

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 CORAL COMMITTEE

4
5 Key West Marriott Beachside Hotel Key West, Florida

6
7 June 18, 2018

8
9 **VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 11 Patrick Banks.....Louisiana
- 12 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 13 Susan Gerhart (designee for Roy Crabtree).....NMFS
- 14 Johnny Greene.....Alabama
- 15 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 16 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- 17 John Sanchez.....Florida

18
19 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 20 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 21 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 22 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 23 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 24 Phil Dyskow.....Florida
- 25 Paul Mickle (designee for Joe Spraggins).....Mississippi
- 26 Robin Riechers.....Texas
- 27 Bob Shipp.....Alabama
- 28 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 29 LT Mark Zanowicz.....USCG

30
31 **STAFF**

- 32 Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
- 33 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 34 Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
- 35 Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
- 36 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 37 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 38 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
- 39 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 40 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Administrative & Human Resources Assistant
- 41 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

42
43 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 44 Eric Brazer.....Shareholders Alliance
- 45 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
- 46 James Bruce.....MS
- 47 Jamie Cournane.....NH
- 48 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL

1 Captain David Dupree.....FWC
2 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS
3 Chad Hanson.....Pew Charitable Trusts
4 Peter Hood.....SERO
5 Dylan Hubbard.....FL
6 Alison Johnson.....Oceana
7 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA, Marathon, FL
8 Lawrence Marino.....LA
9 Bruce McCormack.....Lionfish International, FL
10 Jack McGovern.....NMFS
11 Clay Porch.....SEFSC
12 Bruce Roberts.....NC
13 Lance Robinson.....TX
14 Ashford Rosenberg.....Shareholders Alliance
15
16 - - -
17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....4
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps.....4
8
9 Final Action Amendment 9: Coral Habitat Areas Considered for
10 Management in the Gulf of Mexico.....5
11 Summary of Public Comments Received.....5
12 Review of Amendment.....12
13 Review of Codified Text.....23
14
15 Adjournment.....26
16
17 - - -
18

1 The Coral Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management
2 Council convened at the Key West Marriott Beachside Hotel, Key
3 West, Florida, Monday morning, June 18, 2018, and was called to
4 order by Chairman Tom Frazer.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN TOM FRAZER:** Good morning, everybody. I guess I will
11 call to order the Coral Committee. We will start with the
12 Adoption of the Agenda, which is Tab N, Number 1 in your
13 briefing materials, and so if I can get a motion to approve the
14 agenda.

15
16 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** So moved.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** There is a motion to approve by Dave Donaldson
19 and a second by John Sanchez. All right. The next item on the
20 agenda then would be Approval of the April 2018 Coral Committee
21 Minutes, and if I could get -- Mara.

22
23 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I just have a very important correction. Page
24 1, Line 40, my name should be "Mara" and not "Mary", but it's
25 right everywhere else, and I am going to make the same motion in
26 every committee. Thank you.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Duly noted. Can I get an approval for the
29 minutes?

30
31 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** I will make a motion to approve with Mara's
32 edit.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you. We have a second by John Sanchez.
35 Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition,
36 the motion carries. What we're going to do is we're going to
37 have Dr. Kilgour walk us through the Action Guide and Next Steps
38 at this point. Morgan.

39
40 **DR. MORGAN KILGOUR:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning.
41 Today, the only item really on the agenda is Coral Amendment 9,
42 which is the coral habitat areas considered for management in
43 the Gulf of Mexico. Emily will go over the public comments, and
44 then I will go through the amendment and the codified text. If
45 the committee feels like this document is ready to go final,
46 then you may make that motion at the end.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you very much, and so, Emily, do you

1 want to go ahead and start with the review of the public
2 comments?

3
4 **FINAL ACTION AMENDMENT 9: CORAL HABITAT AREAS CONSIDERED FOR**
5 **MANAGEMENT IN THE GULF OF MEXICO**
6 **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED**
7

8 **MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** Absolutely, Mr. Chair. I am going to
9 start with a summary of the public hearings that we went to and
10 hosted via webinar, and then I will move on to the written
11 comments that we received. We hosted eight in-person meetings
12 and one webinar, and I am going to review them in the order in
13 which we went and did them, and so by date order.

14
15 We started in Brownsville, Texas, and we had two members of the
16 public attend. In Brownsville, they supported the preferred
17 alternatives, and they asked the council to make an effort to
18 protect whatever can be protected. In Palacios, Texas, we did
19 not have any attendees.

20
21 In League City, we had seventeen members of the public attend.
22 They indicated that there may be bandit rig fishing on the Harte
23 Bank and that there was a need to protect corals, but they would
24 like to see evidence that fishing activity is actually affecting
25 the areas before we protect them. Oil drilling is prevented in
26 sensitive areas already and that the industry does not willingly
27 drill in any important habitat areas. There was a question of
28 how the regulations would impact non-IFQ, non-reef fish
29 fishermen.

30
31 Then we hosted a webinar on May 22, with two members of the
32 public that spoke, and twelve people did attend that webinar.
33 There was support expressed for coral protections, with concern
34 that there is a lack of quantifiable evidence showing the
35 impacts of commercial fishing on the areas that are being
36 considered.

37
38 Moving on to Key West, we had three members of the public
39 attend, and two of them spoke, and they said that the deep-sea
40 coral protections in the Magnuson Act are more appropriate than
41 HAPC designations that the council is considering and that the
42 council should add a new mechanism to add and remove areas in
43 the future.

44
45 It was also said that the council should freeze fishing with
46 bottom-tending gear until the areas are surveyed for coral and
47 for damage. Then there is not adequate science to support the
48 alternative, because it's not clear that commercial fishing

1 affects the areas.

2
3 Moving on to Grand Isle, Louisiana, we had four members of the
4 public attend, and all four of them spoke. In Grand Isle,
5 people mentioned that corals are vital, but fishermen already
6 avoid them, and so it's unnecessary to create closures without
7 the data that shows it's necessary. There was also support for
8 putting restrictions on the areas so that they aren't damaged in
9 the future.

