start promptly at 1:30, and so we still have the remainder of

Reef Fish, Sustainable Fisheries, and the Supporting Agency

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on August 25, 2022.)

August 25, 2022

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at Omni Hotel in Corpus Christi, Texas on

Thursday afternoon, August 25, 2022, and was called to order by

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so we're going to go ahead and get started back with Reef Fish, and so I welcome everybody back

from lunch. We're going to start back with the Gulf of Mexico

Fishery Management Council, and we're doing the Reef Fish report. For people that are following online, we're starting

Recreational Bag Limit and Gray Triggerfish Commercial Trip

Council staff provided a presentation on potential management

changes for vermilion snapper and gray triggerfish. Previously, the council requested modifying the recreational bag limit for

vermilion snapper, the recreational fixed closed season for gray

triggerfish, and adjusting commercial gray triggerfish trip

Recently, the council decided to increase the gray triggerfish

ACLs, which was implemented in July of 2021. The council also modified the vermilion snapper ACLs, but selected a conservative

198

Thank you, Mr. Chair. We'll start off with

The vermilion

Framework Action for Vermilion

back on page 7, with vermilion snapper. Dr. Frazer.

Limit and Recreational Closed Seasons, Tab B, Number 9.

ACL to provide more protection to the stock.

snapper ACL change has not yet been implemented by NMFS.

Reports, and so 1:30. Thank you.

Chairman Dale Diaz.

DR. FRAZER:

limits.

Presentation on

3 4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

> 14 15 16

17 18 19

20 21 22

23

28 29 30

32 33 34

35

36

31

37 38 39

Analyses provided by SERO staff indicated a large percentage of 47

48

recreational anglers do not catch the current vermilion snapper

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

bag limit, and, based on projections from available data, the recreational gray triggerfish season would likely close in April or May, if the fixed closed season is modified. However, there is substantial uncertainty in the season duration.

Regarding the gray triggerfish commercial trip limit, a committee member asked if vessels regularly catch the current trip limit and how often this occurs. Council staff indicated it was not part of the analysis, but could be investigated. A committee member stated they wanted all the actions still to be considered, but was willing to separate the action to increase the commercial gray triggerfish trip limit, since it was a higher priority.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Hold on a second, Dr. Frazer. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Yes, sir, and I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I sent it to Meetings, but I can go ahead and read it, if you would like. The motion is to direct staff to begin a standalone framework action for gray triggerfish commercial trip limits.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We have a motion by Ms. Boggs to direct staff to create a standalone document to deal with gray triggerfish commercial trip limits. Is there a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Gill. Is there any discussion on the motion? Did you want to provide some rationale, Ms. Boggs?

MS. BOGGS: After the discussion yesterday, I think this is low-hanging fruit, something that we can get through fairly quickly, and I think we need some more detail before we move forward with the vermilion snapper bag limits and the recreational closures for gray triggerfish. There seems to be some uncertainty around the data and not knowing -- The increases that are coming with the gray triggerfish, or, excuse me, the vermilion snapper, and so I felt like, if we separate it out, this would be something that the council could handle fairly quickly for the commercial sector. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The SSC Recommendations 48 from the July 2022 SSC Meeting, Tab B, Number 5(a), Dr. Nance

summarized SSC discussions of wenchman landings and catch limits. Wenchman is commonly caught as bycatch in the northern Gulf butterfish trawl fishery and is a marketable bycatch species. However, catch limits for wenchman are part of the mid-water snapper complex, which includes blackfin snapper, queen snapper, and silk snapper, and, based on historical landings, which may be incomplete, due to differences in reported common names for the species, for example silver snapper.

Further, wenchman is more pelagic and does not appear to occupy habitats similar to the other three species in the complex, all of which are more closely reef-associated. Substantial wenchman landings in the butterfish trawl fishery has been identified as an issue for the fishermen, who must decide whether to stop trawling for butterfish or discard substantial landings of wenchman when the midwater snapper complex ACL is met. Discard mortality from these trawls is expected to be near 100 percent.

Based on a review of catches and historical records, the SSC recommended wenchman be removed from the midwater snapper complex. The SSC also recommended that the council ask the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission to work with the five Gulf states to compile historical landings for butterfish, wenchman, scad, and other associated species from the midwater trawl fishery for the Gulf SSC to evaluate. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so that last recommendation from the SSC -- I would like to ask Dave on the -- I want to say appropriateness, but that's not right, but is it appropriate, in your mind, and is it practicable, to ask the commission for what the SSC recommended?

MR. DONALDSON: Absolutely, and I've been talking with Ryan about it a little bit, and it's something that we can certainly do. I think that he was talking about the council sending a letter to the commission, and then we could have staff address it.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Do we need a motion for that, sir?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Yes, Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: I would like to make a motion to request the GSMFC to work with the five Gulf states to compile historical landings for butterfish, wenchman, scad, and other associated species

from the midwater trawl fishery for evaluation.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Rindone I think may want to add some thoughts here. Mr. Rindone.

 MR. RINDONE: Yes, and, Mr. Gill, if I can commandeer your motion a little bit, and so to request that the GSMFC, the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, work with the Gulf states to compile historical landings for butterfish, wenchman, scad, and other associated species for evaluation by the SSC at a future SSC meeting. Mr. Donaldson, do you feel like you need any more information?

MR. DONALDSON: Well, "at a future SSC meeting" is -- I mean, I know we talked that we initially were thinking that it was something for next year, but do we want to put a timeframe on that, just so we have some -- So we know where to put it on the priority list?

 MR. RINDONE: I'm thinking March right now, Mr. Gill, because I'm feeling that January is going to be pretty tight, and so March would be the next SSC meeting that I would have room to queue this in.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: It depends on the commission's workload and when they can get it. My view is we've never had it, and so it's not super urgent, but specifying it in a timeline seems, to me, to crank up the urgency, and it's probably not appropriate.

 MR. DONALDSON: Well, I think by the March of next year SSC meeting is certainly doable, and so I don't know that we need to include it in the motion, but, if there was some urgency to it, we should include it, but, if not, a future meeting is fine.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. Okay, and so we have a motion on the board. Is there a second for the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Broussard. Any discussion on the motion? All right. Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: A committee member asked about the data evaluated for wenchman that led to the SSC's --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I'm sorry, Tom. Mr. Anson.

48 MR. ANSON: Thank you. Sorry. About the second recommendation

that the SSC made regarding removal of wenchman from the midwater snapper complex, I was wondering, maybe Andy, what's the process for that, the timeline, and, you know, obviously, we probably have to make a motion here at council to begin some sort of document, but what would that process be?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I was thinking that probably that decision would be somewhat dependent on the review that's carried out by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Any further discussion? Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Just to provide a little bit more context, right now, the wenchman portion of that midwater snapper complex, the landings that helped sum up to what that complex is catching is based on the average landings from 2000 to 2009, and, based on paper logbooks that we were able to review during the SSC meeting, the landings that were available to be used in that time series woefully underestimate what may actually be the real landings, when we add in the other common names that the fishermen were using for the same species, and so having that evaluation of landings gives a better idea of perhaps what a wenchman-specific ACL could be, and it will be important to know that before we go through the process of taking it out of the midwater snapper complex and establishing a new ACL for the three remaining species and then a separate one for wenchman, and so it's not that that particular recommendation is being ignored, but it's just this request to Gulf States allows us to get there.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: All right, and so I'll pick up at the beginning of that paragraph. A committee member asked about the data evaluated for wenchman that led to the SSC's recommendation. Dr. Nance replied that the fishermen were targeting butterfish, and that differentiating between the species at depth was not possible. Further, historical landings of wenchman indicate landings under other common names, and the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission may be uniquely poised to investigate these historical data to better understand past wenchman landings.

Dr. Nance reviewed the discards data presented by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center for gag grouper, red grouper, greater amberjack, and red snapper, which were determined from the most recent stock assessments for each species. The SSC acknowledged

several caveats when interpreting the presented information including differing sampling units, difference in fishery-dependent survey designs, and species-specific discard mortality estimates. The SSC contended that novel management approaches to incentivize release techniques that increase the probability of survival would be required for a meaningful reduction in discard mortality.

Draft Options for Amendment 56: Modifications to the Gag Grouper Catch Limits, Sector Allocations, Fishing Seasons, and other Rebuilding Plan Measures, Tab B, Numbers 11(a) through (c), in June 2022, SERO staff presented options to the council for a proposed interim rule for gag grouper, which is intended to reduce fishing mortality ahead of the development of Amendment 56, which will be a rebuilding plan for gag grouper. SERO staff provided a brief update on the development of this interim rule.

Dr. Nance reviewed the alternative run using the SEDAR 72 base model, but supplanting the MRIP-FES recreational landings data with the same from the State of Florida's State Reef Fish Survey (SRFS) run. The SEDAR 72 assessment was originally presented at the SSC's September 2021 meeting and used updated recreational landings data from MRIP-FES and an ecosystem-informed model for incorporating episodic mortality from red tide.

The SRFS run found gag grouper to be overfished and undergoing overfishing and was determined, by the SSC, to be consistent with BSIA, at its July 2022 meeting.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center also reported a correction to the headboat landings data for an area of landings along the Florida and Alabama state lines that had mistakenly not been included in the original SEDAR 72 run. As such, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center also re-ran the original SEDAR 72 base model using MRIP-FES, in addition to the SRFS run, to discern any effects of this correction.

This resulted in no substantial change to the rebuilding timeline for the SRFS model. However, the MRIP model projected that the stock would rebuild in ten years at Tmin and F equals zero at a fishing mortality rate at maximum sustainable yield (FMSY) proxy using a 30 percent spawning potential ratio, again at F 30 percent SPR, and a medium severity estimate for red tide mortality in 2021.

Generally, the SRFS model estimates similar trends in landings as the MRIP model. Diagnostics demonstrated stable models using either SRFS or MRIP. Generally, the SRFS run scales down the

stock's population size by about 50 percent, but does not change the stock's trajectory or the ratio of SSB to virgin SSB in the terminal year.

A committee member asked about the difference between the SRFS data and the MRIP data with regard to the estimated total biomass of the gag grouper stock. Dr. Nance replied that the surveys estimate catch similarly, but differ in how they estimate effort, which results in a difference in the estimated historical landings.

Another committee member asked why SRFS was suitable for gag grouper in this case, but other surveys had not been deemed so for other species. Council and Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff explained that the SRFS data were calibrated back in time over the same time period as the MRIP data, and that SRFS covers more than 95 percent of all private vessel landings of gag grouper, making it appropriate for both assessment and catch limit monitoring purposes. Further, SRFS underwent and passed peer review for its use for gag grouper, which has not yet been done for the state surveys for other species, like red snapper.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council concur with the SSC's motion regarding the SEDAR 72 Gulf of Mexico gag grouper operational assessment base run configuration, MSY proxy, red tide scenario, and stock status determination to use SRFS data and its consideration as BSIA. The motion carried without opposition. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries.

 DR. FRAZER: Council staff then presented options to consider prior to developing an options draft for the October 2022 council meeting, noting that changing the proxy for FMSY can be done by stating the new proxy, if no other options are being considered (Reef Fish Amendment 48). There are currently three proposed actions addressing sector allocation, catch limits, and fishing seasons.

A committee member asked why it was possible to keep the current sector allocation. Council staff explained that the current sector allocation, monitored under SRFS, would result in a slight de facto reallocation to the commercial sector, due to the higher estimation of recreational landings from the

calibrated historical SRFS landings data.

1 2 3

The committee discussed inclusion of more recent time series for consideration for sector allocation, considerate of factors like the initiation of the IFQ program in 2010. A committee member also suggested looking at the percent utilization of the stock by the sectors that is being explored by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council for gag grouper.

 A committee member asked about justification for the proposed commercial closure in February and March in waters deeper than twenty fathoms, 120 feet. Council staff recalled that almost all male gag, and almost all spawning activity, occurs in waters deeper than twenty fathoms, and that, given the small fraction of the population that is thought to be male, and the depressed recruitment that has been estimated for the last decade, protecting the males, especially while spawning, should be considered by the council. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Dr. Stunz, is this what you wanted to --

DR. STUNZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So Dr. Stunz has a motion, and you have --

MR. RINDONE: I have an updated presentation that shows the different allocations, based on the different years that we talked about casually during committee, that I can show the council.

DR. STUNZ: My motion may or may not make that discussion relevant, depending on if we pass it or not.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So Dr. Stunz has a motion that he wants to make relative to gag, and so let's do his motion first, and then we'll look at the presentation on that. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I am just trying to make sure that we maintain a logic flow here, and I'm thinking this might help, and so, I think, in Ryan's presentation -- In this particular document, there are a couple of action items with alternatives in it, and I think he's going to take this opportunity to review the action items and the alternatives, and so then we might potentially pick a preferred, right, and we don't necessarily have to do that, but to review the action items and the alternatives, so people know where we're going with the document.

