GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

268TH MEETING

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

Hyatt Centric New Orleans, Louisiana

JANUARY 29-FEBRUARY 1, 2018

VOTING MEMBERS

Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon) ......................... Alabama
Patrick Banks ....................................................................... Louisiana
Leann Bosarge ..................................................................... Mississippi
Doug Boyd ........................................................................... Texas
Roy Crabtree .......................................................................... NMFS
Dale Diaz ............................................................................... Mississippi
Phil Dyskow .......................................................................... Florida
Tom Frazer ............................................................................ Florida
Johnny Greene ........................................................................ Alabama
Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley) ....................... Florida
Campo Matens ........................................................................ Louisiana
Paul Mickle (designee for Joe Spraggins) .............................. Mississippi
Robin Riechers ........................................................................ Texas
John Sanchez .......................................................................... Florida
Bob Shipp ............................................................................... Alabama
Greg Stunz ............................................................................... Texas
Ed Swindell ........................................................................... Louisiana

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Glenn Constant ....................................................................... USFWS
Dave Donaldson ..................................................................... GSMFC
LT Mark Zanowicz .................................................................. USCG

STAFF

Steven Atran ........................................................................... Senior Fishery Biologist
Assane Diagne ......................................................................... Economist
Matt Freeman ........................................................................... Economist
John Froeschke ...................................................................... Fishery Biologist-Statistician
Douglas Gregory ..................................................................... Executive Director
Karen Hoak ............................................................................... Administrative & Financial Assistant
Morgan Kilgour ......................................................................... Fishery Biologist
Ava Lasseter ........................................................................... Anthropologist
Mary Levy ................................................................................ NOAA General Counsel
Bernadine Roy ......................................................................... Office Manager
Carrie Simmons ....................................................................... Deputy Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ben Allen</td>
<td>Biloxi, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ken Anderson</td>
<td>Panama City Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pam Anderson</td>
<td>Panama City Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Billy Archer</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tom Ard</td>
<td>Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Greg Ball</td>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Luiz Barbieri</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kevin Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jane Beach-Lee</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Susan Boggs</td>
<td>Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ryan Bradley</td>
<td>Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eric Brazer</td>
<td>Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>J.P. Brooker</td>
<td>Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Donna Brooks</td>
<td>Gulf Wild, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Glen Brooks</td>
<td>Gulf Wild, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>James Bruce</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gary Bryant</td>
<td>Gulf Shores, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shane Cantrell</td>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Daryl Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>David Cavelle</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brian Cheuvront</td>
<td>SAFMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>John Coulon</td>
<td>Buras, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>David Cresson</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Leslie Davis</td>
<td>LA Sea Grant, Lafayette, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jason Delacruz</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nicholas Derbes</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Josh Ellender</td>
<td>St. Bernard Parish, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Richard Fischer</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Traci Floyd</td>
<td>MDMR, Biloxi, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Brad Forhand</td>
<td>Panama City Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Troy Frady</td>
<td>Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Kory Freed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Stephanie Freed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sue Gerhart</td>
<td>NMFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Brad Gorst</td>
<td>Clearwater, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mike Graef</td>
<td>Destin, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Jim Green</td>
<td>DCBA, Destin, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Buddy Guindon</td>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kenneth Haddad</td>
<td>ASA, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Chad Hanson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Darren Haydel</td>
<td>Cocodrie, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Chad Hebert</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Scott Hickman</td>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Larry Hooper</td>
<td>Empire, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Chris Horton</td>
<td>Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dylan Hubbard</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>George Huye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Gary Jarvis</td>
<td>DCBA, Destin, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peter Jarvis</td>
<td>Hollywood, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mike Jennings</td>
<td>Freeport, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benjamin Kelley</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marie Kelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mark Kelley</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bill Kelly</td>
<td>FKCFPA, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bobby Kelly</td>
<td>Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John Law</td>
<td>Panama City Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Douglas &quot;Kyle&quot; Lowe</td>
<td>Destin, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brad Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bud Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stewart Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jack Montoucet</td>
<td>LA Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>David Morgan</td>
<td>Venice, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Billy Neff</td>
<td>OBFA, Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bart Niquet</td>
<td>Lynn Haven, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chris Niquet</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chris Padilla</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alicia Paul</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dennis Peters</td>
<td>GSRC, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Charlie Phillips</td>
<td>SAFMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Corey Pitre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Clay Porch</td>
<td>SEFSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Samuel Rauch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Scott Robson</td>
<td>Destin, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ashford Rosenberg</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mike Rowell</td>
<td>Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Brett Ryan</td>
<td>Venice, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Chris Schieble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lisa Schmidt</td>
<td>Madeira Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dominique Seibert</td>
<td>LA Sea Grant, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Clarence Seymour</td>
<td>Biloxi, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Neil Anthony Sims</td>
<td>Kampachi Farms, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mike Sullivan</td>
<td>Panama City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bill Staff</td>
<td>Orange Beach, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Steve Tomeny</td>
<td>Port Fourchon, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rebecca Triche</td>
<td>LA Wildlife Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mark Tryon</td>
<td>Gulf Breeze, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ted Venker</td>
<td>CCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pierre Villere</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Suzie Villere</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Gunner Waldmann</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ed Walker</td>
<td>Tarpon Springs, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Donald Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Billy Wells</td>
<td>Venice, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Wayne Werner</td>
<td>Alachua, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Tom Wheatley</td>
<td>Pew, Tampa, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Johnny Williams</td>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Dale Woodruff........................................Orange Beach, AL
2 Bob Zales, II........................................Panama City, FL
3 Jerome Zeringue......................................LA
4 Jim Zurbrick..........................................Steinhatchee, FL
5
6  -  -  -
7
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.................................................................5

Table of Motions.................................................................7

Proposed Committee Roster Recommendations.........................10

Call to Order, Announcements, and Introductions......................11

Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes............................14

Supporting Agencies Updates.................................................15

U.S. Coast Guard...............................................................15

Presentations.................................................................16

Louisiana Law Enforcement................................................16

Overview of Aquaculture FMP.................................................20

Review of Exempted Fishing Permit Applications .......................28

Florida EFP Request..........................................................31

Alabama EFP Request..........................................................38

Mississippi EFP Request......................................................49

Louisiana EFP Request........................................................58

Texas EFP Request.............................................................65

General EFP Discussion......................................................75

Update on Open Ocean Restoration Planning............................91

Aquaculture EFP Request.....................................................93

Review of Public Comments on EFP Applications.......................115

Public Comment..............................................................117

Committee Reports...........................................................211

Administrative/Budget Committee Report...............................211

Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report...............................215

Ad Hoc Red Snapper and Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP Appointments........240

Vote on Exempted Fishing Permit Applications.........................241

Supporting Agencies Updates...............................................271

South Atlantic Council Liaison............................................271

Vote on Exempted Fishing Permit Applications (Continued)..........273

Committee Reports (Continued)..............................................277

Reef Fish Committee Report...............................................277
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spiny Lobster Committee Report</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supporting Agencies Updates (Continued)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other Business</td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF MOTIONS

PAGE 10: Motion to approve the 2018 committee roster. The motion carried on page 10.

PAGE 211: Motion to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 214.

PAGE 216: Motion in Action 1 to move Alternative 4 to Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 216.

PAGE 217: Motion to move Action 4 to Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 218.

PAGE 218: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 219.

PAGE 219: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 2, Options a and b the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 219.

PAGE 220: Motion to forward the letter to Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group regarding the use of descending devices and venting tools to increase survival of released fish. The motion carried on page 220.

PAGE 225: Motion to direct staff to develop a document that outlines the component parts of an ecosystem plan. The motion carried on page 225.

PAGE 227: Motion to recommend that NMFS move forward with the implementation of the FKCFA Lionfish EFP request with the recommended modifications to the sampling area and to add a one-year update reporting requirement. The motion carried on page 332.

PAGE 234: Motion to recommend that NMFS move forward with the implementation of the Keys Fisheries Lionfish EFP request with the recommended modifications to the sampling area and to add a one-year update reporting requirement. The motion carried on page 234.

PAGE 241: Motion to recommend approval of each state’s EFP, but such that if federal for-hire vessels are included in any state’s EFP this will not impact the length of the federal for-hire season. The motion carried on page 270.
PAGE 276: Motion to direct staff to draft a letter outlining concerns regarding the Aquaculture EFP Request and forward the letter to NMFS. The motion carried on page 276.

PAGE 278: Motion to direct staff to develop a scoping document to evaluate the allocations of red snapper, taking into account previous deliberations in Amendment 28 and any new information and consider a broad range of social, economic, data correction, and management factors. The motion carried on page 285.

PAGE 286: Motion to remove Alternative 4, Option 4b, and add language to all alternatives that 2010 landings will be excluded. The motion carried on page 286.

PAGE 286: Motion in Action 2, Alternative 6, evaluate recreational trips using the following range of years from Alternatives 2 and 3. The motion carried on page 287.

PAGE 287: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 2, Option 2d, the preferred alternative. The motion failed on page 293.

PAGE 296: Motion to instruct staff to assess requested delegation items from the Mississippi, Florida, and Louisiana letters, determine through the IPT process if there are any items that cannot be delegated, and incorporate those items that can be delegated for the next iteration of the individual State Management Amendments. The motion carried on page 297.

PAGE 298: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 302.

PAGE 302: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 2, Option 2a, the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 302.

PAGE 306: Motion to add a new Action 5.4, Reclamation of Latent Shares. The motion carried on page 306.

PAGE 306: Motion to add a new Action X, Units of Measure for Quota Distribution and Reporting. The motion carried on page 306.

PAGE 311: Motion in Action 4 to make Alternative 4, Option 4d the preferred alternative. The motion failed on page 318.

PAGE 324: Motion to instruct staff to start a white paper exploring rents and royalties in the Gulf commercial red snapper fishery for allocation above 4.65 million pounds. The white paper should include, but not be limited to, a definition of
rents and royalties, examples of resource rent collection in other public resource uses, a calculation of Gulf red snapper rents and royalties value, alternative methods of rents and royalties collection and alternative methods for redistribution of shares. The motion carried on page 328.

PAGE 332: Motion to instruct staff to begin development of an action in the appropriate document that considers removing the historical captain endorsement to reef fish and CMP permits and allow those permits to be fully transferable. The motion carried on page 334.
The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Hyatt Centric, New Orleans, Louisiana, Monday morning, January 29, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ROSTER RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE: We are actually going to call to order the Full Council, because the first thing on our agenda is our 2018 Committee Roster Selection. I am sure all of you have probably had a chance to look over that.

I tried my best to go through and at least your top one through three choices, and I tried my best to get you on those committees, for sure. Obviously the most important thing is to try and keep balance on the committees, but did anybody have any questions or concerns about the committee roster? All right. If we don’t, then we will need a motion to approve the committee roster. Dale.

MR. DALE DIAZ: I don’t want to stop anybody from saying anything, but, if nobody has any objection, I make a motion that we approve the committee roster.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion from Mr. Diaz, and we have a second from Dr. Shipp. We will give them just a minute to get that on the board. We have our motion on the board. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries.

Now we will recess Full Council until Wednesday, and we’re going to back into our committee sessions.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on January 29, 2018.)

---

January 31, 2018

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

---

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Hyatt Centric, New Orleans, Louisiana, Wednesday morning, January 31, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.
CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Good morning, everyone. Welcome back. This morning, we’re going to call the Full Council to order. I will read my Chairman’s statement, and then we’ll add introduce ourselves.

Welcome to the 267th meeting of the Gulf Council. My name is Leann Bosarge, Chair of the Council. If you have a cell phone, pager, or similar devices, we ask that you keep them on silent or vibrating mode during the meeting. Also, in order for all to be able to hear the proceedings, we ask that you have any private conversations outside.

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

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

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

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

MR. JOHNNY GREENE: Johnny Greene, Alabama.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Kevin Anson, Alabama.
DR. BOB SHIPP: Bob Shipp, Alabama.
MR. ED SWINDELL: Ed Swindell, Louisiana.
MR. PATRICK BANKS: Patrick Banks, Louisiana.
MR. CAMP MATENS: Camp Matens, Louisiana.
DR. TOM FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.
MR. JOHN SANCHEZ: John Sanchez, Florida.
MS. MARTHA GUYAS: Martha Guyas, Florida.
MR. PHIL DYSKOW: Phil Dyskow, Florida.
MR. GLENN CONSTANT: Glenn Constant, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
MS. MARA LEVY: Mara Levy, NOAA Office of General Counsel.
MS. SUSAN GERHART: Susan Gerhart, NOAA Fisheries Service.
DR. ROY CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.
DR. CLAY PORCH: Clay Porch, NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.
MR. ROBIN RIECHERS: Robin Riechers, Texas.
MR. DOUG BOYD: Doug Boyd, Texas.
DR. GREG STUNZ: Greg Stunz, Texas.
DR. PAUL MICKLE: Paul Mickle, Mississippi.
MR. DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.
MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.
LT. MARK ZANOWICZ: Mark Zanowicz, U.S. Coast Guard.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY: Doug Gregory, council staff.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, and we do have a few special people in the audience with us today that I would like to stop and introduce. We have Mr. Sam Rauch, who is the Deputy Director for National Marine Fisheries Service. Sam, we’re glad to have you with us. Thanks for being here. I do believe that Mr. Chris Oliver will be here a little bit later, and so we’ll stop at that point and make our introductions then.

We also have Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Secretary Jack Montoucet. Good morning, sir. Did you want to address us this morning, because I’ve been looking forward to it, but I have to tell you that I didn’t have time to brush up on my French.

MR. JACK MONTOUCET: If you will remember correctly, last year, I gave you a little taste of French, and I kind of expanded that this year, and, if you come back next year, we’re going to expand it some more, and, hopefully, by the time you finish your term here, you will be able to do a complete sentence in French. That’s my goal for you.

It’s certainly a pleasure to have you here in New Orleans and our great state of Louisiana. I have to tell you that we set up an ATM so that you can go and withdraw your money from your state and bring it here and spend it. We have a budget deficit here in Louisiana, and we accept anything that you can bring to the table, especially during this time, and so I hope that you’re enjoying New Orleans.

We have a lot of great things to offer in this state, and fishing is one, and I certainly hope that you can come to some resolution and give me some Pepcid, so that I don’t have heartburn this coming year, especially when it pertains to red snapper, and so I look forward to your work here.

Our commission meeting is tomorrow morning, and so I’m waiting for Patrick to be able to send me some good news tonight that I can share with the commission tomorrow. I know your work is very important, and you all take it seriously, and we certainly appreciate that.

Enjoy our city, and we have a lot to offer here. If you have an opportunity to visit the World War II museum, I can assure you that it’s going to be some time well spent, and so thank you for coming to Louisiana. I look forward to work with all of you in the future, and, realizing how important your work is, hopefully we can all come out of here and leave Louisiana with some good news for all of the Southeast states, and especially for all of
our fishermen in these areas, and so thank you so much for being here. I appreciate it.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Merci beaucoup, and, during this time of the year, there is one sentence that I always remember, and that’s let the good times roll, and so, thank you, sir. We appreciate it.

Next on our agenda, we’re actually going to look at our agenda, and we need to see if there is any amendments or additions that need to be made to our Full Council agenda, and, before I ask for that, I do know that there are a couple.

If it’s okay with Louisiana Law Enforcement, Captain Hebert, and Dr. Kilgour, we’re going to go ahead and move up our Coast Guard presentation that would have been tomorrow, and we’ll allow him to do that first thing this morning, if that doesn’t conflict with anybody’s schedules. I am getting a thumbs-up from the audience, and so that will work.

Then I did have one thing during Other Business about the shrimp electronic logbooks, but it won’t take very long, and we can do that at the end. Now, were there any other amendments or additions to the agenda as presented? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as amended.

MR. DIAZ: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion from Mr. Diaz, and it’s seconded by Mr. Swindell. Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Next, our minutes from our last meeting are under Tab A, Number 4. Were there any corrections or amendments? Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Just a couple of clarifications. On page 49, line 10, strike “in menhaden port sampling”. On line 17, change “AIS” to “ANS”. Then, on page 50, line 7, strike “also”. Line 8, change “Lyle” to “Lyles”.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Anyone else? All right. Then I will entertain a motion to adopt the minutes as amended.

MR. GREENE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s so moved by Mr. Greene, and it’s seconded by Mr. Diaz. Is there any discussion? Seeing none,
any opposition? With no opposition, the motion carries. That will bring us to Lieutenant Zanowicz, and I will turn it over to you, sir.

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATES
U.S. COAST GUARD

LT. ZANOWICZ: Good morning, and thank you for your time and allowing me to present early. I just have a quick discussion on Coast Guard enforcement activities since our last meeting. The Coast Guard continues to combat illegal foreign fishing vessels near the U.S./Mexico maritime boundary line.

Since our last meeting, the Coast Guard has interdicted fifteen Mexican lanchas found illegally fishing in the EEZ off of Texas. This is more lanchas interdicted at this point in the fiscal year than at the same point in any of the past three fiscal years. These lanchas represent forty-five of the total number of lanchas that Coast Guard assets have visually sighted in the area since October.

Additionally, since October, we have recovered approximately 21,000 yards of longline gear thought to have been illegally placed by these Mexican lanchas. From these lanchas and year, we recovered a total of 1,067 red snapper, 138 sharks, and twenty eels, along with various other species. Fortunately, most of the longline gear was recovered before it had any catch on it.

Overall, we are projecting that we will meet or exceed the previous record for total number of lancha interdictions this year. The photograph you see here was taken at Coast Guard Station South Padre Island from a December 21 case. This is a catch recovered from just one Mexican lancha, totaling 362 red snapper.

Additionally, we have continued to remain vigilant in enforcing domestic fisheries laws, with thirteen violations this fiscal year, including five cases where vessels were found in possession of red snapper without a commercial permit and outside of the federal recreational season.

Lastly, we recently received the final adjudication for a March 2016 case, in which a vessel was found with 488 red snapper, 152 vermillion snapper, and two grouper onboard that were illegally harvested in federal waters. The photograph you see here was from that case.
Two individuals onboard received criminal sentencing, including imprisonment, for making false statements to the Coast Guard Investigative Service and NOAA Office of Law Enforcement officials. While the boarding was initiated by a local Coast Guard station, this case represented a collaborative effort between the Coast Guard, Texas Parks and Wildlife, and our NOAA partners.

We thank them for their efforts in these and other cases, and we look forward to continuing to work with our state and federal partners in the future. Thank you. This concludes my presentation, pending any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you for the presentation. I had a question. I didn’t quite catch the fact that you said in the very beginning slide. So far this year, what was the status relative to the other years?

LT. ZANOWICZ: At this point in the year, we have interdicted more Mexican lanchas than we have at the same point in any of the past three years, fiscal years that is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: It’s worth noting that thank you all for the cooperation down there on the border. I know, on behalf of our law enforcement group, the coordination with you all, National Marine Fisheries Service Law Enforcement, and our group as well, as well as Border Patrol down there, and thank you all for that effort, and thank you for the continued cooperation as a group. You guys are doing as wonderful of a job as we can do there, but it’s just a tough place to work right now.

LT. ZANOWICZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate that, and we look forward to more of those updates. That is going to bring us to our Louisiana Law Enforcement Presentation, if Captain Hebert is ready. It’s good to see you again, sir.

PRESENTATIONS
LOUISIANA LAW ENFORCEMENT

MAJOR CHAD HEBERT: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is going to be a real quick, brief presentation. This is concerning our 2016/2017 JEA year. In 2016/2017, our total patrol hours were
12,719, and we broke those down between commercial and recreational.

Commercial was 8,161 hours, which was broken down 2,257 to dockside hours, and we had 2,031 vessel hours. We had a total of 3,873 at-sea man hours. On the recreational side, we worked 4,558 hours. That was broken down into 2,065 vessel hours and 2,493 man hours for those vessel hours.

In the public contacts for that same fiscal year, it totaled 11,782, and that was broken down between commercial and recreational, with commercial being 5,066 contacts and recreational being 6,716 contacts.

Of course, with that, we have to do the other aspect of it, which is investigations, report writing, court and administrative hours, and that totaled 2,431, which is broken down to 1,050 commercial and 1,381 towards recreational administrative hours.

In this slide here, this is our observed compliance slide. The top two boxes, the one on the left is our vessel inspection breakdown between the different fishery management plans. As you can see, we inspected 425 vessels, commercial vessels, and those fishery management plans were broken down into percentages of the different types of fisheries that we inspected.

On the right side, the top box, is the observed compliance rates for each different fishery management plan and those percentages of observed compliance. It also included our TED inspections and observed compliance in that box. In the bottom box is the dockside observed compliance and inspection percentages.

This slide is the same, but this is for our recreational activities. The top boxes are the recreational inspections and the breakdowns and percentages of each different fishery management plan, and the right side, the top box, is vessel observed compliance rates for the different fishery management plans. The bottom two boxes are the same thing on our charter vessels, inspections and observed compliance rates.

One case in particular that I wanted to bring to your attention is we had a commercial red snapper violation. The individuals landed some red snapper in Mississippi and brought it into Louisiana. They didn’t have any federal IFQ red snapper transaction approval code for the transfer of red snapper to the business, and they failed to maintain records. They were charged with two counts of the federal Lacey Act, and they were
issued NOVAs totaling $10,500. That will conclude my presentation, pending any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: I am looking at the data here that you presented on compliance between the vessel, which was Slide 6, and I was noticing that, in complement to the recreational side, of the ones that you observed, you had around 90 percent or so compliance, and I assume that that means that you found no reason to issue any kind of citation at that time, and is that right?

MAJOR HEBERT: That’s correct. Our observed compliance rates are the percentage of people that were in full compliance.

MR. SWINDELL: However, on the commercial side, you are less than 50 percent overall. The highly migratory inspection, only 14 percent compliance, and can you tell me anything particular about that reason?

MAJOR HEBERT: That was on the commercial side, you said?

MR. SWINDELL: Yes, on the highly migratory inspection on the Slide 6 commercial.

MAJOR HEBERT: The top-left box is the percent of vessels that we inspected that were engaging in that particular fisheries management, and so, basically, it was 14 percent of the 624 vessels that we inspected were actually catching or targeting highly migratory species, and so that’s the breakdown of the percentage of inspections of the vessels. The box on the right is the actual observed compliance rates, and so 14 percent of the 624 vessels we checked had highly migratory species onboard.

MR. SWINDELL: Okay. That’s better. I was getting confused on this. Thank you.

MAJOR HEBERT: Yes, sir. That’s the inspection breakdown, and then the right box is the observed compliance rates.

MR. SWINDELL: Very good. Thank you.

MAJOR HEBERT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you for coming, and that was a good
presentation. On your compliance rate for TEDs, I see it’s
95.93 percent, and that’s very good, and I am impressed with
that, and so I’m glad to see that, but, on the eleven citations,
and I know this is kind of digging way down into the weeds, but
do you happen to know how many of those would be for people who
just didn’t have them or had them sewn shut?

MAJOR HEBERT: Actually, I think there was only one that had
absolutely no TED in it. Those eleven citations are including
written citations, criminal, and written warning citations, and
so it’s not eleven criminal citations, but I included both
warnings and criminal in there, but, if I’m not mistaken, and
I’m not 100 percent sure on that, but I think it was only one
that had completely no TED.

MR. DIAZ: I think that’s remarkable. That’s a giant success
story, I think, that we’ve got that kind of compliance rate with
the shrimp industry. Thank you for the hard work you do and for
-- I know this is dangerous work, and we appreciate it, and that
was a very good report. Thank you, sir.

MAJOR HEBERT: Yes, sir. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I would just like to chime in and say that I
love your spreadsheet graphs in there. We usually don’t get
quite that much detail, but it’s very interesting that way,
especially when you actually break it down by fishery management
plan that we have. I love that, and thank you, sir. That makes
it very easy to follow. Thanks for being with us today.

MAJOR HEBERT: Yes, ma’am. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have one more question from Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Not a question, but I just think we all ought to
be aware of how well both the recreational and commercial people
are being compliant with the regulations that we’ve had to put
in place, and I think that’s to speak very highly of the people
that are out there on the water. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I agree, Ed. Thank you, sir. Next on our
agenda, we’re going to have a presentation by Dr. Kilgour to
give us a little overview of our Aquaculture FMP, and this is
just kind of a refresher for us, because we are going to see an
aquaculture EFP, exempted fishing permit, later today, and this
is not an FMP that is in front of us all the time, and so I
thought it would be nice, before we get into that EFP, to have a
brief refresher, and so thanks, Morgan.
DR. MORGAN KILGOUR: No problem. In the Aquaculture FMP and final rule that came out of that, there are ten actions, and hopefully I will go through them very quickly, to keep you guys all on track for your EFP discussions after the break.

The very first action established permit requirements, eligibility, and transferability. It established the Gulf aquaculture permit, or the GAP permit, and it’s required to operate and sell aquacultured fish. It also establishes that you must be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident alien in order to have a GAP permit, and it also established that the permit was only allowed for the allowable aquaculture species, which are covered later on in the fourth action in the FMP.

The second action outlines the application requirements, the operational requirements, and the restrictions. This included exactly what needed to be in an aquaculture application, such as the description of the equipment that would be used, gear stowage, modifications, GPS coordinates, assurances of bond documentation, an emergency disaster plan, and certifications that the brood stock was from federal waters of the Gulf and were not genetically engineered or transgenic. It also established that any application must comply with other regulatory requirements, such as those of the USDA, the FDA, the EPA, and, anybody else that needed to be consulted, they needed to have all of their obligations met, too.

The third action established that there would be a maximum of twenty permits issued, and a permit would be valid for ten years, with five-year renewals after that initial ten-year period. The species allowed for aquaculture must be native, non-genetically engineered, and non-transgenic council-managed species.

In the Aquaculture FMP, it has an appendix that outlined the species that would be allowable, and that would have been Appendix A, and, some of those species in that list, the council doesn’t have in the fishery management unit anymore. It also prohibits shrimp and coral aquaculture, and it does specify only federally-managed species.

The fifth action established the allowable marine aquaculture system, and so NOAA will evaluate each proposed system on a case-by-case basis. Some of the rationale provided in the FMP was to allow for flexibility, since there would be -- Things
would change over time, and the FMP provided the rationale that it didn’t want to restrict types of facilities as the technology changed.

The evaluations of these facilities will include an analysis of the risk to essential fish habitat, risks to threatened and endangered species, risks to wild stocks, and risks to public health and safety.

The marine aquaculture siting requirements and conditions, none are allowed in marine protected areas, marine reserves, HAPCs, SMZs, permitted artificial reef areas, and coral reef areas in the council’s jurisdiction. They must have a baseline environmental survey, and they must be two times larger than the actual encompassed systems, and the sites must be at least 1.6 nautical miles apart. The site can be denied if the proposed system proposes a significant risk or results in user conflicts.

The seventh action established restricted access zones, and so each facility would have a restricted zone based on the coordinates and the Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 Permit. No fishing may occur in the restricted access zone. No fishing vessels may operate or transit through the zone unless they have a copy of the facility’s aquaculture permit onboard, and the zone must be marked at each corner with some type of floating device.

The eighth action in the FMP outlines recordkeeping and reporting. This includes reporting requirements for escapement, entanglements, interactions with marine species and migratory birds, pathogens, disease, brood stock harvest, and law enforcement requirements. The facility must maintain reports and sale records for the most recent three years.

The ninth action established biological reference points and status determination criteria, and so this set the proxy MSY and OY at sixty-four million pounds. That MSY can be changed by framework, and it would be reviewed by the Aquaculture AP, and I will get into a little bit of what the Aquaculture AP is. It’s not a typical advisory panel on the council, and then no individual corporation or any entity can be permitted to produce more than 20 percent of the optimum yield.

The framework procedure in Action 10 establishes the role and makeup of the Aquaculture AP, and it is prescriptive in the FMP. It says that it would consist of council members, council staff, NMFS staff, and academic individuals who have the expertise in aquaculture, and so it wouldn’t be like a typical AP, where you
request for -- You make a call. Those individuals with expertise can be identified by the council or staff to be on the AP.

The items that can be adjusted through a framework are the maximum sustainable yield and optimum yield, application and operation requirements and restrictions, siting and system requirements, and recordkeeping and reporting requirements. It also establishes that the Aquaculture AP, when established, should meet biannually and provide very -- It’s very precise in the FMP on what information the Aquaculture AP needs to provide to the council when those meetings take place.

I don’t want to go into this, because this overview of the Gulf aquaculture permit process is outside of the council process. This is strictly with NMFS, and that’s why I have all this text on the slide. The one place where the council is consulted is after a permit is received, and the Regional Administrator can decide to bring that to the council and consult with you, but that’s the only step in this process where the council is involved. Once a permit is received by NMFS, they hold the ball.

The next council steps would be, if a permit was granted or there was an aquaculture facility, to appoint that Aquaculture AP to meet at least biannually and evaluate the management program, and, again, that role is prescriptive, and that AP would provide a written report and rationale for any recommended changes to the Gulf Council.

Again, that report would include production levels relative to MSY and OY, the status of adverse effects to wild stock, marine mammals, protected resources, essential fish habitat, other managed resources from aquaculture, some more economic and social considerations of aquaculture relating to Gulf fishing communities, and a review of management measures regarding aquaculture that may be needed or may need to be changed. With that, I am happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Thanks, Dr. Kilgour. The AP, is there anything that directs us as to the makeup? Like, do they have to be one from academia and things like that? Would we go through the same process of just opening it up for applications?

DR. KILGOUR: No, and it’s in the FMP on who would be on the Aquaculture AP, and that, again, would be like council staff,
council members, NMFS staff, and experts in the field, and so those can be identified by either council staff or NMFS staff as needing to be on the Aquaculture AP, but it’s not -- It’s a little bit misleading, because it’s not our typical advisory panel.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Due to the prescribed nature of this AP and our Law Enforcement, that’s why, a year or so ago, we took certain APs and made them technical committees, and we tried to make that distinction. The only other two technical committees, and they’re not prescribed, is the SEDAR workshop panelists and the Outreach and Education Technical Committee, and so, in our parlance, we’ll be calling this a technical committee, but, back then, everything was an AP.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Dr. Stunz and then Mr. Matens and Mr. Anson.

DR. STUNZ: Morgan, I’ve got a question for you, because I haven’t been familiar with this since I’ve been on the council, and so I’m wondering about this restricted area where they put these facilities, and so how does that -- The reason I’m asking that, I guess I should say, is it’s a restricted area, and it won’t allow others in it, if you put these in key fishing areas, I assume, and is that something the AP takes up, or where does the council input come when they decide where they’re going to go?

DR. KILGOUR: I am probably going to punt that to the Regional Office staff, but, when an aquaculture permit is given, they have to give the coordinates, and the onus is on the Southeast Regional Office to look and see if there are potential user conflicts. I think there is an aquaculture EFP that’s coming before you, and that is exactly what they’re doing, to look and see if there are potential user conflicts before those areas are established.

DR. STUNZ: One follow-up.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think Dr. Crabtree was going to answer your question.

DR. CRABTREE: Just that, when we get a permit application for aquaculture, it would come before the council, and you would have an opportunity to review it and make suggestions about it and those kinds of things.

DR. STUNZ: The last question is that, because I’m not as
familiar as I should be, is what was the history of why not shrimp and coral? It seems like there could be some opportunity there.

DR. KILGOUR: I am not sure, and I will get back to you. I will go back and read the minutes on -- Mara has her hand up in the air, but I will go back and read the minutes as well for you.

MS. LEVY: I am not sure about the shrimp, although I think we could probably look in the FMP and see that, but, the coral, you already have -- We already have a live rock permit that is authorized under the Coral FMP, and so that is sort of coral aquaculture. People put down live rock and grow coral, and so that’s probably why it’s not in here as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: This is really looking at net-pen-type aquaculture, and, most coral aquaculture, there is no pens involved, because obviously it’s not going to go anywhere. In terms of shrimp, at the time we did this plan, there were a great many imports of shrimp coming in from various places, and most shrimp aquaculture is being done either inshore, state waters, or onshore even, in a lot of places, and there was a lot of industry concerns about shrimp aquaculture, and so the council elected not to make that a part of it, and, really, I don’t think felt like shrimp aquaculture was likely to be a candidate for offshore projects in the EEZ.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Matens and then Mr. Anson.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Actually, let me preface what I’m going to say by I personally think this is the coming thing, and I’m certainly not against it. In Number 6, it says the site must be two times larger than the actual area encompassed by the system. Without going into details, I don’t know whether that’s area or -- I don’t care, but, back down here later, it talks about a restricted zone, but it doesn’t talk about how large the restricted zone might be, and has that come up, Morgan?

DR. KILGOUR: I am speaking from memory, and I don’t sometimes have the best, but I believe that the site is the restricted zone. I don’t think that there is a buffer outside of the site coordinates, but, if I’m incorrect on that, I am happy to be corrected.

MR. MATENS: Additionally, based on what you know now, what
species seem to be of interest here?

DR. KILGOUR: There is an aquaculture EFP that will come before you and enlighten us all on the species, and I would like to punt that to Ms. Gerhart, since she’s going to be presenting that to you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: The EFP is do almaco jack, and the other species that I hear most often about have been cobia and also red drum, and a lot of it has to do with their growth rates and how quickly they can convert feed into biomass and come to market, but those are the three species that I have heard more about than anything else.

MR. MATENS: Roy, I understand that, and I’m curious that yellowfin, and maybe even dolphin, aren’t on that list.

DR. CRABTREE: When you say yellowfin, are you referring to the tuna? That’s a highly migratory species, and we didn’t include them in any of this. What was the other one that you mentioned?

MR. MATENS: Dolphin. It’s a fast-growing fish.

DR. CRABTREE: That again, is not a managed species in the Gulf, and we didn’t include that. Now, as this progresses, my expectation is that we’re going to come in at some point and do a plan amendment, and we may well want to consider adding some species to this, if the ability to do it is there, and dolphin may be one of those.

MR. MATENS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Dr. Kilgour, the framework action that you referenced that will be developed, is that specific to just kicking off the review of permits and that the AP that is structured within that framework will remain for an undetermined amount of time, or maybe a time described in the framework, or is that something that will be created for each kind of permit?

I guess, looking at the expertise and such, design and siting and engineering of the actual pen structures, or structures that are going to be used to contain the fish, that might differ, and so there might be some new membership needed for that, and is that something that the council would review or amend through
the framework or just NOAA?

DR. KILGOUR: You’re asking if the AP members would have to be amended through a framework action? I think that that could -- I will look into if the AP makeup can be modified via a framework action or if it would have to be a full plan amendment. I am not 100 percent sure. I don’t think that that’s outlined in the current framework on how to modify the AP, but I will go back and check and see, but it seems to me that it might be a full plan amendment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Diaz and then Mr. Swindell.

MR. DIAZ: Dr. Kilgour, you probably said this, but what would be the timeline for us to appoint the Aquaculture AP? When exactly would the council do that?

DR. KILGOUR: I will come at this from a staff perspective. Because of the intensity on what the AP would be required to do, meeting biannually and providing this extensive report to the Gulf Council, I think it would make sense to appoint or to establish that AP after there is a permit in place that is active in the Gulf of Mexico. Before then, there is really nothing to report on, because you can’t weigh apples and oranges when there is nothing out there to grow your fruit on.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: My first response to your response there would be I would hate for us to be behind the ball somewhat. If you’re going to wait for an application to come in and then try to put together an AP, it could take a half-a-year for us to put an AP together. I think that could be a little difficult, and hopefully we could do something faster than that.