10
11 Then we moved to Madeira Beach, Florida, and we had thirteen
12 people attend that meeting, and eight members spoke. They said
13 that the data shows that the areas are still pristine, and so
14 there is no reason to place protections on them at this point.
15 There was support for creating HAPCs without fishing
16 regulations.

17
18 It was mentioned that there should be an exemption for bottom
19 longlines in the Pulley Ridge area, and it was also said that
20 there needs to be more analysis on how this will economically
21 impact the commercial fishing industry, and it was said that the
22 industry is already heavily regulated, and that corals should be
23 protected, because they face many threats, and they also have
24 medical benefits, and we shouldn't take that for granted.

25
26 It was said that the councils have a duty to protect the corals,
27 and it was said that the corals should be protected
28 preemptively, and the regulatory framework should be
29 strengthened. It was mentioned that habitat protection is the
30 best way to conserve our natural resource. It was also said
31 that the areas are too sticky to fish on already, and they need
32 protections, but they don't need protections from fishermen,
33 because fishermen are not actively harming them. It was also
34 said that fishing regulations should be added to the Southern
35 Bank off of Texas.

36
37 Then we moved to D'Iberville, and there was eight members of the
38 public that attended, and all eight spoke. There was support
39 for expansion of Pulley Ridge with regulations, and that is
40 Action 1, Alternative 2. There was also support for adding
41 fishing regulations to both of the HAPCs off of Texas, and that
42 is Action 5, Alternatives 2b and 3b.

43
44 There was support for all of the preferred alternatives and
45 conservation-based approach to habitat management, and there was
46 also a request for a review of regulations, to see if it's
47 acceptable to anchor outside of the areas, but drift over them
48 to fish, and so, in other words, to not limit fishing entirely,

1 so that you can anchor in those sandy areas outside of the coral
2 protections. There was also support for the most aggressive
3 conservation measures within each action.

4
5 Then we moved to Mobile, Alabama, and there was nine people that
6 attended, and two of them spoke, and there was support for the
7 amendment and all the preferred alternatives, and there was a
8 request that protections be placed in all twenty-three sites.
9 That is a summary of the meetings that we have, and I think it's
10 a good time for us to pause and see if there are any questions
11 before we move on to the written comment.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Does anybody have any questions? All right.
14 Seeing none, carry on, Emily.

15
16 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Okay. Moving to the written comments, we
17 received quite a number of comments. We personally, at the
18 council inbox, received 1,665 comments on this amendment. There
19 was also two campaigns that were conducted by different NGOs.
20 Pew conducted one of those campaigns, and they received 16,379
21 comments, and then the Gulf Restoration Network also put out a
22 call to action, and they received 907 comments, and so, in sort
23 of recent history, I think this is one of the largest bodies of
24 comment that we have received on any of our amendments, and so I
25 think that's important to note as we move forward.

26
27 I am going to do my best to summarize all 18,000 comments that
28 we got, and so bear with me. As it pertains to Action 1, there
29 was support for Preferred Alternative 4, and there was also
30 support expressed for Alternative 2, to ensure that the area is
31 protected from future exploitation.

32
33 Moving to Action 2, Alternative 4 makes a good compromise.
34 However, there is concern that corals are a seed source and that
35 it will be diminished by allowing bottom longlines in adjacent
36 areas, and so Alternative 5 might be the most appropriate. Now,
37 this is that West Florida Shelf one, and Alternative 5 is sort
38 of the large area that protects the shelf.

39
40 We received support for that alternative, Alternative 5, Option
41 b, that the West Florida Shelf should be protected entirely.
42 Bottom gear should be prohibited on the West Florida Shelf,
43 while fishing grounds in non-coral areas should be maintained.
44 Trolling should still be permitted in that area. Bottom
45 longlines should be prohibited in that area, and fishing gear
46 should be kept away from the important coral areas. It was also
47 noted that patch reefs have relationships to one another, and so
48 it's good to protect the entire Florida Wall.

1
2 Moving to Action 3, we received support for the preferred
3 alternatives, and those are Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7,
4 all Option b. Moving to Action 4, we received support for the
5 Preferred Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, Option b. Moving to Action
6 5, we received support for Preferred Alternatives 2 and 3,
7 Option a. We also received support for Alternatives 2 and 3,
8 Option b, which would add regulations to both Harte Bank and
9 Southern Bank. They are known coral areas, and so the South
10 Bank boundaries have already been reduced, and the Harte Bank
11 boundaries show little evidence of fishing, and so adding
12 fishing regulations would allow for more protections now without
13 conflicting fishermen.

14
15 Moving to Action 6, the areas considered in the action should
16 have fishing regulations to protect them from potential future
17 exploitation. We should add fishing regulations now, because
18 new fisheries emerge faster than regulations can be put in
19 place. There was also support expressed for the Preferred
20 Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

21
22 Then, moving to Action 7, there was support for Preferred
23 Alternative 2. Even if bottom dredging is not currently being
24 used, it makes good sense to consider future protection and
25 conservation of coral found in those areas.

26
27 Now I will move on to some of our more general comments that we
28 received on the document. I will start with the general support
29 that we heard and the rationale that was given, and then we will
30 move on to the general opposition that we had to the amendment.

31
32 The general support that we received for this amendment includes
33 support for designating the areas as HAPCs is fully appropriate,
34 according to the council's authority and responsibility under
35 the MSA. The consultation requirement associated with the
36 designation ensures that the council will have a role in
37 reviewing and commenting on activity authorized, funded, or
38 undertaken by any federal or state agency that could adversely
39 affect the EFH, and it allows the council to recommend measures
40 to avoid, mitigate, or offset any of those impacts.

41
42 The MSA requires the council to designate EFH and minimize
43 harmful fishing impacts on EFH and actively protect and enhance
44 it. In 1996, the Sustainable Fisheries Act encouraged the
45 councils to take a proactive approach to limiting gear types
46 that may harm fisheries or essential fish habitat. The fifteen
47 new HAPCs should have associated regulations that prohibit
48 fishing-related activities that damage coral.

1
2 The use of bottom-tending gear should be restricted in all
3 twenty-three sites being considered. Protection should be
4 expanded to all twenty-three sites in the document. Include
5 regulations on fishing gear that interact with the ocean floor
6 and could damage fragile corals at all twenty-three sites.