MR. RINDONE: Not necessarily pick a preferred, but weed out

some of the things that you know that you don't want, and so, when we have an options draft, at that point, you guys can start playing around with the idea of a preferred, since right now we just have the presentation, but there is definitely an opportunity to thin the herd, and so we're crunched on time, yes.

DR. FRAZER: Yes, and that was my bad. Sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so I'm going to recognize Dr. Stunz first. His motion may have some effect on that presentation, depending on where it goes. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you could, ladies, pull that motion up that I sent earlier today, and, Ryan, what you're going to present will have relevance at some point, but I just don't know -- You will see when I make the motion here, and, while they're pulling that up -- I actually sent you two motions, and one is a slight alternate, and it does exactly the same thing, but I'm not sure of the procedure that we want to go down, and so they're the same motion, but just a little bit different versions, depending on the right procedural way to do that. While they're pulling it up, I will kind of -- Do you want me to wait? Then, if I get a second, I will explain it better.

Mr. Chairman, my motion is I move that Reef Fish Amendment 56 base catch limits using SRFS converted landings for the 1986 to 2005 original reference period. If subsequent allocation changes are desired, the council should begin to develop a separate amendment with a full allocation review, based on the allocation policy and guidelines.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so we have a motion on the board. Is there a second to the motion? It's seconded by Dr. Shipp. Can you give some rationale, Dr. Stunz?

DR. STUNZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so my rationale is, and, well, in hindsight, I should have done this maybe for amberjack, and let's try to just move that amendment along, but, obviously, and I don't want to rehash all those discussions, but we pretty much already have, but we really confound these amendments when we have an allocation in there, when we're really just fixing a mathematical or what in my mind is just a clerical error.

Certainly that results in allocation shifts, but then, if folks don't like the way that happened, because sometimes it works

favoring one sector one time, and another sector another, and I don't even know how it's all going to come out, but the point is, when we do an FES, or, in this case, SRFS, conversion, I think we should make that more of an automatic process that's informed by the SSC, and we fix that, and depending -- We might like the allocation, and we might not, and then we don't confound that.

Now, in this case, this is specifically for gag, because we're in gag, but just to tell you that I have another similar motion prepared that is probably more relevant to Sustainable Fisheries, because it's broader than Reef Fish, to do that -- To make that sort of our policy from now on, but, at least for this one specific to gag, since we're kind of in the middle of this amendment.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Is there discussion? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Greg, help me understand the wording of the first sentence. I agree with second sentence. The first sentence, however, I'm not sure that I understand the terminology and the ramifications of that terminology. Is that the basis for allowing other alternatives?

Recollect that, during committee, we had discussions over the appropriate time periods to be included, and, in fact, staff asked me to think about it and bring one back, and, the way it's worded, it gives me some concern that that's obviating that discussion as well, and so could you clarify that for me?

DR. STUNZ: Bob, to be clear, and, if we need to make some changes to verbiage -- I am not trying to do anything here, but the reason I put that, and maybe I'm not doing what I think I'm doing, was that is the original reference period. If we don't like that reference period in the future, because of that allocation, and there is justification to change it, that would be changed at a later time.

What we're trying to do now here is, in my mind, apples to apples, CHTS to FES conversion, and based on how it had been done in the past, and then we move forward with the allocation process and not complicating the document at this point.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: To that point, Mr. Gill? To that point, Mr. 46 Gill, and then Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so what you're saying is

that's effectively Alternative 2, to be followed by other alternatives, Alternative 3, and then other alternatives added around it? No? That's what I'm trying to understand, is what does this darned thing mean?

DR. STUNZ: Well, now I would have to see Alternative 1, Bob, to make sure I'm answering your question accurately, but what I'm trying to do is separate the conversion from the allocation, essentially.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: It would not be Alternative 1 though, and so Alternative 1 would be no action, without any conversion, would be -- That's where the Alternative 1s have been landing, and so it would definitely not be the no action alternative. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Mara likely will weigh-in, but, legally, I'm not sure this would be defensible, in terms of the approach. I understand what Greg is trying to do, and I agree that, obviously, we need to be looking at the change in the currency, based on the new survey methodology, but it is an allocation change, and then that triggers, obviously, the council putting together a rationale and a record with regard to why it's appropriate to change the allocation, and the justification could be, you know, what you're explaining, in terms of a change in the methodology, but there's also a lot of other factors to consider.

Then, under the National Environmental Policy Act, we would have to look at a range of alternatives that are reasonable to consider in association with that, and so, legally, I would love to have Mara weigh-in, in terms of the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. I mean, I think we've talked about this before, the fact that the integration of the new recreational data is intertwined with the catch limits, because it affects the projections, which is why we have not separated it before, and that, if you're going to consider keeping the same percentages then, or updating the percentages, whatever it is, that's fine to be an alternative, and you can have that alternative in your document, and you can select it, like you can select this, but you can't just state one alternative and move forward with it without considering the other reasonable alternatives, the economic impacts, the social impacts, the impacts to the stock. We have to have all of that for the agency to be able to move forward and actually say that what you

want to do is consistent with the Magnuson Act and all of the other required legal analysis.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: To that point, Dr. Stunz?

DR. STUNZ: To that point, and I think, by the way, Bob, Alternative 3 might be the one, instead of Alternative 1, but I need to review that a little more, but, to Mara's point, that's exactly why I want to pull these out, is because we have this —You know, have we fully vetted this?

You know, we talk about the allocation policy, and we've got — I can't remember exactly all the details, but it's much a more involved process, with a full evaluation, compared to what we're doing here, and that's one of the primary reasons that I want to pull it out, to give the —— I mean, a lot is at stake with these allocations, and we're kind of doing it here, versus just substituting in the SRFS numbers and converting them.

Then we go through this allocation process, as you're talking about, in a very meaningful way, where we fully consider the impacts, including economic and everything else related to this allocation. Right now, I don't think that this document is doing that, in terms of we're allocating based kind of on what it says, and we're not really being true to our allocation policy guidelines.

MS. LEVY: To that point?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: So we just had a presentation by staff, using the greater amberjack document as an example, about how these documents do what the allocation review policy sets forth, and so this is not a document yet.

This is an options paper, and there's nothing in it, because it hasn't been developed, but you do go through that allocation review process in doing these amendments, and you can't just skip it and implement this particular allocation and somehow not consider all of those things, and so this is an allocation change. It is, and it affects the commercial sector, and it affects the recreational sector, and it is not status quo, which is what folks are trying to make it be. That's not to say that you could not do this as a defensible new allocation, but you need to have a more considered discussion and consideration of other reasonable alternatives.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: To that point, Dr. Stunz?

 DR. STUNZ: Well, Mara, I respectfully disagree that we really haven't gone through a very deliberative process, and maybe we will, and I don't know, but, I mean, I am envisioning this, and I'm skipping ahead to my broader motion to do this collectively later, but I could imagine a scenario where the SSC, for example, works with the Science Center, just like we did ACLs, for example, and we you come back with a converted number, based upon, you know, fixing that clerical error, and that's that. I mean, that's the facts, and that's how it was, and that was the history in the past, and then we go through, you know, this very deliberative, full allocation process, and I'm sorry, but I'm just not seeing why that can't be done.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Is there any further discussion on this motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I recognize there is disagreement around the table, in terms of the legal advice. I mean, you've heard the legal advice, right, and choose the one who is the trained attorney here giving you that advice, and you may disagree with it, but I think, if we vote up this motion, it creates a huge risk, obviously, with the gag action, moving forward, and ultimately being submitted to the agency, if you consider this approach, and so I would recommend against this, and we can certainly come back and have further discussion about the concerns that are being raised today and that this means.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Just, again, I guess what I was trying to do, for this very reason, was to have Mr. Rindone kind of work through the alternatives, the various action items and the alternatives in his presentation, so we could see where this falls out, and so my suggestion is perhaps if we just table it until after Ryan's presentation, perhaps.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So, basically, Dr. Simmons told me something similar a minute ago, that Ryan's presentation might make some of this clearer for some council members, and I know it's a little unorthodox to not deal with the motion that's on the board, but, if Dr. Stunz does not have any problem, if we go ahead and let Ryan do his presentation, and so I'm inclined to do that at this point, and then, after his presentation, we'll come back and deal with this motion. Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Bernie, could you go to Slide 12, please? Okay,

and so we talked about the sector allocations, and this discussion is actually really good for this part of the We talked about some other year options that conversation. might be considered, like the ones from red grouper, and so, to make them commensurate for gag, we would add, potentially, 1986 to 2009, 1986 to 2019, the South Atlantic's Bow-Tie Method that they have used for allocating some species, and then a proportional reduction, followed by a distribution, and I left that one out of this, because there are some math discrepancies, with currency changes, that we're just not ready to bring this one to you guys yet, and so I want to pick somebody over in the South Atlantic's brain on more about this before I try to put this in -- Or try to consider this, but I don't think, in the short-term, it's something that we should probably burn a lot of midnight oil on.

This is looking at options of 1986 to 2005, which is the current reference period, and that gives you about 35 percent commercial and 65 percent recreational. If you add four more years, it will take you to 2009, and so the last pre-IFQ year. It's virtually the same. It's like half-a-percent difference.

If you add in the totality of the IFQ period, it drops down to about 1.4 percent difference from the current reference period, and the thing to remember for that is, for the last three years, that 2017 to 2019 especially, there's definitely some evidence to suggest that there was a shift in commercial fishing effort as gag got harder to find, and there was less commercial fish that were being landed.

There were less recreational fish being landed as well, and the recreational sector wasn't catching its ACL, and so there were clearly some problems with the stock that may have influenced catch per unit effort during the latter part of that time series, and so, if you were looking for a reason why you might not want to consider an 1986 to 2019, bias related to the condition of the stock would certainly be one of them, and then, of course, the difference between the 1986 to 2005 and 1986 to 2009 is miniscule, from a percentage standpoint, and it would be up to you guys to determine how miniscule that is, in terms of what it means for social and economic effects.

The Bow-Tie Method, the way that this works is that you take the entire time series, and you give that a weighting. The average landings from that whole time series, you give that a weighting of 50 percent, and then you give the other 50 percent of the weighting to the most recent three years in that time series, during that reference period, and so you can see the way that

those shake out there.

1 2 3

Again, with the 2017 to 2019, and we just finished talking about the potential bias there with relation to the stock, but this is a more complex way of doing it, and it still doesn't really result in meaningful differences in percentages, but, you know, it's up to you guys to really determine what that means, and so this is what all those shake out to, and so, if we can look at these, and especially if we can thin some of these things out, it gives me a better idea of what to request of the Science Center before we get into this SSC meeting coming up, for the SSC to look at what these yields look like, where they can recommend those as being consistent with BSIA and pass those on for us to include in an options draft.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any questions for Mr. Rindone? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I'm sure you know more than I, but is Bow Tie the correct terminology here, and does it have specific relation to that technique and process?

MR. RINDONE: I'm sorry, but I guess I missed the first part, and does Bow Tie have specific reference to what process?

MR. GILL: I have not heard Bow Tie terminology, and I'm trying to just reaffirm that it's what you intended.

MR. RINDONE: It's what you think it is. It's the allocation method that the South Atlantic had used in the past, and the intention is to try to upweight the more recent part of the time series, and, in effect, what it ends up doing is not exactly proportional, but it double counts the last three years, because you're including it in the 50 percent to the entire time series, and then you're adding extra weight to it for the second half of that calculation.

I think that -- I don't think that you gain a lot by adding that level of complexity to it, based on just looking at the numbers, especially in the early years here, and especially if periodic reconsideration of any of this is something that's of interest to the council. In the initial years, the yields that we're going to be looking at, regardless of these small differences in percentages -- Like they're going to be low for gag.

We're going to be sorting couch change for the first few years of the rebuilding period, and so the effect is going to be a shift of mere thousands of pounds, to tens of thousands of pounds, at most, I would think, and so just, I guess, food for

thought on that, but, again, if you guys could -- You know, if you guys say we want to just stick with our normal method of solid reference periods, then we can drop the whole Bow Tie thing, or, if you're interested in that, then fine. If there's any reference periods that you want to ignore completely, please tell us, so that we can thin this out, but this is just based on what was discussed in committee, but fewer options will allow us to expedite things.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so are you looking for a motion here or discussion? Why does Ryan keep asking for motions?