I will tell you that I worked on a short project looking for a place to raise cobia fingerlings for an aquaculture facility in Mexico, and do we have any data as to how -- Are there aquaculture facilities off the shore of Mexico that are perhaps even close to our EEZ? Do we have any idea?

DR. KILGOUR: As far as your second question, I am not sure, and I will go and find out if I can find that information for you, but, as far as the Aquaculture AP, I saw Doug raise his hand, and so if that’s okay for him to address that.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Since this is now a technical committee, the Chair and Executive Director can appoint the members, and so we don’t have to wait for a council meeting, but, if the Chair wanted to have the council do it, I think the permit process would probably be lengthy enough to allow that. I don’t think we would get behind the curve very easily.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Just to clarify, there is no process by which the AP reviews the application. The application goes to the agency, and the agency decides it is complete and puts out a public Federal Register notice. During approximately that same time, they would bring the application to the council for the council to review, kind of like an EFP, but there is no mechanism to then submit that to an AP to then get feedback to then have the council make recommendations.

The whole application process and all of the requirements have already been set up through the FMP, and I think the AP is supposed to be looking at specific things like whether you want to make any changes to the FMP, to the MSY, to the OY, to the certain restrictions that are already in place, based on some experience or information that you get about how things are working, and so I just want to make sure there is no misunderstanding about the AP looking in at the structural design of a particular application and things like that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Then, referring to one of the slides that Dr. Kilgour presented, one of the things that I thought I saw that this AP would be reviewing, on a permit-by-permit basis, would be things like siting and engineering of the particular pen structures and that type of thing. Is that something then that -- I mean, NOAA will handle that internally, and is there staff, or will NOAA seek experts in the field, to get some sort of determination as to whether or not those particular engineering criteria or specifics are safe and worthy?

MS. LEVY: Right, and so, the way that the FMP and the regulations set up the structure, it’s that there is all of that consideration, but it’s within the agency to look at all the parameters and decide whether it meets the criteria that the council has outlined.

The agency has put out some guidance on various things, and it is working on other guidance for various things about structural
integrity and all those pieces, and so they are setting up a process to go through to look at the permits and have the people in place to review what folks are proposing and things like that.

REVIEW OF EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT APPLICATIONS

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any other questions for NMFS or Dr. Kilgour? All right. Excellent presentation. I think we are up to speed, as much as we can be, before we look at our EFP on that later. I will pause just for a second, and I see that we have the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries in the room, Mr. Chris Oliver. Thank you, and we’re glad to have you with us, sir. We look forward to talking to you later.

Next on our agenda, we’re going to get into our Exempted Fishing Permit Applications, and, just to kind of outline it for you, it’s my understanding that we’re going to have a short presentation. There are six exempted fishing permits on the agenda today, and five of them are from one of each of the Gulf states, and then the last one is actually going to be to do with aquaculture.

For the state plans, what we were thinking is we’re going to get a presentation from each of the states, and we will let you roll through your presentations, and we can give feedback or ask questions or anything like that after each of the presentations. Then I’m sure there will be some sort of feedback that we’ll have to give about all the presentations working together somehow, in tandem, and so that’s how I planned to go through that.

Today is really the review of those, and the vote on these exempted fishing permits actually comes before us tomorrow, and so today is our day to ask all of our questions. First on the agenda, I believe we have Florida up first. Wait a minute. Ms. Gerhart.

MS. GERHART: We do have the aquaculture EFP as well. Did we want to do that first, since we just went over the aquaculture information?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s on the internet, on our agenda on the internet, that it’s actually scheduled for after lunch, and I wanted it to come right after the presentation. I thought that made a lot of sense, but I think there are going to be some people that want to listen in for that, and so I really hate to kind of change the schedule on that and have them thinking it’s
after lunch and we do it right now, and so is it okay if we go
into the state ones first? Before we get into each of the state
presentations, did you have like an overview that you wanted to
give us? All right. Go ahead, Sue.

MS. GERHART: Thank you, Madam Chair. Last summer, there was a
Senate report directing NMFS to support state management of reef
fish, particularly over artificial habitat. When NMFS discussed
how to do this, we decided the best vehicle was through an
exempted fishing permit, or EFP.

We sent a letter to the states in September of last year,
encouraging them to submit applications to manage reef fish,
particularly red snapper, in federal waters off of their states.
We received draft applications from each of the five Gulf states
in December, and we worked with those states to make sure that
those applications were complete.

Now, the process, just to remind you, for an EFP is that, right
now, the council has an opportunity to make a recommendation to
the agency on whether to approve or not approve these
applications. We will also put out a Federal Register notice
with a comment period from fifteen to forty-five days for the
public to comment, and then we expect, if these are approved by
the agency, to issue the EFPs in mid-April sometime.

All of the applications that we have received cover red snapper
management, recreational management, in the EEZ off of the state
for two years, starting in 2018, this year, and then also in
2019. All of the applications cover the private angling
component, and some of the states have submitted applications
that also include the for-hire component as well.

A little bit about how this would work. For the private angling
component, because all of the states are involved, essentially
there will be no federal season for red snapper. The EEZ will
be closed, and then the EFP will exempt the participants under
each of the states from that closure, and so, with an EFP, we
don’t delegate any authority to the states. We simply exempt
from regulations, and so, in this case, we will be exempting
anyone who holds the appropriate permit from a state from the
closure in the EEZ.

Because the EEZ will be open, vessels can fish anywhere in the
EEZ, but they just have to have a permit for a state that is
open, and so the enforcement will be on landing. When a vessel
lands somewhere, that state has to be open, and so, if someone
is fishing, for example, off of the State of Florida, if Florida
is closed, but they have a permit from Alabama, and they’re landing in Alabama and it is open, then they would be legally fishing and could land in Alabama.

The state will close to landings, as we said, and, wherever those fish are landed, it will count against that quota for that state. Please understand that this is not exactly how the amendments that you talked about yesterday would work, because that would be a delegation, which is different than this exemption, and so, although a lot of this will be pilot for what would happen during those amendments, how the actual regulations would work would be different than what we’re talking about here.

For the for-hire component, we’re exploring ways to deal with that, because, if some states are including the for-hire component and others aren’t, we will have to have a federal season for vessels from those states that are not including them in the EFP, and so we will have to open up federal waters, and we cannot open only off of certain states. We have to open all of the EEZ, and so one of the concerns is that, states where they are including federal for-hire vessels, those vessels would still be able to fish during the federal season. That’s what their federal permit allows them to do.

We’re exploring ways and how to do that, and we looked at subtracting out the quotas as would be assigned to those states that are including for-hire vessels in the EFP, and the federal season would be based on the quota for the states that are not in the EFPs, based on their catch rates.

One of the things that we have done in the past, with the headboat EFP that we did in 2014 and 2015, was the vessels that were involved in the EFP signed a binding agreement saying that they would not fish during the federal season and they would only fish during the EFP season, and so that’s something that we’re exploring as well in this case.

One of the things, of course, is that we have to allocate between the states, the quotas, and we have two separate quotas now of a private angling quota and a for-hire quota, and each of the states, in their applications, has requested a certain amount be assigned to them.

For the private angling quota, the amounts that were requested by the states do add up to less than the ACL, and so there is not a problem there. However, because with the for-hire vessels, two states did not request any quota, we have to do a
little bit of calculation and figure that out, and we can talk about that some more in a little bit. What we would prefer is that all the states work together and come to an agreement amongst themselves about how that would work, but we will need to do that allocation somehow.

What we would assign is the annual catch limit and not the annual catch target to each of the states, but we would expect that the states would implement some sort of buffer, and all of them, I believe, have put in that there would be a buffer of some sort between the ACL and what their actual quota was, and that would be dependent on the reporting that they have. For example, LA Creel has near real-time reporting, and so the buffer can be a little bit smaller than other states where they don’t have as timely reporting involved.

Finally, I want to talk about the enforcement. Again, it’s going to be mostly on landing. We will have enforcement on the water to make sure that people have an appropriate permit from a state that is open at the time, and, of course, if none of the states are open, then no one should be fishing for red snapper in the EEZ.

Also, the bag and size limits will remain the same as the federal under all of these EFPs, and so those will be enforced as well, and so, having said that, I think we’re prepared to go to the individual states to discuss their specific applications.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Ms. Guyas, would you like to get us started?

**FLORIDA EFP REQUEST**

MS. GUYAS: I will be relatively brief and just give an overview of what we are envisioning this would look like in Florida for our EFP. I will start with our goal, which would be to test data collection and quota monitoring methods by the state for management of the private recreational component, and we would also include in that, not necessarily under the EFP, but the state waters charter and for-hire vessels that are working in state waters for the red snapper fishery.

I will start right off the bat with the allocation that we requested under this EFP, and we based that on landings from 2016 through 2015, excluding 2010, similar to what we discussed yesterday with the state management amendments.

This approximates about 42 percent of the private recreational
angler quota, and this reflects recent trends in angler effort off of our state as well as abundance trends off the West Florida Shelf. With that ACL, we would set a 20 percent buffer ACT, similar to what we have now, and then we would be setting seasons based on the ACT, what would be caught, based on the quota that we get.

What this would look like, we would set regional seasons in our state. We would have a Panhandle season, which would encompass Escambia through Gulf Counties, and this is the area of the state where there is a lot of effort that actually happens in state waters for recreational red snapper, as well as offshore in federal waters. Then the rest of the Gulf Coast would have a separate Peninsula season, and so this is everywhere south of there, all the way down to Monroe County.

If we were allocated the quota that we’re requesting, we are projecting that the seasons would be two different seasons for that area. The first one would open on May 25 and run for twelve days, closing June 5, and then we would open the Peninsula season right after that, starting June 6 and run through that time. Again, these are estimates, and it depends on what quota we have, and it depends on when the EFP is issued and when we can actually issue the season and let our anglers know, and so this is fluid right now. It’s not set in stone.

Then, based on what happens during those seasons, we would look at the landings that come in, and, if there was still quota available, we would potentially reopen for a fall season in 2018, and then we would look at what happened in 2018 before we set our 2019 season. As Sue mentioned, these are two-year projects.

Also, as Sue mentioned, we would have a two-fish bag limit and the sixteen-inch minimum size limit that’s in place now, and we would also be encouraging the anglers that are participating in this to use descending devices and venting tools, as appropriate, when they are fishing for red snapper, interacting with red snapper.

As far as data collection and quota monitoring goes, I did mention that we would be projecting the seasons in advance, but we would be requiring anglers that wanted to participate in this opportunity to sign up for our Gulf Reef Fish Survey. They already should be signed up for that, if they’re fishing for reef fish or red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico, but we’ll be providing those lists to NOAA Fisheries Service, so that they know the participants.
We’ll be doing something similar for the state for-hire operations that want to take advantage of this opportunity, and so, if they are fishing in state waters for red snapper or reef fish in the Gulf, they would need to identify themselves to us. We would, in turn, provide that information to NOAA Fisheries, and we would also use that population of people to do, potentially, special for-hire surveys, so that we can have a little bit better information about what they’re harvesting.

We would use MRIP, the Gulf Reef Fish Survey, and then these potential special for-hire surveys to estimate harvest and effort. There are dockside and mail surveys for all of these things, and the special for-hire one could be different.

We’re still working on the details of what that design would be, but there definitely would be dockside components to these, and so, as part of this EFP, we would be requiring that fish that are landed under the EFP must be landed in Florida, so that we can intercept those fish, potentially.

Then, in addition to that, we would also be encouraging participants in this program to report via the iAngler app. We’re trying to gauge the participation and interest in that, and this would be voluntary, at least for the first year, and we would just be evaluating how that goes at this point.

At the state level, I just wanted to describe our next steps. Sue already talked about the federal steps that need to happen, but we’ll be discussing this next week at our commission’s meeting. It’s in Havana, which is right outside of Tallahassee. We’ll be going through where we are with our EFP, and our commission has already seen the concept for this, and we’ll just be giving them a little bit more detail, and we will also be discussing a draft rule that would set up the state for-hire reporting part of this, since that’s somewhat new. We have a statute that allows for this, but we just need to set up the rule to go along with it and direct exactly how this is going to happen.

Then we’ll do the final public hearing for that and another review of the EFP at our April meeting, and that’s at the end of the month, and so, maybe at that point, we’ll have an approved EFP. Then we would issue an Executive Order to set the seasons for 2018.

Then, after that, if we feel like we could open it for a fall season, we would do that in late 2018, and then evaluate the
2018 season before we move forward with 2019, and that’s the big picture. If you have questions, please let me know, and I think Luiz is on the phone, if you have very technical questions and I can’t answer them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I have Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Martha, I saw on your slide and I hear you say that they’re required to sign up for the survey, but does that mean, when they are actually surveyed, are they required or mandated to actually report, or can they say, thank you very much, Martha, but I decline giving the information?

MS. GUYAS: What they’re signing up for, actually, it’s more like they are signing up to be eligible to be surveys, and so we are not surveying everyone that signs up. They are basically just saying, hey, I’m out in the Gulf of Mexico and I’m fishing for -- Actually, there is ten species of reef fish that they have to sign up for.

We survey a subpopulation of that group, and our return rate is fairly good, and Luiz may know it off the top of his head, and just feel free and chime in if you know that, but they’re not required to respond to those surveys, but we have gotten a good return rate.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you. The question I have is, obviously, you will be collecting some data on catch, and, presumably, some data will still be collected via NMFS, and whose data is going to be used to determine the result of this season?

MS. GUYAS: That’s a good question. I will start answering it, and I heard Luiz’s audio, I think, a minute ago, and I will let him flesh out some details. Our Gulf Reef Fish Survey is not -- It’s more of a supplement to MRIP. The two work together in concert, and so it’s not like we would be using one set of information versus another. Luiz, do you want to expand on that?

DR. LUIZ BARBIERI: Yes, thank you, Martha. Madam Chair, if I may.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

DR. BARBIERI: There’s not much to add to that point. Martha, I think what you said is correct. The Gulf Reef Fish Survey, from
the very beginning, was designed to be a boost, an add-on, to
MRIP, because we never intended to discontinue use of the MRIP
in Florida. What we wanted to do is to develop a methodology
that would be complementary to MRIP, and it would be more
accurate and precise to survey the reef fish offshore component,
and so the two surveys, right now, are very compatible, and we
have been working with the MRIP staff in adjusting the draws,
the estimation weights that are used, and so our final estimates
actually integrate data from both surveys together.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Luiz. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: That is going to be an issue that will evolve
with the EFPs. Snapper Check in Alabama and Tails n’ Scales in
Mississippi are well along in the certification process now, and
we’re assuming they will be certified before the fishing begins,
and, contingent on the wording of it, presumably those then can
be used. LA Creel is already certified.

I think Florida is starting the certification process soon, and
so it’s possible that the Florida survey will be certified
sometime as this goes on, and so we’re just going to have to
follow those processes and work with the scientists to decide
what are the best estimates and then react accordingly.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Our certification meeting is actually next week, and
so we were scheduled to have that meeting during Hurricane Irma,
and that didn’t go so well, and so this is when we could
reschedule.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha, I had a question. Are you planning,
and you may have said this already. Sometimes I have to
multitask up here, but are you planning to somehow beef up your
MRIP survey in Florida, because I think, when I read your EFP,
you’re going to have about a twelve-day season on the Panhandle,
and you’re going to have a twelve-day season on the Peninsula,
and so that’s two pretty short seasons, and we know MRIP is not
the best when it comes to short seasons and extrapolating from
there, and so do you plan to beef up those intercepts and those
surveys?

MS. GUYAS: That’s kind of where the Gulf Reef Fish Survey comes
into play. What we do with that survey, that’s essentially what
we do. We make sure that we have more agents at the docks to
interview anglers at these sites where we know that there are
reef fish coming in, and so we target those areas specifically
to get more refined information. Luiz, do you have anything to
add to that?

DR. BARBIERI: What you said is correct, but, Madam Chair, we do
work with the MRIP staff, in terms of adjusting the draws for
the MRIP sampling locations and the number of samples that are
collected. We did last year as well during the red snapper
season, so as to maximize the probability of encounter with
anglers that are catching reef fish, red snapper included, and
so, basically, by working with them, we can adjust the draws and
adjust the weights accordingly, so we end up with valid
estimates, even though we increase our sampling during those
times, and so the short answer to your question is, yes, we will
be sampling more intensively during those times, for the reasons
that Martha presented as well as because we are increasing the
number of samples, draws, for that specific period.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Luiz. All right, and I had one
other question. When I read through all five of the different
permits, I noticed that, in most of them, they said, if they had
an overage, if they had a quota overrun during the first year,
during 2018, that that would be deducted off of 2019 and then
they would make whatever decisions they needed to make to adjust
their season and the way they manage their fishery in 2019 to
try and ensure that they don’t have a subsequent overrun again,
if it was a data collection issue or whatever it may be, length
of season, and there’s a lot of things that you could tweak, after you account for what was overrun the first year and take
that off the second year.

In Florida’s permit, it said that, in the event of a red snapper
quota overage in 2018, the 2019 season would be adjusted as
needed to avoid a subsequent overage, and so I’m assuming that
means cut a day or so off the season, if you need to, and then
it says that FWC would consult with NOAA Fisheries to determine
if a payback of the overage is required as an accountability
measure.

I just think, as we go forward with these, so that everybody is
on a level playing field, that’s pretty much in the rest of the
states’ plans, that it’s going to come off -- From what I saw
anyway, it’s going to come off the second year, and I think
that’s probably an accountability mechanism that really needs to
be in there. I mean, this is a -- It’s a pretty big deal, and
we required it in the EFP that we did for the headboats. That
was an accountability measure that was in there. If they had an
overage, it had to come off the second year of that EFP.
They had a lot of accountability built in, where that probably would never even happen, accountability that we are not able to put into some of these, just because it’s a different type of fishery. They were actually working with tags, and so the ability to overrun your quota, when you have to tag a fish, is a little bit more difficult. Is that something that Florida would consider to put into their EFP, in order to be in line with the other states?

**MS. GUYAS:** I think, if we were in that situation, that would be a discussion that we would need to have.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Banks.

**MR. BANKS:** A discussion that you would need to have is a lot different than saying, yes, we will be accountable for overages.

**MS. GUYAS:** Right, and so, it would be up to the commission to make that decision. That is something that we can discuss when we meet next week, but I can’t stand here and tell you yes or no that we’re going to do that.

**MR. BANKS:** That’s fair enough. We would have to do the same thing with our commission, but we’ve made it abundantly clear that we will recommend certain things to our commission, and I feel very confident that they, being the conservationists that they are, would do that, and so I would hope that you all would commit to the same thing, Martha. If you guys drastically overfish, or if we drastically overfish, it hurts us all, and I think we need to all be on the same page there, please.

**MS. GUYAS:** Sure, and we have set -- The seasons that we’ve set here, we think they’re pretty conservative, and so the goal, from the beginning, is to avoid being in that situation at all.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I agree, and that’s a tough question for me to ask you, and I hate to have to do that, but, on the same token, not only does it have ramifications for all the other states, but, because Florida is such a big player in this discussion -- I mean, you’ve got 42 percent of the private recreational quota in this EFP, and, if you have an overrun, even a small overrun, on the percentage side, it’s going to impact more than just private anglers and for-hire. You’re going to impact the commercial sector, too.

One way or another, it gets paid back, right, and whether it gets paid back the next year from the sector that had the overrun or when we do a new stock assessment and we’ve got to
reduce our quotas because the stock is not quite as healthy as it was before, and it gets paid back one way or the other, and I just want to make sure we have that.  

I want to make sure, on the frontend, that we have an understanding of, with the privilege, what is the responsibility and what are the consequences, and I think that’s important to have that laid out upfront, so that we don’t get into a situation on the backend where it’s a tough one. We all know what we’re getting into. Any other questions for Martha? Thank you, Martha. Next, we’re going to roll to Alabama, and Mr. Kevin Anson is going to give us a brief presentation.  

**ALABAMA EFP REQUEST**  

**MR. ANSON:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Everybody knows why we’re all here. The EFP request that Alabama made is to test an alternative red snapper management plan for Alabama’s recreational anglers, and this is strictly for private recreational anglers and anglers fishing from state-licensed charter boats.  

Private anglers will be allowed to venture into the EEZ and fish state waters when the season is open. State-licensed charter boats, however, will be restricted to the state waters, which is nine nautical miles, currently. They will not be able to go into federal waters.  

The EFP is anticipated to provide several benefits to this group of anglers through increasing accountability, with the use of a mandatory electronic reporting system, and that is Snapper Check, as previously mentioned at this meeting and at prior council meetings. Increasing fishing opportunities through the use of near real-time landings through Snapper Check to reduce the initial buffer compared to the buffer used in the existing management strategy.  

Again, we feel like -- We’ve had Snapper Check in place now since 2014, and, as mentioned earlier, it is going through the certification process with MRIP, and we hope to have that within the next month or two, certified, and we feel fairly confident in the trends in fishing behavior and that we can forecast through Snapper Check.  

It provides an opportunity to increase the season length if fishing is reduced due to unforeseen circumstances. Again, if bad weather comes up and fishing is impacted, potentially we can document that and quantify, or put that into numbers, and then
add more days to the season, if available.

It would also provide additional access to artificial habitat created through the state and private individuals. Again, the spirit and intent of the EFP was originally through the funding bill and related to artificial reef areas off of the Gulf states, and so we have kept that message throughout this whole EFP, and Alabama, which has the largest artificial reef area permitted in the Gulf, or any of the states, the state, as well as private individuals, have invested a lot of resources over the years to build that program up and to build the habitat which red snapper utilize.

Some of the highlights of the EFP, the EFP will be requested for a two-year period, beginning with 2018, this year. The allocation is based on a three-year average of biomass estimated from fishery-independent surveys of habitat, which includes both artificial and natural habitat, and abundance of red snapper.

Dr. Sean Powers at the University of South Alabama, a few years ago, came to the council and summarized his methods for how he estimates the abundance of red snapper off of Alabama, and he has been doing that program since 2011, and he is going to develop a paper and submit a paper this year, to have it, in effect, peer reviewed, through the journal process, but he is certainly available to talk to the council at any point in the coming months to more succinctly provide a summary of those.

I mentioned the reef review that we’re going to have on March 22, and he will also be there and summarizing his methodology and how he comes up with the estimate there, but, essentially, we use a three-year average of the biomass estimate, and we take 10 percent of that biomass estimate, and we deduct a three-year average of commercial landings off of that biomass estimate, and then we take out the landings, the biomass, associated with landings with the federally-permitted vessels, and that would be based on the percentage of sector separation, which is the 42.3 percent number, and so we take 42.3 percent of the balance remaining after the commercial distribution, if you will, and what is remaining is what is available for the private recreational.

For our calculations, it’s 984,000 pounds, and a summary of that is provided in the appendix of the EFP, and we will apply a 10 percent buffer to that prior to making the initial season estimate, and the initial season estimate that we calculated would provide us, in 2018, with forty-seven days, and we’re envisioning a three-day weekend season starting June 1 and going
through Labor Day, and we have also identified the week of the 4\textsuperscript{th} of July that the season would be open during that time. Depending upon how things go in 2018, we may open a little earlier, to encompass Memorial Day, in 2019. Our size and bag limits will remain the same as they have been, sixteen inches total length and two fish per person per day.

I mentioned Snapper Check earlier, and that’s going to be our accountability tool, or monitoring tool. Again, we’ve had that program established since 2014, and it’s been reviewed by MRIP consultants, and we’ve taken a lot of their recommendations to heart and incorporated those into the system.

Just briefly, it is tied in with a mandatory requirement, and then we have dockside surveys to determine non-reporting rates by matching the vessel registration number of the vessels that we observe in the field to those that show up in the landings reporting database, and we make a correction factor for the reported trips based on that proportion of vessels that we observe out in the field that are not showing up in the database.

Enforcement will conduct dockside patrols, as they have been, to check vessels for compliance with the reporting requirement. They can access the database real-time and see if a vessel has reported or not.

Estimates of total landings will be sent to NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office each week for landings from the prior week, and so we’ll be sharing that information as we basically determine it, and we’ll both be able to monitor relative to the allocation that is provided. If the landings are projected to exceed the allocation, the Commissioner of the Department of Conservation will close state waters to possession of red snapper.

If the season ends and significant allocation is remaining, a fall season may be established. Again, that will depend on how many pounds are available and some other factors. That’s it, in a nutshell.

\textbf{CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:} Thank you. Are there questions? Dr. Shipp.

\textbf{DR. SHIPP:} Kevin, Florida gave their numbers in a percentage of the total. What is Alabama’s, if you add the two together, the for-hire and the recreational? What is the percentage?

\textbf{MR. ANSON:} Alabama’s is 25.3 percent, and that’s of the
recreational allocation and not the Gulf total, but just the
recreational.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: That matches the number I have, and so Alabama is
unique among the applications, because of the use of your
biomass estimate and the derivation of a catch level from that,
and we are viewing it more in terms of the context of the amount
of fish that Kevin is requesting and how that fits into recent
catch history, and it’s pretty consistent with the last couple
of years. In fact, it’s a little less than what Alabama caught
in 2017, and so we’re viewing the rationale for the catch level
more in terms of the context of recent catch levels rather than
biomass.

I think, if we progress down this way, we could develop that way
of doing it, but we would need to get that in front of the SSC
and figure out how that estimate lines up with the stock
assessment and the catch level that comes out of that, but it
does turn out that it gives you a catch level estimate that is
pretty consistent with the historical performance of the fishery
in Alabama.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Well, I was just going to highlight a
few things. I like that your Snapper Check is mandatory. I
like that a lot, and I like that it’s been in place for a couple
of years, and so it’s established. I think that’s going to be
very beneficial to you.

One question I did have -- I am assuming it’s a -- You’re doing
weekends only, right, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and so you
said it takes about a week, and so the season, or mini-season,
that week’s season, that stops on Sunday night, the data is
going to flow in for that by Thursday or Friday of the next
week, and you’re going to try and analyze that data before you
open the following weekend, and is that your game plan,
hopefully?

MR. ANSON: No, and how that would work is that we would
establish the season and announce it. Again, let’s assume June
1 through Labor Day, three-day weekends, with the 4th of July
week, and so we would, after the first weekend, we would collect
the data and run the numbers and have those available by Friday,
and then we would just put that in the chart and monitor that.

We would have, in the chart, the threshold, including our 10
percent buffer, as our target, if you will. Each week, as a
number is added to the previous week’s information, it would just simply increase, and it would get larger and go closer to that line, if you will, the buffer line.

We would, at that time, also then project, based on in-season landings information, because each year is different. You may have more effort or less effort, larger fish or smaller fish, increases in catches or whatever, catch rates, and so that is what we would be monitoring in-season.

We would make adjustments based on what the trend is up to that point, so that we can forecast out and say, okay, based on the trend for this season, if the fish are larger than the previous season, that means we would probably not be able to meet our number of days that we initially announced, and so, halfway through the season, or two-thirds through the season, we would kind of compare that and see, okay, if we continue allowing them access for the remainder of the fishing days, the fishing season, we will go over our allocation, and so we need to back that off and shut the season down X number of days before that, to make sure that we don’t reach our allocation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Perfect. I love it, Kevin. All right. I’ve got one more follow-up, and then I’m going to go to John. Obviously, with a mandatory system like that, compliance is pretty important, and so I was wondering, if you are checking people and you see that they’re out of compliance, either they didn’t participate in Snapper Check at all, or whatever the case may be, what do the penalties look like?

Is there a penalty schedule, or what are the ramifications, because I think that enforcement is an important piece. If we’re going to rely on the data, we’ve got to make sure that we have the enforcement and compliance there.

MR. ANSON: The enforcement side of things, as far as those details, I am not too up to speed on. I do know that our enforcement officers will check, and they have written some citations for non-compliance, and I don’t know exactly what the fee structure is. Scott Bannon is here, and he can answer that, if you really want to know, but there is court costs included in that and all of that, but there is a small fee, and then there is the court costs included with that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and then, in order to get their license the next year, do they have to show maybe that they somehow came into compliance and did whatever they needed to do with their reporting?
MR. ANSON: We haven’t considered that for additional penalties for non-compliance for future years. We have not considered that, and we’ll just have to discuss that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I like it. Maybe we can discuss it. Sounds good. All right, but, overall, I really like it, Kevin. I think it sounds like a great plan, and I love that it’s going to be sensitive to changes in-season, and you all have a history, a track record, already with this data collection program, and I like it. Thank you. John and then Mr. Diaz.

MR. SANCHEZ: Kevin, I just had a question, out of curiosity. The state charter boats in your plan, are they going to be weekend-only also?

MR. ANSON: Yes, they will be weekends as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I am an optimist, and the question that you asked him a minute ago about shutting down early, I think what Kevin has laid out, tracking their average daily catch rates, naturally, if your catches are coming in under, you also could make some plans to extend that season, in some way, shape, or form, and benefit folks, and so that is what is really good about this.

By the way, I think Martha’s presentation was very good also, and I think Kevin’s was very good, and I am really excited about the work that the states have put into this and the thought they have put into it, and I like your Snapper Check program, Kevin. I think I have a tremendous amount of confidence that you can manage and stay within your ACT, I do, and so thank you, Kevin.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Dale.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I likewise like that you all are doing the electronic reporting. I think that’s the wave of the future, and I think it’s a good tool to use to stay within your ACT, and I think you’ll be able to use it. My only concern is, if that data ends up, at the end of the season, showing a lot different than MRIP, and if you have stayed well within your ACT, according to Snapper Check, but then somehow MRIP shows that you’re way over, do we have a good confidence that that 10 percent is going to account for that and keep that from happening? Is there any way to understand that?
MR. ANSON: I don’t know. The 10 percent buffer was an ACT, and so we would kind of shoot for that, but we may go over that, but our real intention is to stay below the allocation. It was good to hear Dr. Crabtree mention that they have kind of looked at the numbers to see -- As I interpreted it, at least, to count the -- Change the currency into MRIP currency compared to what Snapper Check currency is, and it’s running about half as much as what Snapper Check is showing. Compared to the MRIP landings, it’s about half that, and so it sounds like Dr. Crabtree had addressed that. Even if -- Under normal conditions, and if it continues to track at half, it sounds like we would probably be okay.

DR. CRABTREE: Because Snapper Check and Tails n’ Scales are still in the certification process, we don’t have the final anything on it, and so I don’t have final calibrations or numbers for either one of them, and so it’s one of those things that we’re just going to have to be able to react to as we go forward, but I certainly don’t consider it to be a show-stopper, by any means, but we’re going to have to see what comes out of the certification, just like we’re going to have to see what comes out of the new assessment and the various calibrations. Then we’ll make adjustments, as appropriate.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Riechers and then Mr. Donaldson.

MR. RIECHERS: In follow-up to Roy’s comment there, I just want to kind of lay a marker out here, and I’ve already talked to Kevin about it. One of the things we’re going to have to do, especially after the EFPs, and if we move forward with amendments that would establish state plans, it’s how we rectify those new collection methods, as opposed to a time series or a percentage of catch that was built on a time series under a whole different system, because we’re going to have to tie it back into that, in some way, if we get to that point, and I’m just assuming we would get to that point.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, even outside the context of regional management, we do have these new data collection programs for catch accounting coming online. On top of that, we have the transition in MRIP from the telephone survey to the mail survey, and so I know Clay and company are focused on how to calibrate, as best we can, all of these programs and integrate it into the stock assessment, and so we’re going to have to deal with that issue, whether we go down this path or not, because it is an issue that will have to be rectified if we’re going to use these systems.
MR. RIECHERS: Just simply either -- I mean, it either penalizes you or helps you if your new method either consistently is under or is consistently over, unless we go back and calibrate, and so, very simplistically, you either -- In Alabama’s case, you almost double the days, or you might hurt your -- If you have consistently have shown you have overestimated, you would then -- It’s not an overestimation. I’m sorry, but there is two different estimations, and, if the one you’re now calibrating or say is the calibrated estimate is quite a bit different, like I said, it either hurts you or helps you, and, since we’re trying to create the percentages of allocation based on the old time series, we’ve just got to figure our way through that, as we think about those recalibrations.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and, until we sort through all of that, there are just some uncertainties with all of this that we have to live with, at the moment. Hopefully, as we go through the next couple of years, we can reduce those uncertainties and pull things together, but, right now, that’s just what we have to deal with.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Patrick, to your point, and, as Kevin pointed out, hopefully both Snapper Check and Tails n’ Scales will be certified sooner than later, and potentially we will have some calibration between MRIP and those programs.

To Roy and Robin’s point, we’ve had a variety of various red snapper workshops, and the fourth in the series is scheduled -- Hopefully it’s scheduled this year sometime, and the focus is on this data calibration and trying to reconcile all these various data collection programs. Martha mentioned the Florida review program, and that’s one of the things, kind of as a side discussion, that we’re going to talk about, scheduling that workshop.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Great. Please keep us informed, because, if we can be there or listen in or something, I would love to hear that. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, just for Kevin and Roy, I am just trying to seek some clarification here. At this point, because Snapper Check is not certified, and let’s say, for example, you were allocated a million pounds. Snapper Check says you get 500,000 pounds, or that’s what you’ve got, and,
because it’s running 50 percent below, does that mean that’s
when you stop fishing at this point? I just need some
clarification here.

MR. ANSON: Well, at least from our perspective, and what is
identified in the EFP, that would be in the currency of the
biomass estimate and 10 percent of the biomass estimate, and so
we would then be tracking the pounds.

The pounds would be coming in through Snapper Check as the
pounds, and so there is the exchange, if you will, or conversion
from those to MRIP pounds, and it has been coming in about half
of what we estimate, and so it all comes in to what the total --
When you include all the other states in, relative to the final
ACL, and so I don’t --

DR. FRAZER: Then I guess this a question for NMFS. Is it the
prerogative of the agency to kind of decide when to stop, I
guess?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I mean, the agency issues the EFP, and so,
yes, I would guess that’s true. What we have now is, one, we
don’t know what’s really going to come out of the certification,
and so there could be tweaks that would develop over the next
couple of months, but the process isn’t finished.

Then, outside of the certification process, there is the issue
of the calibration, and I don’t have a calibration factor right
now, and I am not at all convinced that we will have the
calibration factor before the fishery opens, and so I don’t know
that we’ll be able to reconcile this until after the fact, and
then we’re just going to have to see how it shakes out, and then
we’ll figure out how to proceed with next year and what kind of
adjustments we would make, and I know this isn’t a very
satisfactory answer, but, right now, we just don’t have all
these calibration models and things that we would need to sort
through, and I am not sure that we’re going to have that until
well into the summer, and, by then, things have already
happened.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Essentially, if there is not a certification
for Alabama that happens before the end of this year, and if
there is not a calibration factor that’s developed by the end of
this year, then the measuring stick that Alabama is going to be
measured by, to see if they stayed within quota, is going to be
the MRIP landings, and is that what I am hearing?