7
8 Protect corals now rather than waiting for evidence of
9 destruction before acting. Bottom-tending gear should be
10 restricted in all HAPCs. This amendment would still allow
11 historical levels of fishing for valuable commercial species
12 while protecting deep-sea coral communities. Corals needs to be
13 protected from the oil and gas industry.

14
15 Then we heard that corals should be protected from fishing-
16 related damages from numerous folks, and some of the rationale
17 that they provided was that damage to deep-sea corals due to
18 bottom-contacting gear is well documented and that bottom trawls
19 are particularly damaging to corals, and so their use around
20 coral areas should be minimized.

21
22 Trawling gear should be banned outright. Longlines should not
23 be allowed. All gear that interacts with the ocean floor and
24 could damage corals should be banned. We should be able to come
25 up with a more sophisticated, less damaging gear type that
26 allows us to fish without harming corals. Damage from fishing
27 gear leaves coral areas vulnerable to disease. Fishing
28 practices damage all sorts of corals and sea fans. Bycatch from
29 commercial fishing is devastating.

30
31 We also heard that the council should consider whether allowing
32 historical levels of fishing is possible without risking the
33 collapse of fish populations and the habitats on which they
34 depend. Octocorals should be incorporated into the fisheries
35 management unit of the fishery management plan for coral.
36 Wildlife and global biodiversity should be protected.

37
38 Then we also heard from numerous people that were concerned
39 about damages to corals in general, and they all stated that
40 corals needed to be protected for the following reasons: because
41 they are fragile, because they take such a long time to recover,
42 because little is known about the ecosystem and so it should be
43 protected, because corals have thrived for centuries, but are
44 now threatened by man's interference, corals are an integral
45 part of the ecosystem, they provide feeding and breeding areas
46 for numerous species, they are the basis of life in the oceans
47 and destroying corals would destroy human life, all ecosystems
48 are related to coral and death will impact the food chain, we

1 need to maintain the vitality of our oceans, the ancient and
2 beautiful organisms should be honored for future generations,
3 healthy fisheries and oceans drive the success of coastal
4 economics, researchers are just beginning to realize the
5 potential for deepwater corals to solve human medical issues
6 such as cancer, deepwater sponges provide antibiotics and cancer
7 drugs and bone grafts and dental implants.

8
9 Sea fans contain powerful anti-inflammatory chemicals and soft
10 corals have anti-viral properties, it is important to protect
11 them for our future utility, corals provide complex and diverse
12 habitats for a variety of marine life including economically-
13 important species, rising ocean temperatures and pollution are
14 already taking their toll and so we need to do what we can to
15 protect them, corals offer nursery grounds and protection from
16 predators and contribute to the reproduction and feeding of many
17 species, and corals act as a canary in the coal mine and their
18 health is indicative of the well-being entire system.

19
20 Ocean acidification is already causing corals to die, ocean
21 plastics are already killing corals and so we need to save them
22 when we can, coral reefs are endangered, deep-sea corals play a
23 role in seeding the growth of shallow-water corals, corals
24 provide refuge for crustaceans, and healthy corals are habitat
25 for fish and provide more fishing opportunities.

26
27 It was also noted that protecting corals would be the most
28 significant action ever taken by the council to safeguard this
29 fragile ecosystem and that we are destroying our environment for
30 commercial, for-profit reasons and through recreational
31 carelessness.

32
33 Ultimately, fishermen will benefit from protecting corals,
34 because they will encourage healthy fisheries. As ocean waters
35 warm, fish will move deeper, and so will fishermen, and so it's
36 important to protect the corals preemptively. All corals are in
37 danger, and so we need to protect what we have.

38
39 Amendment 9 is a good start, but we need to do even more to
40 protect our corals. We need to do what we can to protect
41 corals, because there are so many other threats, including oil
42 spills, chemicals, acidification, mining, and a rise in ocean
43 temperatures.

44
45 The Mid-Atlantic Council has protected corals, and so the Gulf
46 ought to do the same. We are already losing species that we
47 don't know about because of oil drilling and spilling.
48 Protecting corals is a long-term way to protect our Gulf and its

1 fisheries, while allowing degradation from fishing practices is
2 short-sighted.

3
4 Finally, killing corals with fishing gear is no different than
5 clear-cutting old-growth forests, like California's Sequoia
6 National Park and the Sherwood Forest in Nottingham Shire was
7 leveled to allow hunting for a few deer.

8
9 Now we will conclude with the general opposition we heard to the
10 amendment and to protecting our corals. We heard that no new
11 HAPCs should be established at all, that no new gear
12 restrictions should be made, that the Gulf of Mexico is a vital
13 environmental resource for the nation and a critical economic
14 engine.

15
16 Descriptions of the areas being considered for HAPC status
17 should not be qualitative and that the areas should not be
18 considered for such status without explicit scientific evidence
19 that shows each area meets the criteria for habitat designations
20 defined in the CFRs.

21
22 The council should include alternatives beyond the two choices
23 of no action or identification of a HAPC when they are
24 considering action for deep-sea coral zone designations. The
25 comprehensive cost-benefit analysis for all potentially impacted
26 industries should be included for each alternative. The council
27 should consider and describe how the alternatives integrate
28 and/or overlap with existing regulations of other federal
29 agencies to avoid unnecessary confusion and potentially
30 conflicting regulatory requirements.

31
32 The council should clearly articulate what the short and long-
33 term management strategies are for our coral resources,
34 including how the strategy integrates with other proposed
35 actions by other federal agencies and that opposition to any
36 area closures to the bottom longline fishery, because there is
37 no real evidence of damage due to the bottom longlines.

38
39 Scientists even state that they have seen rapid new coral growth
40 in areas that are bottom longline heavy, and the coral colonies
41 in Pulley Ridge have declined since it was closed to longlining
42 vessels. That concludes my report.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Emily. I think you did a really
45 nice job of summarizing 10,000 or more comments, and so good
46 job. Before we move on, I was wondering if anybody on the
47 council had any items that they wanted to weigh-in on. Susan.