MR. RINDONE: I just want to put you on the spot. I mean, I don't know that necessarily we have to -- Okay. Here's the thing. I don't know that you necessarily need a motion, but, if you tell me that you don't want to look at things, like I'm not going to intend to bring that back. We're on a tight time schedule for gag, just like we are with amberjack, and so let's get a good idea of what you guys want to do now, so that what we bring back for options -- We're pretty confident that we're not going to be looking at any other allocation options beyond that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I agree with Ryan's comments and doing the Bow Tie complication, both in understanding and a little bit more complex computation, and so I consider that we should not utilize the Bow Tie, but utilize the other three reference time periods.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any other comments about alternatives that the council is interested in or not interested in seeing? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I know it kind of didn't work out with amberjack, but I'm still curious, and so now we have a species that we have an allocation, or an IFQ, that started in 2010, and you've got two options there that don't even -- I guess that's what I don't understand, and I've got to get with Dr. Froeschke, and probably Ryan, some more to understand, because it seems, to me, like somehow that would play into this, because your fishery is changing at that point.

I understand that it's 61/39, but, somehow, I still feel like we need to look at this historical catch with the commercial

fishermen, and their numbers are their numbers, and these percentages bother me a little bit, when you look at -- Again, I understand that you may have to decrease them some, but I just feel like, somehow, that should play into this, and maybe I'm wrong.

MR. RINDONE: Well, it's certainly within you all's purview to say that you want to exclude say the 1986 to 2019, because it includes the IFQ years, and because, at that point, the commercial sector would have been capped, and so it's less of an organic representation of what was being caught.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I am just trying to help you out, Ryan, and the staff, and so, if you were to, I guess, incorporate, or think about Bob Gill's suggestion to get rid of the reference time period using the Bow Tie approach, and then you got rid of the 1986 to 2019, because of the issues that Ms. Boggs just talked about, and so you would have three alternatives in that action, right, like a no action alternative and two historical time series, to consider.

MR. RINDONE: Two to three functional alternatives, yes, because the Alternative 1 would leave it as it is and continue with monitoring under CHTS, which is not something we can do. Alternative 2 would leave it as it is, 61/39, but manage under SRFS, which is a de facto reallocation of the commercial sector, and Alternative 3 is 1986 to 2005, which gives you 65 percent rec and 35 percent commercial, and then a new Alternative 4 would be 1986 to 2009, which would be basically the same thing.

DR. FRAZER: So, again, are you just -- I mean, that's my preference, to keep it to a manageable number, and kind of adhere to the legal requirements that Mara referred to, and then move on from there, and so do we need a motion specifically for that?

MR. RINDONE: I mean, I have good direction, I think, at this point. Ms. Levy has her hand up though.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Go ahead, Ms. Levy, and then we're going to deal with the motion. Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thanks. I think Ryan covered it, but, maybe to Susan's point, all of these documents that we've developed, red grouper, greater amberjack, this one, they all have an alternative to keep the same percentages, right, and so, in that

way, you would be keeping the same percentage for the commercial sector, if you chose that. The issue you have to grapple with is that a total reduction is needed, and what are the implications if you keep the same percentage for the commercial sector, but I just wanted to point out that that has been there, and I think the intent would be to include that, and Ryan noted that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Levy. All right, and so we're going to go back to the motion. The motion, from Dr. Stunz, is to move that Reef Fish Amendment 56 base catch limits using SRFS-converted landings for the 1986 through 2005 original reference period. If subsequent allocation changes are desired, the council should develop a separate amendment, with a full allocation review, based on the allocation policy and guidelines.

Is there any further discussion on this motion? I am going to bring out a few points for your consideration, as you vote. We have advice from counsel that this is likely to be problematic, and could slow down the process, and the reason I bring that up is, like Ryan said, we are on a tight timeline.

 We were notified in January of this year that that stock is overfished and undergoing overfishing, and we have two years to get everything done, and we have to have a new amendment in place by January of next year, and so we're going to have to take action on this by probably no later than June, roughly, of the coming year, final action, and so there's still a fair amount of work to do.

As you seen, through Ryan's presentation, on this particular species, the percentage changes are not very great, and so, if anybody has any comments, they are welcome to make them now. We're going to go ahead and vote. All in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand; all opposed, like sign.

DR. SWEETMAN: I am opposed.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. It's a tie vote, and the motion fails. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: One suggestion on perhaps how you could do this is, given the similarity of the percentages among those three time series, is you could just add an Alternative 3 to the document to set the allocation at 65/35, something like that, and then, in the discussion, you could compare that that percentage is relatively robust among various representative

time series.

1 2 3

 MR. RINDONE: So it's already in there, as a percentage anyway, in Alternative 3, but you're saying just set it at that, regardless of the representative time series, and say that the data support that, essentially, and so there's really no reason that we couldn't use that instead of the current Alternative 3.

 DR. FROESCHKE: Correct, and it would just save a lot of haggling about the time series. I mean, they're all about the same, and that should be, in my view, pretty good rationale that that's a reasonable alternative, and then the back half of that still would apply.

MR. RINDONE: Well, I mean, it's a question, right, and so would you guys rather just go ahead and say, in Alternative 3, to establish a new sector allocation of 65 percent recreational and 35 percent commercial, and then the justification would be that, whether you use 1986 to 2005 or 1986 to 2009, the time series is robust to this, and it results in about this allocation, and so then it doesn't really matter what the time series is anymore, and you're setting it based on a look at more than just one reference period.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Again, because the percentage differences between those historical time series are like a fraction of a percent, I think it makes sense, if it's going to streamline and simplify the workload, for staff to do that, and I don't have any problem with that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So I believe, Dr. Frazer, we're at a point where we're ready to pick up on the committee report. Did you have any other business, Mr. Rindone?

MR. RINDONE: I have already requested that the Science Center produce yields corresponding to the 65/35 split, just in preparation, in case like this happened, because the gap between when this meeting is happening and when the SSC meeting is happening -- Like it was better to ask for it and have it than not ask for it and not be able to review it in time, and so we'll be onboard -- We'll be able to review this, that 65/35, and the projection that will correspond to that, for the next SSC meeting, and so we'll be able to fold that into the options draft.

The only other thing that was on this list that you guys are

going to need to provide any input on is going to be the fishing seasons, and so there were two options that were presented in there, and there's one that reflects the shallow-water grouper closures and closing commercial fishing beyond twenty fathoms in February and March, which corresponds with the peak spawning season for gag.

Typically, we don't find male gags shallower than 120 feet, and spawning activity doesn't occur shallower than 120 feet, and so that was why that shallow-water grouper closure was deemed at that depth in the first place, and then having it set in February and March corresponds with gag peak spawning activity, and so, if that's something that you guys want to continue to consider, we'll leave that in there. If not, speak now, or forever hold that piece.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: A couple of questions for Ryan. Remind me, with regard to the recreational season alternatives, and do we have those in the amendment?

MR. RINDONE: We do. That's Alternative 3, and that reflects what's in the interim rule. Alternative 3 would revise the current recreational fishing season for gag such that it would be closed from January 1 to August 31 and reopen on September 1, and then it would close on November 10, or when the recreational ACL is projected to be met, whichever occurs first, and so that reflects what is currently in the interim rule.

 MR. STRELCHECK: So, related to that, one suggestion is, obviously, we're going to see how that season performs next year. As the stock rebuilds, and hopefully responds to our management measures, the catch levels are going to go up, and I don't know, obviously, if that means the season will get longer or not, but that would be the hope, and so one thought I had was to set a start date and give NMFS the authority to kind of set the fishing season, so that it can allow for an expansion of that season over time and not lock us into the essentially seventy days, and we do that in other fisheries, and in particular the South Atlantic.

Then, while I have the microphone, we heard a lot about closing the commercial fishery and concerns about a commercial closure, and I tend to agree with the commercial fishermen that I think it's better to allow for some harvest as bycatch during that timeframe, even at low levels, but we do have a historically low population of male gag right now, and we have, in place, two

spawning area closures, with Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, that are year-round closures.

Madison-Swanson is far more important for gag, and then we have a seasonal closure for The Edges, and that seasonal closure is January through April, in part to protect male gag, and other gag, in that area, but I was wondering if it's worth considering expanding that to a year-round closure, at least for consideration in this document, to protect gag in that particular deepwater habitat and not opening it, obviously, to potential fishing mortality after the spawning season.

MR. RINDONE: So, I mean, I think that we could put that in here, and I guess the question would be, would it be closed to all fishing activity year-round, and then would we be also sending a letter to HMS, similar to what we just did in the generic framework action, for Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, because we used to have a trolling provision for those that we have since taken back, and I think that was implemented in August of last year, and so we would be talking about something similar for The Edges, because the whole impetus behind that action was the Reef Fish AP telling us that they were -- Certain members of the AP were witnessing a lot of poaching out there, and law enforcement told us that it's difficult to enforce a -- It's difficult to prevent fishing activity on the bottom when there's a trolling provision.

 $\begin{cases} \textbf{CHAIRMAN DIAZ:} & \texttt{Mr. Strelcheck.} \end{cases}$

 MR. STRELCHECK: Ryan, I guess I don't think we need to get into details here, and I don't even know if I would support it. I think, at this point, I would just be -- I don't want to miss an opportunity to at least consider an action and an alternative that might be really helpful for the conservation of gag grouper, and particularly the male population, and so that's why I was suggesting that we at least include it and get some analysis and see what information the Science Center has that would support this action or not.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Rindone.

 MR. RINDONE: Well, maybe it's better to look at that -- I know the idea behind including this, but maybe it is better to look at that separately, because it could be something that ends up affecting the CMP species as well, and so it would be more of a generic amendment, you know, like the other one was, and then I could envision it bogging this amendment down some, and, given the time-sensitive nature of it, maybe this isn't the best place

for that right now, but that's not to say that it's not a good thing to investigate.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Any further comments? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Looking at the recreational seasons, this is not a fishery that is big off the coast of Alabama. I mean, we catch a few gag, but, in hearing the testimony yesterday, the folks from Panama City, and I know Destin catches a lot of gag, and I know Tampa and St. Pete and down there through, and Fort Myers catches a lot of gag, and, from what I heard yesterday in testimony, and I understand the intent and what we're trying to do, but talking about, if you close it during that June-July season, when you're snapper fishing, and you have the discards, and, I mean, I look at this as important, because is it better to keep it open and retain a few fish, as opposed to closing it with all these, most likely, dead discards that you're going to incur, because it's still going to count against your quota.

Again, there's finding that balance, and then you heard the argument of, well, if you open it in September, the shallower waters are easier to catch, and I don't know what's better, but I'm just bringing up the points from what we heard yesterday, to see what is worse, or what is better, and is it better to let them catch a few as a bycatch, I guess you could say, during snapper season, or is it better that they throw those -- Excuse me. Release those fish, and they hopefully survive, or you wait and open the shallower waters, when they're easier to catch.

I was just reading where, in November and December, but I think it says close November 10, which would -- That's when they say the peak season is, and so I really don't know, and I'm just asking the question, but I just know what I heard in comments yesterday. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. All right. I think we're at a point to move on, Dr. Frazer, if you would lead us through.

DR. FRAZER: Okay. IFQ Focus Group, Tab B, Numbers 12(a) through (d), staff presented a draft meeting summary for the August 2-3, 2022, meeting of the IFQ Focus Group in Tampa, Florida. One of the meeting's facilitators was available virtually to answer questions from the committee.

The committee noted the contentious issues addressed by the IFQ focus group members and discussed the expectations for the IFQ focus group, should it be convened for a second meeting.

A committee member inquired about NMFS' efforts to address the recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences study on the Gulf IFQ programs, and the committee requested that Dr. Powers and Dr. Anderson, co-authors of the study and members of the council's SSC, work with the SSC to identify those NAS recommendations that could be prioritized or operationalized. Recognizing the complexity of the IFQ programs, committee members noted the need for more time during council meetings to work on changes to the IFQ programs.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to reassemble the IFQ Focus Group for a second two-day meeting. That motion carried with one in opposition. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Okay, and so Other Business. The committee discussed the state-specific surveys of private recreational red snapper catch and effort, acknowledging the considerable investments and effort on behalf of the states to make these surveys functional and valuable.

A committee member also noted the differences in estimation methods between the surveys and the work being conducted by the MRIP Transition Team with the states to work toward a common data currency.

Another committee member asked about the intent of a committee motion to accept the state surveys by the Council as best available science. A committee member stated that this motion would clarify the council's perspective for the public. A committee member noted that the council is a management body, and, not a scientific one, and, as such, the council doesn't have the authority to deem any survey or body of research as the best scientific information available.