DR. CRABTREE: I suppose that’s possible, but I don’t believe
that’s what is going to happen. I believe the certification issue will be resolved before June, but the certification is done by scientists and all, and I’m not directly involved in it, and so I can’t tell you -- It hasn’t happened, and so I can’t tell you what the details of that are going to be.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Kevin, you have a provision in yours, if I remember correctly, where if, whatever the measuring stick ends up being, if there is an overage, it comes off the next year’s season.

MR. ANSON: Yes, we have a payback provision for the 2019 season if the 2018 landings exceed the allocation, yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess the bottom line, Leann, is we will have to -- We’re going to have to see how this process sorts itself out, and then we’ll have to work with Alabama to deal with where we wind up, in terms of calibration and certification and all those things.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I’m okay with that, because I think Alabama has got -- They have enough safeguards built into their system, and enough accountability, that, whichever way it shakes out, it’s going to be okay. One way or another, it will be dealt with, and so I’m hoping it shakes out in the former, where we get certification and calibration and we can move right on, but, if not, I can see where it’s already written into the plan what will happen, what are the outcomes, and it’s not questionable. I had Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I am just curious. Given the Snapper Check, what would you say, in your experience, is the compliance level of every angler that’s out there catching fish and reporting and it’s human nature. If there is a level of folks that just aren’t reporting, because there are some folks that won’t do anything, what have you modeled in to capture them, so that, again, as you go to estimate your seasonal closure and all that, that all of these things are accounted for?

MR. ANSON: I mentioned earlier about the dockside surveys that we do, and so we’ll send our staff down to boat ramps and marinas and such, and we will interview folks as they are departing their vessels, confirm they have red snapper, and then ask them questions.

We will identify and count the red snapper, and we have some
additional questions as to where they conducted their fishing activity and what type of bottom, what type of habitat, they were fishing on, but, basically, we get about eight minimum elements to match to the report, because there is about eight elements that is required on the report.

Then we try to match those, and, depending upon if all the validations that we get in the field of red snapper vessels are then showing up in the database, there is no conversion, because we assume that 100 percent of the vessels are reporting, but, if there is a ratio of those that we don’t find a report for, then we do the correction, and so that has been running -- This year was the highest, this last year, during the federal season, was the highest compliance rate, if you will, that we had, and that was 35 percent. It’s been running anywhere from 25 to 30 for the prior years, and so we did see an uptick of reporting compliance this last year.

With the advertisement of this, I’m sure we’ll get more people that will see the value of reporting, because there are going to be some folks that don’t comply, and they may not hear about it and that type of thing, but we are trying to document the rate of non-compliance through our dockside sampling.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Kevin, I kind of knew what some of those numbers were, and I wasn’t going to bring them up, and I think that’s kind of where the gist of my question came in with the idea of what do the penalties for that non-reporting look like, to try and improve that compliance, because it’s going to be so important to your monitoring of your in-season catches.

I think you all do a great -- I mean, I’m right next door to you all, right, and so I see your boat launches and stuff, and I think you all are doing a great job of advertising it, that this is mandatory and you have to do this.

It’s right there where you put your boat in the water, and you’ve got signage everywhere, and I think that’s great, and I think you’re over the hurdle of that learning-curve, where it just takes people a little time to get used to it, of, oh, yeah, I’ve got to do that, and so I guess that’s why I was wondering if maybe it might be the right time to maybe put some more teeth into the penalty side of it, and, I mean, I hate to have such negative energy up here, but, anyway, really, if you think about it, I mean, that’s what keeps us all in line. Why don’t we all speed all the time? Because we might get a two-hundred-dollar speeding ticket.
I think, really, also, the idea that you might not be able to renew that license, that -- Because, I think, in this sense, it’s a recreational angler. It’s something he loves to do, and so, if there’s a question that he might not get that privilege, he or she might not get that privilege, again next year, it might just be the seed that makes him remember to report the data. It’s not that he is violating some huge law, but it’s just remembering to do it, that’s all.

DR. PORCH: I just think it’s well to keep in mind that the ABC advice, as it stands, is set in MRIP currency, and so, if it turns out that the Alabama Snapper Check -- If we had gone forward with the Alabama Snapper Check estimates when we did the last assessment, which are, I think, around half of what the MRIP estimates are for Alabama, and that’s where a large fraction of the recreational catch is, if we had plugged those into the assessment, then we would have gotten a lower ABC, and that’s what would have come out of the SSC, is a lower ABC.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any other questions for Kevin? Thank you, sir. All right. Next on the hot seat is Mississippi.

MISSISSIPPI EFP REQUEST

DR. MICKLE: First of all, I will be presenting Mississippi’s EFP, and, first of all, I want to thank NOAA/NMFS for taking the opportunity to offer these EFPs. There is risk involved, as we’ve already discussed here today, and having that experimental mindset in the middle of the Magnuson-Stevens Act is a difficult thing to do, and I just want to tip my hat to the people have gone out and identified the ability to be able to do this and use the five states, and it’s not an easy thing, and I’m pulling for all of us, including Mississippi.

Moving on, the purpose of the exempted fishing permit is to study, to determine, if the recreational Mississippi-landed ACL for red snapper can be accurately attained. Accurate and timely estimation of recreational red snapper harvest and angler effort is crucial for successful management, which I will get into our state ability to do so.

The purpose, continued, is MDMR will gather the scientific data that is currently limited on red snapper, especially off of Mississippi. The EFP will provide private recreational anglers and state for-hire anglers a better opportunity to sustainably harvest the fish, and it will add to the economy of the local coastal communities and allow them an extended, more stable season.
MDMR uses the electronic reporting system Tails n’ Scales for data collection that’s been previously discussed today. It’s unique from the other states, and I have addressed the council, but, for some of the public who may not have heard the presentation back in June, what makes us unique is we offer a prior authorization code, and so, before you leave, before you embark, you need to register in the system and acquire a trip authorization number.

This gives our ability to statistical determine uncertainty a lot of power in the analysis, but we’re unique from the other states, in that we actually require them to possess this trip number. If they don’t have this trip number, they receive an infraction on the water from our law enforcement. If they don’t have a trip number when they land, they can receive a citation for not having that trip number, and so this is true manual reporting, which drives our compliance up very quickly, and I will talk about that, if need be, later on.

This unique authorization code, once it’s given, it has to be one person on the vessel, and they must be on the vessel during the entire trip. Then, when they come back, they have to close it out. They cannot acquire another trip number until they close out that trip number, which keeps the system clicking along, and it keeps people reporting.

Before the trip, they need to put the name of the user, of course, the trip date and time and launch site, where they’re leaving from, and then their vessel registration number. This gives law enforcement everything they need to check exactly what’s going on. After the trip, they need to report number of fish harvested, number of fish released, number of anglers, hours spent fishing for red snapper, and the type of habitat fished. This gives the biological and harvest data that we so desperately need.

A little bit about the specifics of this potential EFP. We are requesting 154,100 pounds annually, and it will be set aside for private recreational anglers and the state charter/for-hire sector, and this is spread over a two-year period, 154,100 for each year. I just want to make that clear.

A 10 percent buffer will be used to make sure the poundage is not exceeded. The timeframe will be that two-year period, which I mentioned, and Tails n’ Scales data collection requires the number of anglers, and much of what I mentioned on the previous slide.
The Tails n’ Scales dockside validation intercepts really is validating that trip authorization number, the vessel registration number, number of anglers, hours fished, number of fish released, fish retained, and biological data. That’s pretty much exactly what I said in the previous slide of what the anglers are reporting through the system, but this allows a validation, to acquire to line up those metrics, to actually acquire the estimation, or to filter into the estimator to get that actual estimation of landings and accuracy of the data to determine the uncertainty.

Tails n’ Scales information, just overall, what we’ll be requesting is 154,100. Through the manual reporting, Title 22, Part 9, which makes sure that we have the laws behind us to make it mandatory. One angler per vessel to require the trip authorization number, and eligible anglers are required to report red snapper harvest for every trip while fishing under the EFP, and the unique authorization code will be provided for each trip.

Methods for reporting is our website web portal, a mobile app, and there’s an image of it there, and a toll-free number that they can call in twenty-four hours a day to get that trip number and to close that trip out. Again, I’ve presented a lot of that information at a previous meeting, three meetings ago, but I can, obviously, delve into it, if need be, for this presentation.

In summary, we’re requesting the EFP to collect scientific data, collection specific to red snapper. The timeframe is two years, and we’re requesting 154,100, and there will be mandatory reporting through the Tails n’ Scales system, and so MRIP -- We are not certified yet. MRIP will running in parallel, and we are very confident that we will be certified within the next month, potentially.

We worked very closely with NOAA, as well as Alabama, and the consultants as well. The consultants are mainly made up of academics, and I want to tip my hat to our fisheries staff for working so hard on the Tails n’ Scales system and working so hard on this EFP as it was brought in at the latter end of last year, and so there was a scramble for all the states to get these EFPs, and, again, NOAA has been wonderful to work with through this process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.
DR. CRABTREE: I just want to say, Paul, that I really appreciate the development of Tails n’ Scales, because trying to estimate state-level catches for Mississippi has been a real problem for a long time, because the magnitude of the catches are relatively low, and so we have, in the past, always had catch estimates for Mississippi with huge variances, and my hope is that Tails n’ Scales will really be an improvement over that.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you. I appreciate that. It’s been fun. It’s a hard process, and I do want to say this, and I don’t want to be a raincloud, but we -- When our finfish director said we’re making it mandatory and we’re doing it now, it scared us all very much, and the first year and the pushback you get from folks, and understandably so. I would have done the same thing. It’s very tough to do, and I definitely wouldn’t recommend trip authorization numbers prior and putting the teeth in of writing citations so quickly, but our anglers have responded, and they really like the system.

Our marine patrol actually uses it as a safety tool. If a vessel is not coming back when the loved ones are reporting that they should, we use this system to know when they left and where they left from and potentially when they might come back, and so this has been a valuable tool for almost every office within our agency, I might add, and it’s a big success, in my opinion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Echoing what Roy said, MRIP, in a small state, can vary wildly, and so Tails n’ Scales, I think, is very, very important for the State of Mississippi. Paul, I would like to ask you a couple of follow-up questions. How many days might anglers get in Mississippi?

DR. MICKLE: I love numbers. It’s what I do, and so let’s get to the numbers. When the numbers came up of what to request, we ran a lot of scenarios, and to actually get daily catch rates is very difficult, because we haven’t had a lot of weekday harvest estimates of hard data for federal waters, because the derby seasons restricted that, and so we got a little fancy, and we kind of got our daily catch rates.

We did some estimates for the weekdays versus weekends and all these different things, and so we ran a scenario of, if we had the harvest rates at 123,795 pounds, which is well under what we’re asking for, that would allow for 260 days of fishing. It shows how small Mississippi is, but how powerful our system is.
That would allow us to fish from May 1 to January 16, which is pretty impressive, and that’s just for the first EFP, and that’s a poundage less than we’re asking for, and so it brings a lot of relatively to the scale of what Mississippi is at and what the other states’ harvest abilities are. Our recreational private fleet is very small compared to you all’s. Our federal for-hire fleet is -- I can literally sit at a picnic table with them. It’s amazing, and they’re all easy to work with, and this allows our state to be very, very efficient and fish a lot, because our impact on the resource is minimal.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead, Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Paul, if you said it, I missed it, and I’m sorry, but do you know the actual compliance rate in Mississippi? Then I would like to say something, if you know it.

DR. MICKLE: Sure, and so we’ve run the compliance rates from the beginning of the system, and we have three full years of data through Tails n’ Scales, and the compliance rate started out, right off the bat, with our marine patrol writing tickets right off the bat, pretty much, and we started around 65 to 80 percent. We ran into the high eighties on the first year.

Year two started in the seventies. Remember, as the season goes on, everyone, of course, becomes more compliant, and so it’s difficult. It’s not a set number. I could have averaged all those numbers, but, again, the system has a legacy now, and so I don’t think that’s really fair to the compliance number as well, and so, just to give a -- Last year, our compliance was around the high 90 percent, and the federal for-hire is 100 percent. Thank you.

MR. DIAZ: I think you’re right. I think the marine patrol did start out right out of the gate, but I think they were writing warning tickets, originally, for some short period of time.

DR. MICKLE: For year one, they wrote courtesy citations during the short federal season, and, as soon as the state season opened up after that, they were writing full citations.

MR. DIAZ: Right, but I think that’s one reason the compliance rate is so high, but, in spite of that, I haven’t heard anybody complain to me about getting citations. I know there’s been some written, but people -- I think, for the most part, the word got out, and it has worked well. This is it for now, and, also, very good presentation, Dr. Mickle, and I’m excited about the
Mississippi program, also.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Banks.

**MR. BANKS:** Thanks, Paul. The information you said about your mandatory reporting and how, when your fisheries director brought it up, everybody jumped back about mandatory reporting, and we’ve seen that same thing within our agency.

When I brought it up about a year ago, our own staff, rightly so, was very hesitant, and I would say the main comment we’ve gotten about this EFP is a fear of mandatory reporting, and the comments, aside from, well, you didn’t ask me my opinion before you ever started developing it, which is the standard comment you get from folks, but, outside of that, it has very little to do with the EFP itself. It’s all about this fear of mandatory reporting.

Was there a time within your conversations with your anglers or a process that you went through that helped them get comfortable with it, or was it just a matter of you had to push it through, let them see it, and then they became comfortable? Can you give us some guidance on how you were able to get that accomplished?

**DR. MICKLE:** Sure. Again, just reminding you of the scale of our universe and our state. We got on the news a lot, and we posted everything, walk-throughs, on our website. We would direct everyone to our website. We launched the app very early, to let people play with it. People in China and India were downloading our app, and are now members, and are now included in this EFP, I would just like to say, and so we welcome them to come.

There are some very hard, dedicated people in our fisheries office, and, when they couldn’t get the information they needed from our 1-800 number, which we subcontracted out, we gave them our own numbers, and we stayed up all night, when they were opening trips at three in the morning, and Carly Somerset and Matt Hill and some other folks would do that all night long, to make sure it’s a success.

I don’t know if I’m at the state to give advice, but getting the app off with mandatory reporting, if it doesn’t succeed in the first year, it’s dead. The community and the universe will club it, and so the resources needed to launch -- It’s like launching an app, right? You launch it and it’s either successful or not, but it takes a lot of effort, but, again, when you add bells and whistles to it of weather and the safety aspects and making the
app really easy, it makes -- They like it a lot, and we’ve
gotten pretty much all positive feedback this last year.

We entered year-three, and people have really enjoyed the app,
and they’re used to it, and we’ve done automatic updates, so
they don’t have to dump it and reload the app, but it’s a hard
thing, and I couldn’t imagine it on a large scale. I don’t want
to push this as the end-all-be-all of everything. On a large
scale, this would be very, very difficult, but thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Dr. Shipp and then Mr. Sanchez.

DR. SHIPP: Paul, I will ask you the same thing that I asked
Kevin, and I ought to be able to figure it out myself, but your
154,000 pounds or so, approximately what percentage of that is
the Gulf-wide take?

DR. MICKLE: I guess NOAA needs to check on my numbers. I kind
of averaged what the private quota has been over the last couple
of years, and I got just over 5 percent. Is that in the
neighborhood, or am I off?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: The number I have before me is 4 percent, but
there is no decimal place, but I think it’s about that.

DR. MICKLE: Well, we’re down to significant figures here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so, Dr. Mickie, I saw too
where you have a certain amount that’s going to be allotted to
private anglers and a certain amount that’s going to be allotted
to for-hire, and so you have those percentages already set?

DR. MICKLE: It’s state for-hire.


DR. MICKLE: The percentages for our state for-hire, they really
just got into the fishery about a year ago, and so it’s hard to
get a true percentage.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Then I was just going to point out a couple
of things. We do have a really good compliance rate, but I know
that, and you say it in your EFP, that essentially anglers who
receive three citations for failing to report their red snapper
trips will result in a substantial fine and a possible
suspension of the angler’s saltwater fishing license for one
year, and so I think that is part of what drives our compliance, too.

I think we have a great staff that really works with our fishermen and helps them to stay in compliance, and so I have to give a kudos there, but that consequence is there, and so I have something on data collection. Did I get everybody that had -- No, I didn’t. John had his hand up, and I will ask mine in a minute. Go ahead, John.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. This doesn’t normally, I guess, apply to you, and maybe everybody else can comment later, but, if you’re going to have, conceivably, a longer season than some of your neighboring states, have you considered a way to factor in, perhaps, some folks, some of your neighbors, coming over and fishing in your state and taking advantage of your open waters? You know, they could get a license, if I’m in Alabama, and I could get a license in Mississippi and be able to do this, but just to factor this into the equation.

DR. MICKLE: Yes, and, if you remember 39, we were the snapper destination of the Gulf with our slice of the pie, and so absolutely, and we built this system with that in mind. As long as they embark from Mississippi, which they have to, because they have to put the ramp they leave from, and we even have private landings sites, so they can leave from their buddy’s house or whatever, but they have to land it, and they have to have that license, and so it all filters into landing the fish in our state and going toward this allocation, from day one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think you mentioned it, but what’s your turnaround time on monitoring those landings and being able to close the season?

DR. MICKLE: We’re in the process of automating everything. It could be the day of, potentially, but, again, these are small numbers coming through, and it’s all automated, but, once the validation data gets entered each time, at the end of each day, potentially, it’s automated through the software, and it could potentially even be linked to the site. With all certainty, I would say a five-day absolute, out of control, maximum amount of time it would actually take, paperwork involved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. If there’s no other questions, I have one. So, there was something in the Mississippi EFP that I didn’t see in a lot of the others, and it was very interesting to me. This is an exempted fishing permit, which is essentially an experiment, right, and, in an experiment, you’re typically
gathering data and information, and one of the things that it says in ours is it says, age and growth rates, and, Clay, I am going to queue you up over there. Age and growth rates, and many models frequently used in stock assessments require the development of age-length key, and this is estimated from samples collected from a population and used to predict the mean length at age over the lifetime of the species.

Reliable estimates are vital to the accuracy of the stock assessment, and so, during our EFP, it says that red snapper collected under this permit will be measured in millimeters for total length, fork length, and standard length, as well as weight. Otoliths from red snapper will be removed and processed for ageing. These observed lengths and ages will be the inputs used in developing the ALK age-length key.

Is that something that is a little out of the norm from what we -- Is that something we’re kind of adding into our data collection to beef up an index that we have or to provide some additional information for stock assessment purposes?

**DR. MICKLE:** Is that a question to me or Clay?

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** You.

**DR. MICKLE:** Clay, jump in at any time. We have a NFWF project, where we’re running pretty much a stock assessment off of Mississippi, so we can get some biomass estimates of stock harvest and age distribution, and so the data from this -- We knew, immediately, this is very inexpensive data to start getting into the stock assessment, through the NFWF, and so this is built into that, and so it’s kind of a bolt-on of another project, and, as an agency, we should all try to bolt things on, just mechanically, and fit things in, to save money, and so this is a data stream that goes into a stock assessment, which I’m sure that I will bring to you as soon as it’s completed. We’re in year-three of NFWF and so probably, in another two years, we’ll have the full stock assessment. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I just thought it was very interesting, and I would imagine, if it’s limited to just Mississippi, then that’s an issue in using something in a stock assessment, because it’s not a broad geographic area, but it’s something neat to be in this exempted fishing permit, and maybe others will think about it and, if it’s something that they can incorporate, that would be nice, too. Clay, did you have any feedback?

**DR. PORCH:** Since you queued me up, but I’m not going to ever
say no to more data. You’re right that it’s a small area, and we do a lot of sampling. The Gulf States Fisheries Commission processes a lot of samples, and so I think it would just be key to work with them, because you wouldn’t just -- If you’re developing an age-length key, we probably wouldn’t do it just for Mississippi, being a small area, and you wouldn’t want to oversample, and so what they basically do is subsample all the data, if they get too many otoliths from one area, and so you would just need to work with Gulf States, and I think they would be happy to accommodate you, but I will leave that to Dave.

DR. MICKLE: I do want to add that Clay’s reference is for a Gulf-wide assessment. With state management, in what my agency is tasked to protecting resources for our state, I am very interested in Gulf-wide assessments as much as an off-state assessment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, and, just for consistency, Mississippi, if we have an overage, it’s going to come off the next year, right?

DR. MICKLE: Yes, and I’m very confident that will not happen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Any other questions for Dr. Mickle? Okay. Since I haven’t seen anybody leave the table to take a bathroom break, because this is thrilling stuff, we better actually stop for a fifteen-minute break, real quick, and then we’ll come back and pick up with Louisiana, and so let’s start back up at 10:45. That’s a little less than fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, ladies and gentlemen. We are going to get back to our presentations on our exempted fishing permits, and, next, is our host state of Louisiana, and so I will turn it over to Mr. Chris Schieble.

**LOUISIANA EFP REQUEST**

MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE: Good morning, council members and Madam Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to present our EFP request. Louisiana is requesting an exempted fishing permit for red snapper only to test the differences in catch effort among different types of hard structure, including oil and gas platforms, artificial reefs, and natural bottom. We’ll also use an exempted fishing permit to test the state management concept as well as the use and validation of near real-time landings
data through electronic reporting.

Our exempted fishing permit request includes all of our anglers, our private anglers, our state guides, and also our charter/for-hire captains.

The timeframe will be for two years, covering the entire coast of Louisiana out to 200 nautical miles. We’ll be recommending the season structure to our commission, and then the commission will make the final call on the season structure. Landings will be monitored through LA Creel, the recreational offshore landing permit website, and a new smartphone app, which I’m going to show you here in a little bit, and also through the electronic logbooks for the federal for-hire captains. We will be encouraging the use of descending devices through an aggressive outreach campaign.

Our participation is voluntary, but our requirements are that the anglers have a valid Louisiana saltwater fishing license and also the free recreational offshore landing permit will be required. Anglers can be domiciled in states other than Louisiana, as long as they have the Louisiana fishing license and the ROLP. Vessel registration is required, per the federal EFP guidelines.

This is a screenshot of our app in development, and this is from our recreational offshore landing permit smartphone app. It shows the registration screen, and I know it’s a little blurry at the top, and I’m sorry about that, but it also shows that we have a required vessel number field on the app, and so, if you’re not a boat owner, you can still choose to participate and report your red snapper landings.

There is an option for picking that I am not a vessel owner, and so you wouldn’t be able to put a number in at that point. Please note that the app is currently under development, and that’s what you’re seeing here. This is not the final product. Obviously, we’re not going to have Latin at the top of the page. We will switch it to English, or Cajun, whichever works better.

This project will test real-time electronic reporting data. Reporting can be done through the ROLP smartphone app or the website for the ROLP, where you apply for the ROLP in the first place, and, also, it can be done by private anglers, the state guides, and the federal for-hire charter captains can elect to use that system as well.

The daily restrictions are anglers must abide by the existing
federal size limit regulations, which is currently sixteen inches for red snapper, and the program will have a two-fish per day bag limit, just like we have now.

We will poll our private anglers to determine what season is the best fit for them. Then we will make a recommendation for the season structure to the commission, and then the commission will make the final call. The state guides will be able to fish in state waters only during the open private season, which will run concurrently with the EFP season.

Our final EFP application states that anglers must register a trip no more than five days prior to their trip, and this is no longer a requirement. They just have to register prior to departure, and there is no time limit on this registration. We have a revised draft for NOAA that will be forthcoming, and so, as the last bullet states, this is an oversight on our current application, and so, if you look and you read it -- Let me repeat this. It is no longer a requirement for them to register for more than five days prior to a trip. They just have to register prior to departure, and there is no time limit on this registration.

This is another screenshot from the app. It will inform anglers of the requirements to participate as they are filling it out, and so the things that I just stated that are requirements of part of the program are also listed on the app as they filled them out.

We’re designating an angler in charge, is how this goes, and so, after a trip, the angler in charge will report the following, the number of anglers on the trip, the number of red snapper landed during the trip, the number of undersized red snapper that are released by all of the anglers on the trip, the number of red snapper released not due to being undersized, the location of fishing activity, which would be the different structures we talked about, the natural bottom or platforms or artificial reef, et cetera, the average depth of the water that they fished in, and whether the red snapper harvest came from an artificial reef, natural bottom, or standing platform.

This is an example, again, of the app, a screenshot. When the angler is reporting red snapper through the app, they will be asked the number kept and the number discarded as well as whether they fished over artificial reef, natural bottom, or near a standing platform. Anglers will also indicate the bottom depth fished and the lease area, and this is a screenshot of the drop-down menu for selecting the different structure, reef
areas, that you fished at, to report them.

The federal for-hire captains will report through the LDWF electronic logbook program or using the ROLP, recreational offshore landing permit, app. They will report the following: the vessel information, name, registration, license, and permit number, the date and time of the trip, the departure and return location from a public or private facility, number of anglers and crew on the vessel, number of hours they fished, the region, which I just showed you on the pull-down, and the target species, of course, and declaration of species and number landed and discarded alive and dead.

Once the angler completes the reporting, using the app, they will receive a summary page to acknowledge it is correct, or they can go back and made edits, and so this is very user-friendly in the app. It does not allow for error. They have the ability to go back and get it correct.

To be clear, from an enforcement standpoint, a copy of the ROLP or trip ID number must be on the vessel while fishing under the EFP. If enforcement stops a vessel fishing for red snapper during the EFP season and a copy of the ROLP or trip ID number, indicating the anglers are participating in the EFP, is not onboard, the anglers may be deemed as fishing out of season.

This is our data analysis. LDWF and LSU will partner to analyze data for the utility of user-supplied data furnished through an online smartphone app, and we’re also going to be analyzing the data from the CLS logbook, from the charter/for-hire captains, and, also, we’re going to be analyzing data associated with different habitat types, mainly under the EFP. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Any questions? Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Chris. That was a good report, and I’ve got a few questions. I had asked Dr. Mickle earlier, and I think the other ones might have stated it, but do you have an estimate of the number of days that the private recreational might get and also your federal charter/for-hire?

MR. SCHIEBLE: I think, for the private recreational, it will be similar to our season structure this past year. We’re fishing, basically, to the same limit, and we’ll shut it down, just like we did this year, and so the precedent would be the same as 2017, as far as that goes.

MR. DIAZ: Do you have an estimate for the charter/for-hire,
federal charter/for-hire?

MR. SCHIEBLE: Well, I mean, their season was forty-nine days last year, and I don’t see why they would get any less.

MR. DIAZ: On the reporting app, if somebody registers, and I realize there’s a lot of reasons why there might be a registration and then the trip never happens, but is there any way that you follow-up with folks that register and then never report back?

MR. SCHIEBLE: Well, we’re hoping to intercept a good majority of these with our LA Creel surveys at the dock, and so that’s kind of the validation part of the whole thing, and so we already have LA Creel in place, and the same anglers will come in that now have these trip ID numbers to the docks to land their fish, and they have already designated a vessel number, as required by the EFP, in the app, when they registered for it to start with. That will be recording the vessel numbers, as they come in, in LA Creel, and we can groundtruth that by having a side-by-side comparison done.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Also, Dale, they wouldn’t be able to get a new trip ID number if we didn’t get a report from them for the first one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you. Good presentation, and I have a question. I may have missed it, but did you interview and ask, like the MRIP interviews, did you ask about how long they fished or lines in the water? I didn’t see that on the list, and do you all request that?

MR. SCHIEBLE: Can you say that again?

DR. MICKLE: Do you request how long they fished, and not time on the water, but lines in the water?

MR. SCHIEBLE: Like angling time, versus time on the water?

DR. MICKLE: Yes, angling time.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I don’t believe it. I think it just asks for time on the water.

DR. MICKLE: We ended up adding it to ours, and you can actually
monitor the -- We do a pressure analyses, to see if there is any pressure on the fishery, if they’re fishing longer and longer.

MR. SCHIEBLE: That’s a good point. They make a long ride.

DR. MICKLE: It’s an easy question to ask.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Just kind of following up with what Dr. Mickle said, since you all are in the development of your app, I will just mention that, when I was reading the different permits, the Mississippi permit actually goes into a lot of detail about the app, and they even kind of mention a few things that were learning curves, as they have tweaked the app over the years.

Like I saw that drop-down list you had, and I’m not going to get too deep into this, but you had a drop-down list, and I think it was for departures or landing locations, and they were seeing that people always kind of picked, I guess, the top few choices there, because they didn’t want to scroll through the whole list.

There is a question before that now that asks you departure or landing county, which, in Louisiana, I guess it would be a parish, and so, when you do that, it scales down that next drop-down list to just the known landing sites in that parish or county or whatever, so that they don’t scroll -- Anyway, I’m just throwing it out there, if you want to look at that EFP, and you never know. There might be a few things that could be helpful in there.

MR. SCHIEBLE: That’s a good point to simplify it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I just want to make a statement, and you all can respond if you want to, but I was glad to see that you all are trying to put the federal charter/for-hire in there, because you all know that I’ve been harping on this. Right now, under the current system, we have not been able, in the last three years, to get our charter/for-hire fleet to fish to the ACT, much less fish up close to the ACL.

I do feel, with LA Creel, that you all should be able to do that, and I’m hoping they get a lot more days on the water. I mean, last year, across the Gulf, the federal for-hire got 92 percent of the ACT, and they caught 73 percent of the ACL, and I guess, if I’ve got a question related to this, what kind of
buffers are you all looking at, and are you all also confident that you all can get these guys to fish a lot closer to their ACT?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: We are confident, and we have not indicated a buffer in our plan thus far, simply because we’re able to track it so closely, and we don’t feel like we need a buffer, in that case. Just as an example, a couple of years ago, we were tracking harvest, and I can’t remember what the poundage was, but like a little over a million pounds, and, when we stopped the season, we ended up being just over a thousand pounds over our target level, and, in a million pounds of tracking, we were only over by a thousand pounds, which, of course, we took off of the following year’s quota, as a self-imposed accountability measure, and so I feel like we can track it almost to the fish, and there is no doubt about it.

As to the charter/for-hire, you’re right that I think we can give them an opportunity to harvest as much fish as we’re allowed under the EFP. Now, whether that equates to forty-nine days or fifty-one or a hundred days, I don’t exactly know, because it’s going to have to come down to, obviously, as we very well know, catch rates and what the final number is.

The number that we have asked for is more than they have caught in the last few years, and so they have not caught that level the last few years, under the amount of days provided to them by the feds, and, under this scenario, we would give them the days they would need to catch that entire amount, whatever that total amount is at the end of the day, and so I feel like that they would have more days under this scenario, but there’s just no way to guarantee a number of days, as we all know.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. This question is actually for Clay. If you have some states that have charter/for-hire kind of included in their EFPs, and some that don’t, and so, ultimately, when you’re trying to incorporate these different sources of data into some type of assessment down the road, does that increase the uncertainty, and would that ultimately reduce the ABC, I guess? If it does, it kind of defeats the purpose. The goal, I would assume, for everybody in this room, is to increase the number of fish that are available to people in each of their states.
DR. PORCH: To the extent that all of the estimation programs are vetted, it doesn’t necessarily increase the uncertainty for the assessment. The more programs, the more independent programs, there are, what it makes more difficult is managing all the datasets and making sure that everybody reports on time and that everything is properly QA/QC’d.

That’s the biggest challenge, I think, that we have for assessments, and we do encounter, a lot of times, now that we get increasing amounts of data from the states, that you find one partner is maybe a little behind in providing the data, and then that slows down the whole assessment, for example.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I am going to come back to the issue of the for-hire vessels and inclusion or not inclusion. There is a lot of complexities with that and things, but I was going to let us get through all of the presentations, and then we can come back and talk to that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Other questions for Louisiana? All right. Patrick, right now, you have both private anglers and for-hire, but you have that quota split.

MR. BANKS: We do, yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That follows the normal allocation that we’ve looked at?

MR. BANKS: It follows the guidance that we received through Amendment 40, sector separation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Thank you, sir. Any other questions for Louisiana? You have a payback, and I know you do, because you just said that you did it last year on your own, right? Okay. All right. It sounds great. Next, we will move on to Texas and Mr. Riechers.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: While he’s coming to the podium, all of the presentations are on our website now, and all you have to do is refresh your website, and they will show up.

TExAS EFp REqUEST

MR. RIECHERS: As Paul suggested, thanks for the opportunity to both be here to present the Texas EFP, but, more importantly, just for the opportunity to see if we couldn’t work EFPs through
this system and possibly create a kind of template of how we might manage these fisheries in the future a little bit.

Of course, as we all know, and since I am last, but not least here, much of this will have been covered, but I will go ahead and walk through a couple of the key elements of the exempted fishing permit.

We know that, at this point, we have set up these permits to be two-year permits, and so this would deal with the 2018 and 2019 seasons. As we have been presenting this, it probably bears talking for just a moment about that timeline. Of course, we’re presenting to the Gulf Council today. In late February, there was a notion, or at least a target, to publish in the Federal Register for a thirty-day comment period with a targeted approval date of somewhere in the middle of April, possibly, and all of those are subject to certain delays that could occur along the way.

For my own commission, Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission, that would then allow us to basically go to them in March and adopt, in May, any changes that would absolutely be necessary in order to do an EFP, if there were any changes, and we don’t necessarily foresee those, but, if there were some that we would have to do, that’s the timeline that we would be working with.

One of the things that obviously did, when we looked at this timeline, was it really forced us to thinking about, just from a notice perspective, a start time of June 1, or later than that, and so that’s kind of where we are in our thinking in regards to that.

We included basically our complete private recreational fishery, whether they were on a private recreational boat or whether they were on a charter/for-hire or headboat. For lack of a better approach in going about this, we went back to Amendment 39, regional management, the preferred motion we had regarding, or at least the preferred alternative that we had at the time, when we were deliberating on that document, realizing that that was a preferred in a draft document and it doesn’t hold any one state, including our own, to this percentage moving forward, as we deliberate over other allocation approaches, if we do go forward with state plans, but we are trying to go back to some sort of concrete catch history and grab some percentage.

The 16 percent is what we’ve been asking for, but, again, I want to reiterate that I don’t think that is an indication of acceptance for that for the future, and I know that Martha would
agree, based on her percentage that she’s done here, and Kevin and others as well. We will still have to deliberate those as we move forward.

How we’re going to go about monitoring our particular proposal is basically we’re going to use our current TPWD Marine Sport-Harvest Monitoring Program. As I indicated yesterday when Nick was at the podium, we have basically taken a look and kind of gone back, based on some of the work that we used to do, in coordination with NMFS, as we tried to hand over red snapper data, and we basically have created some regression, or correlation, type approaches that will allow us to monitor that basically on almost a per-day basis as we go through the season.

To kind of put that a little bit in perspective, we do about 108 survey days that occur at what we call Gulf-only locations, where predominantly we’re going to see Gulf boats. In addition to that, during our high-use season, which is when this will be running, we have about another 834 days, survey day, that occur at other ramps, and, for 2016, for instance, at about 350 of those other survey days, we also encountered red snapper, and so we’ll be able to incorporate all of those red snapper, as we get those into those different boat ramps, or those different locations, at those onsite sampling locations, and we’ll be able to incorporate that into kind of a weekly accounting, and almost daily, but certainly by the end of each week accounting of where we are in regards to quota.