48

1 **MS. SUSAN GERHART:** I think this is just a good time to remind
2 you that this was an environmental impact statement we did, and
3 so we have the draft EIS out for public comment at this time as
4 well. So far, we have only received four comments through the
5 process, but the comment period is still open, and, in fact, it
6 was scheduled to end on July 5, but we have decided to extend
7 the comment period to July 20, because of the holiday being
8 right there when it ended, and so I just wanted to let the
9 council know that. The comments that we have gotten so far, the
10 issues were encompassed in what Emily brought up, and so I won't
11 go through those in detail.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Great. Thank you. Are there any more
14 comments at this point? Seeing none, I'm going to go ahead and
15 ask Morgan to carry on.

16 17 **REVIEW OF AMENDMENT**

18
19 **DR. KILGOUR:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. If it's okay with the
20 committee, we'll just delve right into Action 1 and go over the
21 council's current preferred alternatives, and stop me at any
22 time.

23
24 Action 1 is to modify the existing HAPC boundary for regulations
25 to Pulley Ridge, and so, right now, the no action alternative is
26 to keep the Pulley Ridge HAPC as it is, which is that pie-shaped
27 portion at the bottom with the circles.

28
29 Alternative 2 would expand the HAPC with regulations to that
30 entire large box, which is currently an HAPC with no
31 regulations, with the exception of that pie-shaped box down at
32 the bottom.

33
34 Alternative 3 would expand the regulations for Pulley Ridge to
35 the entire red box, and so, in that area outlined in red, there
36 would be no bottom-tending gear, and I will go through what that
37 is real quickly. Bottom-tending gear would be fishing with
38 bottom longline, bottom trawl, buoy gear, pot or trap, or bottom
39 anchoring by fishing vessels, and that would be prohibited year-
40 round.

41
42 Then Alternative 4 is slightly different, in that it would
43 extend fishing regulations to the hatched area that is within
44 the red boundary, but not the circle part of the pie-shape, and
45 that would allow bottom longlining to continue in that area, but
46 it would prohibit fishing with all other types of bottom-tending
47 gear, which is bottom trawl, buoy gear, pot or trap, and bottom
48 anchoring by fishing vessels. That is the current preferred

1 alternative. Are there any questions? Okay.
2
3 Moving to Action 2, Action 2 would establish new areas for HAPC
4 status in the southeastern Gulf. Alternative 1 is no action, do
5 not establish any new HAPCs in the southeastern Gulf.
6 Alternative 2 would establish a new HAPC named Long Mound, and
7 there is two options, to not establish fishing regulations or to
8 prohibit fishing with bottom-tending gear. Unless I
9 specifically say, bottom-tending gear is defined as bottom
10 longline, bottom trawl, buoy gear, dredge, pot or trap, and
11 bottom anchoring by fishing vessels.

12
13 Alternative 3 would establish a new HAPC named Many Mounds, and,
14 again, there is Option a, no fishing regulations, or Option b,
15 establish fishing regulations. Alternative 4 is establish a new
16 HAPC named North Reed. Option a would not establish fishing
17 regulations, and Option b would prohibit fishing with bottom-
18 tending gear.

19
20 The Preferred Alternative 5 would establish a new HAPC named
21 West Florida Wall, and the preferred option is to prohibit
22 fishing with bottom-tending gear. If we go to the first map,
23 which is on Figure 2.2.1, that will show you all -- Alternative
24 2 is Long Mound, Alternative 3 is the North Reed site,
25 Alternative 4 is Many Mounds, and then the Preferred Alternative
26 5 is that purple box, the West Florida Wall, which combines all
27 three of those in the 400 to 600-meter depth range.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Chairman Bosarge.

30
31 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** I think we talked about this last time, but
32 what did we say the transit provision would be?

33
34 **DR. KILGOUR:** Mara, would you like to take that question?

35
36 **MS. LEVY:** Like we talked about last time, there is no transit
37 provision, because it's fishing with the gear that's prohibited.
38 It's not having it onboard that is prohibited. It's you can't
39 actually fish with the gears listed.

40
41 **MS. BOSARGE:** Okay, and so what are we going to consider
42 fishing? If I am transiting, do all my lines have to be out of
43 the water, or -- Do you see what I am saying? What is the
44 definition?

45
46 **MS. LEVY:** Well, the definition of "fishing" is in the Act and
47 in the regulations, and it's very broad. I think, if your lines
48 are in the water, there would be a case for you fishing. I

1 think it means your gear is out of the water.

2
3 **MS. BOSARGE:** Okay, and so, for the trawl fleet, if we happen to
4 be transiting in that area, which definition applies, the new
5 definition that we created in Shrimp Amendment 17B or the old
6 definition, which is in some state waters, where you actually
7 have to deck your doors?

8
9 **MS. LEVY:** I think that transit provision was for something
10 else, right, specifically about transiting -- I will look up
11 exactly what it applied to, but it wasn't to closed HAPC areas.
12 It had nothing to do with HAPCs. In the regulations that deal
13 with all these HAPCs, there are no transit provisions in the
14 Gulf. It's all prohibited fishing with these gears.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Morgan, to that point?

17
18 **DR. KILGOUR:** That transit provision was for state-licensed
19 vessels to transit through federal waters with shrimp onboard,
20 and so it was specific to having shrimp on your vessel and
21 transiting through federal waters with shrimp onboard when you
22 don't have a federal shrimp permit, if that jogs your memory.

23
24 **MS. BOSARGE:** Okay, and so, for transiting in these areas, we're
25 going to need to deck our doors or we're going to need to remove
26 our bag straps? That is what I am trying to figure out.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Ms. Levy.

29
30 **MS. LEVY:** I don't know that I have an exact answer to that
31 question. It's what can be interpreted as fishing, right, and
32 so fishing is the catching, taking, or harvesting of fish, the
33 attempted catching, taking, or harvesting of fish, any other
34 activity that can reasonably be expected to result in the
35 catching, taking, or harvesting of fish or any operations in
36 support of all of these activities.

37
38 I mean, it's a matter of what the agency and what law
39 enforcement is going to determine that fishing means in those
40 areas. If you have gear in the water that is capable of taking
41 fish, then, technically, I think you would be fishing, but I
42 don't know enough about shrimp trawls and what's in the water
43 and what is not in the water to be able to tell you, right here
44 and right now, whether it would be considered fishing under the
45 circumstances, I guess.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Chairman Bosarge, I have a quick question. I
48 know that there was a lot of discussion with the Shrimp SSC

1 about this particular issue, and so it's not clear to me that
2 there was a lot of effort in this newly created Wall, and is
3 that true?