The committee recognized that the SSC is typically the body that makes recommendations about what is consistent with BSIA and would likely be tasked, at least in part, with any evaluation to that end. It was noted that it is the resultant completed analyses, which include consideration of the available indices, surveys, and studies, which are considered for evaluation as BSIA, and not the individual surveys themselves. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. I want to apologize, Patrick. I know you raised your hand before we got into Other Business, and I know you probably had something for the previous item, and so sorry I didn't get there quick enough, and so we're going to drop back, probably, to some IFQ stuff. Patrick, go ahead.

MR. BANKS: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. Yes, my comments are about the IFQ focus group, and so we heard some discussion about that group during public comment, and one comment that I heard, and I don't recall who said it, was we need some more guidance from the council specific to what we need to do, and so I was just -- I wanted to pose the question to the council of do we need to have some more conversation here, to try to clarify a little bit more, and I thought we were fairly clear in their charge, but it sounds like at least some of them thought that they needed a little bit more guidance as to what we were asking them to do, and so is that something that we need to discuss, to try to give them some more guidance? I'm not saying we do, but I just wanted to bring that up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Shipp.

DR. SHIPP: A point of order, and my mind is going, but I thought we left a motion on the floor yesterday, or whenever it was, and I don't see a motion there, and we just kind of adjourned, and someone else can --

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I think you're right, Dr. Shipp, and Bernie is going to pull that up, and so I think we left that motion at the end of Reef Fish. Bernie, if you could pull that up, please. Thank you, Dr. Shipp. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, regarding the IFQ focus group charge, I mean, my suggestion would be that we -- That staff makes sure the group reviews the report, and we essentially finalize the report, and, when we bring that back, we can bring back maybe a draft charge, or something from that meeting, to discuss perhaps for October.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So we are not going to be able to get this group together before the next meeting, and it's going to happen in between the October meeting and the January meeting, and so staff could -- Okay.

So the motion on the board is the council recommends acceptance of the state surveys of private recreational catch and effort as best available science for assessment and management. Okay.

That's a different topic. Before we get to that, is there anything else about IFQs? Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It was brought to our attention, during public comment, that us, as a council, put a person in a seat that shouldn't be in a seat, and I know that was during closed session, and I don't even know the names, but I just wanted it to be surfaced and that everybody be aware that we voted to put someone in a seat that shouldn't be in the seat on the IFQ focus group.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I don't agree with your characterization of shouldn't be in that group. He fit the category as defined, and he was a little unusual, in that he had shares, and I know there is opposition by members of the focus group to his being there, but we chose him based on the criteria that we went out with, and he fit those criteria, and we made that decision, and so to say that he shouldn't be in that seat I think is incorrect.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any further opinions on this? All right. I am not seeing anybody make any motions to do anything. I did one to bring up one other thing about IFQs, because we leave that topic, and so we heard some comments, during different -- The recent history indicating that some participants in the program don't feel comfortable about commenting, for fear of retribution that would impact their ability to do business.

I want to make sure and say, on the record, that we currently allow for the submission of anonymous public comments through our online comment form, and so people can submit comments, without filling out their name or their address, and we will accept those comments, and so that is something that can be done now.

I would also like to just drop the idea, and I talked some with Emily and Dr. Simmons, but we also kicked around the idea of having a voice mailbox just specific to IFQ issues, so that people could leave anonymous comments, and, if they left anonymous comments, staff would summarize those comments, and we wouldn't get them one at a time, where they could be brought back individual, but they would be brought back in some type of aggregation, and I did want to get some input from the council, if people think that's a good idea to have the voice mailbox that people could leave anonymous comments. Any feedback on that? Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I guess what's the legal requirement? I mean, when we do public testimony, we ask folks to provide their name and, you know, location, before they do comments, and, you know, there is some -- I just was wondering if that's even allowable, to just anonymously give a comment, just for the legal side. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Ms. Levy, I'm going to see if you can weigh-in on this, because -- Can you give us some guidance here, please?

 MS. LEVY: I would need to double-check the provision that talks about comments. I mean, I know we allow anonymous comments on rulemakings, but I don't know that there is anything preventing that, but, I mean, when someone gives physical public comment, it's kind of hard to be anonymous, but, if you give me a minute to just look at the language in the statute more closely, I can circle back with you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: If you would circle back with us, just so we would know, but I just want to provide an avenue, and I personally don't like anonymous comments, but, in this circumstance, it seems like it might be a reasonable way to move forward, because people are telling us that they're afraid of retribution, and it bothers me that people want to comment on how to improve a government process, and they're afraid of retribution, and so I think we should be able to have ways for folks to be able to give comments to try to help us improve the program, and they already can do it on our online system, and we've been accepting comments by people that don't provide their name. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I will make this as a statement, but I would hope, or I don't know if they think it's going to be retribution from this council or retribution from the other commercial fishermen, and I hope that we're all adult enough, and business-like enough, and I hope in this audience, that we wouldn't do that, and that this council wouldn't do that.

 I know that we have heated debates around this table, but I don't think anybody -- I mean, nobody is being vengeful, and we're all just trying to watch out, I guess, for our best interests, or the best interests of our constituents, and so I would just like to say that I hope that our fishermen are above that level of action.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Right, and I would like to -- For people listening online, and people around the table probably

understand what I'm saying, but, for people online, the retribution that I've been hearing people saying is that, whenever they comment on the program, they have a hard time finding shares to lease, and so that's the retribution. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Two things. One, certainly, in terms of obtaining information from constituents about the program, I encourage council staff to reach out to my IFQ program team, in terms of mechanisms and ways that maybe we can help with collecting information, and then I do note that Eric Brazer is in the back of the room, and, based on what Susan just said, I would just encourage, you know, great representatives like Eric and the commercial industry to send this message as well, with regard to communicating with all constituents and the concerns that we have, obviously, about what's coming before the council regarding the IFQ focus group.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Thank you. All right. I think we've had enough on that, and we'll hear back from Mara. Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. The provision in the Magnuson Act that talks about how meetings are to proceed does have a section that talks about comment, and it basically says that interested persons shall be permitted to comment, and it does say that any oral or written statement shall include a brief description of the background and interest of the person in the subject of the oral or written statement, and so it does require that the person state their interest and background, in terms of the statement they're giving.

Now, that is for meeting procedure, and so that's different than, I would say, doing a comment on one of the documents that you're developing through your online form, right, and that's not a meeting, and so that's specific to meetings of the councils, APs, advisory groups, whatever you set up, however you set them up.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Well, thank you for that, Ms. Levy. We appreciate it. Okay. I think we're done with Reef Fish, or we've got to deal with this, right? All right. We have a substitute motion on the board. I'm going to read the substitute motion, and we'll have some discussion.

The council and NOAA Fisheries greatly value the work of the Gulf states to develop private recreational fishing catch and effort surveys and are committed to working collaboratively with the states to improve data collection and ensure the council is

using the best scientific information available for management decisions. Is there any discussion on the motion? Dr. Shipp.

DR. SHIPP: Again, just a point of order, and I don't know who made that motion, or seconded it, the substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I believe that Mr. Strelcheck made the motion, but it looks like I'm lacking here in the seconder, of what's here in my notes, and so I don't know, of the top of my head, and I believe the previous motion was seconded by Greg Stunz. It was made by you, Dr. Shipp, and seconded by Greg Stunz, and I don't know who seconded the substitute right now.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Tom.

DR. FRAZER: I was the seconder for that motion.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. The motion is seconded by Dr. Frazer at this point, and so is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Ms. Chair. I am going to try to do something a little different here, Bob, and so we tend to want to not compromise and divide one another, and I think we talked, in committee, and at least some of us view that neither one of these motions really mean or say a lot, and that may not be, obviously, your position, but I am certainly willing to withdraw my motion, if you're willing to withdraw yours, acknowledging the fact that we are working really well with the states right now, and we'll be talking about calibration here in a minute.

We're incorporating the state surveys into our science and management approaches, and we are taking some pretty important steps to make this science available for use in both the management process and our stock assessments, and so I offer that as an olive branch.

DR. SHIPP: We're playing poker now. I'm not going to withdraw my motion. However, yours is going to win, and so let's just leave it as it is and see how it pans out, but I'm sure you're going to walk away the winner with the pot this time.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so we have a substitute motion, and I just read it into the record. I am not seeing any hands. All in favor of the substitute motion, please signify by raising your hand, eight for; all opposed, raise your hand.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I would vote for it.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: So that would be nine to seven. Thank you, General Spraggins. Okay. The substitute motion carries. That ends the Reef Fish Committee. Thank you, Dr. Frazer, for your -- Mr. Strelcheck, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: As much as I want to get home, like everyone else, no motion here, and I just wanted to have a brief discussion, and so, if you remember, at the June council meeting, Kevin made a motion to have the SSC review updated calibrations, based on newer time series of data, and there were some questions, at that time, with regard to whether that would require an independent peer review and how that process could work.

We sat down, and we talked with the state directors and let them know that, as long as we're taking the kind of approach that was previously approved, updating that data and statistics, that we could move those forward for consideration by the SSC. We stand ready to kind of share, obviously, the data and information to generate those calibrations and work with the states to put together any documentation to go to the SSC.

 I did speak to Ryan and Carrie, today at lunchtime, and my understanding is that the September SSC has already moved forward with an agenda to be filed, and so, at this point, I will let Ryan or Carrie talk about the timing of an SSC meeting, but it sounds like maybe there's potential for something to get done before the end of the year.

MR. RINDONE: So I currently have it on the January meeting. If it was going to have to happen before then, the first two weeks of December are it, and we don't -- It would have to be a special meeting, and availability of people can be more difficult in December.

They know they have a January meeting, and so they're generally available for that meeting, and so it's you all's pleasure to have a special SSC meeting, and that's the information that I have for you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: If I understand this right, Ryan, once -- If these recalibrations are run, and there is some differences, we have to take those differences and start a document here, work a document through our system, and they couldn't -- Nothing could

be done before January of 2024, and is that basically correct?

MR. RINDONE: I don't know about that. I mean, if we started a document in January, and you guys then saw options on it -- I mean, it could still be a framework action, because the last one was a framework action.

The last calibration one was a framework action, and so, I mean, you could see options on it in April, and then you could go final on it as soon as June, and then it could be in place for 2024, but it would still need to be reviewed by the SSC, and I think the review by the SSC would need to have some pretty well-thought-out terms of reference too, to make sure that the review is paying attention to the things that it needs to pay attention to and we don't wiggle off into anything that might be construed as management related, and so the merits of using certain time series versus others, in terms of how it might correct for any sort of management bias, or fisher behavior, or anything like that, and actually have some supporting evidence from the states as to why they might pick A versus B and whatever scenarios that that might apply to.

As long as it's all -- As long as the methodologies aren't what is changing dramatically, then, you know, we should be okay. I think a concern would be that, if the methodologies have changed in a way that's substantial enough that it might require a new peer review, which, you know -- Sorry, Mr. Chair, but I just don't think it's reasonable to pull that off by January. That takes time to find people and set a lot of stuff up.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Certainly. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess what's not 100 percent clear, to me, is this would be the three eastern states, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, that we would be looking at the recalibration for, and are the states ready to go with S&T? Have they worked this out, and we're ready just to have a document that goes before the SSC? I guess I'm not really clear on where are with that timing. Are we the holdup here? Is that all ready to go?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I can't speak for the states, other than the conversations that I've had with them, but we stand ready to provide any data and information they need for the calibrations, and I think we would want to discuss, as you're pointing out, within the terms of reference, the documentation,

and then a lot hinges on timing, because of when we could convene the SSC meeting.

2 3 4

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Well, thank you for that discussion, Mr. Strelcheck. All right. Is there any other -- Seeing no further discussion, I believe that concludes Reef Fish. One more, Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Just if Andy could refresh my memory about -- Was it an abbreviated framework? I mean, I think Dr. Simmons mentioned a framework, and I didn't know if there was -- The difference, and if there was a timing difference on your end for getting approval, because, if we take it up in April, and go final in April, the earliest, according to what I recollect for a framework, would be October-ish, or November, and so I didn't know if an abbreviated framework was anything that -- Would it decrease the amount of time that it would take for the agency to review and implement?

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, to that comment, I think it certainly would, and so I would want to talk to my team directly, in terms of whether it would be appropriate to use that.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I just wanted to try to wrap my head around this a little bit as well, and so I thought, originally, Kevin, what you were interested in doing was simply extending the time series that was used in the calibration, and there's not a lot of new methodology involved here, right, and so it's much like an interim analysis, in that way. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you. Okay. We are moving on from Reef Fish this time, for real, and we're moving into Sustainable Fisheries. Dr. Stunz.

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES COMMITTEE REPORT

 DR. STUNZ: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is the Sustainable Fisheries Committee for August 24, 2022. The committee adopted the agenda, Tab E, Number 1, and approved the minutes, Tab E, Number 2, of the April 2022 meeting as written.