In addition, certainly we’ve been working with Greg Stunz and Harte Research Institute regarding iSnapper, and I believe we’re on the fourth year of that, as I am recalling, and MRIP, I think, helped fund one year, and we’re now on a NFWF grant, if I’m correct, Greg, but, the very first year we did this, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department also put up a website. After us both creating websites and going our own ways, we thought better of that, and we certainly are trying to give only one website for that self-reported, voluntary self-reported, data that will occur there.

Certainly, when we think about that data, we’re using that as kind of a calibration, and, of course, all of us created those electronic systems when we were into these real shortened seasons, where some of these other programs didn’t do as good of a job, and so, with this season, I don’t know how well it will do, but we’ll be running those simultaneously.

One of the things, and I don’t think it’s been mentioned too much here, but one of the things that I think that I wanted to
point out is it mentions there that we’ll be monitoring and will try to close when it’s reached, but I think some of the things that we recognize as uncertainties here are, first of all, given the shortened seasons and given where we’ve been with red snapper in some of the recent years, do we have some pent-up, latent demand that’s going to come into the fishery, because you have a longer season, and I just don’t know the answer to that question, but we think there could be.

The other thing that we know we’re dealing with is, kind of as we look at those catches, we’re really going back into a time period before 2010 and looking at that behavioral modeling that we’re looking at, in terms of trying to create these projections, because that’s a time period when we get the seasons back to a length that make -- That are similar to what we might expect with these EFPs, and, therefore, you are dealing with some historical data that may not apply right now, in the current situations, as well as it did back then, but that’s what you have to do.

Then, lastly, we also know that all of us, when we date back into those time periods, as opposed to more recent time periods, the size of those fish and the weight ranges on those fish have changed, and so we’ve tried to make that adjustment as well, but all of those are uncertainties that all five Gulf states are dealing with, and certainly we’re no exception there. With that, that really is the nutshell of the EFP, and I will answer any questions, if I can.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Are there questions for Mr. Riechers?

Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I may have missed it, Robin, and I’m sorry, but I was working on some other stuff, but what’s the plan for accountability measures?

MR. RIECHERS: I think Ms. Bosarge would have gotten to that, but it’s in the document as well, and, basically, what we suggest is, after the season, we’ll tally up the accounting, and we will take it off next year and make an adjustment, as needed, into the next year. We did leave it somewhat flexible in how we make that adjustment. It can be on season days, or it could be a bag limit reduction. There is ways to handle that, but we’re going to leave that somewhat flexible.

That actually brings up an excellent point, and I missed it though, and I should have made it, but, when I said we were going to start June 1 as well, I just want to go on record here
that, depending on how this works out and depending on what the quota level actually is, or the poundage level actually is, there is some talk amongst our group now, most recently, about is there a way maybe to, depending on the number of days, to get Labor Day weekend, and so we may slide that start date, depending on that, and try to figure out what may work best there.

MR. BANKS: A follow-up to that, Robin. Thanks, but my concern was -- I’m glad about the accountability measures, and I think that’s good, but my concern was a discussion we had yesterday about the data not coming in and being ready until about mid-year the next year, and so do you feel pretty confident that you all can get that information finalized and ready to make that decision?

MR. RIECHERS: The full estimation won’t occur, because we’re stratified by that high use and low use, and so the full estimation, where we can really look back at the whole year and look at the pressure that has occurred -- It’s different on weekends or weekdays or holidays through that whole season.

That won’t occur until a time period after that, but we feel fairly confident in this kind of estimation technique that we’ve created that will allow us to basically estimate in a timely fashion, but then we’ll go and true it up at the end.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think, at the beginning of this, Sue Gerhart kind of prefaced this by saying that NMFS isn’t delegating things to the state, and so, in this particular case, wouldn’t the bag limit -- You wouldn’t have the flexibility to reduce the bag limit, would you?

MR. RIECHERS: We certainly would in state waters, but I would assume it would stay the same in federal waters, if that were the case, yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Are there other questions? Of course, I have some. Mr. Swindell, go ahead.

MR. SWINDELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. The question I have is regarding discards. Louisiana, so far, has been the only plan that has mentioned accounting for discards in this whole process. As I look at these EFP, they are data collection, research programs, and I really would like to know just what are we doing about collecting the data for discards, and I assume
that you -- I am going to have to just assume that the states are going to collect the data from the anglers on their discards, or are we not?

Particularly, to you, you’re using a fifteen-inch instead of a sixteen-inch size limit, and do you have any data to back up whether or not the fifteen-inch is giving you a benefit on less discards?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: We would have to go back and look at the past historical data on that, Ed, and I don’t recall, right offhand, but I do know that the fifteen-inch is actually where we receive the highest -- The maximum biomass associated with a fifteen-inch. We have had that cha-cha that we’ve done, and help me out here, Roy, but we were at fifteen, and then we went to sixteen, and then we found out that maximum yield per recruit was still at fifteen, and we stayed at fifteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: The rationale for going to sixteen had a lot more to do with extending the season back, I guess, ten or twelve years ago now, when we set it. It was less emphasis on yield per recruit and those kinds of things.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I’ve got Dr. Stunz is actually, I think, going to speak to Mr. Swindell’s point, and I will just say that one thing that I was impressed, in your EFP, with is that you mentioned that anglers participating in the pilot study covered by this EFP will be encouraged to use descending devices or venting tools, and so I appreciated that. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I wanted to comment regarding this EFP, but also to Ed’s comment, and I would encourage all the states in the EFP to collect as much discard data as they can, because that’s an area that we’re really lacking, and it would really help out a lot of the things that, of course, we discuss around this table.

Specifically to your question, the iSnapper app has always, and does, collect very valuable discard data related to that fishery, and it also is an opportunity as well, while I’m plugging electronic data, to collect socioeconomic information about the fishery, and I know there’s much debate on how much you ask, but some very simple questions on discards and socioeconomic gets us a long way, in terms of putting better data on these fisheries.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think Mr. Anson is next.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to your question or inquiry about the other states and data collection activities, at least for Alabama, we have other activities or programs that we conduct that get at the information that at least Dr. Mickle had described earlier, and so we have separate sampling assignments to collect those specific data points.

One thing to consider, when you’re looking at dockside surveys of any survey, is that there comes a point where you collect too much information, and you kind of get into a situation where you don’t get as much as you would expect, at the end of the day, and so we stayed focused on validation of vessels relative to reporting of red snapper and getting that minimum data that we feel is necessary.

Then we also collect biological information that can be available and is available through the commission and to NOAA for stock assessment purposes, the other length information and otolith age information and that type of thing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Great. Thank you.

MR. RIECHERS: If I can, I would echo what Kevin said there. We’ve got some -- Of course, we range from the one-boat ramp kind of location to where there may be three or four boat slips, and on a busy weekend, when you have two crews trying to get information, as boats are coming out, there is that whole notion about speed and efficiency, so that your anglers can get on the road, as they’re trying to get back home on Saturday or Sunday evening as well.

I think, at least as far as our creel goes, Ed, to answer your question, we have collected it through the online reporting that we’re doing with iSnapper, but, in our creel, we do not collect that discard data. We have relied on other programs, as Kevin suggested, where you can apply that percentage, if you need to. It’s certainly accounted for in the stock assessment, as we have moved forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Most of the data comes in through your regular creel survey, but the only spot that you’re grabbing discard information is through the iSnapper, and so I guess this is more of a question for Greg.
What is the use percentage, and I wouldn’t say compliance rate, because it’s not mandatory, but how many people actually use iSnapper? Do you get a lot of people, compared to how many people total are fishing that actually use iSnapper? I guess I’m trying to understand how much data do you actually get on discards, since yours is the only portal to collect it.

DR. STUNZ: We certainly would like more participation than we have, and it ranges from about 5 to 20 percent, depending on the year. This last year, because it was such a short season initially, I think there was some disenfranchisement. As far as improving that, we certainly would like to see that go up, and what was the second part of your question there, Patrick?

MR. BANKS: You answered it, the 5 to 20 percent. I was just trying to get a feel for, of the overall universe of people fishing, how many people were using your iSnapper, because it sounds like, unless I’m wrong, that’s the only portal for them to give you guys discard data.

DR. STUNZ: Right, and, also, keep in mind that we have people working closely with Robin at all of these ramps, and we’re knowing what anglers we encounter that are entering the app, and that’s mainly for validation purposes, but we know how many we’re missing as well, and so that’s factored into our estimator, and, working with MRIP statisticians, we’re still feeling pretty good about, even though we’re not having to measure every single boat’s catch, for example, to still know what’s going on.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. So, Robin, and so I know you all usually report your landings to NMFS twice a year, I think, right, and I know that, in this EFP, you’re going to change the way that you begin to analyze and evaluate your landings data, and you’re going to do it more frequently than, I guess, you have in the past.

It looks, like you said, about sort of weekly, on a weekly basis, that you’re going to be evaluating some catches, and I’m wondering -- So, that’s my first question, and the second question is, at what point will that go and flow back to NMFS, as opposed to the usual twice-a-year timeframe?

MR. RIECHERS: I don’t want to misinform you in any way, and so we’re not changing the way we stratify our samples, and so, really, the only time we can create the final estimates is going to be at those two period of time during the year, or one period
of time that has both included, however you want to talk about
that.

But, what we’re going to do is we think we’ve created an
estimation technique that will allow us to create preliminary
estimates that will allow us to monitor the fishery on a week-
to-week basis, and then we’re going to make our adjustment based
on that, closed or open or so forth, and then we’ll have to go
up at the end and true-up, because, until you get that final
estimate, you’re still dealing with a stratification that’s
different. You’re dealing in a different time period than when
it ended, and so that’s just the way we’re going to have to
treat that in this current setting.

It’s no different than if any of these other people who are on
MRIP and if their time cutoff happens in the middle of a wave.
It’s truly no different, but they just have waves that are
shorter.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I have one more question, but I’ve got
to think about it, because you gave me a lot to chew on right
there. I remember what it was. So, we’ve already sort of
gotten into the accountability, and I do read in yours -- You do
say, in your EFP, that, if there is an overage, landings in
excess of the annual catch limit would be deducted from the
following year’s catch limit, and you kind of do go on to say,
though, that you’re hoping for a little flexibility, in that,
when you deduct the overage, you might do it in such a way where
you have a reduction in bag limits, which we sort of talked
about, and I don’t know how much that’s going to help you,
because it would only be for state waters, nine miles, or a
number of the federal days and changes in season timing.

Now, I can see where that is pretty relevant. I’m assuming, if
you shifted more of your season to maybe like wintertime fishing
or something like that, you would probably decrease your
landings, and I guess the only thing that concerns me there is
it sure does seem a lot cleaner to just take the overage off
first, before you start estimating.

You’re going to have to do some estimation and some changes
anyway, if you had an overage the first year, and you’re
obviously going to want to tweak how you arrange the second
year, to try and prevent that overage the second year, and it
seems like, instead of taking it straight off the second year
and then starting your estimations, you end up with estimations
on top of estimations, if you do it a different way, like
changing timing and stuff.
Anyway, that’s just a thought, but at least you did write it in there, and I appreciate that, that you’re going to take it off the next year. It’s going to come off.

MR. RIECHERS: Yes, and it may be that it’s not clear, Leann, and I apologize for that, if it’s not, but the only way I assume you would do it was you recreate the estimation, or the poundage you have in the next year, and you then create an estimation of the number of days that would give you in that new year, and so you’re going to have to adjust it.

I guess maybe we’re saying the same thing, but in different ways, and you’re going to have to make that adjustment. Now, kind of like Martha, there is also what we can call a substantial overage and a non-substantial overage, and I think that’s part of the flexibility, as we talk with NMFS and as we do these things.

There is going to have to be a lot of handshakes with NMFS along the way, and this is not going to be we come to you at the end of the year and say here’s where we are. We’re going to have to be reporting this information along the way, and I assume all five states are going to be doing that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Robin, I heard you comment that you were going to have to work through your commission to establish the opening of your season and how long the projections of the season would be, and you talked about how you were really wanting to get the Labor Day season in, or would attempt to do that, but is there any estimate on the number of days for the private recreational and the charter boats?

MR. RIECHERS: Well, Johnny, until we get pounds, it’s hard to make estimates. We have made some, but I am reluctant to put them on the record, because, until I know what the poundage we’re dealing with is, I don’t know whether I’m even in the ballpark.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Any other questions for Mr. Riechers? Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. I would just like to emphasize the huge challenge we have, in general, in estimating discards. I mean, that’s one of the biggest challenges we have in our assessments and giving management advice, is quantifying those discards,
and, as you know, in the case of Texas, we don’t have estimates of discards historically, and so we have to do things like assume the ratio of discards to landings in Texas is the same as Louisiana and those kinds of manipulations, which is not ideal. I just think now would be a good time to rethink how we get those discard estimates everywhere across the Gulf. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Anything else you want to throw out there, from a data collection standpoint, you know we’re all ears. That’s what this is all about, and, any improvements we can make, we would love to hear them, especially from somebody like you. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Since it was brought up, and I didn’t address it, to Mr. Swindell’s question earlier, but, in the Snapper Check application, we do collect dead discards that occurred on the trip for the vessel.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so, Robin, you said -- I’ve been trying to write these percents down, and so you said 16 percent is what you’re asking for, and I’ve just been trying to total these up for the private angler, because that’s the only thing that’s stable across the board, and what percentage of that is private angler?

MR. RIECHERS: Roughly, as we looked at that historical time series and the average over that historical time series, private angler is going to make up about 22 or 25 percent of that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So, 22 to 25 percent of 16 percent, and I can do the math in a minute, but I’m not that good in my head. Any other questions for Mr. Riechers? All right. Thank you, sir.

We have had our presentations from each of the individual states, but obviously it’s a zero-sum game, and so it’s all got to add and tick and tie, and so are we going to have some overarching conversation now about how we’re going to weave all of this together and make sure that, as a council, we are approving EFPs that stay within our legal parameters and the scientific boundaries of Magnuson? Dr. Crabtree.

GENERAL EFP DISCUSSION

DR. CRABTREE: Let me just make a few comments about it, in particular about some of the intricacies of the issue with the for-hire vessels. Normally, what an exempted fishing permit does is it exempts you from the regulations of some sort, and so, when we’ve thought about this might work, for the private
recreational anglers, if we do this with all five states, there
would be no private angler recreational season in the Gulf, and
it would be closed.

Then private anglers would be allowed to fish -- They would be
exempted from the closure if they’re fishing under the terms of
a state’s EFP, and I think that works okay, and, according to
the numbers that I have, the amount of fish each state is
requesting for the private angler component sums up to about
ninety-six-and-a-half percent of the overall ACL, and so one of
the things we’ve got to make sure is the amount of fish we’re
handing out to the states has to add up to less than the ACL.
It can’t be more than the ACL.

Now, it’s more complicated with the for-hire fishery, because
some states are requesting to include the federal for-hire
component, and particularly Florida and Alabama are not, and
most of the for-hire catch occurs in Florida and Alabama.

That means there will have to be a federal for-hire season this
year that will begin on June 1, and, last year, it was forty-
nine days, and they were a little under their annual catch
target, and so my expectation is that, this year, the federal
for-hire season will be fifty-one, or something like that, days.
It will be a little more than last year.

It will be a Gulf-wide for-hire season, because I have no
authority, under the EFP, to only open part of the Gulf. Now,
under a plan amendment, we have more things we can do, but,
under an EFP, it will have to be a Gulf-wide season.

Any federally-permitted for-hire vessel will be able to fish in
that federal for-hire season, and I have no way to tell some
segment of for-hire vessels that they can’t fish then, and so
that makes it complicated to figure out how to include for-hire
vessels in a state’s EFP.

We have had a number of discussions for how that might work, and
I guess, if a state could get all of the for-hire vessels in
that state to enter into some sort of binding agreement with the
state that they’re only going to fish under the terms of the EFP
and not fish in the federal for-hire season, that might work,
but I can see how that would be a difficult thing to do.

If the state was willing to have state waters open concurrently,
or their state EFP for-hire season to be concurrent with the
federal for-hire season, then I think that’s okay, but then the
question is what’s the point of including it in it if the
seasons are going to be the same?

Then the problem we also have is, when we set the federal for-hire season, we are largely basing it on the catch rates and what we saw in the previous year, or maybe the previous two years, and that’s how we project the season, and so we’re looking at what were the amount of fish caught off of each state in 2017, but, as we heard in the presentations, Louisiana and Texas, the share of the for-hire quota they’re asking for is based on a historical percentage of the catch that goes back -- I think it goes back into the 1980s, and so that gives you different answers.

When we sum up, right now, what we think will be caught in the federal for-hire season by Alabama and Florida, and then we sum up the amount of fish that are being asked for by Louisiana and Texas, you end up with a number that’s greater than 100 percent, and so, if we go down that path, it seems that we would have to bring down the amount of fish that we would be able to allocate for the for-hire vessels off of the states that want to include them, to make sure that everything sums up to 100 percent.

If we didn’t, and we gave them what they’re asking for, that would mean the federal for-hire season would be shortened, and I suspect that will have issues that would be objectionable to some, and so that’s the largely the issue right now with the federal for-hire vessels.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Roy, I understand where you’re going with that, but it sounds like, to me, that you would be giving deference to catches and activity in Florida and Alabama completely over anything in our two states, and I would ask that, rather than reducing what we’re asking for completely, and I can understand that there should be some reduction, but it seems like the reduction should be across the Gulf, to try to make it work equally for everybody.

Florida and Alabama, yes, you’re going to have to set a season for the federal waters, but it seems like, to make this work, why should our two states’ charter industries have to fish less? It seems like everybody should have to fish less.

DR. CRABTREE: The problem comes down to the baselines, because what we are allotting that we think will be caught off of Louisiana is the same percentage you’ve caught in the couple of previous years. The amount you’re asking for though, because
it’s based on this longer timeframe, is actually more than 
you’ve been catching in recent years, and it’s the same 
situation off of Texas.

Now, if you want to come in and set an allocation state-by-state 
that shifts things more back to how it was in some historical 
period, that’s fine, but I don’t really think an EFP is the 
appropriate place to start making difficult allocation 
decisions, but, in my judgment, we’re not taking any fish away 
from the Louisiana charter boats.

We are, in fact, assuming they will catch the same fraction of 
the Gulf-wide for-hire catch that they have been catching in 
recent years, but that is less than what they were catching ten 
to fifteen years ago, but I think, to make an adjustment of the 
allocation to reflect some historical period, again, that’s an 
allocation decision that the council would need to make in a 
plan amendment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: A follow-up to that?

MR. BANKS: To that point, I understand that, Roy, but we do 
need to remind ourselves that our guys can only catch the number 
of days they’re given, and so I think the reason they have 
cought less than that historical percentage is just because, 
naturally, the days they have had to fish is less over the last 
several years, and so it just seems like it --

I am just trying to -- I am not all that opposed to reducing the 
ask, I guess, in our EFP for our charters, but it just doesn’t 
seem fair for me to have to reduce it all the way down to what 
they caught last year, because the reason they only caught that 
last year is because they only had so many days to fish, and so 
it seems like everybody should share equally in that. Everybody 
should have to give a little bit to get us to 100 percent is 
what I am saying.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that is what is happening, because the 
Louisiana charter fleet, last year, had the exact same number of 
days that the Florida and Alabama charter fleet had. There is a 
Gulf-wide charter season, and they all get the same number of 
days, and their seasons have all been reduced by the same number 
of days, and so I don’t -- I am not sure that I understand that 
-- It’s not that anyone is being reduced down, but it’s just 
that, over the past twenty years, there have been changes in the 
distribution of where the catch is occurring.

Some of that probably reflects population trends, and some of it
probably reflects recovery of the stock down the west coast of Florida and a whole host of things, but, again, I don’t think an EFP is the correct place to come in and make an allocation to adjust for that, but I will leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: While I echo a lot of what Patrick said, I will try to make some different points, or ask some different questions. One of the ways we fix this, Roy, is to just -- If Alabama and Florida were to bring charter/for-hire in, and is that a possibility?

DR. CRABTREE: That would be up to Florida and Alabama, but, if they did that, then the question would be how many pounds does each state get, and we would be left with the same issue of trying to figure out how to do that.

MR. RIECHERS: So another option to do that, inclusive of that option, would be for the states to find an agreement on how we went about picking the share of allocation within the EFP, because, basically, much has happened -- When we were told in San Antonio that we don’t have any real guidance, and it’s been quite some time, for you all creating your electronic reporting, and we all went and did separate electronic reporting, and, of course, they’re all a little bit different, as you might expect. The same thing goes here when you asked what poundage do you want, and Florida took a more recent time series, because that benefited them, and Alabama took a biomass approach, and other three of us took a percentage approach, based on a time series, and so, I mean, it does beg the question of, if there was an agreement we could reach, where we all agreed on the time series, and they were all-inclusive, would that be an option, realizing that we’re all running shy of time here, and I’m not saying we’ve got another month to go to work here, but I am just wanting to explore what the possibility could be.

DR. CRABTREE: I suppose, if all of the states adjusted their EFPs and all of the states requested that the for-hire vessels be included, then our main concern would be that everything sums up to the ACL or less.

Of course, the other option would be to do this just for the private sector and leave the for-hire out and let them fish the federal for-hire season, but I think, if the option you just mentioned, if the states could all do that in the EFP, we would certainly consider that.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That would be a pretty big change in what we've been presented, and is that going to come back before this council in April for us to review and ask questions about, because there is some big decisions there, too.

DR. CRABTREE: The timeline we’re looking at, and hoping for, is to -- We would put a notice out in the Federal Register, which we would like to do as soon as we can, and have a thirty-day public comment period for it. Then I think our goal was to issue the EFPs in mid-April, and that’s where we’ve been shooting, and I’m not sure when the April council meeting is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think it’s mid-April, but I would have to go back and look.

DR. CRABTREE: So, I can’t predict timing of things enough to say whether it would be issued, but I think, at that point, it would be very difficult for us to make any more changes to it, if we’re going to have this in place in time for the summer season.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: I just want to remind everyone that -- I am not going to speak for the other states, but, for Mississippi, of course, we have to go in front of the commission. They’re the ultimate authority, and so, please, let’s remember that factor as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The patient Dr. Stunz. Yes, sir.

DR. STUNZ: Roy, this is a question for you regarding the for-hire discussion we’re having here. These are EFPs, but I am trying to get my head around this a little bit. If we went with Louisiana and Texas’s plan, do you have a -- How many pounds of fish are we talking about? Is this a lot of fish or a little fish? Since it is an EFP, maybe it’s a two-year, temporary deal.

DR. CRABTREE: I believe Sue sent a table to council staff that shows what the requests are and what percentage of the ACL they are for the private and the for-hire components, and then it shows what the proportion of the landings were. There it is, and so you can see the amounts there.

Now, the Texas number is based on 2016 charter catches and 2017 headboat landings, and the bulk of the Texas catch is from the
headboats, but you can see, for Louisiana, it’s somewhere in the neighborhood of 80,000 pounds. For Texas though, it’s more than that. It’s several hundred-thousand pounds.

That’s assuming that seventy-three-and-a-half percent would be caught off of Florida and Alabama, and that’s what happened last year, and then, if Mississippi is leaving the for-hire vessels out, then there’s a few more fish in there that would fall into that.

The other thing then is that it’s hard for me to see how this would work, other than the state allows their for-hire season to run concurrent with the federal season, because it’s not clear to me how a state would be able to close the for-hire component if federal waters are open. They could potentially extend it, if they had the fish, but it’s not clear to me how they could close it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: If I remember correctly, because what we’re talking about doing here is possibly carving out a portion of the for-hire fleet that gets managed in one way, and the rest of the for-hire fleet is managed under a different system, and it seems to be one of the biggest issues is the numbers that we’re coming up with.

When we went through the EFP for the Headboat Collaborative, that program, those guys had to look at their recent landings. The boats that were going to participate in it had to look at their recent landings and see what those were, and, whatever that percentage was of the total landings for that year, and this is recent years, then that’s what they carved out.

If they went back to a longer time series and looked at something that happened in the 1980s or the 1990s, then what they were going to do is really have a big impact on the fishermen that weren’t in the EFP, and do you see what I’m saying?

The only way to kind of keep it fair was to really look at the current stuff, and, now, I agree with you that, if you’re making an allocation decision for the long term, yes, you want to look at a long time series, but, if it’s a short-term, two-year EFP, in order to not harm the people that are in the EFP, you’ve got to kind of look at those more recent landings and use that.

If you go above that, then it’s essentially coming out of the rest of those guys that aren’t fishing under the EFP, and they’re almost getting punished, and do you see what I’m saying,
for not being part of the experiment, and I kind of have some
qualms with that. All right. I have Mr. Banks and then Mr.
Riechers.

MR. BANKS: Well, just looking at these numbers, and, Roy, I
appreciate you all putting the numbers together. I was worried
that we were going to not be able to see these before we try to
come to a resolution.

I mean, certainly, our private anglers, except for the EFP, will
not have a season, it sounds like. It sounds like the charters
will have a season, whether there is an EFP or not, and so there
is at least something to fall back on, but I will say that it
looks like it’s cutting out about somewhere between 20 and 25
percent of our fish for the charters.

There is one thing that that group has been unwavering on, in
the two years that I’ve been at the council, and that is that
they want to be managed by the state. Now, do they want to be
managed by the state if they only get one day? I don’t know.
Their tune may change, but, in this case, it seems like that,
with the reduction in that kind of poundage, I still feel like
all of the states should have to reduce theirs, so that we get
to 100 percent.

Robin and I shouldn’t have to be the only ones to have to give
on that, but, if we are, or if I am, I still think our charter
guys would rather be in our plan. I would rather keep them in
our plan, even at the reduced level.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could respond. I mean, that’s fine, but, if
we reduce, in the way that you’re suggesting, it would end up,
in the charter fleet in Louisiana, having more days than the
Gulf-wide charter season, and so we would be, in effect,
shifting days for the for-hire vessels to Louisiana and to
Texas, if we did it that way. Now, I am not rendering a
judgment about that, but you can clearly see how that would be
distributed.

Now, I will offer up another way to think about this, since this
is sort of a pilot project and we’re testing something. A
fourth path forward would be to go ahead and do this this year
with just the private vessels, but with the understanding that
we may expand it in 2019, for some states, to bring in the for-
hire vessels, and that would allow more time for -- That would
allow a couple of things. One, we could see how this goes, and
then we would have more time to work out some of these
allocation issues, maybe.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I would ask that we would prove that it’s an issue and then take the charters out, before we assume there’s an issue and then put the charters in. I like Roy’s idea about seeing how this first year goes, but I think I would rather see how it goes with the way we’ve proposed it first, but that’s my opinion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Robin.

MR. RIECHERS: I guess I’ve got a couple of points. One is, Leann, your previous description, I would have agreed with you, except, just recently, we found out that they didn’t have that real history on all those participants in the headboat survey, because they couldn’t identify the individuals, and they could only go back for a short period of time, and so, in some respects, your description of that was a little different, just because the history didn’t back that up anymore, which was, frankly, a new revelation in most recent times, at the last couple of council meetings.

I certainly appreciate getting these numbers today, and that helps us in having conversations with the different sectors here, so that we can actually share that with them, because we’re talking in pounds here, but what everyone else is concerned about is days, and so that allows us to turn that into days and have those real conversations about what that would mean to them as a sector.

The other thing we may have to do here is go back and, as states, come to sort of grip with -- Because it kind of goes to the fairness and equity question that Patrick is asking for here. This has shifted through time, and that’s kind of why we’re in the place we are with much of this management.

It has shifted between sectors, and it has shifted between states, and we don’t expect those things to stay static, but it reaches a point where it is an equity concern. The other part is, when we have just been asked to go create the poundage you want, some of us were more conservative, and some were less conservative, in their ask, and so I think maybe there is some room here for, and, again, in short order, to work to see if there is a better compromise that, as you suggest, Patrick, we all give a little bit here to help the greater good as we move forward with an EFP.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha and then Dr. Crabtree and then Dr. Stunz.

MS. GUYAS: I don’t see this table online, and can we email this out or post this or something? I know other people have been trying to stand up to try to be able to even see it, and so that would be very helpful.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I see a shaking of heads yes, and so, next, I have Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: We’re certainly willing to work with you guys on figuring some resolution to it, and I am not necessarily averse to including the for-hire sector for Louisiana and Texas, but the only thing that really is a stickler for us is it’s got to add up to 100 percent of the ACL or less. We can’t move this forward if it doesn’t, and we can get the technical folks, who put these numbers together, to answer any questions there might be about them.

You may be right, Robin, that there is different ways that states put it together that would give us some flexibility on it, but, to get this done, we’re going to need to work all of this out pretty quickly, because June will be upon us before you know it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Dr. Stunz and then Mr. Anson.

DR. STUNZ: These numbers are certainly useful, Roy, and, obviously, we need that. I guess sort of the question that I was asking before is, if everyone was to do the same and either have the charter captains in or out, what I was more interested in is what’s the difference or what -- If Texas and Louisiana did their thing, what is the -- When it all shakes out, how much more or less are certain states getting, and maybe I’m not even quite asking the right question, but it’s not the end numbers here, but it’s just how many fish are we talking about difference if Louisiana and Texas did their own thing? I’m not sure you have that handy, but I suspect it’s not a whole lot.

DR. CRABTREE: I can just do the quick math, and it looks like, with Texas, it’s on the order of 350,000. In Louisiana, it’s on the order of 80,000, and so you would have to take roughly 450,000 pounds out of the Florida/Alabama -- The 2,092,000. You would have to pull that out, because now that’s going to be caught in the western Gulf, and so you would be shifting somewhere close to that amount of fish from the east to the west.
DR. STUNZ: Maybe the lancha fleet is willing to give it back to us to share.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, look, I mean, at some point, we have got to come to grip with all of these allocation issues, and we’re just not going to be able to get regional management moving forward as a viable long-term management tool without dealing with the state-by-state allocations, and that means you do have to deal with, as Robin said, all the changes and shifts and things that have changed over time, and my hope is we will get that done, but I don’t see how we’re going to get that done before June 1 in the context of these EFPs.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I have Mr. Anson next.

MR. ANSON: It’s been stated, by a couple of folks here -- I mean, obviously, we’re kind of under the gun, so to speak, relative to the private recreational season this year, and we approached, in Alabama, the EFP in trying to keep in line with the spirit of the language that prompted this whole discussion, and that was that it was to be focused on the private recreational, because they seem to have the most pressing issue, in regard to access and opportunity for those anglers.

In terms of looking at the big picture and to see what possibilities we can have at a state level to include our federally-permitted charter vessels, which are not included in Alabama’s plan, we went to them and had a meeting with them, and we contacted them through email, and, in the short amount of time that we had, we kind of summarized the issue, the EFP, how the EFP would work, what our plans or proposals were, at least at the time, for identifying the number of pounds they would have and how that would translate to the number of days they would have.

Using the formula that we have come up with, based on abundance or a population estimate off of Alabama, and then applying the sector separation percentages, it happened to work out that the number of days they would get would be very similar to what they are getting in the federal season right now, because Snapper Check shows that there is more landings than what MRIP shows for Alabama.

We asked them to respond to a poll, if they wanted to be in or out, yes or no, a simple question, and we contacted I think it was 138 emails of 142 vessels that we determined to be fishing in Alabama, and that included those permittees that lived
outside of Alabama, but kept their boat in Alabama, and so we tried to get everybody included.

We did not reach the minimum number of yes votes, and it wasn’t a percentage. It was an actual number of vessels, because we thought, at the time, that maybe we could carve out a percentage of those permitted vessels and do something that Roy had talked about earlier, and that was just kind of having a smaller subset of the federally-permitted vessels work within an EFP, for the whole purpose of seeing if it could work, seeing if it could work for those vessels.

Really, at the end of the day, the only thing that we could offer, based on the numbers, the math, was that the potential for making up lost days. If we had bad weather or something, that potentially we could extend the season for those charter boat guys, but they decided that they were not interested, and so it kind of puts us in a dilemma for trying to go back to the table, if you will, and include those, because we received a pretty loud and clear message that they did not, at this time, want to participate.

Now, is it something that we could bring back to the table, if you will, and, in the meantime, for the next year, if we had kind of a transition period, and say, in year one, maybe we don’t include them, but, in year two, maybe we could, and that might be something that we’ll just have to take back to that group and get some feedback on.

The issue, besides there just being no difference in the number of days, the other issue that we heard was that there was some concern that they would not have the protections that they currently have, and so we tried to stress to them that, based on the EFP and based on NOAA basically approving the EFP and basically withdrawing an EFP if you go outside the bounds of the EFP, that they had those protections.

I am just wondering, Dr. Crabtree, is that how you perceive the EFP to work, that, let’s say we had the federally-permitted vessels in there, and, if Alabama didn’t do as we had said in the EFP and tried to move pounds around, or tried to do something that would penalize that group, you would basically withdraw the EFP for Alabama or somehow penalize us to make things right, at least in how the EFP was originally set up and approved?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that’s a complicated question, and it would depend on exactly what the terms of it all were. I mean, it is
complicated, because we have sector separation, and so, when we grant an EFP that includes the for-hire, are we then saying you have to adhere to sector separation and you can’t let one sector fish on the other sector’s quota? I don’t know if we’ve gotten to that point yet. I mean, that’s why it is a significant complication to pull the for-hire guys into this, and I don’t -- Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: I mean, I think this goes back to the question of what an EFP is, right? So, the agency is limited. They can exempt people fishing from certain federal regulations, but you can’t make an allocation decision, and you can’t change the way the sector separation structure is set up. That’s not -- I mean, it’s just not contemplated.

I mean, we could think about whether we could exempt people from the different quotas, but I think it does get more complicated, because that’s really then that you’re talking about a management decision, and I guess we would have to think more about how that would work, but we are constrained by the exemption piece of it.

With regard to the idea of taking back an EFP, and so it’s a permit that’s being issued, and so there is a mechanism to suspend or revoke it if you’re not complying with the terms and conditions, but just remember that that does require its own sort of enforcement action, and it’s not something that can just happen without any notice and process and things like that, because it’s a permit that the agency is giving out.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Robin, were you planning to keep sector separation in place? How are you going to manage your for-hire and private anglers? Were you going to keep sector separation in place and protect those quotas for each of the two sectors, components, that you would be managing in Texas and allow one group to fish their percentage and the other group to fish those percentages laid out in sector separation?

MR. RIECHERS: The way we were approach it was, de facto, they would fish the opportunity that they had during the season they had, and, assumingly, they would catch percentage shares equal to what they have in the past.

Now, obviously, I am dealing with a little bit of a different situation in my state, as we come into the next year, where there may be different groups impacted more by the hurricane
than others, and I don’t know how that’s going to play out exactly, Leann, as we go up the coast. I certainly know that there is locations that are more impacted than others, and some of those are both key private recreational locations as well as key charter boat for-hire locations.

Again, this is the first we’ve seen these numbers, where National Marine Fisheries Service has shared what they were basing the calculations on, and so it’s probably a lot different discussion than the discussion I’ve been having, with these numbers, but I think it still behooves us though, as a group, in some respects -- Kevin, we’re not trying to change what you guys set out to do. That’s not our goal at all.