4
5 **MS. BOSARGE:** No, we don't have any shrimping effort there, and
6 that's why I was just asking about how do we transit? If we
7 happen to be transiting -- Because it is a wall, right? It's a
8 long, cylindrical box that kind of parallels the coast, and so,
9 if you have to transit across it -- I don't think you would want
10 to run all the way down one side of it to go around it or
11 something, and that's why I was just trying to get clarification
12 of which transit provision are we going to live by there, so
13 that we don't get fined.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Sure. I appreciate that. Mr. Atran.

16
17 **MR. STEVEN ATRAN:** I am trying to look it up right now. I know,
18 for Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps -- Now, we're not
19 talking about shrimping and we're just talking about finfish
20 fishing. Where fishing is prohibited, transiting is allowed,
21 and there are specifications that state that the gear has to be
22 stowed aboard the vessel. That is not the exact wording, and I
23 was trying to find the exact wording, but there is a provision
24 for those closed areas, as far as transiting goes.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you. Morgan.

27
28 **DR. KILGOUR:** In this document, the alternatives and the
29 prohibition on fishing are consistent with the other HAPCs with
30 fishing regulations, and so the terminology is exactly what is
31 already in the CFRs for fishing regulations, if that makes you
32 more or less confused, or if that clarifies anything, but this
33 is exactly what is currently in the CFRs for other HAPCs with
34 fishing regulations.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Okay. Patrick.

37
38 **MR. PATRICK BANKS:** I hate to put him on the spot, but maybe
39 Scott could help us with some idea of -- When he is working with
40 federal law enforcement and he is dealing with the shrimp
41 fishery, if you guys are dealing with a shrimper that is
42 supposed to not be fishing versus fishing, how do you guys
43 determine it? Is it as long as the door are out of the water?
44 Is that how you guys would determine whether a shrimper is
45 fishing?

46
47 **CAPTAIN DAVID DUPREE:** Good morning, everyone. Captain Pearce
48 is not here yet, and I'm Captain David Dupree. I'm the Regional

1 Captain for FWC down here in Monroe County. If the doors are in
2 the water, there is an intent to fish. You are attempting to
3 fish or you are finishing fishing. If the doors are out of the
4 water, there is no question that you're not fishing at that
5 time.

6
7 At least what we would do, if the doors are in the water, is
8 begin a questioning process to find out are you beginning or are
9 you finishing, but it definitely shows an intent of either
10 finishing the job at the time or beginning the job, and it would
11 require further questioning. Did I answer the question?

12
13 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Yes, and thank you very much. Chairman
14 Bosarge, any follow-up on that? Are you good? Thank you. Mr.
15 Atran.

16
17 **MR. ATRAN:** If you are finished with that, I will pass, but I
18 found the exact wording for Madison-Swanson, if you're
19 interested.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Very interested.

22
23 **MR. ATRAN:** Okay. It does prohibit trawling, among other
24 things, and transiting means moving non-stop progression through
25 the area with fishing gear appropriately stowed, and, with
26 regard to a trawl net, it says a trawl net may remain on deck,
27 but the trawl doors must be disconnected from the trawl gear and
28 must be secured.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you. We'll do a little homework before
31 Full Council, and we will circle back on this, but, in the
32 interest of time, I think, Morgan, go ahead and move forward.
33 Excuse me. Captain Greene.

34
35 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** Good morning. Before we leave this
36 particular action, and knowing that we're fixing to move into
37 Action 3, but, in Action 3, there is a Sub-Option c. When you
38 look at Option b, it prohibits bottom-tending gear and longline
39 and bottom trawl and everything, but, in Action 3, there is an
40 Option c that is the same deal, but it excludes bottom
41 anchoring, and I can't remember why it is not in Action 2, and
42 would you please remind me, Morgan?

43
44 **DR. KILGOUR:** Sure. In Action 3, there are three areas, Alabama
45 Alps, L&W Pinnacles, and Scamp Reef and Roughtongue Reef, that
46 all have significant bandit rig fishery VMS points, and so that
47 is why there is the exemption option of allowing anchoring,
48 because those areas are used by bandit rig gears, and, when I

1 look at the VMS data for all the other areas, those are either
2 bottom longlines or bottom trawls, as appropriate, and so I was
3 given the direction by the council to look at each area and see
4 what type of gear is used and to provide you with alternatives
5 that would allow that historically-used gear.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Captain Greene.

8

9 **MR. GREENE:** With that being said, I understand that point, and
10 I appreciate that point, but the thing that sticks out to me is
11 that we are going a little further offshore, and we are fishing
12 areas we normally -- I am fishing areas that I haven't ever
13 fished, and I don't know if excluding anchoring in this area is
14 a good way to go or not, because these fishermen may not be
15 anchoring there now, but they may be one day in the future, and
16 so we may need to look at some point that if we need to come
17 back and do that that we will, because, if you've got boats that
18 are trying to anchor and use different types of gear, when the
19 weather is rough and those guys are trying to fish and they're
20 trying to hole up on a spot where they could traditionally
21 anchor, they may be drifting around and drifting their gear all
22 over the place, and it would probably do more damage than if
23 they were just anchored in one place, and so just bear that in
24 mind as you move forward with this, because it may not be
25 anything that's a big deal right now, but, the way things are
26 changing offshore and the water temperature rise that I am
27 seeing offshore, it may be a tool that we need to put in the
28 toolbox.

29

30 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Johnny. Ms. Levy.

31

32 **MS. LEVY:** Just to clarify, were you speaking to what is
33 currently in Action 3, or were you suggesting that -- Maybe not
34 to do it now, but, at some point, something like Action 2 should
35 have the option to allow anchoring, and is that what you were
36 speaking to?

37

38 **MR. GREENE:** Yes, ma'am. That's it exactly. I mean, it may --
39 I don't know how easy it's going to be to come back down the
40 road and do it, because it's one of those things that we're
41 pretty dynamic individuals as fishermen, and I know we're trying
42 to do the good for the coral and stuff, and I don't know that we
43 shouldn't put it in there, but I don't know that, at this point
44 in the process, it's appropriate, but it's certainly something
45 to consider.