Presentation on NOAA's Climate Southeast Regional Action Plan, Tab E, Number 4, Dr. John Quinlan, from NOAA Fisheries, gave a presentation on the agency's southeast regional action plans for climate change. Dr. Quinlan noted that NOAA Fisheries' climate strategy is a proactive approach to increase production,

delivery, and use of climate-related information to fulfill the agency's mandates.

 The strategy includes seven objectives to reduce impacts and improve resilience with evolving ocean and climate conditions. The objectives range from building and maintaining an adequate science infrastructure to developing climate-informed reference points.

Dr. Clay Porch, with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, emphasized the ambitious goals of the regional action plan. He indicated that many of these objectives would be difficult to achieve, given that minimum sustainable yield cannot be computed for several managed species. Therefore, assessing long-term management goals are confounded by a changing climate. He stated that using novel management approaches, such as interim analysis, could be beneficial to working through those challenges.

Committee members expressed interest in the data available to assist in climate-related fisheries management issues. Dr. Stunz, the committee chair, noted that staff drafted a comment letter and encouraged committee members to offer suggestions and recommend additions, as warranted.

Andy Strelcheck, with the Southeast Regional Office, suggested that, in addition to the comments in the draft letter, the council could consider outlining specific actions and recommendations of interest that align with council priorities. Council staff noted the importance of a continued engagement with the process and indicated that suggestions and recommendations provided by the council would be included in the final letter.

 Mr. Chair, I wanted to back up, and we can fix this in a minute, but I think -- I just wanted to be clear that Dr. Porch said, "given minimum sustainable yield", if that's correct, and we can fix that in a minute, I just wanted to verify that, Dr. Walter, and make sure, in that sentence there.

Draft Comment Letter on NOAA's Equity and Environmental Justice Strategy, Tab E, Number 5, the committee received a draft comment letter concerning NOAA Fisheries' Draft Equity and Environmental Justice Strategy, which reflects comments made by the council during its June 2022 meeting. The committee was encouraged to review the letter and consider any further comments before the council.

 SSC Recommendations on Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC) Control Rule, Tab E, Number 6 Dr. Jim Nance, the chair of the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), reviewed the SSC's July 2022 discussions about the development of revisions to the council's ABC Control Rule.

The SSC began revisionary work, with the aid of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, at its May and July 2022 meetings, and will continue this work during 2022 and early 2023. The SSC is exploring these revisions to better assess and account for scientific uncertainty in the stock assessments and other catch analyses it reviews.

The current ABC Control Rule has been found to generate unreasonably narrow buffers between the overfishing limit (OFL) and ABC, due to an insufficient accounting of scientific uncertainty. Even though the current ABC Control Rule has been in use since 2011, the SSC is not required to use the current rule for recommending catch advice. More information on the current ABC control can be presented. However, the revisions being proposed to the current rule will be substantial. Mr. Chair, would you like me to stop there, because we talked about making some motions and update the group on what has happened in that process.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Yes, please.

DR. STUNZ: If you recall, we were talking about coming back with some motions for some of the work that Jim Nance provided that the SSC needed, and this is where I was prepared to offer those motions. Well, it turns out the staff was on the ball and ahead of us, and they had already done that, through a formal letter, and, Ryan, I don't know if you want to comment, and I think you were involved, with that or not, but so those motions were not necessary at this point, and, in other words, it's already in the works, so to speak, and so, if that's okay, I will continue, or that's an update.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and the SSC will review that in January.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, sir.

DR. STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Ryan. Moving along, Presentation on Mechanisms and Options for Automating Catch Advice from Interim Analysis, Tab E, Number 7, council staff presented how

updates to catch advice following interim analyses might be implemented in a more automated fashion. Interim analyses typically use data, such as a fishery-independent index, from the previous year to inform any proposed modifications to catch advice.

Interim analysis is a SEFSC tool developed for understanding stock health and trends between stock assessments. The purpose of this tool is to capture a more real time understanding of stock health, as stock assessments often have a terminal year of data that is one to two years old. Currently, interim analyses that result in SSC-recommended changes to the OFL and ABC for a species are presented to the council, and then the Council requests that staff initiate a framework action (Reef Fish) or framework amendment (Coastal Migratory Pelagics) to modify the catch limits.

This process usually takes the council about six to eight months, followed by another six-month review, comment period, and implementation process for NMFS. By the time the catch advice is able to be implemented, it is already two years old or more.

Council staff demonstrated options for automating the implementation of SSC-approved changes to the OFL and ABC, and the resultant changes on the ACLs and ACTs, within certain thresholds for consideration by the council, potentially bypassing the need for the council to initiate and review a document under every instance.

Such an automated process will reduce the time between the SSC's recommendations being finalized and catch limits being updated via regulatory document, without defraying transparency and opportunity for stakeholder input on the proposed changes.

 Committee members discussed potential hurdles to the process, including National Environmental Policy Act requirements that would still be required for the rulemaking and implementation process. Some committee members thought the simplicity of the automation was advantageous, noting that all other aspects of the process would still remain open to the public.

A committee member asked if the council could intercept the automation process if it wanted to explore a catch limit different than that which would result from automation. Council staff replied that the council would always have that ability and would simply need to make that desire known to initiate the typical regulatory amendment process to revise the catch limits

for a species.

1 2 3

NOAA General Counsel stated that the current abbreviated framework process could be used to further automate the current process to changing the catch limits. However, current NEPA requirements would limit the extent to which changes to the catch limits could be expedited. The committee encouraged further communication with the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils on their methods and to explore possible parallels for implementation in the Gulf, as well as qualifying reduced time for implementation.

Overview of Research Set-Asides (RSA) Timeline, Composition, and Draft Objectives, Tab E, Number 8, council staff presented --Sorry.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I think the committee discussed having a motion regarding the automation process, and I think there is a draft provided, and I didn't know if you wanted to consider that now.

DR. STUNZ: Yes, Carrie, and can you give me a minute to pull that up? Sorry, and I forgot to send that one to Meetings. While we're waiting, and sorry, committee, or council, but I forgot to send this motion to the Meetings.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, Dr. Stunz. If you would read your motion into the record, and we'll see if we get a second.

DR. STUNZ: Okay. My motion is, in collaboration with SERO staff, explore mechanisms to improve timeliness and efficiency of updating routine changes in catch advice, using either the existing framework process or suggest changes in framework procedures that could be used to reduce the time between the completion of science and implementation of management changes. Provide an update at a future council meeting.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so we have a motion. Is there a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Broussard. Dr. Stunz, can you give us some rationale?

DR. STUNZ: Yes, and I think I would defer to Carrie. Carrie, do you mind providing a little bit of rationale, in terms of how this going to improve our efficiency? That would greatly help me out.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Chair, and so, during the committee, we just put some ideas out there and took a preliminary look at what other regional management councils are doing to try to streamline the regulatory process, and my understanding was, you know, there were some concerns brought up by Ms. Levy, as well as Mr. Strelcheck, and getting their staff more involved in trying to help us figure out what changes can be made to the closed framework procedure and trying to engage with other councils and trying to quantify how much time this has increased throughput for them and try to come back with that information for the committee.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Carrie. That was much better than I could have done.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I will back up to the beginning of the research set-asides, I think, and is that where we left off now?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Yes.

DR. STUNZ: Okay. Overview of Research Set-Asides RSA) Timeline, Composition, and Draft Objectives, Tab E, Number 8, council staff presented an overview of next steps for evaluating the potential for an RSA program in the Gulf.

A committee member recommended that the work group consider focusing on applied science that would support fishery management needs as a goal of the RSA program. He also urged the work group to not be constrained to the design of the RSA programs of the New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils, but to consider what would work best for the Gulf.

Another committee member noted that Mr. Gill has been instrumental in exploring RSAs and inquired why he is not listed as a work group participant. Mr. Gill responded that he didn't feel a need to participate and commented that there are strong individuals comprising the workgroup. He also cautioned against making the work group too large and acknowledged his plans to sit in on meetings when possible.

A committee member then inquired how the council members were selected to be on the workgroup. Mr. Diaz responded that he made selections based upon expressed interest from council

members, while considering a balance of membership.

Moving on, Discussion on the Florida Pompano Petition for Federal Rulemaking Letter, Tab E, Number 9, Mr. Strelcheck reviewed a petition letter for rulemaking for Florida pompano and provided an overview of the guidelines for establishing a federal fishery management plan.

A committee member stated that the State of Florida has been successfully managing Florida pompano, along with African pompano and permit, as a complex for several decades. A committee member asked about the motivation for the petition and was informed by SERO staff that the petition was the result of a lawsuit and that the agency was obligated to explore management options. The committee agreed that more information would need to be collected and presented at a future meeting, before making any determination on potential federal management. There is a motion there, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so we have committee motion, and the committee motion is to request staff begin work on a presentation that addresses the factors that need to be considered when contemplating the need for federal conservation and management of Florida pompano. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to clarify that the state plan manages three categories within that species, pompano, African pompano, and permit, and it looks like the work that we're requesting staff to do is specific exclusively to pompano, and is that the way we want it to be?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: That would be up to the council to make any changes to that. I think there was some discussion, during committee, and this is the way the motion was modified, at the end of the committee, to move forward to Full Council. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Phil's comment is directly related to mine, and that is that, while I may well not support getting into all that, but, if we're going to look at pompano, Florida pompano, than we ought to be adding permit and African pompano. They're the same complex, and they're all caught in federal waters, and so it makes no sense to pick one out and consider that, and so, with that, I would like to offer a substitute motion, which is the same motion and adding, after "Florida pompano,", "permit and African pompano".

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right, and so we have a substitute motion. The substitute motion is to request staff to begin work on a presentation that addresses the factors that need to be considered when contemplating the need for federal conservation and management of Florida pompano, African pompano, and permit. Is there a second to the motion? It's seconded by Dr. Shipp. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: The discussion in committee, and why it only pertained to Florida pompano, is we were only petitioned to focus on Florida pompano, right, and so I can understand you wanting to expand this, Bob, but that wasn't part of the petition request.

Then, in terms of the committee report, I guess I would make a recommended edit. It says, "A committee member asked about the motivation for the petition and was informed by SERO staff that the petition was the result of a lawsuit that the agency was obligated to explore management options." That is not technically accurate. I cannot explain the motivation for the petition for rulemaking, and there is certainly a lawsuit that has been filed against Florida.

What I can say is the agency received a petition for rulemaking, and we are obligated then to bring this before the council for consideration, based on the need for conservation and management and going through those factors, as discussed.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you for that clarification, Mr. Strelcheck. Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am going to vote in opposition for this motion, even though I abstained with the first motion in committee. Obviously -- As Andy said, the case that is at-hand, and the petition that's at-hand, is specific to Florida pompano, and it's not for African pompano, and it's not for permit.

 This case is going to be wrapped up in early 2023, and the regulations that we have are intertwined between them. It is currently on our workplan, in order to start working on this, once the case is over, and we intend to start doing that in 2023, and I would leave it there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Sweetman. All right. Any further discussion? All right, and so we're going to vote on the substitute motion. All in favor of the substitute motion, please signify by raising your hand. All right, and so Dr.

Sweetman said that he was going to oppose the motion, earlier, and so all opposed to the motion, signify by raising your hand.

General Spraggins, did you vote for this, yes or no, General Spraggins?

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Yes. I was trying to get my hand up, but it wouldn't work.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I'm sorry, General Spraggins, but did you say you voted yes or no?

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: So that would be six to seven, and then I didn't know if Mr. Williamson -- I'm not sure he got to vote, and he just stepped back in. I got six to seven, with two abstentions, I believe.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay, and so the motion fails. We're going to the original motion. The original motion is to request staff to begin work on a presentation that addresses the factors that need to be considered when contemplating the need for federal conservation and management for Florida pompano. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion on the motion, all in favor of the motion, please signify by raising your hand.

DR. SWEETMAN: I'm going to abstain.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: So we're voting on the original motion now.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All opposed, please signify by raising your hand. The motion carries. Dr. Stunz. Did you have something, Ms. Boggs?

 MS. BOGGS: I guess the question is, and I understand that everybody is trying to, I guess, wrap their head around this lawsuit that deals with Florida pompano, but there's nothing that precludes us from coming back later and adding African pompano and permit, because, as I understand, this is more specifically a federal-water fishery, and, of course, we would never know that until we pass the motion and did the analysis, but we can come back and address that, correct?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, if you would like us to, after we complete this task, come back and

consider African pompano, we can look into that as well.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I am not seeing further hands. Dr. Stunz, do you have anything else?