I think Patrick and I are just trying to do what we thought was best, and, again, as we’re want to do, not given guidance of how to come up with those numbers, we all approached them a little bit differently, and so, as we can -- As we can maybe have some discussions here, Leann, I don’t think it’s going to change dramatically, and certainly we all have the avenue of the public comment period to help us understand what’s going to go on, if it does go to public comment and it’s a little different than what we’re seeing here.

We’re all going to have that avenue as well, and so I don’t think that’s a big hurdle, and I think we all recognize, if we’re going to do something that is subtly different, and I don’t think it’s going to be hugely different, but, if we’re going to do something that is subtly different, we’re going to have to do it pretty quickly, but I don’t think any of us should be forced to sit at the table and try to make that decision like that, since we just saw these numbers.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So your game plan is like you will have a season opening, let’s just say June 1 or whatever, and you’re going to -- That will be the season opening for your for-hire and your private anglers, and you’re going to monitor the landings. It will be open seven days a week for both components, and you are monitoring that, and you’re going to try and shut them down when they’ve hit their quotas.

MR. RIECHERS: That’s the way we were going to approach it originally, yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: You shut it down when the overall quota is reached. Both sectors get shut down. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Bear in mind, at the same time, there will be a
federal for-hire season this year, and it will start June 1 and run for fifty-some-odd days, and all federally-permitted charter boats in the Gulf will be allowed to fish in federal waters during that season.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So we’re going to blow the quota out of the water again, is what you’re saying?

DR. CRABTREE: No, the numbers that way will add up. Now, I don’t have any expectation that -- We should stay within the quota. The federal charter boat season will be based on their ACT, with the 20 percent buffer below the ACL, based on the allocation that we set up in Amendment 40.

Now, if states allow extra days for charter boats outside of that, that potentially comes out of their allocation under the EFP, if we do it this way, and it could come out of the private, when all is said and done, and I don’t know, but I don’t see how there is any way, with where we are, that we don’t have a federal charter boat season, and I don’t see any way that we, through an EFP, can tell charter boats they are not allowed to fish in it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have a list. I have John Sanchez. He is good. Okay. Dale. You’re good. Camp, I saw you flagging me.

MR. MATENS: Kind of side note here, but this is an interesting dynamic. This goes back to the root of why many people would like to see regional management. All of our guys, private recreational and charter/for-hire, prosecute this fishery in a little different way. I have a lot of confidence that Patrick and his staff can come up with a solution that will allow Louisiana to fish, the charter/for-hire, under Patrick’s department.

Just one small example of how this thing is prosecuted differently is there is some states that the charter/for-hire guys can run more than one trip a day, and that’s great, but our people can’t. Our distances are too great, and so, again, I think that this is -- Every problem is solvable, and I think this is a solvable problem, and I think we need to move forward in a prudent manner, and as rapidly as we can, to find a solution that the people at this table are comfortable with allowing the other states to do what they wish to do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I have John, and then we’ve got to talk about lunch.
MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I kind of like, having heard everything for a while, the suggestion to try -- If you’re trying to do this and get something moving forward by June, then take the charter, the federal for-hire, out of it and try it for the year. Then, oddly enough, once you remove their percentages from these equations, you are right around the 100 percent that you need to be at. It seems too clean, and it makes too much sense, to me.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think that’s kind of the line of thought that I was going along with too, kind of Dr. Crabtree’s suggestion that you give it a shot, and then -- Because I just think we have to have more time to flesh out all of this, and I think, if there is a question as to whether they are afforded those protections or they’re not, that’s going to have a lot to do with whether they want in it or not.

That seems to still be fuzzy, and so I just don’t see where we’re going to get it done in time for the normal opening of this season, but we’ve got to work on lunch, because we’re a little bit late on that right now. It’s 12:12.

This would be my suggestion. We’re supposed to go to lunch from 12:00 to 1:30. Let’s hold true to that schedule. We will come back here at 1:30. At 1:30, we are supposed to have the other EFP presentation on aquaculture, and so we need to go through that and get through that one.

Once we can get through that one, then we can circle back, and hopefully we’ll have some time left before public testimony, and we can circle back and continue this conversation. Does that sound like a plan? All right, and so lunch. I will see you back here at 1:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on January 31, 2018.)

---

January 31, 2018

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

---

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Hyatt Centric, New Orleans, Louisiana, Wednesday afternoon, January 31, 2018, and was called to order
by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are going to carve out a few minutes for Mr. Sam Rauch to come up and address us. We’re glad to have you, sir, and we look forward to hearing what you have to say.

UPDATE ON OPEN OCEAN RESTORATION PLANNING

MR. SAMUEL RAUCH: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for the opportunity to address the council. One of my duties, as the Deputy Director, is to oversee NOAA’s Natural Resources Damages Program, or at least the part of it that the Fisheries Service is engaged in, and I have been asked, in that capacity, to brief the council on the Open Ocean Restoration Planning that we’ve been doing in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

There is a significant amount of money that needs to be allocated to help restore the fish and invertebrate resources of the Gulf, and we are going to be rolling out some of those restoration plans in the next year, and I was going to take a few minutes here to brief the council on that.

As everyone here is deeply aware, the injuries to the ocean resources from Deepwater Horizon was vast. Trillions of individual fish larvae and invertebrates were killed, and it affected more than 1,400 fish species. As a result of that, the settlement allocated, amongst the many pots of money that were allocated, $380 million to restore fish and water column invertebrates in the open ocean, and that’s in addition to the $20 million early restoration project currently being implemented.

The Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group, and that, by the way, is a group which consists of the federal trustees to the process of NOAA, Interior, EPA, and Agriculture, and they have outlined ways to spend this money and to restore the lost resources in the open ocean. It is the only group that is focused solely on that aspect. There are numerous other groups that are looking at near-shore habitat, wetlands, other kinds of -- The states are all involved, and the states have their own individual pots of money, but this group focuses only on ocean resources.

The restoration goals from that group are to restore the injured fish and invertebrate species across a range of coastal and oceanic zones by reducing direct sources of mortality and increasing the health of fisheries by providing fishing communities with methodologies and incentives to reduce impacts
to fishery resources, and these are all voluntary, incentive-based programs.

We do not foresee a regulatory component to this. The fishermen were not the ones that caused the oil spill, and they do not need to bear the burden, but there are a lot of opportunities, working together with the fishermen, to achieve some significant mortality reductions and help increase the health of the fisheries that were affected.

Due to the large number of fish resources affected by the spill, we couldn’t do everything all at once, and so we’re currently trying to prioritize a smaller subset of fish resources that we can focus on in the next two to three years, and the first plan we were focusing on is reducing bycatch and bycatch mortality of these reef fish, highly migratory species, and coastal migratory pelagics.

They are dividing the restoration plan into two, and so the first one will be focused on birds and sturgeon. We expect that to be released in the early summer of 2018. The second one will be focused on fish, sea turtles, marine mammals, and mesophotic and deep benthic communities, and we believe that will be released by the end of the calendar year.

Now, prior to the release of those plans, NOAA does intend to engage in a stakeholder effort to gather information on initial project ideas being considered, and we also intend to come back to this council with a more specific list of the things we’re talking about, and so my goal today is just to alert you that this process is coming and to indicate that we will be coming back to talk to you more specifically about the various projects that we would propose to undertake under that.

We do think that there will be two draft restoration plans, as I mentioned, and also NEPA documents for public review, and all of that will be by the end of the year, and so that is the only goal that I wanted to do today, was just to give you a brief update that that’s coming and to look for that in the next year, and we will be looking for ways to engage the council directly. Thank you, and I would be happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for Sam? Well, we appreciate the update a lot, and we’ve actually been kind of delving into that a little more than we normally do in the last couple of council meetings.

I don’t think it fits into those categories that you were
talking about, but we’re going to write some letters, after this
meeting, to see if we can’t have some of that BP money spaghetti
chart that goes everywhere be aimed at the dead zone and
mitigating the dead zone and restoring that habitat, so that
hopefully we can have healthy fisheries there again. Thanks,
Sam. Just keep it in mind.

Now we’re going to pick back up with our agenda. We have one
more exempted fishing permit application that we need to go
through, and then, after that, we need to review the public
comments on all of our EFP applications, and so I’m assuming
that’s going to cover the six that we are going through today,
plus we had three during our Sustainable Fisheries Committee,
dealing with lionfish, and so is it Ms. Gerhart that is going to
go through our next exempted fishing permit application on
aquaculture? I will turn it over to you, ma’am.

AQUACULTURE EFP REQUEST

MS. GERHART: Thank you. This application is from Kampachi
Farms, and it’s a -- The purpose of this is to validate the
feasibility of a temporary, small-scale, demonstrate net pen to
raise almaco jack in the Gulf of Mexico. There is Sea Grant
funding for this project. The applicants would raise two
consecutive cohorts of almaco jack, and this would be for less
than a year, and the amount of almaco jack would be around
34,000 individuals.

They would conduct thorough environmental monitoring programs
and water quality analysis, per the EPA requirements, and their
intention is to do some outreach and address public concerns
about open ocean aquaculture.

If Bernie or Karen could put up the diagram that I sent to you
earlier, but the pen is a single pen, and it’s a twenty-five-
meter diameter pen, and it’s called a PolarCirkel-style net pen,
and it’s actually not going to be moored itself. It will
actually be tethered to a sailing vessel, which will be
anchored, and so the vessel will be the only mooring point.
There will not be a separate mooring point for the pen itself,
and so this is a diagram showing you what that pen looks like.
The net pen, vessel anchor, and the required buffer zone around
the area will encompass just under one-square mile.

The original location was to be thirty miles due west of Boca
Grande Inlet, in about thirty meters of water. There were some
concerns from the shrimping industry, and the applicants have
discussed with members of that industry other sites, and so the
red box towards the bottom is the original site, and the red box farther north was suggested by the shrimping industry as an alternative site, and so that’s in discussions with them right now.

The original siting was done through what we call our AquaMapper tool, and it’s a tool that looks at all the different uses for those areas, things like not just fishing activity, but also oil and gas exploration and navigation and things like that, to look at what are good sites for putting these aquaculture pens at.

Regardless of the site chosen, a baseline environmental survey, as required by the FMP, will be conducted and include a seafloor survey, hydrographic data, and another analyses. We aren’t the only agency that is involved in this permitting. They are also working with other agencies, including the Army Corps of Engineers, the EPA, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Coast Guard.

A NEPA analysis will be done on this as well as an Endangered Species Act analysis, EFH analysis, and any other regulatory analysis, in cooperation with these other agencies, and so an environmental assessment will be produced that will be out for public comment and will be published in the Federal Register for public comment.

The process, of course, we’ve gone through a couple of times at this meeting already. We will ask for the council’s recommendation at this meeting, and we will publish a notice in the Federal Register for a fifteen to forty-five-day comment period, to get public comment, and then make a decision on whether to approve the EFP, after all the comments have been taken and discussed with the applicant. Mr. Dennis Peters is here from the Kampachi Farms, and so, if you have any questions about the details of the application, I would like to direct you to him.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Sue. I just want to say that I do appreciate your office’s ability to engage with the shrimp industry and talk to them, along with the applicant, and try and figure out where this is going to be sited.

I mean, I will be honest that the shrimp industry’s preference is to have this somewhere outside of about 165 feet. Usually, if you can get it outside of sixty fathoms, we’re fine, but, in this particular area, you could even go shallower than that. We would like to have it outside of 165 feet. Then you won’t be in our shrimping grounds at all, because that is one of the clauses
in our FMP, is that you have to make sure that you’re not going
to have an impact on an existing fishery to develop a new
fishery.

Now, having said, that we are working with NMFS, and we’re
trying to work with the applicant to, if we can find something
shallower than 165 feet, which would make it more economical for
them, we will try and work with them. Our fear is, in doing so,
that we set a precedent, and then it seems like it’s okay for
any aquaculture project to be put in shrimp grounds, and so
we’ll get there. We’re working through it.

It’s the first one we’ve ever been through, and we’re going to
try not to be extremists about it, but I think it is very
important to work with industry, especially as that is one of
the goals of this project, is to get buy-in from the different
fisheries that aquaculture is not going to be the end of the
world for us here in the Gulf of Mexico.

I did wonder about the structure some, but I’m going to hold my
comments. It looks like we have some other questions, and so I
have Ms. Guyas and then Dr. Frazer.

**MS. GUYAS:** I don’t have questions so much as just a couple of
comments. If alternative sites like this are going to be
considered here, I would suggest that they probably need to
coordinate with FWC. We have some different datasets that are
in the AquaMapper, and so I think we can, hopefully, provide
some additional data there about what may or may not be at some
of these sites.

Because this is occurring off of Florida, there is going to be a
CZMA process here, and it probably would be good to include some
of the state agencies in Florida that are going to be involved
with this, FWC, DACS, and then DEP as well, in those preliminary
meetings. That would be awesome.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Frazer.

**DR. FRAZER:** Thank you, Madam Chair. My question, really, is I
noticed, at the beginning, that they have to do some survey
work, but are they required to do anything after their permitted
period, I guess, to assess if there are impacts on the
environment?

**MS. GERHART:** As Dr. Kilgour went through this morning, there
are certain reporting requirements and testing requirements that
were put into the FMP for any aquaculture program, and we would
intend for them to carry those out.

A lot of this, as we’ve talked about with the earlier EFPs, we can put conditions on the EFPs when we give them to the applicants, and we would require some of that kind of reporting that is part of the FMP as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sue, along those lines, when I read the application, I saw where you’re going to have that baseline environmental assessment done, but then, when I was reading through the application itself, and it was talking about the different testing that’s going to be done during the duration of the project, it seemed like most of that testing focused on the water column and seeing what’s ending up in the water column, from the standpoint of the feed that they’re using, and it doesn’t get eaten and it’s dispersed and then, when the fish is done with the feed, and they’re all in one pen and one area, and where that gets dispersed.

I was wondering, are we going to be doing -- I want to see a lot of testing on the bottom, because we are going to have a lot of fish in a small area, and this is pretty shallow water, and so, yes, some of it is going to be in the water column, but I think, in this particular project, you’re going to have more that ends up concentrated in a smaller area on the bottom than you may have in other aquaculture projects, where the depth of water is much deeper, and so it’s going to get dispersed in a wider swath before it hits the bottom, whereas, in ours, it’s pretty shallow, and I think that’s about ninety feet of water, I think is what that is, and the net pen is twenty-five meters in diameter, and so twenty-five times three is seventy-five feet, and so fifteen-foot from where the bottom of where the fish are to the bottom of the ocean right there, or the Gulf right there, and so I want to see a lot of testing there, because that’s where we make our living, is off the bottom, and, if we end up doing some things to the bottom that prevent shrimp from coming back in that area or whatever, that’s going to have an effect, and so I would like to see a lot of testing there.

DR. CRABTREE: We can talk to the applicant about that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Anson and then Mr. Diaz.

MR. ANSON: Sue, the representative is here as well, and maybe they can answer, but there is a reference to the net pen design that they proposed to use that is being used in Japan, and so I looked on Google Earth and kind of looked at some of the coastline images, at least, of that bay in Japan, and I noticed
there were quite a few, but I also noticed that, the body of water that that bay is, it’s relatively small. It’s only about eleven miles across and about twenty-five or thirty miles in depth, or height.

Although it is deep, 700 or 800 feet of water, in that particular bay, in the deepest part, the conditions might be a little different in the open Gulf of Mexico, as far as wave action and such, than it is in that bay, and I’m just wondering if that design is the same design that’s utilized out there, or have there been any modifications made to the design to kind of capture or mitigate for some of the wind and wave conditions that could be experienced in the Gulf of Mexico during the project period?

**MS. GERHART:** If I could get Mr. Peters to come up and answer that question, but just to point out that part of the point of this pilot program is to test the design in the Gulf of Mexico.

**MR. DENNIS PETERS:** Good afternoon. My name is Dennis Peters, and I’m with Gulf South Research Corporation. Also, on the line today, if we have other questions, we also have Neil Sims, who is the principal investigator, and also Lisa Vollbrecht, and so, if we have other questions, I might defer some of those answers to them as well.

As Susan said, as a research and short-term pilot study, we’re going to be working very closely with EPA to design the final concept and requirements for environmental monitoring, and, yes, it will include benthic analyses as well as water column. I realize the EFP currently, in its state, really only addressed the water column part, and so that’s a very good question, and we will be working very closely with Kip Tyler and some of his folks.

The other point I wanted to bring out is, because this is a very short-term experimental project, we have chosen a single mooring system, which is basically a ship’s anchor, and so, even though we’re in shallow water, the ability for this net pen to basically swing in a clockwise pattern, based on currents and wind, is going to eliminate the potential for a long-term concentration of any type of feed or fecal waste in one particular area.

The single-point mooring, I might also add, also provides a benefit for user-group avoidance, because we feel like it’s not a huge infrastructure on the bottom, such that other trawling vessels or navigational vessels can easily move very closely to
it or around it, and, therefore, not really restricting access
to traditional shrimping grounds or fishing grounds. I think I
answered more than what was asked, but --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dale, go ahead, and then I’ve got a question.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Mr. Peters,
for coming to answer questions. Part of my question, you may
have answered just a minute ago, but this is the first EFP for
one in the Gulf of Mexico, and the rules, if I’m not mistaken,
say that the area that you lease has to be at least twice the
size of the size of your equipment, but you’ve got one-square-
mile here, and how did you all determine that you needed one-
square-mile, because boats are not going to be able to even come
through the area that you say is under your control, and you’re
going to have to buoy it off at the corners, and boats can’t
even pass through there, and so, while I’m interested in having
sufficient buffers, I want to make sure, when we think about
buffers, that we think about the right-sized buffers, and so can
you speak to that any?

MR. PETERS: I can. I will first caveat that the organization
is not really advocating any restricted area at all. In fact,
we have asked for that exemption in the EFP from that rule in
the FMP, but, having said that, we will abide by the restricted
access areas that are imposed upon us. The one that we have
that came up with the one-square-mile is basically 500 feet
around the direct project area, and that’s what gave us one-
square-mile, particularly in a circle area.

That’s just the typical 500-foot buffer that the Section 10 Army
Corps of Engineers is likely to impose. We don’t know that they
will or have yet. We have submitted an application for Section
10 as well, as Susan said, and we’ve also submitted the
application for the NPDES permit, and so we’re willing to abide
by whatever restrictions come out, or requirements come out, of
those permitting actions, but, the one-square-mile, that’s how
we got to that size, currently.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have a question about this mooring system.
All right. I call it anchoring, and so you’ll have to bear with
me. The boat is anchored, and the net pen is tied off to the
boat, and the net pen is allowed to kind of float. It’s tied
off, but float freely behind the boat, and so what happens when
you have a hurricane and the boat has got to go to the dock?

MR. PETERS: We address that, minimally, in the EFP, but,
obviously, we have to have a more robust contingency plan, but,
currently, under nominal storm events, or even Category 1, the net pen would be tied to the mooring and submerged. It is a submergible cage system, and so we suggest to submerge it down at least -- I think ten meters is what we’re recommending at this point.

Now, Category 3, 4, and 5, all bets are off, and we’ll probably be relocating the pen and the whole array system from the water area, but, currently, the submersible pen is kind of the practical ideal for allowing the culture to continue, while taking the vessel into safety.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I don’t think you’re going to have ten meters though, if my math is right. If you’ve got a twenty-five-meter diameter pen, and you’re in thirty meters of water, you can’t sink it ten meters.

MR. PETERS: It’s thirty meters, and so we’re in ninety feet of water, and the net pen is fourteen meters, at the maximum, in depth, and, the more we work with the Southern Shrimp Alliance and other user groups, if we are recommended to go to the shallower waters, then we’ll be probably utilizing and considering a smaller net pen system.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So what is the diameter of the net pen that you’re planning to use?

MR. PETERS: No larger than twenty-five meters is what we have in the EFP, but the depth is fourteen meters, and, again, that’s the maximum. At that point, we were looking at a thirty to forty-five-meter water depth, and, like I said, as we work with other user groups, and you’re making recommendations for shallower positioning, then we would go with a smaller system.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: You said, in a Category 2, 3, 4, or 5 hurricane, that you would relocate the boat elsewhere, and explain that to me. I mean, are you going to try to tow this back to the harbor, or are you going to pull it up and harvest the fish at that point?

MR. PETERS: We are still in conversation with both the Army Corps of Engineers and the Coast Guard for what is the most appropriate contingency plan for a major storm event, and so, again, we have not worked out all those details, to date, but we definitely know that we will have worked through them before the approval of the EFP, or even the signature of the NEPA
MR. GREENE: Okay, and so I have a boat, and we have what is called a named storm deductible that is applied to the vessel. If there is a named storm, the deductible of the insurance goes up quite high at that point, and so we have to have a plan in place that, if we have a hurricane coming, what are we going to do, and this has to be laid out. Every year that my insurance is renewed, I am going to take the boat to this marina, and it’s going to be hauled out of the water, and it’s going to be secured, and I have to know that ahead of time.

You’re going to anchor this up with a tender vessel, and tell me about the tender vessel. Is this a sailboat, or is this a crew boat or a supply boat? What type of vessel are we talking about?

MR. PETERS: We initially identified a -- It is a sailboat that was used before in Hawaii, for the previous two pilot projects, but we had to identify at least one that we had a commitment from, and it’s our full intention to hire something locally, either out of Port Charlotte or now up near the Sarasota area, and get more of a commercial tender vessel. We’re looking anywhere between a forty-five to sixty-foot range that would be able to house the technicians, the people, and also serve as an interim feed barge.

MR. GREENE: Owning a sixty-plus-foot boat myself, I can tell you that I certainly have no desire to stay out in a Category 1 hurricane. There are vessels in the Gulf that can do that.

MR. PETERS: I didn’t suggest that the boat would stay out in the hurricane. We would tie the net pen off to the mooring, and the PolarCirkel net pen is submersible, and so it would be submerged, and the boat would leave the premises.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: When you tie your anchor off to this net pen, what kind of -- Tell me how that’s going to work. I mean, surely, it’s not going to be -- I am looking at this round circle on here, and I don’t see any kind of structure built in, on this picture, which is very basic, to handle that anchor in a storm situation. I don’t see where you’ve got some heavy-duty, reinforced areas that you’re going to have a bridle come off that anchor and hopefully come to several different pull points on that pen, and can you tell me a little bit about how you really plan to attach that anchor line to that pen?

MR. PETERS: Sure. This is where I might invite Neil Anthony
Sims to give his experience from Hawaii, but they have engineered the entire tethering and mooring system, and this is a very simplistic picture, just to give kind of a conceptual idea of what it would look like, but this is in no way the engineering design for the actual system that would be employed.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I guess that’s probably going to be pretty important to us, since you’re the first to do it in our Gulf waters, and it’s real shallow, which is kind of out of the norm, and so there is a few things that -- You know, I tried to watch a few videos on this, about net pens like this that they sink in storm situations, to take a little bit of the storm pressure off of the net pen, but it seems like you have to sink it to a fairly substantial depth in order to really relieve some of those storm pressures from that pen, and we’re not going to have that depth that we need in this particular situation.

I mean, getting it twenty or twenty-five feet below the surface is really not going to relieve all that much pressure, but I am going to go back to Vice Chairman Greene, but I have one more question. What speed do you tow this thing at when you tow it out there?

MR. PETERS: I think it’s very slow, and is Neil on the line? Can he address some of these? I thought he was going to be participating, but I don’t have that answer for you. I don’t know what speed it’s towed, but it’s extremely slow. I think it’s probably like five-knots or less, on its way out.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I guess what I’m starting to envision, in my mind, is you’re probably going to have to have some sort of plan, right, and so, if you’re towing at speeds that are that slow, and you’re towing something to boot, you can’t wait until it’s blowing like you know what to start towing and get out of there.

It’s going to take you a while to get back to shore, and so, unfortunately, in the Gulf, we don’t have a whole lot of that warning. Once it gets to where it’s about to be in the Gulf, it’s going to be blowing, because it doesn’t matter if the storm looks like it’s headed towards Louisiana, but it’s going to be blowing where you’re at, and so I think those are things that we really are going to have to think about and have it written out and understand what the game plan is before we get in that situation, because it’s going to happen. It’s not a question of if it happens, but it’s just a question of when it’s going to happen in the Gulf of Mexico, but, Mr. Greene, I am going to go back to you.
MR. GREENE: Okay, and so I apologize for earlier, and I will read directly from the text. During nominal storm events, such as storms less than a Category 1 level or other similar tropical storms, the tender vessel would remain on the location and the pen would be submerged approximately ten meters below the surface until the storm or high wind and wave height conditions diminish.

During storm events greater than a Category 1, the net pen would remain submerged, and the tender vessel would, at the captain’s discretion, either stand-off of its own anchor or return to an identified safe harbor. Once the storm has passed, then, obviously, the vessel will return.

Dealing with the northern Gulf of Mexico and the currents that are out there and understanding and seeing some of the large oil field boats that are off the Louisiana coast and Alabama coast that we fish a lot, a net that size, I don’t think it’s going to be towed any faster than a shrimp net, but most shrimp boats that work in the Gulf are fairly large vessels, seventy or eighty or ninety or a hundred feet, or better, at that, and so the concern I have is that, while you -- You’re going to have to have some responsibility for somewhere, but you always have this clause in any type of an insurance agreement that you have these acts of God, such as lightning strikes or hurricanes, et cetera.

How am I going to feel comfortable that you are going to leave this thing out there submerged ten meters, and knowing that we had wave heights approaching that during some of the recent hurricanes that we’ve had in the central Gulf of Mexico, that this is going to be safe and it’s going to be returned as you left it, so to speak?

What I am concerned about is that, with this type of a situation and the anchoring system that you have, is that it gets dragged offsite and then you don’t really -- You may not know where it’s at, at that point, and so is there any type of a tracking system that is going to be permanently affixed to the net that is going to have some way to ping back, some way, some new technology that I am not aware of, that’s going to be there?

MR. PETERS: We did not go into great detail, but I believe we mentioned that in the EFP, that there is also going to be some live video as well as a GPS tracking device, so that we can monitor it not only from the tender vessel, but from a shore-based location.
To your earlier concerns, and I appreciate all the comments, but, in our early discussions with the Army Corps of Engineers, we realized that this contingency plan has to be developed and matured, and we only scratched the surface in providing the information for the EFP.

The EFP, as you can tell from earlier testimony today, did not really lend itself to an aquaculture situation in describing, and so I took a lot of liberty in responding to the EFP, and I tried to provide as much detail and robust information as I could, while still answering the different line item requests for the EFP application. Therefore, that’s why I believe these other permitting actions, as well as contingency plans and nutrient plans and other emergency plans that we’ll be developing in concert with the Corps of Engineers and EPA, will resolve and answer a lot of these questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Kevin.

MR. ANSON: Thank you. You describe a little bit of the number of fish and the production cycles, if you will, during each year, and I’m just curious. For almaco jack, is six months -- Is that what you anticipate your culture period would be, or are these fish going to get bigger and then there would be some additional impacts to the larger fish, due to extra feeding and such, and so does that kind of fit into the business plan, as far as having that sized fish in there for six months and then harvesting?

MR. PETERS: Yes, and the ideal size that they have tested in Hawaii and other locations is about a two-kilo fish, and so four-and-a-half pounds, at the most, and so we’re, obviously, depending on when we can get started and water temperatures and everything with growth. Therefore, whether five to six months is sufficient, but the net harvest target is still going to be two-kilos.

To your earlier questions, we’re running two back-to-back cohorts, where we are getting the fry, or the fingerlings, from either the University of Miami, where we have a partnership with Dan Benetti, or Mote Marine Lab, in recent conversations with Kevin Main. We will be getting our stock from there, and the stock is from the Gulf of Mexico.

They will be brought out and pumped into the net pen, once it’s in place, and that is the grow-out cycle, once the fingerlings are onsite, is that five to six-month period. Again, with water temperatures, if we don’t get started until November, which I
think was my last schedule in the EFP, it might be closer to
seven months, but, ideally, through the requirements of the
National Sea Grant Program and the funding that we have, we
tried to select and develop a pilot project that would fit
within that -- It’s a three-year program, but the grow-out part
is only a year-and-a-half, at the most, before we have to
logically bring it to conclusion and also perform the marketing
trials on the sale of the fish.

MR. ANSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Can you tell me about the anchor itself?

MR. PETERS: I wish I could, but I cannot. I should have been --
I thought that my counterpart was going to be online today to
explain it, because he has used this single-point mooring system
several times in Hawaii, and he’s more familiar with that.
Other than a large anchor, and that’s what I conceive it to be.
Beyond that, I would be guessing at telling you what the style
of the anchor is and the weight of the anchor and the amount of
scope on chain and the whole shackling and engineering part of
it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Did you ever go through a storm in Hawaii
with this system, a named storm?

MR. PETERS: I am from Florida, and so I know about Florida
hurricanes. I’ve been here for almost thirty years, and I am
helping the project with the permitting applications. I am a
marine biologist and an aquaculturist. I have worked with a lot
of different species, in closing their life cycles, in Hawaii
and south Florida and the Bahamas.

Neil Sims, the principal investigator, is the person that
actually performed the two pilot projects that are described in
the EFP permit in Hawaii, and that’s why, again, I was hoping
that he might be able to address some of those specifics that he
actually experienced himself.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am sorry that I am harping on you,
especially about the physicality of it, but, what I saw of the
project in Hawaii, if there was a storm or something like that,
you sink the structure, and that’s fine, because that project
was done in I don’t know how many thousands of feet of water,
right?

MR. PETERS: Right.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We’re not dealing with that here. We’re dealing with ninety feet of water, and so, if I have concerns about the structural integrity of that pen and those domesticated fish getting into the Gulf of Mexico, and hopefully it wouldn’t be a big deal, but I need to understand more about the physicality, because this one is going to have to endure more of those storm-force conditions than it did in the project in Hawaii. You can’t sink it and get away from it. We’re going to have to know that it can stand up to it.

MR. PETERS: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: At some point or another. Okay, and so let me change gears. I was excited that you said that you got your -- I think it’s called brood stock, but from the Gulf, right, and so it’s wild fish from the Gulf of Mexico.

MR. PETERS: Right.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That’s excellent news, and I’m glad to hear that. I don’t want any other fish over here, in case they get out, and it is our native species. What kind of analytics are you running on that brood stock? Are you doing any genetic testing, so we have like a baseline, so that, if we have an issue in the future, we’ll have a genetic baseline for that stock of fish that we can then go back and resample the wild stock and see if we see any changes, genetically?

MR. PETERS: I’m sure that you will, yes, and I say I’m sure because I have had limited conversations with Dan Benetti from the University of Miami, and I have not spoken to Kevin, but I know that they adhere to strict protocols with breeding programs and also with the guidelines that are in the FMP for brood stock and genetic integrity, and so, yes, I think all of that will be made available to you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, we definitely want some genetic testing of the original brood stock, because this particular species of fish, we really don’t have a lot of information on it. It’s one of our data-poor species, and so, if there is a problem, unless we have some baselines to look at, it’s going to be hard for us to assess how bad is the problem, where we’re at, and where we need to do, and so, the more baseline testing you can do on that brood stock, we would really appreciate that.

Then, as you’re breeding these fish, are you essentially picking out the ones that are the more prolific breeders, and I’m not sure what the scientific term is for what I’m trying to say
here, but are you picking those and then trying to streamline that into what your stock becomes?

MR. PETERS: I cannot answer that question. That would be a comment for the University of Miami and Mote Marine Lab. I’ve just got a request. You had another call-in earlier today with one of the other EFPs, and our cohort is trying to call in and cannot.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We’re making that arrangement now. We just have to promote him to organizer so that he can speak.

MR. PETERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BERNADINE ROY: He needs to enter an audio pin in order to be able to speak into the room.

MR. PETERS: He has been buzzing me relentlessly to allow him to share some comment with you, because I know that he has a lot of firsthand experience that would help you with a lot of your questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We will let him get on the line and maybe answer one of my ten-million questions that I’ve had. Then I will go to Mr. Swindell and let Mr. Swindell give some feedback. Mr. Swindell, go ahead, while we’re waiting.

MR. SWINDELL: Why are we reviewing this now? Evidently, there is not enough final planning for us to get this done, and so what is the purpose that we’re even looking this now?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: NMFS?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, this is before us, and, as we talked about earlier, our intent is, when we get back and we feel like we’ve worked from the particulars of the design from the applicant, we would put a notice out in the Federal Register and take public comment on it, and then we’ll make a decision on it, and the process is we bring these projects in front of the council to hear your comments and concerns.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: One of the problems that I am having is that there is a lot of engineering, and there’s a lot of questions, like feeding and so forth, that’s got to take place for us to understand whether or not this thing is really -- The anchoring and whether it’s going to be a solid anchor or -- There’s a lot
of things that have to be understood, and we could spend two
days here talking about a system that we don’t have all this
engineering already done and the brood stock and the netting and
what’s going to happen in a hurricane and is he going to have to
hire boats to haul this thing somewhere else and can you do it
fast enough, and there’s a whole bunch of ifs, ands, and buts
that we don’t know, and I would hope that the department would
have answers to all of that before it comes to us to really try
to make any kind of reasonable decision. That’s why I am asking
what decision are we being asked to make at this point.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if you guys want to voice concerns or
express support or whatever on this, you are free to do that. I
mean, Ed, I could go through this and satisfy all of my
questions, and then I could very likely bring this before the
council, and you would come up with a whole set of new
questions, and so that’s the process of where we are and trying
to understand what the council wants us to look at about it.

MR. PETERS: Madam Chair, I believe that Mr. Sims is available,
if you would like to have him provide some greater detail to
some of these questions we have.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir, Mr. Sims. Feel free.

MR. NEIL ANTHONY SIMS: Thank you very much. We do appreciate
the questions, and we do appreciate the consideration from the
council in moving this project forward. It’s been a long time
coming.

I would like to just assure the council that, to the question of
sea states and managing the array during inclement weather, we
are working very closely with the National Ocean Service, with
folks out of Beaufort, North Carolina, and they’re the ones that
have the AquaMapper, and they have historical records from NOAA
buoys in the area, and we have shared that information with --
There are two companies that we are discussing the net pen
array, two engineering companies, and one is Rayleigh, and they
have extensive experience deploying their single-point mooring
pins in the Mediterranean.

There, they are designed up to nine-meter significant wave
height, and they have the wave data from the nearest NOAA buoy
there, and they are, at the moment, engineering the anchor and
the mooring array to the tender vessel and then the cage system,
to ensure that it’s able to cope with those conditions.

The other company that we are working with is a Chilean company
that they have had a similar pin array that has been deployed offshore in Chile, in an ocean that exposed to the full brunt of the Pacific Ocean there, and that was in a grid array, and so we’re talking to them to make sure that their engineers understand the challenges if we are converting that to a single-point mooring.

The engineering is something that we will detail. We will go through it in great detail with the Army Corps of Engineers and also it will be available in the draft environmental assessment that we will present to the Army Corps and NMFS.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: But I don’t guess you have those ready to email to us?