46

47 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Johnny. Is there any more
48 questions? Dale.

1
2 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Just going back to the shrimp thing, I thought
3 we had it settled until Steven brought up that comment from
4 Madison-Swanson. I don't know how we proceed from here, but my
5 intention would be for folks to be able to transit this area
6 without having to disconnect their nets from the doors. That's
7 just not reasonable, and this is extremely deep water. If their
8 doors are out of the water, that is perfectly clear. Anything
9 that -- I just do not want us to leave this where they have to
10 disconnect the nets from the door. That is not reasonable.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Dale. Ms. Levy.

13
14 **MS. LEVY:** Well, so that definition that Steve read is not in
15 the regulations related to these habitat areas of particular
16 concern. It's in the reef fish part of the regulations, and it
17 allows transit through that area, because, essentially, you are
18 not allowed to fish or possess Gulf reef fish in those areas
19 unless you are transiting.

20
21 That is even a bigger restriction. You can't even possess fish
22 on your vessel unless you are just transiting, and so then it
23 has a definition of what transit means, but this definition of
24 what transit means for this purpose does not carry over into the
25 HAPC regulations. That is just a prohibition on fishing, and
26 so, as long as you're not fishing, then you don't need a transit
27 provision, and does that make sense?

28
29 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** I think that makes sense, and I really do
30 appreciate all the comments around the table. I don't think the
31 intent here is to unnecessarily regulate anybody that is trying
32 to actually move through those areas, and, over the next couple
33 of days, we'll make sure that's the case, before we bring it
34 back to Full Council. Are there any additional comments? All
35 right. Seeing none, Morgan, go ahead and move on.

36
37 **DR. KILGOUR:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. We're moving to Action 3.
38 Action 3 is new areas for HAPC status in the northeastern Gulf.
39 These are the areas that I just briefly touched on that they
40 have some slightly different options available, based on
41 historic fishing practices.

42
43 Alternative 1 would be no action, do not establish any new
44 HAPCs. Preferred Alternative 2 would establish a new HAPC named
45 Alabama Alps, and the current preferred option is to prohibit
46 fishing with bottom-tending gear, and, as Johnny noted earlier,
47 there is Option c available, which prohibits bottom-tending gear
48 with the exception of bottom anchoring by fishing vessels.

1
2 Preferred Alternative 3 would establish a new HAPC named L&W
3 Pinnacles and Scamp Reef. Option a is do not establish fishing
4 regulations. Option b is prohibit fishing with bottom-tending
5 gear. Option c would prohibit fishing with bottom-tending gear
6 with the exception of bottom anchoring by fishing vessels.

7
8 Preferred Alternative 4 would establish a new HAPC named
9 Mississippi Canyon 118. Option a would not establish fishing
10 regulations, and Preferred Option b would prohibit fishing with
11 bottom-tending gear.

12
13 Preferred Alternative 5 would establish a new HAPC named
14 Roughtongue Reef. Option a would not establish fishing
15 regulations. Preferred Option b would prohibit fishing with
16 bottom-tending gear and, again, Option c would prohibit fishing
17 with bottom-tending gear with the exception of bottom anchoring
18 by fishing vessels.

19
20 Preferred Alternative 6 would establish a new HAPC named Viosca
21 Knoll 826. Option a would not establish fishing regulations,
22 and Preferred Option b would prohibit fishing with bottom-
23 tending gear.

24
25 Preferred Alternative 7 is establish a new HAPC named Viosca
26 Knoll 862/906. Option a would not establish fishing
27 regulations. Option b would prohibit fishing with bottom-
28 tending gear, and Preferred Option c would prohibit fishing with
29 bottom-tending gear, but provide an exemption to the prohibition
30 on fishing for fishermen that possess a royal red shrimp
31 endorsement and are fishing with royal red shrimp fishing gear.
32 If you go to Figure 2.3.2, I will explain the rationale for that
33 last preferred alternative.

34
35 If you see that deep purple that goes right through the Viosca
36 Knoll 862/906, and that's the box on almost the bottom left, and
37 there is a purple that goes through it, and so this is one of
38 the two prime areas for royal red shrimp fishing in the Gulf of
39 Mexico.

40
41 If you go back up to 2.3.1, this is the VMS data under the
42 outlines of those areas, and, if you will see Alabama Alps, L&W
43 Pinnacles, Scamp Reef, and Roughtongue Reef, those are all areas
44 that have bandit rig fishing gear. All of the other HAPCs in
45 this area don't have a lot of VMS points in them. I am happy to
46 take any questions on this action.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Are there any questions for Morgan? Dale.

1
2 **MR. DIAZ:** I don't have a question, but I just want to clarify
3 on the record, for people that are listening to the webinar that
4 may have heard this for the first time, it exempts trawlers in
5 those areas, but they have to have the trawl gear off the
6 bottom. Just for people that are listening, so they will
7 understand that, that the gear does have to be off the bottom.
8 Thank you.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Mr. Banks.

11
12 **MR. BANKS:** I have a question, and maybe Morgan can clear this
13 up. I have heard a lot about how this is a compromise type of
14 document, and there was a lot of input from the fishing
15 community in some of these areas, but what were some of the -- I
16 just find it hard that the fishing industry would compromise on
17 a place like Roughtongue and Pinnacle and Scamp and Alabama,
18 when they are such heavily fished.

19
20 Can you remind us at all about some of the comments from those
21 industries about those particular areas? It seems like we're
22 taking some areas that historically folks have made their living
23 in, and we're about to now kick them out, but then I hear a lot
24 about this being a compromise, and so was this a compromise for
25 those communities?

26
27 **DR. KILGOUR:** This document was provided to the Reef Fish AP,
28 the Shrimp AP, and the Coral AP, and so, for the two areas that
29 the biggest compromise happened, it would be Pulley Ridge area
30 for the Preferred Alternative 4, with the bottom longline
31 exemption, and this Viosca Knoll 862/906 for the royal red
32 exemption.