DR. STUNZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just for completeness of the report, because we went to that motion, there was one just small statement that, during committee, that motion carried with one abstention. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. Is there any other business to come before the Sustainable Fisheries Committee? Seeing none, we're going to move on down the agenda, and so we're going to move into agency reports. I am reluctant to take a break at this time. We're scheduled to end at 4:00, and we're going to keep moving through agency reports at this time. I would urge council members, if you have to take to get up to take a short break, to do that, and I believe, if we don't proceed, we will not finish in our allotted time. South Atlantic Council liaison, Mr. Griner.

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATE SOUTH ATLANTIC LIAISON

MR. TIM GRINER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. I know it's late, and everyone is tired, and so I will be brief. I wanted to first express my gratitude for allowing me to participate in your meeting. I always find your discussions quite informative, and I do apologize for not being able to be there in person. I always come away from your meetings better informed, from the robust discussions that take place.

 I first wanted to touch on just a few of your discussions. Electronic logbook concerns, as Andy noted, this will reduce the burden on our commercial sector and is a much-appreciated advance to the current technologies available. However, the rubber really meets the road, as your discussion identified, when attempting to determine the utility of these reports in the SEDAR process and the validity of the data, as determined by SEDAR.

 I encourage this council to pay close attention to any added fields, especially one that would count the number of fish in addition to the total weight of fish. As a commercial fisherman, I cannot fathom counting every fish that went into my box.

48 Yellowtail snapper, your desires were duly noted. Thank you,

and we will take those into consideration. Your amberjack allocation, these are not easy discussions, and probably the most important issues facing our councils currently, and I would just add that, in the South Atlantic, when we're presented with multiple OFLs and ABCs by the SSC, that all end up at the same rebuilding timeline, we lean toward the highest ABC without the use of additional buffers, via the implementation of an ACT.

I will only touch on a few of the items from our June meeting, an update of which is included in your briefing materials. We are reaching out to the public to gather input on our allocation decision tool, in an effort to broadly assist us in management decisions.

 Electronic reporting, our discussions closely mirrored those you had here. Again, the devil is in the details, and I think it would behoove both councils to have a full presentation, screen-by-screen, data-field-by-data-field, of the actual eTRIPS platform that is being proposed.

The ABC Control Rule, for our Dolphin Wahoo, Golden Crab, and Snapper Grouper FMPs that categorize stocks based on scientific uncertainty, and incorporate the council's risk tolerance policy, using a probability of overfishing, or P*, our council will specify that P*, based on relative stock biomass and risk rating.

Our gag grouper, we're in the same boat, and we're facing drastic cuts, and we are moving forward with a new approach, as Andy mentioned, that looks only at a recent landings stream and equally reduces each sector to the get to the new ABC and then increases each sector equally as the stock rebuilds. At the end of the rebuilding period, we found that we were back to our original allocations.

Amberjack, I just wanted to point out that we have decided to retain our April spawning closure for both sectors. Red snapper, I almost hate the words coming out of my mouth, but we are exploring methods, through Regulatory Amendment 35, that will look at reducing dead discards by modifying fishing gear and/or time and area closures, and, our dolphin wahoo, we beginning the development of empirical management procedures. We have agreed to prioritize the Southeast Fisheries Science Center's work on developing a management strategy evaluation to determine an index-based procedure that will provide us with some catch level and management advice. That's really all I have. Again, thank you, and safe travels to everyone. Thanks again.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Griner, and I would echo what you said earlier. I always learn a lot when I come to the South Atlantic, and so we appreciate all the hard work you all do, and thank you for sticking in with us all week this week. Any questions for Mr. Griner? All right. Seeing none, we're going to move to our next report, Texas Law Enforcement Efforts.

Before you start, Lieutenant Casterline, I want to thank you all for being here with us all week. I know you and a couple of your staff have been here all week, and we appreciate you all showing up and all the good input that you all give us on the breaks and everything you all do for us, and so we appreciate it.

TEXAS LAW ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

LT. LES CASTERLINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate yourself and the council having us here as well. It's always a great experience to attend these meetings and be able to be a part of it. Thank you all for letting us give you a short presentation on some of our activities that are occurring throughout the state.

Before I get started, I would kind of like to introduce -- Some of you all may have already met Lieutenant Rickles. Lieutenant Rickles, since our last meeting -- I have currently transitioned into the Assistant Commander of Fisheries at headquarters, and Lieutenant Rickles came on as our Lieutenant of Fisheries, and so she's doing a great job, and we're very grateful to have her as part of our team, and so you all will be seeing her at these meetings in the future as well, and I appreciate you all taking the time, those of you all that have visited with her throughout the meeting, and I know we're running short on time, and so I will go ahead and get started with our presentation.

Here in Texas, we, of course, have a large state, and there's a lot of different things that game wardens cover. We don't actually just have our game wardens only doing fisheries, as some states actually have marine-patrol-type enforcement, and we do hunting, and we do fishing, and we do boating, and we do homeland security and several other things, like community policing, and our officers are very busy, but our coastal fisheries, and enforcement along the coast, is very important in what we do, as far as a division.

If you will see, moving through, our coastal enforcement is specifically through our JEA, and we've got a few different

priorities that we concentrate on, and the enforcement efforts put towards these JEA priorities are made up of about 120 game wardens that are found along our coast, and, also, we contribute about seventy-six vessels to this effort along the coast as well, and so we -- Like I said, it's very important to us, and we put a lot of personnel hours and equipment into these patrol efforts, and they do a great job.

Of course, probably our longest-standing enforcement priority is going to be TED enforcement. Of course, not only to Texas, but every other state on the coast, and TED enforcement is very important. It's not only important to the conservation of turtles, but the enforcement leads to just our capability of our industry to maintain their capability to operate within the Gulf of Mexico, due to certain requirements, because of the Endangered Species Act.

This current year, we provided -- We're almost wrapping up all of our hours for all of our priorities this month, and, this year, we had 150 hours of long-range hours, as well as 308 mid-range hours, assigned to this priority, and those, of course, would be vessel hours for each of these. As far as referrals to our partners over at NOAA OLE, we had one referral related to TEDs this year, and that would be either a case that occurred in federal waters, or it would have been a fairly egregious violation that would have occurred in state waters, and that's what we would refer to NOAA, through our current agreements with them.

Moving on through, we'll move to reef fish enforcement. Of course, you all covered that quite a bit over the last couple of days, and so, moving through this, we also put quite a few hours towards this, whether it would be -- On long range, we put 128 hours, this year, towards long-range reef fish enforcement, and another 240 hours of reef fish enforcement hours on our midrange platforms.

As far as referrals this year, we had ten closed season referrals for red snapper season, as well as we had another five daily bag limit referrals to our partners over at NOAA OLE. What you're going to find in all of these coastal hours is these are going to be -- In some cases, where you have something like IFQ, it may be placed in one certain area, because of the effort, but, when you get to reef fish or TEDs, we try to cover the entire coast fairly evenly, so that all of the vessels up and down the coast are getting a fair amount of inspections by our officers, and so you will notice that we spread out these hours throughout the coast.

Moving on to the next slide, you will see a lot of enforcement from our officers dealing with highly-migratory species, whether it be, you know -- Whether they're shark fishing from the shores of our beaches, state waters, or, as you all have seen us talk, and I will talk a little bit more further down about the shark fishing that occurs on the southern coast, with our lancha fleet coming out of Playa Baghdad down in northern Mexico.

We also have some patrols, from time to time, where we're able to send our new eighty-foot patrol vessel out too, and we've got the Perdido platform about 120 miles off of South Padre Island, where we've got tuna fishing and things like that that occur, and we do actually have a presence out there.

This year, we only had mid-range hours, but I will tell you that, whether we have the hours or not, we still put additional funding towards doing those offshore patrols, and so, just because we didn't have funding from NOAA -- We also put money towards doing these patrols, when that is not present for us to utilize.

Then, of course, the IFQ enforcement, and just, of course, most of this occurs on the northern coast. Pretty much from Freeport to Galveston the IFQ landings will occur, and these are land-based patrols that we assist with evaluating the offloads that are occurring at our federal dealers for the IFQ species. This year, we had 139 hours assigned to this priority, and, like I said, this is one of those priorities to where, often, maybe we actually exceed those hours and provide more, although it exceeds the funding levels, and it's important to us, and it's important to our state, and so we will enforce it to the level that it needs to be enforced.

As for probably one of our new priorities, the IUU enforcement, of course, this is actually a land-based IUU enforcement for everybody, and it's a priority that was brought to us by NOAA OLE just in the last few years. What I will say about this is this has been a very positive experience for our agency to take on this new priority.

 It's actually built a lot of new relationships along some of the ports of entry throughout the state, and it's gained a lot of interest from our partner agencies in law enforcement, and, I mean, you see agencies that just normally we might not do fisheries enforcement with, but, when you bring in this IUU, and the international nexus to these imports, you bring in these other agencies, and it is part of what they do.

2 3

Customs and border protection and office of field operations group, over there at our ports of entry, they're very important to this process, and we appreciate them allowing us into their facilities and working with us, because they provide a lot to this, as well as to our other state and federal partners that assist in this.

When we were looking at these operations this year, the 139 hours, we worked with NOAA OLE on some targeted operations at some of our ports of entry along the lower Texas border, the coastal region, but, in addition to this, we actually put quite a few hours towards this priority, out of the state's pocket, and we actually have game wardens, at this point, that, because of the activity and the discussions with other agencies and the importance when these products are coming across, we actually now have game wardens assigned on a schedule on call for the ports of entry, to respond to any kind of products that are identified by our partners over at CBP, and so that's become very popular, and I expect it to continue.

Although this is not actually a part of the IUU priority and what we do with the joint enforcement agreement, it is very important to our resource in south Texas, and that's dealing with the actual act of IUU fishing that occurs along the Texas-Mexico border.

What you see in front of you right there is a few different pictures related to the lancha fishery that you all probably hear quite a bit about, and what we run into a lot in south Texas is, if you're in the Gulf, we're going to have large gillnets, miles and miles of longline. Moving through the brackish waters of the Rio Grande, you're going to have crab traps, and you're going to have gillnets. Moving into our fresh water, you'll have trout lines, hoop nets, gillnets, and so it's a border-wide issue for us, as far as illegal fishing.

 Just a couple of notes that I brought up on this one is the -Specifically to the coastal region, we had thirty-seven
encounters with either illegal fishing gear or lancha vessels,
particularly, and I kind of went through some of the statistics,
to give you an idea of what we're running into, as far as the
gear.

In the Lower Rio Grande, we might see something as short as a fifty-foot stretch of gillnet. I also looked down and found that, offshore, we found a ten-mile stretch of longline, and just kind of a little bit of insight on this and some of the

extra discussions that are occurring because of this activity and relationships that are being built, and that ten miles of longline was actually important recently because of a stranding on the National Seashore.

Some networking that went on between NOAA's veterinarians and ourselves and the stranding network, we were able to identify that, although it was a different hook set that what we're normally seeing, using j-hooks instead of circle hooks, the gear was similar to the longline that we normally saw for these vessels.

I reached out to our local game wardens, and they actually informed us and sent us pictures of the ten miles of line they had just pulled, and it was consistent with what we found on the stranded sea turtle, and so it's kind of that trickle-down effect, is those relationships being built and those folks being able to collaborate with each other and actually identify these different things.

Because of some of these interactions with sea turtles, it's actually brought us into some different enforcement training, and so, whereas in the past, of course, the game wardens down there would have contacts with the stranding network, now we're actually having conversations, because it's not if we run into a sea turtle, but what are we going to do when we run into a stranded sea turtle. That has kind of changed the thought process, and we're setting up protocols of what the stranding network needs to see from these and how we can properly handle these stranded sea turtles.

We're not too far along in this, but, in addition, some additional funding is on the way for patrolling for this type of gear, and we were selected as one of three projects that were proposed for some NRDA funding, and ours was specifically lined up with recovering and pulling some of this gear that's out there, this illegal gear, along the southern border, from Corpus Christi down to the Texas-Mexico border.

We have not gone through all the particulars, but the possibility of that including operating funds, as well as equipment and vessels, to accomplish that, and so, as we move forward, and, of course, that's pretty far out, but that will be coming in the near future, hopefully.

In addition, this year -- This is also kind of a different twist on what we've done, and a new addition, is the sanctuary patrols at the Flower Gardens. We had ninety-six hours assigned to this

priority this year, and what that accumulates to is that's just about enough for us to take our eighty-footer out there and do extended patrols for two trips, and it's about two weeks.

We did so this year, and I don't believe we had any actual encounters with vessels, but the knowledge of our vessel being out there, and we are hearing that -- Through the past few years, the fact that the game wardens are patrolling is being spoke about, and the officer presence is being seen.