MR. SIMS: No, there is going to -- First of all, we have to identify the site, confirm the site, and the depth, and then that will be the challenge for the engineers, to go and make sure that the array that they are -- At the moment, they are working through hypothetical versions of this array, but, once we have confirmed the site, then they will go and firm that up, and so it will be presented in the draft environmental assessment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir, and did you hear our questions about the assays of your brood stock, the genetic testing?

MR. SIMS: Yes, I did, and I am happy to address that. These fish came from -- The brood stock that are currently held by Mote came from this very area, somewhere offshore off of Sarasota, and so they are local brood stock, and that is what is required under the fishery management plan.

We will, over the long run, we will be looking at genetic markers for these fish, but we won’t be going any further than second generation, and there won’t be any active selective breeding until we have -- Until we’re able to come back to NOAA and confidently and comfortably assure them of minimal risk of escapement.

Then there is a calculation, and NOAA has a model where they look at the escapement risk and the potential impacts of the escapes and how far you can go forward, in terms of a selective breeding program, but that’s going to be happening over ten to twenty years’ time. This is not something that -- At this initial, experimental pen, they will all be first generation from the wild fish, and there is going to be no active selective
breeding on these fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and I’m glad that you’re not going to do active selective breeding, but are you going to do genetic testing on those wild fish that you caught to put in your tank to breed? I ask that because we have very limited, if any, data on this species, and so we really need you to do the genetic testing on those wild-caught fish, so that we have a baseline in the future.

MR. SIMS: We have a genetic testing program that we are conducting here on the Hawaii fish at the moment, and we will probably be extending that to Mote, to work with the folks at Mote, so that we could be getting the baseline genetic information on the wild stock, if that was the point of your question.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir, that’s it.

MR. SIMS: Yes, we will be getting fin clips from those fish, and we will be -- We want to ensure that there is abundant genetic diversity in the brood stock that we have going forward, and we will be able to use that as a benchmark for measuring the genetic drift, or the genetic difference, between the subsequent generations and what was originally there in the wild.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That’s perfect. Yes, genetic fin-clippings on the original, wild-caught brood stock and then on the progeny, and that’s what we need, for sure, and that would be excellent. Thank you, sir. Let me turn to the rest of the people around this table and see if they have any other questions. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you. My question is related to what you’re going to feed them. In each of these cohorts, you have 17,000 fish that are ultimately going to be two to two-and-a-half kilograms, and that’s a lot of food, and so I’m trying to figure out -- Potentially, you’re going to have an order of magnitude more food than that, and so several hundred thousand kilograms of feed, and there is going to be some efficiency in that feeding, and so a lot of that food is going to make it to the bottom, either as food directly or waste materials, and I’m just wondering if you have done anything to calculate what the expected kind of delivery of that material is to the bottom and how that might either impact the bottom ecology and/or how you’re going to deal with it.

MR. SIMS: Certainly, and there are several questions there, and
let me unpack that. First of all, the type of feed that we’ll be using will be a formulated yellowtail diet from either Skretting or EWOS or Cargill or one of the other established feed mills in the U.S.

This is formulated to be almost the same as the diet that we had been feeding to the Kampachi, when we operated the commercial Kampachi farm here in Hawaii, that continues to operate to this day. There was extensive water quality monitoring around those pens, and these were -- We had up to eight net pens stocked with up to 70,000 fingerlings per pen in a grid array, and so it wasn’t moving. It was not a single-point mooring, and there was no detectable impact on the water quality.

You essentially couldn’t tell the difference in water quality from up-current of the net pen to down-current of the net pen, the reason being that there is -- There is feed that is formulated to be highly efficiently digested, and that’s what we want. We want these fish to convert the feed very, very efficiently, and there is also a phenomenal amount of water. Part of the beauty of moving out into deeper water, further offshore, is that there is a lot of water that moves through these net pens.

This can be modeled, and the NOS folks from Beaufort have done similar work in modeling this for the California yellowtail, a very similar species, working with Jack Rensel’s group out of Washington State, and they can model the impacts on water quality and on the substrate, and so we will be using that in our initial environmental assessment.

We will project the extrapolation from the model that they used for California and that they’ve also developed here for Hawaii and what that would mean for the amount of fish that we have here in Florida, but we will also be monitoring that.

This is a very small demonstration project, and the point here is to be able to show the local community and the fishing community, such as yourselves and other policy makers, and the legislators. We want to be able to take people out onto this array and show them that this is fish in a pen. This is what offshore aquaculture is all about, putting fish in a pen in deep water with good circulation, and, if you do it right, the closest analogy is like running cattle on the open range.

It is a very limited impact on the ecosystem, if any measurable impact on the ecosystem at all. As a demonstration project, we’re not going to be able to fully show what the impact of a
commercial array would be, and we would like the council to fully understand that our intention here is to eventually, with your consent and with the consent from the community that we will be working, to move forward with a commercial plan, but we will have also extensive monitoring around whatever commercial array goes out there, because we want to be able to demonstrate that there is minimal impact from these sorts of operations, so long as they are sited correctly and operated correctly.

The other point about fish feed falling to the substrate, please understand that we spend a lot of money on feed. This stuff costs around two-dollars a kilo, by the time you get it out onto the net pen, and every kilo that goes through the net pen and outside, onto the bottom, is just dollar bills washing away, and so, in the past, for the Velella project, we had divers in the water that were monitoring the feeding, and, as soon as you could see pellets starting to get towards the bottom of the cage, they would send a float to the surface.

When we move to a commercial operation, you have cameras, or other means, for detecting the feeding pattern of the fish, and you want to ensure that you cut off the feed, start to slow down the feed and then eventually cut off the feed, as the fish start to achieve satiation. We don’t make money on any of the feed that we throw away.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: On the subject of feed, are you going to put any antibiotics in that feed, if you see issues with your fish?

MR. SIMS: We have no plans to, and part of the beauty of working in open ocean is that you see very little in terms of bacterial issues with fish. However, if our fish ever did have a bacterial issue and there was an approved antibiotic that was available, then we would use that under veterinary direction, and that is the humane thing to do. You don’t want to sit there and see your fish suffer.

There are only, I believe, only two antibiotics that are approved for use in aquaculture in the U.S., and we would have to get consent from NOAA and from EPA. There would be monitoring around the pen while we were doing those treatments, and this would be highly unusual if we had to do it.

There are other fish health issues that might become an issue, and there is an ectoparasite on the Seriola that is about the size of flea, but, if they become -- If they proliferate and they become abundant on the fish -- They are present on the fish in the wild, but the levels are generally one skin fluke per
wild fish, is what we’ve found here in Hawaii. What we have found with the Velella project, when we moved to a single-point mooring, is that the skin flukes are not problematic at all, that that resolves that issue.

If, however, we find, in Florida, that the fish are suffering, and we are concerned for the welfare of our fish, then there are approved -- There is a single approved treatment available that is a chemical that breaks down to water and oxygen in sunlight, and so it’s just a very short-term treatment, and, again, that would only be with NMFS approval, EPA approval, and there would be extensive monitoring of any effluent water that came from that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I have some concerns about antibiotics in the wild environment.

MR. SIMS: We share those concerns. We absolutely do share those concerns as well, that it is something that, in the long-term, we would want to be operating any operation without reliance on antibiotics, and this has been -- My cofounder in Kampachi Farms had worked in the Chilean salmon industry, which has an unfortunate history of heavy use of antibiotics, and Michael had established a farm down in the 11th and 12th Regions of Chile, in very remote regions, and the farm that he has established down there, to this day, is still the one single farm in Chile that has not used antibiotics on their site, and that is because he located them in the correct sites, and it was very careful management of those fish. It’s just good husbandry is the primary preventative measure.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any other questions from the council? Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Thanks for being here, for both of you. Now, there has been a lot of email, and I know you guys have been working on this for a long time, because I’ve got some emails between you all and I guess some people with EPA back in April of 2017, and Sea Grant applied and got a little bit over $100,000 for funding for this, and was that just to provide the source, the brood stock, or the fingerlings that you’re going to use?

MR. SIMS: No, some of that funding is for collecting the information and preparing the EFP. Then that project also has funds for the fingerling production, either out of Miami or out of Mote, and for the deployment of the demonstration net pen, because the demonstration net pen, in and of itself, won’t make
money, but we believe that it is important to be able to put a demonstration pen out there to show the local fishing communities and the other folks there that this can actually have benefits to the community, and so that’s the primary reason behind this, is for public education.

We saw here, in Hawaii, when we had the Velella beta test and the Velella gamma test, the first two versions of this project here, that the array out offshore acted like a phenomenal FAD, fishing aggregating device, and the local fishing community here went from being generally skeptical about the idea of offshore aquaculture, because they didn’t understand it and they hadn’t seen it, to being emphatic, rowdy supporters of our operation, to the point that when we had to remove the pen from the Velella gamma, because it was the end of the project and our permit was only for a single cohort, I had fishermen coming up to me in the harbor and saying, please, please, don’t take that net pen out of the water and that’s the best fishing I’ve seen in my life.

We want to, through this project, we want to be able to show the local fishing communities, and also the tour communities. Here in Hawaii, we have dive tour operators bringing snorkelers out onto the offshore array, and we would like to be able to show that there are multiple benefits to the broader community from an offshore aquaculture industry, and so, this initial net pen, the Sea Grant project will fund for most of the costs for the demonstration array. There are also matching costs that we and our collaborators will provide, but then the long-term goal here is for us to be able to move towards a commercial operation.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Right, and this looks like a proposal, and you said you’re going to make some income, by selling fish directly to distributors and to people that you take out, or you will have tours of the place, with people being able to snorkel inside or outside the net and being able to fish inside the net, and so I see that.

In this proposal, there is a lot of claims of the lack of the need to get any permits, because of where this is going to be located, but it sounds like that has changed as the different agencies have taken a look at this and have been asking, I guess, similar questions that we’ve been asking. Do you have to go through a permitting process with the Corps of Engineers, I presume?

MR. SIMS: Yes, and the initial proposal, because we were initially looking to find a way where this could be done fairly expediently, and the initial proposal was that we weren’t going
to have this permanently moored in one spot, but it would be
itinerant, as it were, and that’s what we had with the Velella
beta test here, the first unanchored Velella project that we had
here in Hawaii.

We only needed to have a permit from NOAA and from the Coast
Guard, because it didn’t have any anchor and it was less than
100,000 pounds of fish, and we -- Initially, the proposal that
we had for Sea Grant was that we would do the same thing here in
Florida.

After discussions with the Army Corps and EPA, and they both
said, look, we would still like to go through the permitting
process with you, and we don’t want to have to argue the fine
print about how often you’re going to move the anchor and
whether it’s itinerant or whether it’s a fixed mooring, and we
would like to go through this and give it the full scrub. We
said, fine, let’s do that. We want to be able to work with both
the agencies, the local fishing associations, fishing industry
representatives, and the local communities, because we think, in
the long run, this will be something that everybody will have
good cause to support.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for being on the line, Mr. Neil. I
think we do have a lot of questions, and it sounds like you’re
sort of in the early phases of this, and I know that there’s at
least a few around this table that, once you finish getting your
engineered drawings, we would love to see them, and no offense
to Chilean engineers or Israeli engineers, but I think that we
would like to see them around this table.

We do have at least one engineer, by trade, on the council, and
I would like the fishermen to see them, how you’re going to moor
it, what the structure is going to look like, because I
guarantee you that the fishermen may not have an engineering
degree, but they can look at in about five seconds flat and tell
you if that’s going to hold or not, and it’s their Gulf waters
too, and so I hope that you will bring us back some more
information, so that we can take a deeper look at this and
hopefully proceed in the future, maybe.

MR. SIMS: Thank you very much, and, yes, I would hope that, at
some future council meeting, that Lisa and I would both be able
to be there, to be able to answer your questions in person,
rather than through the phone, but I do want to compliment you
on your audio system here. This has got to be the best webinar
connection that I have ever experienced for a meeting of this size.

We would also, as we’re going through the EA process here, it’s under the NEPA rules, but who cares about the NEPA rules? What we want to do is get community buy-in, and so we will be reaching back out to fishermen’s associations and sharing with them what we are proposing to do, the engineered drawings, as they come to hand, as we have them, and we’re happy to have people poke holes in them, and absolutely.

This sort of engagement is the ultimate intention of this project. We don’t want this to happen in a vacuum. We want this to happen in the full light of day and with full buy-in, or perhaps, if not full buy-in, at least passive acceptance from all of the user groups that we have to work with over time, and so thank you very much, council and Madam Chair. We do appreciate the opportunity very much, and we look forward to meeting you sometime in the future.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sounds like a plan, sir. We look forward to it, and thank you. Next on our agenda, I think we’re going to go through some public comments, that may span all of our EFPs that we’ve looked at thus far this week, and so I will turn it over to Dr. Simmons to lead us through that discussion.

REVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENT ON EFP APPLICATIONS

DR. CARRIE SIMMONS: Good afternoon, and thank you, Madam Chair. The council staff received and posted the exempted fishing permits in the briefing book on Friday, January 19. We developed an online portal to collect public comments. No comments were received, to date, on the lionfish or the aquacultured exempted fishing permits.

We did receive seventeen comments on the Gulf states’ exempted fishing permits, including several that have come in since we requested the Monday, January 29th deadline, and so, in that Tab S, Number 8, there is going to be a couple of additional comments that came in since then that you can go to the online portal and read, but this verbal summary will include them, but I will let you look at those for more detail, because this is going to be very short.

All comments supported the exempted fishing permit for private recreational anglers in the Gulf. The majority supported leaving charter and headboats under the federal management system or have an opportunity for them to opt into the state
EFPs after they had a chance to see what was going to happen with the private anglers.

Overall, the commenters believe that the for-hire sector has been very successful under the current federal management framework, and they believe the EFPs can be effective to modernize the fishery management for private anglers.

Other comments stated that the EFPs must adhere to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management Act, to ensure that private anglers don’t go over the catch limits, and these comments came from the states of Alabama, Texas, Florida, and Louisiana. That is the short summary. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Thank you. Let’s look at our schedule here. We are scheduled for public testimony at three o’clock, guys. I really don’t think we can jump back into our EFP discussions that we were having earlier, and so let’s all take a short break, but I would like everybody back here at 2:55, and that’s five minutes before public testimony starts, please. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: For members of the public, this is a little bit smaller room than we’re normally in, and so, if you’re going to have any conversations, private conversations, I am really going to need you to take them outside the meeting room, or it’s going to get very difficult to hear.

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 person in the subject of the statement. All written information shall include a statement of the source and date of such information.

Oral or written communications provided to the council, its members, or its staff, that relate to matters within the council’s purview are public in nature. Please give any written comments to the staff, as well as all written comments will also be posted on the council’s website for viewing by council members and the public, and it will be maintained by the council as part of the permanent record.
Knowingly and willfully submitting false information to the council is a violation of federal law. If you plan to speak and haven’t already done so, please sign in at the iPad registration station located at the entrance to the meeting room. We do accept only one registration per person.

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

Thanks to everyone for coming, and you can see the list of your names. If you happen to be out of the room when I call your name, I will circle back around to you at the very end of public testimony, to see if you’re still here and if you would like to speak, and so, first this afternoon, we are going to have Paul Sawyer, followed by Bart Niquet.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. DAVID CAVELLE: Good afternoon. My name is David Cavelle, and I’m here on behalf of U.S. Congressman Garret Graves. Paul Sawyer could not be here today, and so I’m here in his place. It is very concerning to see that this council is considering IFQs for the charter/for-hire sector. From what we have seen in this management style, it caused the commercial sector to shrink in size, leading to consolidation of a public resource into the hands of a few people. Please tell me, are there any other federal resources that we just give away like this?

I don’t think you can, because it’s not a fair and equitable way to manage the American people’s resources. Catch shares, on the commercial side, shortchange the nation, which is bad enough, but catch shares in the charter industry will tilt the balance so far to the charter side that I wouldn’t hire one again, because I feel that I am getting ripped off.

I strongly advise the council to not change, to not go down this road, on the recreational side. The success of the LA Creel has shown that the states are more than capable of managing fisheries and better at collecting the data as well. Furthermore, each state has been working towards developing a plan that will allow for state-based management for recreational fishermen, and I believe the council should not work against the states by passing these amendments.
Instead, you should work towards allowing the states to have more flexibility in the way they manage reef fish, so that all Americans can enjoy recreational fishing. Thank you, Congressman Garret Graves, member of Congress. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir, and what was your name again, for the record? I called you as Paul Sawyer.

MR. CAVELLE: Yes, ma’am. I’m David Cavelle, with Congressman Garret Graves.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. David Cavelle. I am assuming that you work with Mr. Paul Sawyer.

MR. CAVELLE: I do.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate it. Next, we have Mr. Bart Niquet, followed by Jerome Zeringue.

MR. BART NIQUET: I am Bart Niquet from the Panama City area. I’ve been fishing all my life, all kinds, and, once again, I came to a meeting with hope of some kind of forward-looking policies, and, instead, we’re asked to consider a new data collection process, which will take at least three years and much expense and will, if the program as outlined is enacted, will be unlawful or, at the best, unheeding laws already in effect, and, in some cases, in contrary to them.

The charter/headboat community doesn’t need this. You would be better served by a select group of data collectors free to roam around the Gulf fishery ports with no published agenda to randomly take data from fishermen as they interview them. This would be a far more effective process than phone calls or emails sent hours after landings and reminiscing, and it would be a lot cheaper, also.

As to the red grouper stock, as far as I can tell, no commercial fisherman or fish dealer was consulted about the increase in the TAC. We, as a group, didn’t want it. All you did was devalue the price of both shares and leases. Maybe that’s the salvation or the solution, to the red snapper problem that this council seems to have. Raising the TAC a couple of million pounds would give them more fee money to go to the enforcement and make more fish available for the general public.

On amberjack, the commercial fishermen don’t want a longer season with smaller catches. This is not a cost-effective
process, and we would like to catch as many as we can in as short a time as it takes until we reach our limit.

I listened to the exempted program from Texas on that was put up there, and it sounds like they want at least 16 percent of the total catch as an exemption, and is that including or is that in place of or added to their present quota? To me, I am not a fishery biologist, but that sounds just like a fish-grabbing system, and I couldn’t be for it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Jerome Zeringue, followed by Gunner Waldmann.

MR. JEROME ZERINGUE: Thank you. My name is Jerome Zeringue, and I’m a state representative here in Louisiana. On behalf of Louisiana, I want to welcome you all, council members, and I appreciate you all coming to Louisiana, and I hope you all have a good time in our great state.

I am here today to talk about a couple of issues. Primarily, I would like to talk about and applaud the council on its efforts, encourage its efforts, to work on state management. I think, from our perspective, our Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Mr. Patrick Banks sits on the council, and, unfortunately, he had to leave, but they’re doing a great job in terms of fisheries management, and LA Creel is a much more thorough and comprehensive process than the federal MRIP survey system.

The MRIP was never designed to set season lengths and manage in-season quotas, but that’s exactly what it’s being used for. In fact, I’ve spoken to several fisheries scientists who even say that the methodology of the MRIP is fatally flawed. The process requires extrapolation, which results in imprecise data, to determine precise things, like how many pounds of fish have been caught, and it simply doesn’t work.

Programs like LA Creel and Alabama’s Snapper Check and Florida and Mississippi programs use a more precise and specific sampling method, and, if we allow those systems to work, give them some time, there is no doubt that we will generate enough data to establish the trends and, long term, all those programs will be more efficient and run more effectively and cheaper.

I am also here in opposition of Amendments 41 and 42. The IFQ system for charters will put a lot of Louisiana charters out of business, and Amendments 41 and 42, which further privatize roughly another 20 percent of the fishery, and combined with the catch share system in the commercial sector, will mean that
almost three-quarters of our fishery will be given away for free and held by private businesses.

We request the council to kill, or at least table, these amendments with the states, working on plans to manage the recreational sectors in the red snapper fishery. The states are working on two fronts right now, through the exempted fishery permits plans and the state management amendments, which are better methods to manage the fishery, and so the council should not tie their hands by privatizing another segment of the fishery.

The council should give the states more flexibility to salvage our fisheries, as opposed to 41 and 42, which complicate the process. Catch shares on the commercial side shortchange the nation, which is bad enough, but catch shares in the charter industry, as in the commercial sector, will result in restricted consolidation, which will dramatically tilt the balance to the charter side and have a dramatic effect on the price and availability for non-boat-owning anglers, and these amendments appear to be a solution in search of a problem, and, therefore, we are opposed to those amendments.

Now, as I said, I am a legislator, and it sounds like, based upon some of these actions that we’ve already seen, that the fix may already be in, but I hope that’s not the case, but, as a legislator, we’re going to be going into session in the next few weeks, and, like, was similarly enacted in Kentucky, where, in fact, we’re going to consider in Louisiana a work requirement for the Medicaid program, a work requirement for a federal resource, of which all taxpayers pay to contribute and support.

Similarly, our fishery is a federal resource that taxpayers contribute to support, and, as such, as taxpayers, the Gulf Council should implement a work requirement for commercial catch shares. Anyone given the privilege of this exclusive access to a federal resource, they should be required to participate in the harvest or the processing of that resource. If not, those catch shares should be reallocated and offered to those individuals who work in the utilization of this valuable federal resource and its long-term enhancement and resource protection, and I thank you for the opportunity to comment today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Thank you for being here. If we do have any other dignitaries in the room, if I could ask you if you’ll just kind of come over to staff and let them know you’re here. We’re going to put you at the top of the order,
simply because, when you come in in the middle of the order, sometimes it causes a little confusion on the lights, and dignitaries are afforded slightly longer times, if they need it, and so, if you could do that, it creates a lot less confusion in the end, and we appreciate that. Mr. Gunner Waldman, your turn.

MR. GUNNER WALDMANN: Thank you, esteemed members of the council. Thank you for letting me share my opinions and speak on this important matter to everyone. I am a recreational fisherman, and I’ve been fishing for over fifty-five years. I live in southwest Louisiana.

One of the biggest things that I’ve seen in the last twenty years is I have just a small, twenty-five-foot bay boat, and we can get out thirty miles in the Gulf of Mexico below Lafayette, which is roughly seventy feet of water, seventy-five foot. The amount of rigs that are being taken out is just astronomical. We’ve been fishing an area in the vermillion blocks, the 70s and 80s and 100 blocks, that are in seventy-five foot of water, and the last eight platforms that we fished, or scuba dived, are gone. They were for Black Elk, and, now, I’m going to have to venture out in a twenty-five-foot bay boat forty miles or fifty miles to get to some new areas.

One of the things that I have noticed in that is the barotrauma is minimal to red snapper in seventy to seventy-five foot of water. We rarely have a fish in that, when we’re fishing, that doesn’t go back down, and so I would ask that you all look at that.

I am against catch shares. I am against the 41 and 42 amendments, and I would just ask that you all give us our Louisiana plan that Mr. Patrick Banks has championed, along with Wildlife and Fisheries and most of the recreational fishermen here in Louisiana are for. Because of LA Creel, we can manage -- We have proven that we can manage our fishery and not go over the quota.

I challenge any one of you all, and I invite any one of you all, to come on my boat. I am a huge scuba diver, and I will take you out, and I can show you videos that -- We have so many small snapper on those platforms that they’re actually a nuisance, because we can’t shoot mangrove, sometimes, or other species, that are targeted, because the small snapper, when you go to take a shot, are in the way, and so I feel that we could sustain at least a higher quota for years to come, and we would have snapper for my grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Thank you for the time to let me speak. Have a wonderful day.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Ted Venker, followed by Mr. George Huye.

MR. TED VENKER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Ted Venker, and I’m with the Coastal Conservation Association, and, first off, I really just want to applaud the states for all the work they’ve done on these EFPs.

They are mostly overcoming the allocation hurdle that derailed the Amendment 39 effort, and that is a huge accomplishment, and we appreciate how hard all you state folks are working to make this a viable alternative for the recreational sector, and I really want to just encourage you to keep working with each other and with NOAA in good faith to have these EFPs implemented and succeed.

However, we do remain concerned over Amendment 41 and Amendment 42. As an organization with 130,000-plus anglers and members across the nation, we have a lot of members that fish on the back of these boats, and we’re concerned about how these amendments might impact those anglers that depend on these boats.

Every IFQ program that has been implemented, I think, in the nation and around the world has resulted in significant consolidation. That’s what IFQs were designed to do, and that’s troubling, because nothing shows that fewer people are going to be moving to the coast in the future. In fact, the opposite is true. We have more and more people moving to our coasts, and some percentage of them are going to rely on these charter/for-hire and headboats to go fishing.

Scarcity makes the price go up, and scarcity makes it more difficult to book a trip, and we just don’t believe that enough attention has been given to how these amendments are going to impact the anglers on the back of those boats. I know this was discussed yesterday, but I would just ask this council to allow the states to fully explore what they can do to manage this fishery before they start down the road to privatization of the recreational sector.

States are very likely, in my opinion, to provide management that provides stability for everyone, but, once you go down this road toward IFQs, it’s impossible to change course.

Secondly, I was at the AP meeting last week, and they were
really sincere in doing everything they can to reduce the recreational discard mortality rate. Our rate is in the 15 to 20 percent range, and we would like to see that reduced to zero, of course. I will venture that a sixty-dollar descending device that could successfully send most of those fish back down to the bottom alive would be a price that everyone is willing to pay, and so I would ask that this council consider, again, to make that a requirement.

Interestingly, that AP also touched on all the different sources of mortality in the red snapper fishery. They were told that the discard mortality rate in the commercial directed fishery is 75 to 80 percent, and that seems like a really significant number.

The AP heard about the IUU fishery operating out of Mexico, and I have to say that the cartels are not really known for undertaking projects like this for modest returns, and I don’t think they’re out there for fun, and so I’m not sure that dismissing this as a modest impact is giving it the attention it deserves.

Shrimp trawl bycatch is said to be within acceptable bounds. How many pounds of dead juvenile red snapper is that? Grouper and other reef fish fisheries must be having some bycatch mortality, as well as the charter and headboat sectors.

My final point here is that a lot of red snapper are ending up dead, in one way or another out there, in a variety of ways, well beyond what is accounted for at the dock, the numbers that we always hear, and I think it would be really useful for the public to know how many pounds are being killed every year from every source, just so we can make sure that we are applying the most effort to address the biggest problems, and so that’s all I have to say. Thank you very much.

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

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Ted, I have thought for a long time that this discard issue is a big deal. How do we capture that information? You have probably given it more thought than I have.

MR. VENKER: It’s a good question, and I would have to turn to the experts around this table, and I have heard them say that it’s accounted for in the assessment, and I think that might be technically defensible, but I think it’s very important to get
it all in one place, so that you council members can see exactly what's being caught.

I think it might need some outside study. I think we can all do a little bit more to document it, but I'm not really sure how to answer that from a technical standpoint, Phil, but I would certainly think that some of the folks around this table would have an idea.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. VENKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. George Huge, followed by Ms. Suzie Villere.

MS. SUSAN VILLERE: Hi. I've been told that Mr. Huye is ill and won't be here. I am not him, but I am Susan Villere.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for the update.

MS. VILLERE: Hello to everybody. I want to thank all of you for your service on the council. As a former council member, I served alongside some of you, and I know firsthand how challenging the management of the fishery in the Gulf of Mexico is for all of you, and I wanted to share some personal experiences as a recreational fisherman and some observations about the impact that the saltwater fishery has on Grand Isle, Louisiana, where my camp is located.

My family has owned the property where my home is for almost a hundred years. My father built our camp over fifty years ago, and it has been a source of pleasure over four generations that have enjoyed it, but what is most important is the fabric of Grand Isle, a town of only 1,200 that swells to a population of over 15,000 in the summer months, driven solely by the recreational fishery surrounding the island.

The economy of Grand Isle almost entirely drives local employment. It creates hundreds of jobs for the marina workers, launch attendants, bait pickers, housekeepers, grass cutters, boat mechanics, fish cleaners, restaurant and bar service, and the list goes on and on. It was very apparent a couple of years ago, when the short red snapper season profoundly affected the entire local economy, in contrast to last summer’s season, which was extended at the last minute.

The difference in activity on the island was very apparent.
Without a recreational fishery, Grand Isle’s economy would be gone, and I believe you can say the same about other fishing communities along the entire Gulf Coast. Please support the Louisiana state amendment option and kill Amendments 41 and 42. Our state has proven that we can manage these fish better, and any further privatization of our fishery is contrary to the management of a resource that belongs to all of us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ma’am. Next, we have Mr. Pierre Villere, followed by Mr. Peter Jarvis.

MR. PIERRE VILLERE: Hello, everyone. I am married to Susan, and I want to also mention that I think the job you have is very challenging, and we thank you for the time and effort. She served on the council with some of you, and the stories that I used to hear at night were hard to believe sometimes, and so your service is much appreciated.

I am just going to echo what she said. Suzie and I have been together for thirty years, and married for twenty-five, and I have watched Grand Isle proper as a result of a robust recreational fishery. Louisiana was on its knees in the 1980s, from an economic standpoint, and to see the recovery from 1990 onwards has been remarkable.

Camps are being built down there that are very expensive, construction-wise, and boats are being bought, but the most important thing is the hundreds and hundreds of people that are employed by the recreational fishing economy down there, and I can count ten, on my hands, different people that do things for us, as a result of having a camp and a couple of boats down there, and so don’t lost sight of the fact that the recreational fishery is a big driver of not the only the economy of Grand Isle, Louisiana, but every single Gulf-front community.’

Cocopidrie, Venice, Shell Beach, and you can go down the list, but it’s an important aspect of our economy, and further privatization of this fishery, I will say again, or I will repeat what my wife just said, but it isn’t fair, when you consider that the resource belongs to all of the public, and privatizing portions of it just seems in contrast to that bounty that belongs to all of us. Thank you very much for your time.

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

MR. PETER JARVIS: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to be here. Director Gregory and Madam Chairperson
and esteemed members of this council, my name is Peter Jarvis, and I am the President of Southeast Fisheries Association and owner of Triar Seafood Company in Hollywood, Florida.

This is my first opportunity to be at a Gulf Council meeting, and so I have found it to be very informative and very interesting, and it’s nice to meet those that I have not met before. Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words on behalf of all sectors of the fishing industry represented by our association.

We are concerned that the balance between commercial and recreational voting members on the Gulf Council has become biased against commercial fishermen and seafood providers. In the late 1980s and 1990s, Florida went thirteen years without a commercial fishing representative on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and we cannot take that again.

This observation does not criticize the integrity of anybody now serving, but the Magnuson-Stevens Act calls for balanced representation, and our association will continue to bring this imbalance up to Congress and the Trump administration. Our association opposes giving management of red snapper in federal waters to the states through any of the schemes or programs that we have studied. There is only one true equity when National Standards are required. The marine resources belong to all the people and not just the people who fish.

We are greatly concerned about the negative impacts that reduced commercial harvest is having on chefs and the thousands of restaurants that serve, or wish to serve, fresh Gulf seafood. When commercial fishing is diminished, not only do fishing communities suffer, but all of the restaurants and retailers that provide seafood to the public, most of whom do not fish and don’t own boats.

Our association supports the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as long as there is nothing in the language giving state control over federal resources. Thank you for your time. I’m Peter Jarvis, on behalf of Southeast Fisheries Association.

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

MR. CHRIS NIQUET: My name is Chris Niquet, from Panama City, Florida. I am going to talk to you today about two species, mainly, the red grouper and the red snapper. The discussion has come up in this committee before, and it’s going to come up
One of the complaints that I have heard this year from commercial fishermen who want to lease allocation is the price is just too high. This is a market-based economic fishery, and that’s why it’s called commercial fishing, and, if the price is too high, what is the reason? Could it be a lack of allocation?

You tried it in the red grouper. You increased it between 35 and 40 percent, and the allocation price fell from a dollar to, I think, less than a dime in one year. Do you want to reduce the price of red snapper allocation? Raise the amount of allocation available to be fished. It’s like milk or cookies or raisins. If there is too much supply to meet the demand, the price of that commodity will fall. I don’t care if it’s lobsters or lettuce. It’s the same thing.

I don’t know what’s going to happen in the red grouper fishery this year, but I have heard a similar situation exists. The red snapper fishery, so far as I can tell, is about on par as what it was last year, and I know the allocation that I deal out every year is gone. It was gone on the 7th of January, and you say, well, that may be okay, one or two boats, but, with the other people I deal with, it was a total of 190,000-plus pounds. The demand is there, ladies and gentlemen. If you want to get the price down, raise the amount of allocation available. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mike McMahon, followed by Mr. Gerard Demarco.

MR. DAVID CRESSON: Good afternoon, council members. I happen to know that Gerard and Mike have both also come down with the flu. We’ve got an epidemic, it seems like, going around Louisiana. I am David Cresson. I am the Executive Director of the Coastal Conservation of Louisiana.

Thank you for having me here and to hear my testimony. I come to you on behalf of 23,000 recreational saltwater anglers in Louisiana, and, on their behalf, I would like to welcome you to my hometown and speak on two topics, the Louisiana state management amendment and Amendments 41 and 42.

In regard to the Louisiana amendment, we strongly support this initiative, and we hope you will do the same. We were pleased to work closely with Assistant Secretary Banks and his staff to develop the plan, and we look forward to the flexibility that it will allow us to manage Louisiana’s fish and our anglers very
effectively.

As you’re aware, the cornerstone of the Louisiana plan is the angler-funded LA Creel program, which has allowed us to manage our recent state seasons and the thirty-nine-day extended season last year with a high rate of precision and confidence. The Louisiana plan has the support of our organization, the Louisiana charter fleet, our Governor, our Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, our state legislature, and others. Louisiana has proven, without a doubt, that we can execute the plan in an expert manner and manage these federal fish at the state level. Please give us that opportunity.

As for Amendment 41 and 42, the story is much the opposite. I remember sitting in these meetings, several years ago, asking you, during public comment, to reject sector separation, hearing person after person get up here and try to convince you all that it would not lead to IFQs in the charter sector. Yet, here we are today.

Virtually no one in Louisiana wants catch shares in the recreational sector. If you approve 41 and 42, this council will have privatized almost three-quarters of the Gulf’s red snapper, leaving only one-quarter for millions of recreational anglers across the coast. Our charter fleet does not want them, and they have made that clear. Our state legislature, our anglers, and our commission does not want them. They all know that, while this system identifies winners and losers, over time, it will, ultimately, shrink the charter fleet, like it has done in the commercial sector, and put many of our captains out of business. 41 and 42 would also likely be a hindrance to our ability to implement the Louisiana plan or the exempted fishing permit that Louisiana has applied for.

I appeal to our Louisiana council members, and all of you, to please, please, put an end, once and for all, to these damaging amendments that, if approved, would be a slap in the face to our Louisiana charters, our recreational anglers, and anglers across the Gulf. Thank you, as always, for your time, and I hope you enjoy the rest of your stay in New Orleans. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Cresson. Mr. Horton, if you give me just a second, but, for the record, I am just going to call the names of the two gentlemen that you said were sick, so that we can be consistent. Mr. Mike McMahon. Okay. Mr. Gerard Demarco. Then Mr. David Cresson just spoke, and thank you, sir. Mr. Chris Horton.
MR. CHRIS HORTON: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the council. I am Chris Horton, with the Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation and a Gulf angler. First, I want to speak to 41 and 42. We are fundamentally opposed to 41 and 42, because we are fundamentally opposed to catch shares in the recreational sector.