33
34 The council added those Option c for those areas for bandit rig
35 fishermen, but I couldn't say that we've had a lot of comments
36 specifically towards those areas, nor did I go out to every
37 single bandit rig fisherman and ask them for their input on
38 those areas, and so we have reached out to the advisory panels
39 for the reef fish for those areas.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Any more questions or comments? Mr. Gregory.

42
43 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** Excuse me, Morgan, but, for
44 this graph, how many years of data are accumulated here? Is
45 this one year, or is it an average of the number of years, or is
46 the total over a series of years, because that might help
47 explain some of this.

1 **DR. KILGOUR:** This is the total over a series of years, and so
2 these are two-and-a-half-nautical-mile-by-two-and-a-half-
3 nautical-mile grids, and it's the sum of VMS points from March
4 of 2007 to July of 2015, and I wanted -- That's a good point to
5 bring up.

6
7 VMS points do not necessarily indicate active fishing, but, when
8 you see kind of a concentration like this, you can infer that
9 these are probably heavily-fished areas, in contrast to the
10 shrimp ELB data, which is also a sum of points over a long
11 period of time, but those points have been filtered for active
12 fishing, and I want to qualify that. They are going at a speed
13 at which they can be fishing, and so it's inferred that they are
14 actively fishing, and that's algorithm has been calibrated by
15 LGL Ecological Associates and is now used by NMFS.

16
17 Additionally, the VMS data -- VMS are on all boats that have
18 reef fish permits, whereas the ELB data are only on a third of
19 the fleet, and so VMS gives the whole picture, and the ELB data
20 only gives you a third of what we have federally permitted.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Morgan. We're going to keep moving
23 along, to keep us on schedule, unless there is any additional
24 questions or comments.

25
26 **DR. KILGOUR:** Okay. Action 4 would be new areas for HAPC status
27 in the northwestern Gulf. Alternative 1, no action, is do not
28 establish any new HAPCs. Preferred Alternative 2 would
29 establish a new HAPC at AT 047. Option a would not establish
30 fishing regulations, and Preferred Option b would prohibit
31 fishing with bottom-tending gear.

32
33 Preferred Alternative 3 would establish a new HAPC named AT 357.
34 Option a would not establish fishing regulations, and Preferred
35 Option b would prohibit fishing with bottom-tending gear.
36 Preferred Alternative 4 would establish a new HAPC named Green
37 Canyon 852. Option a would not establish fishing regulations,
38 and Preferred Option b would prohibit fishing with bottom-
39 tending gear. I would like to note that this area has three of
40 the deepest HAPCs that would have fishing regulations in depths
41 of about 2,600 to almost 5,000 feet.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Are there any questions about this action
44 item? Seeing none, Morgan, carry on.

45
46 **DR. KILGOUR:** All right. Action 5 are new areas for HAPC status
47 in the southwestern Gulf. Alternative 1, no action, is do not
48 establish any new HAPCs. Preferred Alternative 2 would

1 establish a new HAPC named Harte Bank, and the Preferred Option
2 a is do not establish fishing regulations, and Option b would
3 prohibit fishing with bottom-tending gear.

4
5 Preferred Alternative 3 would establish a new HAPC named
6 Southern Bank, and Preferred Option a would not establish
7 fishing regulations, and Option b would prohibit fishing with
8 bottom-tending gear.

9
10 If we go to Figure 2.5.1, that is the -- Those are the areas
11 with the VMS underlaid on them. When I looked at the data on
12 that Harte Bank, it looked like those were VMS on vessels that
13 have shrimp permits, but this was an area that -- In public
14 comment at the public hearings, I learned that maybe vessels
15 with shrimp permits go back and use bandit gear when they are
16 not shrimping, legally and not illegally, but it was something
17 that wouldn't show up, necessarily, because they had shrimp
18 permits, and, if you look at the shrimp ELB data, which is
19 Figure 2.5.1, you can see that neither one of those areas is an
20 area that is shrimped.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Are there any comments or questions on this
23 action item? All right. Seeing none, Morgan.

24
25 **DR. KILGOUR:** Action 6 would add new deepwater coral areas for
26 HAPC status, but none of these are recommended to have fishing
27 regulations. Alternative 1 would be no action, do not establish
28 any new HAPCs.

29
30 Preferred Alternative 2 would establish a new HAPC named South
31 Reed. Preferred Alternative 3 would establish a new HAPC named
32 Garden Bank 299. Preferred Alternative 4 would establish a new
33 HAPC named Garden Bank 535. Preferred Alternative 5 would
34 establish a new HAPC named Green Canyon 140/272. Preferred
35 Alternative 6 would establish a new HAPC named Green Canyon 234.
36 Preferred Alternative 7 would establish a new HAPC named Green
37 Canyon 354. Preferred Alternative 8 would establish a new HAPC
38 named Mississippi Canyon 751. Preferred Alternative 9 would
39 establish a new HAPC named Mississippi Canyon 885.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Are there any comments or questions on this
42 action item? Just for clarification, all of these eight HAPCs,
43 or potential HAPCs, are without fishing regulations. Okay.
44 Carry on.

45
46 **DR. KILGOUR:** Okay, and the last action is Action 7, which would
47 prohibit dredge fishing in all existing HAPCs that have fishing
48 regulations, and so, currently, there are three HAPCs that have

1 fishing regulations that don't specifically prohibit dredge
2 fishing, while the others do, and so this would just maintain
3 consistency for the CFRs for HAPCs with fishing regulations.
4 Alternative 1 is no action, and Preferred Alternative 2 would
5 prohibit dredge fishing in all HAPCs that have fishing
6 regulations. That would specifically apply to the Pulley Ridge
7 HAPC, Stetson Bank, and McGrail Bank.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Okay. Any comments or questions on this final
10 action item? Okay. I expect that we're going to have a lot of
11 public comment on this particular amendment, and so we'll hold
12 off for the time being, and if we could go ahead and move on to
13 the review of the codified text.

14
15 **REVIEW OF CODIFIED TEXT**

16
17 **DR. KILGOUR:** The codified text is Tab N-4(c), and, if Sue
18 doesn't want to take the reins, then I can go through it.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Ms. Levy.