 Then, lastly, of course, the SEFHIER patrols that were discussed earlier in the week, and, of course, we're participating that, and we were provided some additional funds to go and perform inspections on the charter/for-hire fleet, when they're landing.

We're kind of a little bit different in Texas, and we work with NOAA OLE. This was originally built as a land-based patrol, but, because of some of our situations, they allowed us to actually add in some nearshore vessel patrols, so that we could basically target the vessels as they're coming into port and follow them in, rather than having to drive around by land to catch them and waste a lot of time, and this allows us to kind of enter those choke points where the vessels come in and go to the dock, rather than having to do a lot of driving and waste time. At that point, that is the end of my report, at this point. If you all have any questions, I would be happy to answer anything for you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any questions for Lieutenant Casterline? Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks for the presentation, and I saw you sitting here all week, and so I know that you saw a lot of what was going on, and we had a pretty lengthy discussion about sharks, right, and I know, in the past, when we got presentations from your group, that, you know, part of the IUU history is sharks, but I wasn't interested in what you did on the water, for boats that may be coming over the border or something like that, and the Coast Guard talks about that too, but what I'm interested in is whether or not you intercept the illegal transport of shark fins into your metropolitan areas that are coming either from Mexico or another state.

LT. CASTERLINE: As far as fins, we have had some of our cases that have been made on shark fin possession for commercial sale. In those, of course, we've actually found some.

As far as the catching them on the shark boats themselves, the

lanchas going to Mexico, I think you actually saw that baited hook, and, believe it or not, that was a shark fin that was on there, and we were kind of surprised to see that as part of the bait on that hook, but I don't know that we could tie it directly to Mexico, at this point, are the ones that we're seeing. We have had some that have been pulled off of shrimp boats before, but, just in general, we have had some fairly substantial interdictions of shark fins in the state.

DR. FRAZER: Just as a quick follow-up, Dale, if I might, and so, when you find those shark fins, can you attribute them to a species, like a group of species, like the larger sharks in particular? The reason I'm asking this is because, when we talk a lot about shark fins, right, it's the larger sharks that kind of attract the most money, and so it's not economically feasible to even fish for the smaller sharks, because the fins are of little value.

LT. CASTERLINE: I don't have that information here with me. If that's something that would benefit the council, I mean, we definitely can look into the size of the shark fins or any of that information that would benefit you all, and I could actually try to look that up and provide that at a later date, if it's needed.

DR. FRAZER: No, and I don't want to add to your workload, but just, if you had it at your fingers, I was just interested. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you. Thank you for coming. I've heard some different scenarios in different areas of the Gulf, where the commercial boats will come in and hail-in with a certain quota, and then simply get to the dock and, if there are law enforcement officials there, they adjust their trip ticket, or quota, as getting checked, and I'm wondering if you all are seeing that here in Texas.

LT. CASTERLINE: I would say we actually have discussed this, a few council meetings back, and I think that's when we were looking at some percentages, at that point in time, was in the discussion at the three-hour notification, and, at that time, we were seeing -- You know, we actually had a particular boat that had hailed -- Had done the three-hour notification, and it was considerably lower than what they showed up with, and that's kind of what drove that discussion.

 Now, I don't know that I would say that that is real widespread, but it definitely -- It is something of concern, that there is that capability that it could occur. Now, I don't know that I could put a percentage that we think that would actually be occurring, but it is -- It's a vulnerability that be exploited, if that's your question.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: All right. Thank you, Lieutenant Casterline. I do want to say that you did a very good presentation, and your officers have to be very diversified with all that they encounter, and, being as a person that's been around a pretty long time, and I'm definitely one of the old-timers at the table now, I think the JEA dollars is some of the best funding that's been used to help marine law enforcement that I can remember.

I can remember the old days, when JEA didn't provide very much, and now it's at a level where it's actually making an impact, and we see it through your report, and I hope that program continues, and maybe expands, and so thank you very much.

LT. CASTERLINE: Thank you, all. You all have a great day.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Moving down our agenda, next up is the Office of Law Enforcement and Mr. O'Malley.

NOAA OLE

MR. JOHN O'MALLEY: Good afternoon. I'm John O'Malley, and I'm the ASAC for the League City, Texas Office of Law Enforcement, and I'm going to give you the Quarter 3 enforcement report, but, before I begin that, I've been listening to some of the questions that you all have asked that I wish we had law enforcement's buy-in, and so I'm going to answer a couple of those right now, before I start.

In reference to the motion to change the preferred option on trip declarations in SEFHIER, and I believe the wording was something like along "submit a trip declaration for any trip that will be engaging in any type of fishing activity or charter trip", OLE's preliminary view on that is we think it's good. We are going to look at it further, and we will get back to you before the next council meeting with some final comments.

Somebody had asked about SEFHIER violations and what they could be. For us, a violation could be handled anywhere from compliance assistance to a written warning to a summary settlement, and a summary settlement would be our entry-level penalty, and a SEFHIER violation would be about a \$500 summary

settlement, if that was warranted, or it could go up to potentially a case referred to General Counsel, and that would be a NOVA violation, and so it's a wide range, but somebody was asking for a dollar amount, and that's what it would start out as.

For our overview, please refer to the Fiscal Year 2022 Quarter 3 Fisheries Management Council Report, and the quarterly report will have a lot more details. For this last quarter, we opened 192 incidents. Of those 192, seven cases were referred to General Counsel or DOJ. Thirty were summary settlements, ranging from \$100 to \$200, and they included violations such as retention during closed season, TED or BRD requirements, IFQ requirements, dolphin feeding, or fishing in the sanctuary, such as Sanctuary Preservation Areas.

The remaining were either unfounded boardings, and we do document boardings of an incident, fix-it tickets, compliance assistance, written warnings, or could be still under investigation, and, of those 192 opened incidents, seventy-five of those are from the Gulf of Mexico area, and they included boardings and inspections with no violations found.

On our enforcement highlights, we had a lot of MMPA this quarter. We had some targeted patrols, MMPA violation patrols, in Florida and Texas, and the one in Florida was in the north Florida area, and it did result in a dolphin feeding case, which ended up being a \$500 summary settlement. We had one harassment, and that actually took place in Corpus Christi, and that's tied in with the dolphin that was in the canal over on Padre Island that we've been monitoring for about two years.

It could enter, and it could leave, but it would leave and come back, and it ended up getting very habitualized with people, and it started hearing boat motors coming in, and people were feeding it, and we did a lot of outreach and patrols and signage, but it really didn't help, and it had several prop scars on it, and it had gone blind in one eye, and so eventually a decision was made that it needed to be removed and evaluated, and that took place in late June. It was taken over to the Texas State Aguarium and evaluated.

Right now, it's at Sea World in San Antonio, but it's been determined that the dolphin will not be released to the wild. They don't believe it can be successfully rehabilitated, and so, again, we encourage people to not feed, touch, harass, or pet the dolphins.

 The one case that was made, over in Padre Island, was an individual who had posted a picture on Facebook that he had actually lifted the dolphin out of the water and was hugging it, and so that was one of the summary settlements that was made.

We also had a dolphin death in Freeport that it was reported that there were folks that were playing with this dolphin, and they were actually holding it under the water at times. The dolphin did die, and it's under investigation right now as to whether they hastened the death or caused it, but it's still under investigation.

Other notable incidents, we did have a summary settlement agreement that General Counsel finalized with an illegal charter operator out of Florida, and that was for a \$5,915 penalty to settle the case. We also had our Florida enforcement officers and the U.S. Coast Guard that did a patrol targeting illegal charters on the west coast of Florida, and all the vessels checked were found to be in compliance, and they did do a rescue, actually, of several overturned vessels, and one vessel was sinking, and so, while they didn't make any violations, it probably saved some lives, and so that's good.

 In addition, we also did a training, and we did SEFHIER and marine sanctuary training with the Coast Guard and FWC and TPWD. We did TED training and operations with the gear mitigation team with Mississippi Marine Resources Division and the U.S. Coast Guard, and then we've been doing port inspections along the Texas-Mexico border with Texas Parks and Wildlife, CBP, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the U.S. Coast Guard.

We do work with a lot of partners, and we can't do it alone. We have our state JEA partners of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, and we work with the United States Coast Guard, D7 and D8, and CBP, which includes their air and marine and their border inspection folks.

During this period, we had fifty-one overall enforcement referrals, and that's across the entire SED. Within the Gulf of Mexico area, we received referrals from FWC and Texas Parks and Wildlife in this last quarter.

We have some operations, and we had Operation TexMex/Yellowfin, and those were IUU port inspections down along the Texas-Mexico border, and it included SIMP inspections. From those of you that don't know SIMP, it's the Seafood Import Monitoring Program, and there's thirteen different species. The ones we commonly see coming across here in Texas, that are on the list,

are the tunas, the BAYS tunas, the bigeye, albacore, yellowfin, skipjack, and bluefin; shrimp; blue crabs; red snapper; dolphin; grouper; sharks; and swordfish. Those operations, working along with Parks and Wildlife, CBP, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife, we inspected over 58,000 pounds of imported seafood on those inspections.

In Florida, there was Operation Big Bend, and that was gaggrouper focused, and that was with FWC. Unfortunately, the weather was poor, and so we didn't have the greatest results, but that was a gag grouper patrol.

Operation Blue Sky in Mississippi was a TED focus, and that was with Mississippi and the U.S. Coast Guard. There was twenty-six boardings, and there were five minor violations found, which were all on skimmer trawls, which had some new regulations that came out in the last couple of years.

Down in south Florida, you have Operation Mutton Mood/Greenhorn, and Mutton Moon was targeting patrolling the spawning aggregations of the mutton snapper. In previous years, we had seen very high pressure on the mutton spawns, both commercially and recreationally, and, this year, they looked at the Tortugas North Reserve and South Reserve. Two boats were found to be fishing in the North Reserve, and they were able to deter one boat in the South Reserve that was about to start fishing at Riley's Hump.

Operation Greenhorn was a patrol with a bunch of our new EOs, where they went out and taught them the ropes and showed them how to do some of these patrols.

What we're currently looking at and focusing on is SEFHIER outreach and enforcement. As I said, we have a different range of what we can do, and it's been out for well over a year now, and we've done a lot of compliance assistance, a few written warnings, and I'm not sure how many summary settlements have been issued, but it's getting to the point now that people should be in compliance, and we're hoping they get there.

We're still looking at unpermitted charter operations, and we're looking for them, and we're finding them, and then we're investigating them. TED requirements, we're still focused on that, and we're definitely looking more into the dolphin feeding and harassment, since we've seen an uptick in incidents there.

The dolphin tours have been heating up with tourists, and we've been reminding businesses, by doing outreach, to try to remind

them to keep the proper distances and avoid interactions with the dolphins, and I mentioned the mortality that happened up in Freeport.

Finally, this is just a list of some of the resources, and that's the OLE website at the top, and you can see our enforcement priorities, annual reports, vessel monitoring information, IUU information. The middle is the one for the bulletins, and I think you all know how to get those, and, at the bottom, you see our link to our Office of General Counsel enforcement actions, where anybody can go and see what General Counsel has done, has issued, and, of course, I referenced back to our quarterly report for more details. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any questions for Mr. O'Malley? Mr. Banks.

 MR. BANKS: Thank you for that report. I just had a quick question about your Operation Big Bend. You said it was gagfocused, and you said you weren't able to do it because of weather, and that -- Was it just a one-day effort, and I just wanted to know a little bit more about that.

MR. O'MALLEY: It was a patrol focused on gag grouper violations, and it's just that the weather was not conducive to a real effective operation.

MR. BANKS: I guess, when you say that, it makes it sound like that was like a one-day effort.

MR. O'MALLEY: I'm not sure of the actual time on that one.

MR. BANKS: Because, if the weather was poor, I guess I'm thinking that --

MR. O'MALLEY: Sometimes an operation might be one or two days, or sometimes a week, and it just depends on what they planned on from the beginning. We have to bring in resources from other areas, because, you know, we are kind of spread thin, and so, when we do an operation, there's a lot more planning that takes place, versus doing the actual op.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any other questions for Mr. O'Malley? Thank 43 you, Mr. O'Malley. That was a very good report. We appreciate 44 it.

MR. O'MALLEY: Thank you.

48 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We're going to move down the agenda, and next is

the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and Mr. Donaldson.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've got just a couple of items that I want to make the council aware of. The first has to do with the Return 'Em Right program. We now have results from the attitudes, perceptions, awareness, and actions survey that was conducted by Southwick and Associates.