The very purpose and need of these amendments states that it’s to reduce management uncertainty, improve economic conditions, and increase fishing opportunities for federal charter vessels and their angling passengers. I would argue that all of those have already been met through sector separation.

Management uncertainty has already been reduced, and the charter/for-hire sector has been under their quota for the last two years and under their ACT, and the economic conditions have improved, with a near fifty-day season, which will be a fifty-day season this year. It has improved for vessel owners, and it has improved for the local communities.

The longer season, under Amendment 40, has provided increased fishing opportunities for both the vessels and the anglers that fish on their boats. Basically, all of these things have been addressed through sector separation. It’s working for the charter/for-hire sector.

However, if you go down the road of catch shares in 41 and 42, you are picking some winners and losers, because, in every other catch share, and I saw a number somewhere that it’s like 30 to 60 percent of the participants in the fifteen or sixteen other catch shares in this country -- Those participants are gone now. It has been reduced and consolidated, and you say it won’t happen here, but it would be the only one that it has never happened in.

Echoing what everybody else has said, there should be a real concern for anglers that depend on charter vessels, because there is going to be fewer opportunities, and, undoubtedly, there is going to be higher prices.

The other thing that I wanted to touch on real quick are the EFPs. We are very appreciative and supportive of the states’ efforts, and we’re really appreciative of NMFS in working with the states to develop these, and I really urge the continued cooperation with the states, to help us figure out how we can get these implemented this year.
Then, finally, I am going to touch on one other thing, and I know it’s certainly not a solution for the red snapper situation for the recreational sector, but it is the responsibility of the council to look at allocations every so often. The red snapper allocation has been rusted shut for decades now.

We tried it with Amendment 28, and that wasn’t really a true reallocation. That was more of a data reset, based on the latest and best science, yet the courts rejected it, but they didn’t say you can’t do it. They simply said that you’ve got to do it differently, and so I would urge the council to go back and look at Amendment 28 and figure out how we can do it better next time and do a fair and equitable distribution of the allocation across the sectors. Thank you for your time, and I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. J.P. Brooker, followed by Mr. Bill Staff.

MR. J.P. BROOKER: Good afternoon, and thank you, Ms. Bosarge, and thank you to the council for the opportunity to give comment. I am J.P. Brooker, and I’m an attorney with Ocean Conservancy, based in St. Petersburg, Florida.

I wanted to give some details and offer some of Ocean Conservancy’s perspective on our recent litigation on red snapper. In December, the D.C. District Court issued a stay in our lawsuit against Commerce, NOAA, and NMFS for the decision to extend the 2017 private recreational red snapper fishing season.

This stay is basically a mutual agreement between the plaintiffs and the defendants. Instead of taking any draconian measures, the parties have agreed that the court will act as a guardian over the upcoming season, to ensure that this year’s management decisions are focused on sustainability and accountability, for the benefit of both the fish and the fishermen.

Ocean Conservancy is not an anti-fishing group. We are pro-fishing, and we are pro-sustainability. We know how important red snapper is to Gulf fishermen and to coastal communities from Texas to Florida. We want to make sure that there are fish to catch for generations, and the best way to do that is to stick to science-based rebuilding plans.

I would also like to note that we didn’t make our decision to litigate lightly. Ocean Conservancy doesn’t litigate often, and we prefer to work collaboratively to find the best possible solutions. We were compelled to go to court to defend the
science-based management system that has made the U.S. a world leader in fishery management. Continued court oversight will ensure fairness and sustainability, with an eye toward long-term solutions, and, in that vein, we support long-term solutions.

The current suite of proposed EFPs for state-managed fishing for recreational red snapper could be a viable way to test core concepts and innovations necessary to ensure successful implementation of state management, and they represent a unique opportunity to change the way red snapper is managed in the Gulf, to better meet stakeholder needs.

However, these EFPs must be forward-thinking, and they should embrace that spirit of finding long-term solutions for the private recreational red snapper fishery. Merely using the EFP concept as a loophole to allow for status-quo fishing in the recreational red snapper component of the fishery or repeat the overfishing of the 2017 extended season is insufficient, problematic, and could violate existing laws and regulations. Thanks again for the opportunity to give comment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Bill Staff, followed by Mr. Gary Bryant.

MR. BILL STAFF: Bill Staff, owner and operator of the Charter Boat Sea Spray. I’ve been charter fishing for about thirty-six years, and I’ve been coming to the council meetings since the mid-1980s, and I’ve seen a lot of changes, and probably one of the most significant was sector separation, as far as keeping people in business. It kept a lot of people from going out of business.

At this point in time, we would like to keep us separated under federal jurisdiction. I would like to see 41 and 42 go forward. Last year was a tough year with only red snapper to sell. The last meeting we came to, we left encouraged that we might have six or seven months of something to fish for, triggers, jacks, and snapper, spread out.

I am willing to look at and explore any kind of avenue that will lengthen our seasons, if it’s a bigger size limit or less creel limit or whatever, but, right now, we just need the seasons to sell. It’s like I said one time before, if churches don’t have any chicken, they are going to close their doors. They can’t sell it.

On amberjack, we’re finding them harder to catch, and I would like to see them, like the triggers and the snapper, come back,
and I think probably the most important thing would be letting
them spawn. Hopefully we can get the stock rebuilt and then
come back to a spring and a fall season that would make
everybody happy. Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Gary
Bryant, followed by Mr. Dylan Hubbard.

MR. GARY BRYANT: I’m Gary Bryant. I currently own two federal
charter boats, six-packs, and a commercial boat, and I’m Vice
President of the Alabama Charter Fishing Association. Today, I
want to speak on behalf of our association.

When this first came up about state management plans, the
Alabama Department of Marine Resources very graciously reached
out to us, and we met with them. They presented their
proposals, and they gave the charter boats in Alabama the
opportunity to vote on whether they wanted to be part of the
state plan.

Our contingency voted not to be part of that plan and to stay in
the federal system. We respect the right of the private anglers
to move forward and to develop a fishery management plan is good
for them. Basically, you all are asking to take a set number of
fish and try to find a better way to catch them. The charter
boats are asking to stay under the federal system. We’re asking
to take a set number of fish and try to come up with a better
way of catching them.

Amendment 40, sector separation, is of extreme importance to us.
We feel like that has basically stabilized our industry and
helped us stay afloat with all the changing rules and
regulations, and we would ask that we be allowed to move forward
with 41 and 42. Let it go to referendum.

Whether it lives or dies, we have faithfully come up here and
followed the council process, and we deserve the right to finish
that council process and let the industry decide if that’s what
it wants, and we would appreciate the opportunity to keep
working on that and have the tools we need to work on it.

The electronic logbooks are going to be very important, and that
would simplify so much, if we had histories on our fleet, but we
do support private anglers having their EFPs, but we, as a
charter industry in Alabama, do not want to be part of the state
plan. We want to stay under the federal plan, and we would like
to continue to develop 41 and 42 and let the industry vote on
it. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Dylan Hubbard, followed by Mr. Benjamin Kelley.

MR. DYLAN HUBBARD: Hello. My name is Captain Dylan Hubbard, and my family business has been fishing the central west coast of Florida for nearly ninety years and four generations. Plus, I am a recent MREP graduate. We operate six federally-permitted vessels, both charter and headboats, and I represent the Florida Guides Association, as their offshore director.

Red grouper, there is no great dilemma surrounding the red grouper fishery, according to the SSC, made clear by their lack of recommendation on interim action. We urge the council to wait until the standard stock assessment for red grouper in SEDAR 61 is completed before assessing any action on the red grouper fishery.

State management of red snapper, in the EFPs or the amendments, please do not include the for-hire recreational sector in any type of state management scenario.

The amberjack season for 2018, it was very disheartening that the rulemaking discussed at the October Biloxi meeting is not completed yet and not a regulation. Hopefully it will be done in time for May of 2018. This is what we were told, and this was what we are planning our businesses around.

Also, we would fully support seeing the idea of a split quota. A 70 percent fall and 30 percent split quota would allow for greater Gulf-wide access, which was the goal of the fishing year and season changes made back in Biloxi, in my opinion.

Descending devices and venting tools, we would like to see venting tools and descending tools outreach begin ASAP. In regard to any future policy, flexibility would need to be added as well. In the partyboat industry, descending devices are nearly impossible to use, while venting tools are very much a preferred method, coupled with serious onboard demonstration and education. Plus, we do seminars across our area that often always include proper venting and descending techniques.

While charter fishing, you can utilize descending devices much more realistically, and we have had great success using descending devices, only when coupled with appropriate weight and retrieval gear. However, sharks become present, and we have to start venting instead of descending. Flexibility is also needed in the definition of venting tools as well, because
venting large grouper or large amberjack is impossible with any
gauge needle. We have developed tools to help us combat this,
but they are not included in the definition of venting tools.

Finally, we urge the outreach to include incentives to ensure
anglers know proper use of these tools and techniques could help
increase their access. Keep in mind that new fishing gear is
exacerbating the needs for more outreach in venting and
descending, because these new high-speed reels cause barotrauma
much more significantly.

The MREP program, I had a great experience, and I look forward
to being involved again in 2018. One of the most glaring items
that I learned at the workshop is that the Gulf Council, South
Atlantic, and Caribbean Councils all share one Science Center,
and, if you include the HMS and the sharks, it’s like we’re
sharing the Science Center with five councils, whereas, on the
Pacific Coast, they have two Science Centers for one council,
and, so, in my opinion, what a lot of people argue about is the
lack of data and science, and you hear people drone on about
that all the time, and a simple addition of Science Centers,
while needing a lot of money to do so, I think it would solve a
lot of problems. On my journey to learning and educating myself
on the process, it just seems like a pretty simple fix, if you
had the money to do so.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir, and I am glad to hear that
you went to the MREP program.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, and it was very cool.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think Mr. Swindell has a question for you.

MR. SWINDELL: My question is around discards and descending
devices. You say you have something else that you’re using
besides the standard ones that we’re aware of?

MR. HUBBARD: Oh, yes. Well, I mean, the venting tools, the
standard venting tool works great on smaller fish, but, on
larger fish, when you’re talking about a forty or fifty or
sixty-pound grouper -- Luckily, in central west Florida, we have
an awesome grouper fishery, with huge gags and big red grouper,
and it’s impossible to vent a large fish like that with any
gauge needle, and so we have developed two different items.

One, a local machinist has come up with a small stainless-steel
tube that has kind of been made into a venting tool, just at a
much larger diameter, and then the other is myself and my father
take the long skinny knives, the Dexter-Russell high-carbon knives, and, after they get to a point where you can’t sharpen them any longer, we cut them in half and leave the blade only about four inches, maybe four-and-a-half inches, and we make sure that it’s a very, very thin diameter, and we use that to vent those larger species, because you’re able to make about a fifth-of-an-inch incision, and, with a simple twist of the blade, the fish is going to be vented in a matter of ten to fifteen seconds, whereas, the largest gauge needle, it’s going to take forty-five to fifty seconds, and, in my opinion, decreasing the amount of time that fish is on the deck, losing slime, and out of the water increases its viability and chances for survival.

We have done a few different things, as far as testing venting tools, and, as far as descending devices, increasing the weight on the descender, because, in a partyboat setting, or in a charter boat setting, especially in our area, with a high volume and high rate of catch, we use a heavier weight and increased retrieval gear. For our purposes, we use a bent-butt rod with an electric reel and about a twenty-pound sash weight. It increases the speed of the descent at such a rate to where it makes it more viable in a charter fishing setting.

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

MR. BOYD: Thank you for your testimony. I appreciate it. For clarification, are you running six-packs or headboats?

MR. HUBBARD: We have two headboats, one licensed for 120 and with a permit for 130, and then one we have run with up to sixty-five, and that’s licensed for, I think, 110. Then we have two multi-passenger charter boats, one licensed for twenty-two and one licensed for twenty-six, and then we have two six-pack charter boats as well, but all six vessels carry federal permits.

MR. BOYD: Okay. Thank you for that. It sounds like, from your testimony, that venting devices, or descending devices, are not a problem for your deckhands or your captains.

MR. HUBBARD: Since you originally made the policy and originally started talking about venting tools, we have used them, with great success, and I do seminars at Bass Pro Shops across our local state, and, every seminar, I bring up venting, and most of the people in the crowd who offshore fish regularly, they have very little to no idea how to properly vent a fish,
and most of them -- The joke was made, I think during Mr. Atran’s presentation, about the hook going into the swim bladder of the fish and sticking out of the mouth, and most people believe that’s the way to properly vent a fish.

At these seminars, hands-on demonstrations, showing them how to vent a fish, using a bait fish for example, has been very successful. Then, on any of our trips where we are planning to fish an area where barotrauma might be possible, typically anywhere beyond three atmospheres, we do a hands-on demonstration onboard the vessel as well, and so that way, if a captain or a crew member is not available, a lot of our more advanced anglers don’t want to wait, and so we won’t let you release a fish until it’s been properly vented, and so we’ll give them the tools to do it and give them the know-how to be able to accomplish that successfully and not kill the fish.

MR. BOYD: I think our Outreach Committee needs to get your phone number.

MR. HUBBARD: I would love to, and I think Martha’s idea, and I think it was with YouTube videos, would be very, very wise, and there is a lot of different ways that I think Ms. Muehlstein -- Her ideas, as far as web-based promotion, is pretty good. I don’t think you can get much better, but I would be happy to throw my two-cents in.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: I know we’ve had you up there a long time, and so I’m going to ask you to answer as quickly as possible.

MR. HUBBARD: I will stay all day. I’ve got more to talk about.

MR. DYSKOW: Well, but other people are waiting. You didn’t mention your opinion on 41 and 42.

MR. HUBBARD: In my opinion, on 41 and 42, I would not be in support of 41 and 42.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, but we do have a whole crowd.

MR. MATENS: Please forgive me, but you have been up there a long time, and you’ve been very gracious to do so, but, when you say fish to three atmospheres, do you mean total three atmospheres? Do you mean ninety-nine feet or sixty-six feet?

MR. HUBBARD: Three atmospheres, to me, would be ninety-nine
feet.

MR. MATENS: I meant under the water and not counting this one.

MR. HUBBARD: No, I am not counting this one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and, last but not least, Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: I was just wondering about the depth of fish that you see the barotrauma.

MR. HUBBARD: Most of the time, the depth of fish where we see the barotrauma really depends on water temperatures. In the summertime, we can see barotrauma occurring in as shallow as sixty feet with high-speed reels, but, typically, seventy or eighty feet. Then, in the wintertime, barotrauma is much less prevalent in that shallower water.

You have to go out to about eighty or ninety or a hundred foot, but, again, the use of high-speed reels really, really affects barotrauma. If you’re using a high-speed reel and you’re not taking it out of that high-gear ratio, once you have the fish up off the bottom and hooked, then, a lot of times, you’re going to create barotrauma much more frequently.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I think we’re done with you. Thanks.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Next, we have Mr. Benjamin Kelley, followed by Mr. John Law.

MR. BENJAMIN KELLEY: I am Benjamin Kelley, from Panama City Beach, and I have a sixteen-passenger boat. We have been there for about thirty-four years, and this Amendment 41 and 42 is like beating a dead horse. I mean, we are tired of it, and we have come to meeting after meeting, it seems like for a decade now, and I know it hasn’t been quite that long, but we are tired of Amendment 41, and we would appreciate to table this.

We did some math yesterday, with you all’s numbers, and my boat would get eighteen amberjack per year, twenty-eight triggerfish per year, and we would start at 400 red snapper. Now, we caught 1,085 red snapper last year, and, before we lost our jacks season, we were catching right at 400, and so why would I vote for something to put me in a cage like this that would put me
Now, if we had some good historical data that showed actually who caught the fish over three or four years, we could revisit this, but, without the history, like was in the commercial fishery, you can’t do this fairly to somebody like me, who has worked so hard to have the business I have.

The amberjacks are more important to us in north Florida. We don’t have oil rigs, and we don’t have tuna. We only catch amberjacks in the spring that draw the outdoorsmen there, and we have the b-liners and Spanish and stuff, but the amberjacks are what sells the trips, and May is a very profitable month.

We need the amberjacks in May. We don’t need them so much in August. We have huge tourism in August, and you’re going to increase a lot of effort by opening jacks on August 1, and so I would move them and open them on September 1, and you could close them the end of November, and so you would have May, September, October, and November.

We also support the one fish per two anglers. We carry big groups, and, if we have ten people, we don’t necessarily need ten thirty-four-inch amberjacks. That’s a lot of meat, but, if we could get four or five amberjacks and go on to catch something else and make the season longer, and maybe include April at some point, it would work well.

Another thing is the split quota. It’s a decent idea, spring and fall, 60/40, but the thing that concerns me is, if you have an overage, like in the fall, would that overage go to the next fall, or would it climb over into the spring 40 percent, and, as long as the overage was affecting whatever sector or season it was caught in, that split quota is a decent idea. I don’t understand why we moved the calendar year of amberjack to August 1. I mean, why didn’t it stay January 1, and that’s all I’ve got to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Kelley. Next, we have Mr. John Law, followed by Mr. Mark Kelley.

MR. JOHN LAW: Hello. My name is John Law, and I operate a federally-permitted six-pack boat out of Panama City Beach. I’ve been in operation for twenty-two years, and I just wanted to say that I strongly don’t support Amendment 41 and 42, and I wish that we could kill it or table it, and I would definitely prefer a spring jack fishery. Amberjacks would be definitely needed in May, and, if we could have them in August, September,
and October, that would be great, and that’s pretty much it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mark Kelley, followed by Mr. Ben Allen.

MR. MARK KELLEY: My name is Mark Kelley, and I’m from Panama City. I have two charter boats, which are dually-permitted, and I am also a member of the Charter Advisory Panel. Today, when Dr. Crabtree said we were getting fifty-plus days, I thought we were being blessed, even though I consider it should be about sixty days, because we’ve been under our quota for the last three years.

Saying that, setting on the ad hoc panel, I am not in favor of 41 going any further. I think it’s high time that 41 and 42 be called what it is, and it is a catch share, but it’s setting up intersector trading.

When you have guys that will stand up here and say they would rather have less fish, but be able to use them anytime of the year they want to, that don’t make sense, in business terms, because, when you’re talking less fish, you’re talking me taking about a 50 or 60 percent cut in what I’m already catching. Somehow or another, those fish will be made up, and I think intersector trading, which is the word not to say, but let’s call it as it is, because that’s where we’re headed.

Also, as far as the amberjack season, I think we need to go back to a January 1 start date, and I think it was hijacked. We’re using the spawn as a reasoning behind going to August 1, but we’re taking the fishery away from the people that has actually caught it in the past few years and we’re putting it in the fall to a select few.

We are already downgraded down to the fact that we’re going to get one month, and so why not us be the first month, instead of August 1 and changing, because we’ve talked about changing the commercial sector to August 1, and why can’t we just leave it at January and let us be content with a May season and August and September and October in the fall.

I am in favor of a split, and I want a split if we don’t get the January 1 start date. A 60/40 split, and I am also, as my brother said, if the 60 split overfishes their quota, I want it to come off of their fall quota and not come off of my spring quota. We have all suffered, and everybody will tell you that we ain’t caught no fish in the western Gulf. Well, we ain’t caught none in the eastern Gulf either. It’s been closed on us.
I also think that there needs to be some accountability measures set on the National Marine Fisheries Service’s staff, and that’s the fact of we did all we could, as a fishing industry, to get the jacks stock from opening on January 1 and to get the triggerfish stock from opening on January 1.

I think the decision on the triggerfish was made in April, just about a year ago, and the decision on the jacks was made in August, and here we sit, and we’ve done all we can do, and somebody didn’t do their job, and I am ashamed of that. If they worked for me, they would be looking for a new job, because they didn’t do their job. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Kelley. Next, we have Mr. Ben Allen, followed by Mr. Jim Zurbrick.

MR. BEN ALLEN: Hello, everyone. I’m Ben Allen, and I’m from Biloxi, Mississippi. I work alongside Jay Trochesset on the Silver Dollar III, and it’s a federally-permitted headboat, basically, out of Biloxi, Mississippi, and I just want to touch on a few things. First off, thank you for having me. It’s a pleasure to be involved in this process. It’s empowering and encouraging for the future, a future that I intend to be in for a very long time.

First off, to touch on Amendment 40 and how important it has been to this fishery for us and many other members in the charter fleet, it has helped sustain our businesses, and it has basically guaranteed us protections, to ensure that we have a stable future.

With that said, it’s important for everyone to know here that we are certainly against being involved in any form of state management at this point. Now, it is not because I believe it’s a bad idea. I think, for the recreational side of things, it’s a great opportunity to pioneer it.

However, with all of the fog on the horizon, not completely understanding the difficulties that could arise from it, as I think Dr. Crabtree and Mr. Sanchez have brought forward in regard to the allocation, especially in how the sectors would pay back into it, amongst other things, that, right now, it would be best for us to step back and have the recreational sector see how it goes and then possibly be able to opt into it in the future.

Also, in regard to 41 and 42, I understand that it is a
remarkably complicated concept. However, I feel that there has been a lot of work put into a document that is certainly not where it needs to be. I would ask that you please allow all of the people that have put the effort into this to continue to flesh it out for a couple of meetings, perhaps.

Obviously, things will have to be addressed, and, at that point, decide if it could go to referendum. I think there has been too much effort put into it to just get rid of it at this point. It would be misguided and wasteful, in my opinion, and so please allow us to continue to develop that 41 and 42.

Also, briefly, and I didn’t intend to touch on this, but I will give you a brief reminder of my stance on amberjack. Everybody needs to catch fish to sustain their business, and I understand that, but everyone also understands the importance of a healthy fishery.

In the end goal, we need to ensure the health of the stock. It is our responsibility, morally, beyond anything else, to ensure our future, and so please take that into consideration when setting these seasons. Don’t forget our friends that need them early on, but allow them to breed. That’s the only way we can save them. Thank you.

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

MR. JIM ZURBRICK: Thank you, council, for allowing me to speak. Again, I’m Jim Zurbrick, from Steinhatchee, a long-time charter guy, and not anymore, but I’m a commercial fisher and a dealer, and I’m also a director for Fish for America USA, and all my comments, all four of those hats, really, are how I feel about it.

First of all, comments made about the IFQ, none of us knew, when we developed that IFQ, and I have worked with it, just where it would all end up. It is supposed to be somewhat of a work in process, but some of the ignorance surrounding it -- We went to an IFQ because of the overcapacity. We had too many boats fishing for too few fish. It’s what you do. You have to reduce effort. It’s what the recreational fishers -- They haven’t come to that realization.

We watched all the days diminish, because there is too many people chasing too few fish. The charter guys tried to develop this 41 and 42, and I think you ought to allow them to vote on it, but some facts about the IFQ. You saw that, earlier, you
had a presentation about safety. Jim Zurbrick, and Patty, we
don’t have to run out there anymore in sloppy stuff, knowing
we’re going to sit for two days trying to beat the derby that
was going on. We get to pick and choose, and so safety is a
huge issue.

Also, the price. We get more now for our fish, and none of us
had an idea that fish prices would increase like they have, and
so our price of our fish is more. Also, the consumers.
Remember, it used to be on every menu, everywhere you went, of
grouper, when available, market price. That grouper and snapper
now hold their own. If you go into a restaurant, you just
assume that you’re going to have it.

For the folks that said that overcapacity was something -- We
had ninety days a year, at the best, red snapper fishing. Now,
this happened to me. I had a 200-pound limit, and so, when I
came back, and I wasn’t going to make it back to the beach in
time, we had to throw 200 pounds of red snapper overboard, and
that’s the system that we left.

Also, when I hear about the auctions, I am always open to
anything, and that’s pretty much been my reputation. I’ve been
a moderate about everything, because you listen to all, but an
auction consolidates even more, and I think that we don’t have a
lot of consolidation in our IFQ system, not as much as other
places have, because the fishermen still -- The majority of
shares are owned by actual fishermen, but, if we had an auction,
the guy with the most money is going to end up with those
shares, and that small fisherman -- This is why we need to
pursue this quota bank, and I sure want to get some champions
from the council supporting our quota bank system.

We’ve got to take some of the allocation increases and set them
aside to divvy up to those that need them for our discards, and,
boy, the time left me here, but one final word, if I might. A
500-pound trip limit on amberjack. I said it before, and let’s
quit fooling ourselves. It’s a bycatch fishery, and let’s do
the best thing for the fishery and be able to keep the dead
discards that we catch without targeting them, because nobody is
going to target them for 500 pounds. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Zurbrick. Next, we have Mr.
Ken Haddad, followed by Mr. Brad Forhand.

MR. KENNETH HADDAD: Pardon my voice. I am fighting one of
those colds that is going around, but my name is Ken Haddad,
American Sportfishing Association, from Lloyd, Florida. I have
got a whole bunch of things that I want to cover, and so I’m going to do it as quickly as possible.

We support recommendations coming out of the Private Red Snapper Recreational AP, and we hope this council will take all of them up, in some form or fashion. Descending devices and venting tools, we support moving forward with a policy. We have some concerns, and we would like to see an addition, and we ultimately want to be in a position to increase catches by reducing mortality, fishing mortality, and we see no mention of this in the policy.

We think it should be incorporated in the policy statement, or purpose, or the background, somewhere, but it’s just simply ignored at this point, and we don’t think that’s good, over time, and so please address this for us.

We note the AP specifically requests exploring these devices as a requirement, and we think somehow that should be at least incorporated as a thought or a mention in the policy also, at least in the background.

We would also like to see the council implement something that provides for a measure of success of this policy, and you’ve had discussion on that, and we think it’s a very important component of anything that you put in place.

Allocation, I bring it up every meeting, and we believe there is a good cause to revisit red snapper allocation. Yes, Amendment 28 was struck down, but it was on a violation of National Standard 4, and the court even acknowledged, based on National Standard 1, that you’re responsible for dealing with allocation, and so a new amendment, we believe, is warranted and should readdress allocation that does not violate National Standard 4 and takes into account IFQs and their impacts and considers a broad range of the social, economic, and data corrections and management factors that need to be considered.

This has been recommended by the private recreational AP, and, three meetings ago, NOAA essentially said this was a viable direction to take, when discussing the lawsuit.

For state management and the EFPs, we support alternatives that give the maximum allowable and technically practicable management authority to the states. You’ve got a lot to work out, but we hope this moves forward, and we encourage the states and the council to put your all into this.
Amendment 41 and 42, we continue to have grave concerns over 41 and 42, due to their complexity and the addition of species, and, most importantly, the totally inadequate analysis on the impact to the entire recreational sector, and so thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Brad Forhand, followed by Mr. Stewart Miller.

MR. BRAD FORHAND: I’m Brad Forhand from Panama City Beach, Florida. I run the Charter Boat Reel Commotion out of Captain Anderson’s Marina. I carry twenty-four passengers.

Amendment 41 and 42, I would like to see them done away with, tabled, put away. We have gone through it, and we have stood up here, and we’ve told you that we don’t like it and we don’t want it, and I personally believe that it would be a way for an IFQ system to come into the charter industry.

I have been left behind in the commercial IFQ. I am not interested in it at all, and the fish mostly that you can catch, red snapper, more so than others, the people that own most of the quota, they charge more, and you really can’t make any type of money with the fish, to speak of, and it’s very difficult to get the quota when you can get them.

Amberjack fishing, I would like to see it left at January 1. I don’t see any reason why we need to move the fishing year. That’s just out of nowhere, and I know that it’s probably to get away from some overage, but we really need those fish in May, in the spring in general, April or May, but we could stand just May. That’s a very good month for us, and we have a lot of people that like to come catch them. The water is cooler, and the mortality rate is not as high, and I’ve heard some people talk about the amberjack fishery not being in good shape, and that boggles my mind.

We haven’t fished them much the last couple of years at all. Plus, it’s where you could generally pull up there and fish and fish, and you could catch the limit, and you wouldn’t have to measure them and throw them back and get a couple more and get a legal fish. You pull up there and a thirty or forty-pound fish will take the bait, with the lead at the tip. I mean, there is no shortage of amberjack in our area. That’s pretty much it. Thank you, all, for having us.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Stewart Miller, followed by Mr. Mike Sullivan.
MR. STEWART MILLER: My name is Stewart Miller, and I own and operate the Charter Boat Great Escape. It’s dual-permitted, federally-permitted, up to nineteen passengers. I also own the commercial boat the Lady M. I am here on the amberjack, and I need a spring season.

I mean, I need mine in April or May for amberjack, and I would like to have something that my people can be proud to catch, something big. I mean, last year, we didn’t have any. I used to run over 300 hours in the month of May, and now I run like fifty. It used to be a very good month for me, but now it’s not anymore. They all wait to come in June for snapper.

If we do have to go to one fish for every two people, I would be okay with that. I mean, it being open is better than it being closed. I can at least sell something, and they can come down and fish. I am not for Amendment 41, and that’s pretty much it. Sorry that I don’t do very good speaking, but you have a good day.

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

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Captain. Where are you based?

MR. MILLER: Panama City.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Mike Sullivan, followed by Mr. Chris Padilla.

MR. MIKE SULLIVAN: I am Mike Sullivan, and I’m out of Panama City, Florida. I own three certified charter fishing vessels that are dual-permitted, and I’ve been there for seventeen years operating them.

We’ll start on the amberjack situation. With changing the season, the start date, from January 1 to August 1, I got it. By changing that, when the quota is met, it’s shut down, and so, in August, when it opens, I’m sure the quota will be caught in those three months and we won’t have a spring season, but in the western Gulf, that’s when they like to catch the amberjack. The weather is better, and so I understand why someone wanted to shift it, but I don’t understand -- It’s a lot of money spent to get it to shift, and so I’m for definitely keeping it January 1. Everybody is trying to budget.
In the same hand, everybody needs to win, and so the only way to do that is truly to have a split season, to where people in the eastern Gulf, the Panhandle, we can have the spring season in May, and I understand that we catch more fish in a shorter amount of time than they will in the fall, and so they will have the extended season in the fall, the 60/40 split or what have you. That way, everybody can somewhat win. You can never make everybody happy, as you all are well aware.

For Amendment 41 and 42, I am against it. I understand why people would like catch shares, because maybe they have other things going on, like they do hunting guide trips or they tuna fish or what have you, and then they could catch those fish at certain times, but, for the guys who are just strictly charter fishing and that’s all they do, you’re going to lose. You’re getting fifty-plus days now that you can catch them, and you can go as hard as you want, and it’s in the summer. That’s when everybody travels, and that’s when it’s the busiest time, and so I am definitely for that.

Back to the amberjack, and I forgot this one thing. I am definitely in favor of going to a one fish per two persons. It’s the only way that it’s going to be sustained open, and that’s the main thing, is open seasons. When you put closed, that takes away the opportunity, and the average person doesn’t like that, and, if they can at least have the opportunity to catch the fish, it’s wonderful.

Just like Mr. Mark Kelley said, it is kind of a black-eye how we worked so hard to get amberjack and triggerfish to open, triggerfish in March and amberjack not until May 1, and it wasn’t. It was opened, which, theoretically, it should punish us from days, and that’s not fair to us, because we got a two-day heads-up, and it’s not like we can just pick the phone up and get customers to come, and it’s also a rough month for everybody, weather-wise, and so thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Chris Padilla, followed by Ms. Alicia Paul.

MR. CHRIS PADILLA: Good afternoon, and thank you for having us, ladies and gentlemen. I am a Panama City charter fisherman, just like the few guys that spoke in front of me, and I am going to echo exactly what they said. We need a spring season for our amberjack. We are okay with a fractional limit and a split season, but we need that spring season to sustain a business.
It’s going to hurt a lot of people and put a lot of people behind the eight-ball, if we can survive.

41 and 42, I’m totally against intersector trading. That just still, at this point, looks like a setup for intersector trading, and it’s going to limit the field, again. These guys have already addressed that, but it needs to be done away with and move on. Let’s move to the next thing or radically change it, to prevent it, whatever you need to do.

Also, we’re okay with the split season, but, as mentioned before, we would rather have accountability for the season, either the spring or the fall, wherever they go over, and it costs them. That way, other regions aren’t being affected by the actions of a different area. Texas isn’t bothered by what’s going on in south Florida, because the seasons are different. That’s about all I have today. Thank you for the opportunity.

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

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Captain. You didn’t touch on state management, or at least I didn’t hear that. Would you be okay with your charter operation being in state management, or do you not want to?

MR. PADILLA: At this point, no. It’s a crapshoot, because what are they going to do with the fish? Right now, we’re making it. We’ve got fifty days of snapper that we’re supposed to catch, and it’s reliable. We are under our quota in the catch, the numbers you guys presented, and we don’t want state management and then, all of a sudden, we’re lumped back in with that over catch.

I do fish recreationally myself sometimes, and I understand wanting to go and availability, but, if it’s going to be state management for the recreational sector, that’s great, but we can’t afford to be lumped back in with them, because it’s a crapshoot. We don’t know what we’re going to get.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

MR. PADILLA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Alicia Paul, followed by Mr. Mark Tryon.

MS. ALICIA PAUL: Good afternoon. I’m Alicia Paul, and I have a
dually-permitted vessel in Panama City, Florida. I am going to
talk about a few things today. I am okay with Amendment 40,
sector separation, and I do not want to be under state
management.

I do not like 41 and 42. I would like to see that go away.
There is really no need for it. I stood up in front of you two
years ago and put on the record that status quo was -- Sector
separation had to be better with status quo, and I like it, and
let’s keep it that way. I see 41 and 42 going to a catch share
program, and I have been left behind in the IFQs, in catch
shares. I’m a young entrepreneur, and I’m trying to survive in
this business, and catch shares and IFQs is not the way for me.
I can’t afford them now, and I won’t be able to afford them.

Amberjacks, it’s a must-have in the spring for us. We’ve built
our business around it, and I would support a one fish per two
people bag limit. I said that backwards, but one fish per two
people bag limit, and a split season, and 60/40 is fine by me,
as long as the paybacks go back to the fall or the spring,
whichever the overage is, and I see no need to moving the date
to August 1.

Every fish that you all manage under this council, the fiscal
year starts on January 1, and why are we making the amberjacks
open in August, and it makes no sense. If you’re going to do it
to the recreational sector, then you’re going to do it to the
commercial sector, and what’s next? Let’s leave it all January
1.

Vermilion snapper, I do not support a reduction in the ACLs of
the vermilion snapper. Other than that, that’s really all I’ve
got to say. Thank you, all, for taking the time to let me
speak.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ma’am. Next, we have Mr. Mark
Tryon, followed by Mr. Billy Wells.

MR. MARK TRYON: Good afternoon. I’m Mark Tryon, a commercial
fisherman from Gulf Breeze, Florida. First, I want to address
this proposed auction scheme with the red snapper, and it seems
like we’ve always got some sort of a scheme hovering over us,
which is kind of like a punitive scheme, that demonizes the
commercial red snapper fishermen.

We have had reallocation, and we survived that, and now we’ve
got this auction business, and then we’ve always had talk about
how bad leasing is and demonizing that. Anyway, I am totally
against any type of auction. I think it will, as some of the others have said, it will benefit the people that have the deepest pockets, meaning really the largest shareholders.