21
22 **MS. LEVY:** I mean, it's in your briefing book. I think the
23 thing to note is that, if you look at it and compare it to the
24 current regs, the order of things is a bit different, because we
25 tried to organize it by area, and so we added these new things,
26 and so the things that are already in the regulations are still
27 there, but they may just not be in the same place, because we
28 added the new stuff and tried to put it in the logical order,
29 and the ones with fishing regulations have those in there
30 consistent with what is already in there for the other HAPCs.
31 You can look at it. If you have any questions at Full Council,
32 we can address it before you decide whether to submit to the
33 Secretary.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** All right. Thank you very much. I think we
36 will take the next couple of days to review -- Mara.

37
38 **MS. LEVY:** I had one other thing that I wanted to bring up, if
39 this is the appropriate time. I think, in the last couple of
40 weeks, or a couple of weeks ago, council staff and Sustainable
41 Fisheries staff got some comments from HMS folks about their
42 potential permit holders, a dozen or so, that may or may not use
43 bottom longline gear in some of the areas where we are looking
44 at prohibiting fishing with bottom longlines.

45
46 I looked back in past amendments, where the council has done
47 these HAPC-type regulations and fishing with bottom longline,
48 and there has usually been at least a very brief statement about

1 it not including HMS gears, and then what the council has done
2 is asked HMS to do parallel rulemaking, so that their regs in
3 their section of the regulations mirrors the council regs in our
4 622s.

5
6 I guess my suggestion here would be to give staff some
7 discretion to address the HMS issue in the document, and I would
8 suggest just saying that it's not including HMS gear, but then
9 asking HMS to do the parallel rulemaking again, so that it's
10 very clear in their regs what applies. Not that we change our
11 regs, but just that we say that in the document, and then the
12 Sustainable Fisheries Division can work with HMS to actually get
13 that rulemaking done, so that they're consistent, if you do
14 decide to actually take final action at Full Council.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you. Mr. Gregory.

17
18 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** A question, Mara. Does HMS use
19 both bottom longline and mid-water longlines, or do they just
20 use mid-water longlines? You referred to it as bottom, and I'm
21 just not clear.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Jack.

24
25 **DR. JACK MCGOVERN:** They use bottom longline for sharks, and
26 they also use pelagic longlines for swordfish and other species.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Chairman Bosarge.

29
30 **MS. BOSARGE:** I was just wondering. I guess you're inferring
31 that, yes, they will prohibit bottom longlines, because, when
32 you started that conversation, it almost sounded like they have
33 some fishermen that are using bottom longlines and maybe they
34 would want an exemption, and I guess will there be a whole
35 process of deciding, through the HMS side of the house, whether
36 that is going to be prohibited or not with their stakeholders?

37
38 **MS. LEVY:** I mean, in the past, when the council has done these
39 type of regulations, HMS has done the parallel rulemaking to
40 have the same -- They basically cross-reference the Gulf
41 regulations and say fishing with bottom longline or for these
42 permit holders for this gear is prohibited in these areas and
43 look at the 622 regs.

44
45 My assumption would be that they would be willing to do the same
46 thing here. I think that we still have some lack of information
47 about how much fishing they think occurs or doesn't occur there.
48 Like I said, this sort of came up at the last minute, and I'm

1 not sure why.

2
3 We had engaged HMS on this before, and they were part of our
4 process, but I think maybe it wasn't on their radar until the
5 last minute, and so I don't have all the information, but I
6 think, consistent with what we've done before, if the council
7 just asks HMS to do the parallel rulemaking, then hopefully we
8 could go back and do it together, because we've done that in the
9 past with the Dry Tortugas stuff, and we did one rulemaking, HMS
10 and Gulf. The agency did one rulemaking for both and we got it
11 implemented, but I can't say exactly what's going to happen in
12 the future. I just suggest that we try to follow the same
13 process here.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Okay. I appreciate that. Real quick
16 question. Well, I'm going to let Martha go, and then I have a
17 question.

18
19 **MS. GUYAS:** Along those lines, my question was, where this has
20 happened in the past, either the Gulf Council or another council
21 has had regulations that impact HMS, and have we ended up in a
22 situation where HMS didn't go along with it? That would be my
23 concern here, is if we're prohibiting bottom longlines for one
24 group of fishermen but not another and we kind of had a screwy
25 situation.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Ms. Levy.

28
29 **MS. LEVY:** As far as I know, in recent history, no, but maybe
30 Jack has some other information. I know in the South Atlantic
31 they did the same thing and HMS did the parallel rulemaking,
32 and, like I said, in the past, with the ones we have on the
33 books now, HMS has the compatible regs that mirror the Gulf
34 stuff, but I don't know if Jack has more information.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Jack.

37
38 **DR. MCGOVERN:** I am not aware of any situation where HMS did not
39 go along. When the South Atlantic did their MPA amendment a few
40 years ago, there was compatible rulemaking at the same time, and
41 so there were no problems.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you. Chairman Bosarge.

44
45 **MS. BOSARGE:** Yes, but on the South Atlantic, they have some
46 liaisons that sit at that table that actually participate in
47 some of those fisheries, and so it is a -- I mean, I am with you
48 that they probably went along, but I would venture to guess that

1 they probably had some conversations along the way, with people
2 like Dewey sitting at the table, that participates in some of
3 those fisheries and goes to all the HMS meetings and things like
4 that.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Jack.

7

8 **DR. MCGOVERN:** I actually think that pre-dated Dewey, but we did
9 have HMS involved during the development of the amendment.

10

11 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you. Mr. Gregory, real quick, I guess
12 what will happen at this point is that staff will work with the
13 HMS folks to try to move this along in parallel, and you will
14 make that request?

15

16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Most definitely and inform the
17 council immediately if HMS in any way does not want to go along
18 with the prohibition on bottom longline, because that defeats
19 the purpose of trying to protect the corals.

20

21 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Absolutely. All right. Thank you very much.
22 Morgan, is there anything else over there?

23

24 **DR. KILGOUR:** No, I'm good here.

25

26 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Okay. Are there any additional comments or
27 questions about the review of the amendment? Seeing none, I
28 think this will end this particular session. Thank you.

29

30 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 18, 2018.)

31

32

- - -