In the briefing book, in R-4, there is a fact sheet that provides a high-level results of that survey, and Charlie Robertson, on our staff, he's the coordinator for Return 'Em Right, and he's planning on giving a more in-depth presentation at the January council meeting about all the research that this survey, as well as some of the other research that we're doing, but I just wanted to make you all aware of that.

My other item is the upcoming commission annual meeting, and it will be October 17 through 19 in San Antonio, and we have a variety of different meetings, sub-committee and committee meetings, as well as a general session about remote sensing and using technology for data collection, as well as the Sea Grant Reef Fish Extension is meeting on Monday, and I believe it was the April meeting, council meeting, that they had their first meeting, and this is the next in that series, and so, with that, I will take any questions.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: I do have high hopes for Return 'Em Right, Dave, and I'm hoping that we can show some measurable decreases in dead discards with Return 'Em Right, and so I have high hopes for that, and I think Charlie and Mr. Haddad are both doing a good job, as well as the other people that's been cooperating and working with you on that. Any questions for Mr. Donaldson? Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: Not a question for Dave, but more just a headsup. I wanted to do some cross-regional collaboration, and so, when I was in the Caribbean, they made a motion to start working on descending devices, and I bragged about the Return 'Em Right program and told them that they need to get in touch with you and the commission, and so, if they haven't reached out, they should be reaching out in the near future for some information for the upcoming December Caribbean Council meeting.

MR. DONALDSON: I appreciate that, Andy. Thank you.

48 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Okay. I don't see any further questions, and

we're going to move on, and so we have the U.S. Coast Guard Report and Lieutenant Commander Motoi.

U.S. COAST GUARD

LCDR MOTOI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. I'm Lieutenant Commander Lisa Motoi, and I serve as the Living Marine Resources Officer at Coast Guard District 8 in New Orleans, and so my primary job is overseeing and working with the district's operational units to execute the fisheries mission, more at the strategic level.

For today's update, I will briefly discuss District 8's area of responsibility and what we do, upcoming Coast Guard and Mexico meetings to address the lancha threat, the Gulf of Mexico Regional Fisheries Training Center, and then highlight some recent operations.

Here is an overview of District 8, really for the new council members, and so, as you can see, it covers all, or a part, of twenty-six states throughout the Gulf and the heartland, and there is three regions, the inland region, where there is over 10,000 miles of waterways, with a \$4.6-trillion economic impact, the coastal region, which is home to two of the nation's busiest ports, New Orleans and Houston, and then the offshore region that captures the outer continental shelf, the oil and natural gas industry, and the district is divided into seven sectors, as you can see, and, of the seven, four of them are coastal sectors of Mobile, New Orleans, Houston/Galveston, and Corpus Christi.

These are the sectors that conduct the Coast Guard's fisheries mission, and then the district also has three air stations and five fast-response cutters, which have been instrumental in combating the lancha threat. In fact, really, half of our lancha interdictions come from our fast-response cutters.

Upcoming Coast Guard and Mexico meetings, there is two separate meetings scheduled for next month, and the first is with the staff talks in Mexico City, at the top-left of the slide, and it will be a high-level strategic meeting that will address a broad range of topics, and there is working groups set up, not only for illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, but also for counter narcotics, search and rescue, pollution response, port security, cyber security, and intelligence.

 Then the embassy meeting, on the lower-right, will be at the Mexican Embassy in Washington, D.C., which will focus more on the IUU-F in the Gulf of Mexico and the persistent lancha

threat, and attendees will include NOAA Fisheries, the Coast Guard Fisheries Enforcement Division at the headquarter level, myself and other members of District 8, and Mexican officials.

The goal is to reduce the number of incursions and repeat offenders, and so the current lancha crew member population apprehended by the Coast Guard is predominantly repeat offenders.

 The bottom-left picture is a recent lancha case, and so, this fiscal year so far, we have seventy-six lancha interdictions, and then the top-right picture reflects a collaborative at-sea operation between the Coast Guard and Mexico, which is something that we want to see more, and we want to build and improve on specifically working at-sea operations, to hand off interdicted lanchas directly to the Mexican Navy.

Next is the Gulf of Mexico Regional Fisheries Training Center, and so the Coast Guard has five regional fisheries training centers, one being in the Gulf, that's located in New Orleans, and they're just an exceptional resource for everything fish related, and so they're the ones teaching the regulations and providing hands-on instruction to our boarding officers, boarding team members, and other law enforcement agencies.

We do have a new commanding officer, Lieutenant Victor Alma, and he just recently took over, and so I knew the district is happy to have him at the helm.

The bottom-left picture is of a classroom, and the top-right picture is of a workshop, touring workshop, and then I provided some stats of the schoolhouse, and so, so far in Fiscal Year 2022, they have a combined total of 3,900 hours of in-person LMR management and law enforcement instruction. They have traveled to every Gulf coast state with touring workshops, and they have trained ninety-five Coast Guard law enforcement officers from over twenty Coast Guard units across the Gulf. They have trained twenty-nine partner law enforcement agents throughout the Gulf, and the bottom-left picture is of two days ago, with GRFTC and TPWD, with Lieutenant Rickles.

Some of the topics that they will cover are the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, fisheries management plans, National Marine Sanctuaries, the fishing vessel gear and identification, boarding procedures, species ID, fisheries case package preparation, and the Commercial Fishing Vessel Safety Act.

 The next few slides just highlight some recent operations from July and August, and so the first one is the Edgar Culbertson, and they're an FRC stationed, homeported, in Galveston, Texas, and they recently did a maritime boundary line patrol, and they interdicted two lanchas, eight Mexican nationals were apprehended, and they retrieved four sets of longline gear from the water.

The bottom-left picture is they have fifty-five sharks located in a fish hold, and so, Dr. Frazer, maybe that picture kind of helps with shark size, but that's something that I can take back with me too, and we could circle back, and then the bottom-right picture is crew members removing longline gear and catch from the water, and one of these interdictions, I just wanted to note, was a good effort between the Coast Guard and CBP's drone.

This one is of the Jacob Poroo, and so they are homeported in Pascagoula, Mississippi, and they recently conducted a fisheries patrol in the Sector Mobile area of responsibility, and so, during this patrol, which is about -- It's a few weeks, more or less, and they did eleven vessel boardings, with ten violations issued, seven from one boarding, and then twenty-four new crew qualifications, and I just wanted to highlight that, just to show that there's a lot that goes behind mission readiness, and twenty-four qualifications is pretty commendable, and examples of these qualifications could be anywhere from standing watch on the bridge to operating the cutter small boat to engineering watch to actually conducting vessel boardings.

Of course, these patrols would not be as successful without the air support that they received, as well as sector support, and then the top-right depicts a recreational boarding.

Then the last that I wanted to highlight is the Harold Miller, and that's another FRC homeported in Galveston, Texas, and they recently conducted a fisheries patrol across three sectors, Mobile, New Orleans, and Houston. They did nine vessel boardings, thirty-nine violations issued, with three vessel terminations.

I highlighted one boarding that they did, and it was just a slew of violations, from no distress signals onboard to an expired EPIRB, survival craft equipment was deficient, and the master was under the influence of marijuana. The vessel was declared reef fish, but they were actually targeting HMS, and NOAA Enforcement met this vessel at the pier, and they monitored the offload, and, sure enough, it consisted of thirty-six yellowfin tuna, one swordfish, three wahoo, and one dolphin. That

concludes my presentation, pending any questions.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Lieutenant Commander. Any questions? Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Just a quick question. Thank you, Lieutenant Commander Motoi, for being here. I appreciate seeing you again, and the Mexican -- You mentioned the Mexican Navy, and they don't have an equivalent to the Coast Guard, correct, and is it just the navy that operates and patrols their waters, or do they have like a unit for --

LCDR MOTOI: It's the same, our counterpart, and we call it SEMAR, and it's Secretary of the Navy in Spanish.

MR. ANSON: Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any further questions? Thank you. We're going to move on, and we have two Other Business items. The first one is an exempted fishing request from Texas Sea Grant, and I think, Andy, you were going to handle that. Mr. Strelcheck.

OTHER BUSINESS EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT REQUEST

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mr. Chair. The Fisheries Service received an application for an EFP from Texas Sea Grant, and we want to note that Laura Picariello is here in the audience today and can answer specific questions, if you have them.

The application involves the testing of new bycatch reduction devices in the commercial shrimp fishery throughout the Gulf of Mexico. It's a joint project with the shrimp fleet, Louisiana Sea Grant, Texas Sea Grant, the NOAA Restoration Center, and the Fisheries Service to restore finfish populations damaged by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

The EFP would exempt the research activities from federal regulations, and, if granted, the EFP would be effective through August of 2024. The project identifies, or is intended to identify and develop, new bycatch-reducing technology to minimize commercial shrimp trawl finfish discard mortality, and, additionally, the project seeks to advance cost-effective solutions and incentives for the Gulf shrimp fleet that would maximize the adoption of improved BRDs.

Up to thirty federally-permitted vessels would be selected to participate in the testing, and those vessels would be

distributed across the Gulf shrimp fishery and fishing grounds.

During testing, vessels included in the EFP would be surveyed for qualitative information about the new BRDs and any other use recommendations that are needed, and then additional BRD information, including time and difficulty to install, longevity, ease of use, bycatch, and shrimp retention characteristics, as well as overall cost, would be collected by the applicant to assist with the promotion of the new BRDs for industry usage.

We will be publishing a notice in the Federal Register this Friday, August 26, with a fifteen-day comment period, and we'll also be sending out a Fishery Bulletin, and so, with that, if you have any specific questions, feel free to ask me or Laura, in the audience.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Any questions on the request for the exempted fishing permit? Bernie, there was a motion, I think, floated around, and can you put that on the board, please?

DR. STUNZ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make that motion, please. Are you ready?

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Yes, sir, Dr. Stunz. Would you read it into the record, please?

DR. STUNZ: Yes. The motion is the council recommends approval of the exempted fishing permit (EFP) provided by Texas and Louisiana Sea Grant to test bycatch reduction devices (BRD).

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Is there a second for the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Anson. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries. The next thing that we have on the agenda is Mr. Gill had asked that we add an item called Elephants to the agenda. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have withdrawn that item from the agenda.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Gill. With that, there's a few things that I wanted to discuss before we conclude the meeting. The first is I wanted to let the council know that, once we start a new council year and we elect a new chair, generally we sent things out. We send reminders out to the council for you all to start looking at your committee rosters, and so we're going to be asking you all to review the committees you're on.

The process is going to be very similar to last year, and Dr. Simmons, I think, is going to review the process, and so, if you all have any comments about the process for last year, but it seemed to work very smooth, or at least on my end it did. Anyway, roughly about a week from now, Dr. Simmons will review the process, and we'll be sending you an email, asking you to review your committee assignments, to sign-up for new committees that you might be interested in.

Please think long and hard if you're willing to chair a committee, or be vice chair of a committee, and we will go through that process. Roughly, we're going to send it out whenever the staff gets it out, and we're going to have it with you for about two weeks, and there will be a deadline to get it back in.

We would like to get it back in fairly soon, so we can go through the process on our end, and there's a lot of checking that we've got to do, to make sure all this works out right and we balance it with the appropriate number of people, and we try to get people the committees that they request, which takes a little bit of time.

 That's going to be something that's going to be happening very soon, and, also, I just wanted to mention that, at this council, we have started some new documents, and we've got some new scoping documents, and so there's a lot of new tasks that have been added to our process, and so myself and Dr. Stunz is going to be working closely with Dr. Simmons and the staff and trying to figure out how we can fit all this into the coming meetings.

We'll probably also be consulting with Mr. Strelcheck on some of the -- When we get deliverables on some of the things that we need, and so, anyway, we just want you all to be aware that -- I know, from discussions around the table, some people want stuff to happen at the next meeting, and there's different opinions about when we should be taking stuff up.

We are trying to make thing happen as far as possible. If you have some input about what your priorities are, if you want to let me know what those are, it would be helpful. Did you have anything else, Dr. Simmons?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think just keep in mind that we have a lot of things that we are required to get done in a very short period of time, and I think even the new framework action that we passed to start working on changes

to the recreational and commercial sector for amberjack is under a very tight timeline, because the emergency rule will run out, and so we have a couple of items that we almost have to put on the agenda, and we cannot delay, and so just keep in mind and be patient with us on some of these bigger tasks and projects and special meetings and things like that, to make sure that we're organized and can use our time the best we can, when we're convening the council, and so I appreciate everyone's patience on that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: With that, is there any other business to come before the council? I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

MS. BOGGS: Make a motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN DIAZ: We have a motion to adjourn. It's seconded by Dr. Stunz, and so we are adjourned. Thank you all for your hard work this week.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 25, 2022.)

22 – - -