I think, if you’re looking to generate some revenue, maybe you should go look into the, which is right now, presently table the expansion of the reef fish IFQ program for the vermilion, the amberjack, triggerfish, et cetera. We’ve already got a system in place to handle that, and it would offer a steady stream of additional income, over time.

Regarding the amberjack, I think that would be good to go with the 500-pound trip limit. It would extend the season, and I think, as Mr. Zurbrick said, it’s a bycatch fishery, for the most part, and so I think it would allow for a steady supply of fish to the market, or a more steady supply of fish.

Regarding the charter/for-hire, I think that should be kept under federal management, and I think that -- There has been some talk, for quite some time, about implementing the VMS to enhance accountability, and I think that should be something that should be actively pursued.

One last thing that was -- One of the fellas up here before had mentioned about discard mortality, I guess with red snapper, and one of the things that I don’t understand is why, in the recreational fishery, do we continue advocating the high-grading. In other words, each person out there fishing is hoping to get a ten or fifteen-pound, or maybe even bigger, fish, and, as a result, they’re fishing and fishing and fishing and discarding lots of fish, and so I think that needs to be looked into. As far as a slot limit, maybe one big fish, and the other fish is a slot limit, or something like that. That’s about all I have to say. Thank you.

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

**MR. BOYD:** Thank you. You were talking about a slot limit and size. In your commercial fishing, what is the desired size of the fish?

**MR. TRYON:** Well, for the dealers that I sell to, there is no actual -- They never told me there is a desired size, and so I’m not doing any grading. Now, some people may be doing some actual grading and trying to keep the smaller ones or whatever, but, anything over thirteen inches, I am keeping, and so my discard -- I am fishing with rods-and-reels and not in
particularly deep water, and we’re catching the fish up in the water column.

We’re using like one hook, an ounce-and-a-half weight, and we’re dropping it down until we get twenty or thirty feet under the boat. We’re only fishing over big, big schools of fish, and so our discards are very, very few, because we’re not seeing many fish under thirteen inches. We are keeping all the fish from thirteen inches up, and, if we do have to throw a fish back, being we’re not dragging them up off of the bottom, they usually survive, unless there is porpoises around, or sharks, which is a problem.

MR. BOYD: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Billy Wells, followed by Mr. Josh Ellender.

MR. BILLY WELLS: Hi. I’m Billy Wells, and I run the Wild Bill in Venice, Louisiana, for the Mexican Gulf Fishing Company. I believe that state management would be a good way to go. LA Creel has proven that it’s very good at collecting numbers of fish, and I constantly see Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries on the dock counting fish, as the boats come in, and I get weekly surveys and emails.

Before LA Creel came in and started counting fish, I don’t ever remember having anyone count any fish, and I was always kind of curious how everybody came up with the numbers of what was being caught, and I think LA Creel has shown to be a good way to count the fish.

I am very much against catch shares for the charter industry. To me, it kind of seems like it punishes the people that are better at fishing. There is a lot of charter boats that can make a hundred snapper last a lot longer than the ones that are more proficient at fishing, and I think it would punish the good captains, and it would shorten the number of days that you’re able to fish, if you weren’t real careful about limiting the number of fish that you allow your customers to catch on a daily trip.

It’s kind of tough, to me, when you charge the amount of money we charge, and you get out and the fish are biting and you tell people, well, we have to stop fishing, because you have reached your number, and they’re going to know what the deal is, and they’re going to wonder why -- There is always going to be someone thinking that they’re getting the shaft, because you’re
letting someone else catch fish, and they can’t, and it just seems, to me, that catch shares is a bad idea.

Stick with a limit, and each person gets X number of fish per day when the season is open, or the season is closed, and it is what it is. It’s cut-and-dried, and it seems like a much better way to do things, to me.

That goes into the amberjack as well. When you have five people on the boat, and you have fractionalized amberjack, and you have one amberjack for two people, I really don’t want to have to argue with that fifth guy every day that he can catch an amberjack and cut off half of it and throw the rest back. I don’t want to have that argument, and I know I’m going to have that argument, but just please don’t make me have to have that argument.

As far as the start of the season for amberjack, it seems smart, to me, to start the season after the fish have had time to spawn, which is in the spring, and so let them spawn, and let’s keep the fish going for years to come.

Something else that I haven’t heard anybody talk about, but there are twelve-hundred-and-something charter permits in the Gulf of Mexico, thirty of which are historical captains permits, and I think it would be nice if we could get those converted to real, regular -- If the number is just thirty, I can’t see how it affects the fishing pressure or the value of the permits, but it’s kind of self-serving.

I do have one of those permits, a historical captain, and I turn forty-three next week, and that Gulf of Mexico is pretty rough. You start thinking that it would be nice to be able to, if you hurt yourself, have another captain fill in and run your trips that you have booked, and so I guess that’s all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Josh Ellender, followed by Mr. Corey Pitre.

MR. JOSH ELLENDER: Hello, everyone. I am Josh Ellender, owner and operator of Ellender Charters. I’ve been to a few Gulf Council meetings before. I am a prior permit holder, and I sold mine, because of all the craziness going on, and obviously we can’t agree on anything, whether it’s good for the west or good for the east or what.

A lot of stuff I’m talking about has to do with the Louisiana Charter Boat Association, and I am a board member, but I’m also
a recreational fisherman offshore. One of the questions that I do have, and Billy kind of hit it, is, for amberjack, if I go out by myself, as a recreational fisherman, and I catch one, what do I do? I am curious. I don’t know. Do I have to throw it back? Do I cut in half and throw one-half back and bring back half?

That is one of the big points that you have as a recreational fisherman, and it doesn’t fit that need. Yes, it does fit for big headboats and whatnot. You can split the fish, but you can’t ask somebody to cut a fish open or say, well, you can’t catch it, but these guys can, and that’s just not fair.

As far as amberjack, I am in favor of having the May/August through October season. Like Billy said, give the fish time to actually spawn and reproduce, to give a better stock out there, and so that will definitely help it out. Obviously, it helps out the western side of the Gulf, if we don’t open it January 1, because it is rough out there, and, a lot of times, we cannot fish, and that’s just a plain fact of the matter. We can’t control that, and so we like the May season, opening May, and then August through October.

Another thing is I am in favor of the Louisiana state plan, or state management, and, also, I am in favor of the Louisiana exempted fishing permit. I think state management is the way to go. We obviously know our waters the best, and who is better to control that than us, and so I am in favor of that. I am against Amendment 41 and 42. I think we need to table that and just move on and cut our losses and go.

I do hear a lot -- Going back to the amberjack, and a lot of people say, well, we want it during the January 1, to open up, or we want it in the spring, because that’s their popular times, and they make a lot of money, and they benefit from that time. If we can’t go to state management, then one of the things that we talked about in the past was the east and west zone.

Draw a line right down the middle, 50 percent and 50 percent to each side, and go from there. That way, it satisfies Florida, Alabama and Florida’s fishery, and then it also satisfies the west. I think that’s about it.

Also, on historical permits, yes to normalizing them. I vote in favor of normalizing the historical permits. Let the guys have it. There is no reason to have separate ones. Thank you for your time.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Just a comment to the fractional bag limit, and we’re not going to ask anyone to cut a fish in half and release half, I can assure you. The way it would work is, if there is one person onboard the vessel, they could keep one fish. If there’s two, they could still only keep one fish. If there is three, they can keep two fish. If there’s four people, they can still only keep two fish, but we’re not contemplating asking you to release half a fish.

MR. ELLENDER: I didn’t think you were. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Corey Pitre, followed by Mr. John Coulon.

MR. COREY PITRE: How are you all doing? My name is Corey Pitre, and I’m a six-pack charter boat captain in Louisiana. I have a couple of comments to comment on. Reconsider the Amendment 41. I am not in favor of catch shares to charter fishermen in Louisiana.

Two, the historical permits, allow the guys who are holding offshore permits for two decades to be grandfathered into the system. They deserve it. Three, the greater amberjack, I am fine with the already passed August, September, October, and May season. I would like to see somewhat of a spring season, also, keeping the bag limit at one per person.

Four, allow state management for the Louisiana plan and the EFP. With this, I would like to see the most allocation we can get, and don’t get -- If so, don’t give us an unfair percentage, and that’s it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. John Coulon, followed by Mr. Brett Ryan.

MR. JOHN COULON: Thank you, and good afternoon, council. I’m John Coulon, and I operate a twenty-passenger partyboat out of Venice, Louisiana, and I’m going to try to make this short, because Captain Larry Hooper that came in with me signed in before me, and I don’t see his name up there, and so I will kind of keep it short and try to get to the points here.

I am against Amendment 41. Table that, if possible, and I am flexible with the amberjack situation, whether it’s a fractional fish or a whole fish, being a twenty-passenger boat. Anyone
that is not happy with their state management, bring it to
Louisiana. We have plenty to share, whether it’s with the
public or the boats, it doesn’t matter. We like the
competition. The little bit that we’re allowed to fish, it
would be handy.

As far as the season, six weeks under the federal guidelines.
As we would have now, it’s six weeks, and it’s just not enough.
Six months out of the year, it doesn’t matter what you allow us
to fish, but just allow us something and have public access to
accommodate the phone calls that we’re turning away at this
time. I will ask you if it’s okay if I let Captain Larry Hooper
have his say. I will cut it short. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: You don’t have to cut it short. He is on the
list. I saw him. He’s just a little further down the list.

MR. COULON: He was actually in front of me, but okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: John, I signed you up earlier.

MR. COULON: Thank you. I don’t know much about the Louisiana
exempted fishing permit, and I’m not real familiar with it, but
I have worked both with the federal and Louisiana reporting, and
the survey as well, with the LA Creel, and, over the years, the
last fifty years, in the industry, in excess of fifty years,
they both did a good job, and Louisiana did every bit as well as
the feds, and they went back and forth there for many years, but
I am in favor of the Louisiana plan and state management for the
red snapper. It would be hard to mess it up worse than it is
now.

Like I said, it’s a nuisance fish. You can’t go out and target
another species, because, to me, the best available science,
over the years, there’s only so much that can occupy one space
at a time, and we can’t get away from the red snapper to go out
and target another species.

It’s a problem, but, like I said, right now, one of the biggest
problems is to accommodate a customer that wants to come to
Louisiana, whether he’s a Louisiana resident or coming from
across the country, and it’s a lot harder being a twenty-
passenger partyboat, as I said.

My rates are based on twelve passengers, and it’s harder to
organize larger groups. It takes more time, and it’s just not
possible to do spur-of-the-moment changes here, where we have to
get on some kind of schedule where, when the phone rings --
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Coulon, are you just about done?

MR. COULON: Yes, ma’am. That’s wrapped up.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Sorry. We do have a question though, from Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: John, it’s good to see you again.

MR. COULON: It’s always good to see you, Mr. Swindell, and I thank you, buddy.

MR. SWINDELL: I do have a question about descending devices. Are you doing a lot of red snapper fishing, and do you have descending devices onboard your vessel?

MR. COULON: We catch so many fish -- I never fish any deeper than I have to. Like I told you guys at the last meeting in Biloxi there, we’re catching the red snapper now in as shallow as fifteen feet of water. Years ago, it took forty or fifty feet of water, and it’s not that big of an issue.

We get out close to 200 feet of water, then yes. We have experimented with descending devices and venting tools, and we’ve experimented with all of it, but, most of our fishing, we can actually do shallow water, enough where it’s not -- The mortality rate is not that high.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. COULON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Brett Ryan, followed by Mr. Darren Haydel.

MR. BRETT RYAN: Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Brett Ryan, and I run an offshore charter business out of Venice, Louisiana. It’s a federally-permitted boat. I want to start off by thanking Mr. Ben Webber and Mr. Richard Foster for everything they do. Not a lot of the guys from Venice can make it up here to these meetings, or meetings anywhere else, and it’s a beautiful weather day, of course, and so there’s a lot of people offshore fishing today.

Not a lot of us can make it, and these guys really speak for the majority of what we are for. As far as that goes, I am for the Louisiana exempted plan for fishing. The amberjack is a tough
one, and I really haven’t made up my mind on that yet, and the
historical permits, as Captain Wells mentioned earlier, we need
to give those guys their permits. They’ve been fishing for a
long time, before the moratorium was created. There is a
moratorium now, but I personally know of two permits that were
never renewed and are gone forever.

You’re only talking about thirty guys throughout the Gulf Coast,
and I know of two permits that never got renewed and are gone
forever, and we should give those thirty guys the permits they
deserve. They have been fishing long enough.

Our fishery along the coast, out of Venice, Fourchon, Grand
Isle, is extremely different from Destin and Texas and Pensacola
and Panama City, because of our proximity to the continental
shelf. We have lots of red snapper that come in, and we have
tons of other fish, and so we really need Louisiana to be able
to manage our own reef fishery, to do it correctly, because the
LA Creel survey program has been working.

We have been seeing and documenting fish, and you have
biologists taking otoliths out of fish and measuring how old
they are, and it’s a program that’s been working, and, from what
I hear from biologists, we never even met our quota that the
state allotted for last year, and so they cut it off before we
even overfished it, by their numbers, which are hard numbers,
because they’re at the docks. They are doing the work, boots on
the ground, and they are monitoring these fish, and that works,
because we have a different fishery than Florida, where there is
hundreds and hundreds of marinas and tons more coastline.

We fish in remote areas, and you pretty much don’t have much
costline that are accessing these fish that we are right off of
the shelf, and so I am for state management of our fishery, and
I guess that’s really all I have. You all have a good day, and
thank you for listening to me, and enjoy New Orleans while you
all are here. It’s Mardi Gras time, and so have some good times
while you’re out there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Darren
Haydel, followed by Mr. David Morgan.

MR. DARREN HAYDEL: Hello, and thank you, all, for having me
today. I am Darren Haydel from Cocodrie, Louisiana. I’ve been
a licensed charter boat captain for twenty-four years, and so,
on the historical permit, I was eight or nine years before the
moratorium, and, at the time, I didn’t have a boat that I was
running for a marina, and so I fell into the historical captain
permit, and I have had my own boat now for fifteen years, and, I
mean, if I ever want to give it up or one of my kids wants to
take over, or if I get sick, or if somebody wants to run my
boat, they can’t, and so I feel like thirty permits is not that
big of a deal to normalize it and make it where I could move it
on.

Amberjack, I am definitely in favor of the summer season,
because I don’t even start until April, typically, because out
of Cocodrie, we’ve got long runs to the fishing grounds. It’s
sixty or seventy miles just to the amberjack, and, in the
springtime, it’s just too rough to get to them, and so, the last
couple of years -- Last year, we didn’t get to fish them at all,
I mean zero, not even one day, and so I’m definitely in favor of
a summer season and the bag limit being at least one per person,
because, the money we charge and the runs we make and the time
we spend on the water, I think it’s definitely worth these guys
to be able to at least catch one fish per person and be able to
keep it.

I’m in strong favor of state management, because, the last few
meetings I’ve been to, you listen to everybody from a different
region talk different about what they think should be right, and
it just kind of makes perfect sense, to me. Why not let your
state do it? I mean, our fishery is totally different than it
is in Florida, and so I think it would definitely be better
managed by each state individually, and that’s all I have to
say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. David
Morgan, followed by Mr. Richard Fischer.

MR. DAVID MORGAN: Good afternoon, and thank you for having us.
I run a small business out of Venice, Louisiana, and I’m
speaking on behalf of the small-business owner and the Louisiana
Charter Boat Association.

I would support no on Amendment 41 and 42. As for the
historical permit, I believe it should be able to be transferred
through the lineage of the family or sold or run thereafter. As
far as the amberjack season, it’s more beneficial -- The winter
months, opening in January, right now, most of the fleet has not
been able to fish or utilize any of the amberjack season as is,
and so a later start in summer would be better for us as well as
-- Let’s see. Normalizing the permits, I am for.

The creel limit, I feel, on the amberjack should still remain
one fish per person. I know there is the fractional talk, but I
would be against that, at the moment. As far as the management of the snapper season, I believe we should move that to Louisiana state management, in accordance with the state laws, as well as the federal management. I think that’s all I really have today. Thank you, all, for having us.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Richard Fischer, followed by Mr. Bob Zales.

MR. RICHARD FISCHER: Good afternoon. This is Richard Fischer, here representing the Louisiana Charter Boat Association. I’m pretty much going to repeat a lot of what you all just heard in the last few minutes from a run of our captains.

Yes, we support the Louisiana EFP, and we also support the Louisiana plan. There was a recent poll of our charter fleet, both LCBA captains and non-LCBA captains, and there was more than a super majority in favor of state management, as opposed to federal management, and I’ve talked about this here up on this podium before. For every one federally-permitted captain in Louisiana who favors federal management, there are nine who favor state management, nine-to-one, and it’s pretty clear.

We really want to secure state management in both of those documents, the EFP as well as the Louisiana plan. For the EFP, if that means 8.4 percent, it means 9.4 percent. We want state management, and we’re going to fight for more allocation in the Louisiana plan, but the charter sector wants to be in both, absolutely.

As for amberjack, we do not favor fractional management, for the most part. As you have just heard from the last few captains, we just, for the most part, we just don’t think it’s right for us to have to tell six paying customers that three of you, sorry, you all are out of luck.

We’re fine with the August, September, October and May season, starting the fishing year in the summer. We think that’s a pretty good compromise, talking to our captains, and I would say just about all of them are in favor a late summer/fall season, and maybe about half of them have been in favor of a spring season, and so it seems like a pretty good compromise to start in the middle of the year and guarantee a summer season. It’s pretty likely that there is also going to be a spring season as well, and, when I say a summer season, I also mean a summer/fall season as well.

As you heard, we do not favor Amendment 41, and we do not favor
catch shares in charter fishing. We hope that you all would reconsider tabling it at Full Council tomorrow, and, finally, I will end on the historical permits, which you heard a little bit about.

Mr. Billy Wells spoke earlier, and he actually owns one of those, but it’s not just Billy. It’s our captains in general, and we just feel like these guys have been in the business now for two decades with a historical permit, and they have proven that they’re in the industry and they’re invested, and they’ve been working hard. It made sense, at the time, to go ahead and kind of put them in the little gray area, when you guys wanted to cap the amount of permits, but we’re down from 1,900 down to about 1,250, and so that has been accomplished and then some.

We’re talking about thirty-something guys, and it means very little to the rest of the fleet, but it means a whole lot to those thirty-something guys, and so we would definitely ask you all to go ahead and get that done, and I’m out of time. If you all have anything for me, I would be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you very much. I have a real quick question. How many captains does your organization represent?

MR. FISCHER: We represent about 300 captains, both inshore and offshore, and we represent about two-thirds of the offshore fleet in Louisiana that is actively participating.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Shipp has a question for you, too.

DR. SHIPP: Thank you, Richard. You mentioned the vote on one issue, and then you also mentioned that you all are against 41 and 42, but what was the vote on that, if you recall?

MR. FISCHER: From a poll of our captains, I don’t have specific figures on a poll of our captains for 41. However, I would tell you that that kind of falls into the state management versus federal management discussion, and so, if it’s nine-to-one for state management, as opposed to federal management, it would certainly stand to reason that our captains are also very against Amendment 41. In the conversations that we’ve had with our captains, that has also panned out.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: In your organization, of the 300, how many of those are federally permitted?

MR. FISCHER: I would say probably about forty-five to fifty.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Bob Zales, followed by Mr. Tom Wheatley.

MR. BOB ZALES, II: I’m Bob Zales, II, and I’m President of the National Association of Charter Boat Operators and also of the Panama City Boatmen’s Association, and you all have emails that I have sent you all in the past couple of weeks, and so you pretty well know where we stand on amberjack and also on 41 and 42.

I am going to tell you that -- We all know that we had what they call a blue moon, or some kind of special moon, last night, and so you all can get ready for a strange year, because of that, and, Dr. Crabtree, I am agreeing with a whole lot that he has to say this week so far, which hasn’t happened in a long time, and so this could start out to be a strange year.

Anyway, I appreciate Roy’s comments, but Mark Kelley hit on some things when it comes to 41. I am one of those people that -- I am not as good as Benji. I only landed about 945 snappers last year. To get back to that number, if you go forward with 41, I am going to have to buy or lease a whole lot of fish to get back up there, and that is just not going to work.

There is a host of reasons why we’re opposed to that, and that’s just one of them. It’s just not the right thing to do, and Dr. Crabtree pointed out that, depending on how this thing moves forward, the six-pack operators are probably going to be the big losers. My boat carries twenty-five. We’ve been in business, my family and I, are we’re in our fifty-third year, and so I’m going to get twice as many as that six-pack, but I’m still going to have to build back up to where I am now.

With the change in the designation of MSST, in the paper that you showed yesterday, red snapper should now become no longer overfished, and reaching that category of not undergoing overfishing and not being overfished, your accountability measures for management go out the window. You now have more
flexibility to manage that fishery.

For our fishery and the for-hire, we’ve been below our targets, and you now can get closer to that target without the fear of having to pay back the following year, if we happen to hit it or go over a little bit, and so everything that we’re playing with, everything you all manage, is getting better.

Red snapper is excellent, and most of the other fish are doing real good, and so there is no need -- If we’re looking at fifty to sixty days this year in snapper, and we get a month in May for jacks, and we get two or three months in the fall for jacks, and we get triggerfish in there, and somebody said something about having six months, and we’re into a six or seven-month season of fishing.

That’s what we need, and so 41 and 42 -- If you concentrate more on the data system, and work with the states. Figure out a simple way to do it, because they’re doing it simple. The feds, for whatever reason, is just complicated as hell, and we can’t get to the endpoint, and so, if you put your effort in the data, and you get that straightened out, and, if you need to revisit 41 and 42 when that is done, do it, but I don’t think there will be a need for it. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. ZALES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question for you from Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Bob. I have heard both sides of support and then some concerns with the fractional bag limit, one fish for two people, and I would like if you could elaborate on the importance of this and what it means to you, perhaps, in your fishery.

MR. ZALES: The jack fishery, clearly our back has been pushed against the wall. I mean, this thing came up years ago, and, historically, we’ve been opposed to fractional bag limits in any fishery, but, when your back is against the wall, you do whatever you can do to try to survive.

One fish for two people, for a temporary measure, should ensure that we stay within the quota, and that’s our goal, is to try to get everybody a little shot at the fish. You hear, on the west side, that they haven’t had them. Well, we haven’t had them either, but, in this scenario, we get a little bit in the
spring.

In other parts of the Gulf, they get a little bit in the fall, and so, by doing that one fish, as Dr. Crabtree pointed out, if you’ve got one person, you get one fish. If you’ve got three people, you get two fish, and so it’s not what you’re catching, but it’s what you’re able to keep, because you can catch jacks all day long and wear yourself out, and, when you catch two or three jacks today, at the size that they are, you’ve got a pretty good mess of fish, plus everything else that you’re able to catch from the peripheral side of that.

MR. SANCHEZ: I might add that one fish per two people -- They do have two fillets.

MR. ZALES: Exactly, and you’ve got plenty of fish. I mean, you’re looking at a twenty or twenty-five-pound fish, and so you’ve got plenty, and, like I said, you can wear yourself out catching them and throwing them back.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have one more question from Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Bob, what is your thoughts on this historical captain thing that’s coming up?

MR. ZALES: I’m glad you asked that, because I was -- Some people on the council may not know, but I was Chairman of the Ad Hoc AP that designed that moratorium, and, when we did that with the historical captains, the purpose was it was patterned after the commercial historical captain thing that was done before we did that one.

On the commercial side, pretty much, once that allocation was set for red snapper, the historical captains sold all their quota, and so that was part of the reason why we said that the thing would be non-transferable, but that whole plan was done not to reduce effort, but to cap it, and, over time, permits have gone away, and so you’re looking at thirty people, and give it to them. It’s not going to make any difference.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you.

MR. ZALES: Thank you.

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

MR. TOM WHEATLEY: Good afternoon, council. My name is Tom
Wheatley, and I am here representing the Pew Charitable Trusts. I live, work, and fish out of Tampa, Florida. I would like to start by commending the council for starting the year with what seems like a broader sense of cooperation on recreational red snapper management.

The five exempted fishing permit proposals submitted by the states show promise in both allowing more flexibility in setting seasons for recreational red snapper fishermen and, importantly, improving monitoring on a regional basis, catch monitoring.

As the council and NMFS move forward in meeting the needs of both the anglers and the red snapper rebuilding plan, we offer these thoughts. First, it is important that the red snapper remain under federal management and the core conservation standards in the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The EFP and the proposed state management plans do just that and are evidence of the flexibility already built into the Act.

Second, including strong accountability measures is important to keep rebuilding on track. We would like to see consistency in how the accountability measures, including setting the annual catch targets, the ACTs, and overage adjustments are calculated and implemented across each of the five states, but that doesn’t necessarily mean that all of the ACT buffers need to be the same, as some states have shown real improvements in monitoring catch to reduce that uncertainty. It means that there should be well-designed standards for how we set ACTs and how overage adjustments, or paybacks, are applied.

Building on that idea, we really think these plans represent an opportunity for all of the states to improve catch monitoring of the recreational red snapper catch, and we are pleased that most states have included those improvements directly in their EFP applications.

Lastly, the one factor that really gets you older, more productive fish is time. The rebuilding plan’s goal of having a broad spectrum of age classes, particularly the older, more fecund fish represented in the red snapper population, really should still guide all management decisions, and that’s all I have, and so thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Wayne Werner, followed by Mr. Kory Freed.

MR. WAYNE WERNER: Good afternoon. My name is Wayne Werner, owner and operator of the Fishing Vessel Sea Quest. I fish
right here in Louisiana, and the first thing I would like to speak about is the amberjacks. Amberjacks have become just basically something we throw back for most of the year now, and I would like to see it go to a 500-pound trip limit. It will help a little bit, but it’s not going to help totally, but I feel like it will help.

A lot of the quota is caught up in the first two months of the year by south Florida, and then we get the remainder of the summer, and there’s not much left, and we just continue to kill them all the rest of the year, and so I would like to see that come to an end.

I agree with Bob Zales about data. I think it’s very important. The most important thing about Amendment 41, to me, was the logbook program, getting to an electronic logbook. I think that’s very important. I think it’s important to get real data. Data from fishermen is good, and it’s real good, and I think that -- I don’t have a dog in the hunt, as far as which way it goes as far as the rest of it, but I think the logbook program is very important.

As far as -- We talked about having the lottery or auction, and it would be nice. We could have two more Werner’s in the business then. Two more to deal with for a bunch more years, and I don’t know if you want that, but I think this council should go back and look at the new entrant program that you all did before.

Today, you have fishermen that could use it, that need it, and you all passed it, and you all did it. Camp, you were part of it, and I think Dr. Shipp was part of it, and most of you all right here were, and you ought to go back and look at that program, because it might help some of the people in the eastern zone of the Gulf of Mexico, and that’s really all I have to say. Thank you.
allocation, with near certainty.

I would like to remain under the protections as set forth under the Magnuson-Stevens Act for federally-permitted vessels. Regarding amberjack, I support a fractional bag limit of one fish per two people, along with a split season that includes August through October and then again for the month of May at a 70/30 split. I said August through October 1, and that’s if you go where the calendar year begins in August.

I was glad to hear clarification from Dr. Crabtree today about at three people that you get two fish. There seemed to be a lot of confusion regarding that, and so I was glad to hear that.

Since my last testimony, it should be known that I have completely flopped on this. I disagreed with many in my own fleet, and I wanted to stay at the one fish per person. Since that last testimony, and listening and talking and thinking, and talking to my customers, reality had to set in. The days, and I took part in it, but the days of kill, kill, kill are over. It’s archaic, and it’s time to come to that realization.

I heard people saying that they can’t tell half of their customers that they can’t have a fish, and I don’t know everybody’s business model, but, for me, I am overwhelmingly private charters, and so I am very fortunate to have a very good rapport with my repeat customers, and so, when I call them and I say this very situation -- Let’s say I have six people, and I have three jacks, and everybody gets a fillet, and everybody is good. It’s a new time, and it’s a new era. I guess that is it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mike Graef, followed by Mr. Greg Ball.

UNIDENTIFIED: I can tell you that Mike Graef had to leave.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Thank you, sir. Is Mr. Greg Ball present?

MR. GREG BALL: I am here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right.

MR. GREG BALL: Good evening. I am Greg Ball from Galveston, Texas, and I own and operate three charter boats over there, and I’m also the President of the Galveston Professional Boatmen’s Association.
We’re organized in Galveston and promoting Galveston fishing to ensure conservation and sustainable management and enhance the cultural heritage of our fishing communities, and we would like to see -- We support the state management for the private anglers, but we would like to have all the charter boats removed from the EFPs. We don’t support that.

We support Amendment 40, and we would like to see you all move forward with Amendments 41 and 42, to be addressed by the industry, and that’s -- Just taking everything out, that’s pretty much all we’ve got. Thank you, all. Have you got questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSAR GE: Yes, I think we do. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you. Again, I’m just curious how many captains you represent in your organization.

MR. BALL: We have over a hundred captains, and we’ve got about thirty-five or forty federally-permitted boats in Galveston, and about ninety in our area that are federally-permitted, but, right now, we have about thirty-five, I think, that we support.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSAR GE: We have one more question from Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I heard from some of the other states how they were approached and asked and had a lot of exchange and dialogue, in terms of asking groups such as yourself, and do you guys want in an EFP or don’t you?

MR. BALL: No, sir.

MR. SANCHEZ: Were you guys ever --

MR. BALL: We don’t want any part of the EFP. We feel like we need to --

MR. SANCHEZ: What I am asking you is were you ever asked if you wanted to be in one or out of one by your state folks or something that are promoting the EFP?

MR. BALL: Well, I’ve had a few emails, but I don’t think, as a group, we have not. I have personally had an email, but we have asked all of our group, and they all do not want to be included.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Mr. Riechers and then Mr. Anson.

MR. RIECHERS: Mr. Ball, just because your group is a little bit new, we’ve got a Boatmen’s Association, of course, that is out of Port Aransas, and are you associated with that?

MR. BALL: No, sir. We’re in Galveston.

MR. RIECHERS: But I haven’t heard of you all before. Are you new?

MR. BALL: Yes, we’re new. We have been -- About two months ago, we organized.

MR. RIECHERS: Okay. Are you all associated with the Charter Fishermen’s Association as well?

MR. BALL: Yes.

MR. RIECHERS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I was wondering if you had any comment on the discussion we had during the council regarding the historical captains and converting those permits to permanent status.

MR. BALL: Yes, and I don’t know. I don’t have any comments for that.

MR. ANSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. BALL: All right. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Ed Walker, followed by Mr. Scott Robson.

MR. ED WALKER: Thank you. I wasn’t going to comment, but, since it was just asked about the historical captain issue, if those guys have been charter fishing that long in the same place, and they didn’t just acquire that, they have earned that license. Just give it to them, and I believe it will eliminate a lot of extra printing. On all of the council stuff, there has always got to be a whole other paragraph, in addressing those thirty guys that have that particular permit, and, as a guy that
had to buy his permit, I say give those guys their permit. They earned it.

My name is Ed Walker, and I’m from Tarpon Springs, Florida, which is west central, and I pretty much live in the middle of grouper land down there. Grouper is the big thing for us, where we are. I am a commercial fisherman, and I’m a charter fisherman, and I’m also a recreational fisherman.

One of the things that I would like to confirm with you all is that there are some issues with the grouper population where we are, as your data shows, and I can confirm that that’s very accurate. Our red grouper catch has plummeted, and I have fished four commercial trips this year, grouper fishing, and I’ve caught -- My last trip, I caught one. I have caught less than six in four trips. We catch gags and red snapper and stuff, but there is something going on.

I have talked to Luiz Barbieri and some of the others, and it may be a cyclical, normal part of the typical fishery, and I’m not sure, but it’s pretty severe. There are places, vast areas, where red grouper used to live out there that they’re not there anymore.

The price for red grouper at the market has gone from $3.25 or $3.50, and it’s a solid $4.25 now, and, if you want to broker it, you could start an auction around town, if you have a red grouper to sell to a fish house somewhere, and it’s a thing.

Along those same lines, the gag is also off, as your data also indicates. They said they didn’t catch but 25 percent, I think, of the gag ACL, and less than 40 on the commercial side, and that’s recreational. I mean, I am seeing that as well. I do a lot of gag charters, and I commercial gag fish all winter, and we’re way off on that, and I just wanted to let you guys know that. I don’t know why, and I don’t know the solution, but it’s there, and so that’s for people smarter than me to figure out.

I am a big fan of the idea of a 500-pound trip limit for amberjack. Very few people directly target them anymore, but a lot of us throw them back because the season gets blown-up so quickly every year, and we’re out there grouper fishing. It will make the season longer, and it will give you a better market price for the fish, because they’re not all being dumped on the market at the same time, and I think it’s a win-win, and virtually all the commercial guys that I have talked to agree, except one guy, who is a big amberjack spear fisherman, and he would like to keep his big bag limit.
The fractional amberjack and the charter thing, I think that’s a great idea as well. It will allow a captain to sell a trip with the potential to catch one or two big fish to hang up on the dock, and he can bring in his box of b-liners or grunts or whatever he wants, and he’s got one trophy, or two trophy, fish, and he can sell the trip, whether he even catches it or not, and so that’s my opinion on that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question for you from Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: Mr. Walker, do you feel that the low catches of gag and reds have been a displacement issue, as red snapper moved in? You mentioned these areas where you just don’t get the gags and the reds anymore.

MR. WALKER: No, sir, I don’t think that’s an issue at all, because, the places where we used to catch a lot of red grouper are low, hard-bottom areas, and sometimes they get red snapper on them as well, but those are just blanks now, and I’ve got a plotter full of them, and we tow our anchor from spot to spot, and we fish five minutes a stop, and you either get them or you don’t.

When you’re commercial fishing, you’re looking for the homerun. You try this one, and you try that one, and you try that one, and so we get a lot of stops in in a day, and a lot of these historically good red grouper areas are just blank. There is no red snapper, and it’s not gag bottom, particularly. It’s lower relief, and there is just nobody.

It’s not like a bunch of red snapper took over and the red grouper -- If they did move, the commercial guys would find them, but they haven’t. They haven’t caught -- I don’t know, and I think the number was 24 percent or something, of their quota.

It’s a very low number of the commercial red grouper quota, and so I think they would find them if they had been displaced. The only guys that are catching any, to my knowledge, are going way southwest of where we live, past where we used to fish, and catching some down there, but not that many.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you.

MR. WALKER: Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson does.
MR. ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Walker. I don’t know if you heard the discussion we had during the Reef Fish Committee, but the council hears you and other fishermen regarding red grouper and that there seems to be a problem.

There is an assessment that will be completed at the end of this year, but, administratively, there won’t be a chance to have any of that information available to impact next year’s distribution of IFQ quota, and is that something that you would be supportive of, is if we looked at some sort of change in how that process occurs, to maybe hold back some pounds for next year and just wait to make sure that we got the assessment process completed?

MR. WALKER: Yes, sir. I can tell you that as a red grouper shareholder, and I’m on the Reef Fish Advisory Panel, and I am included in some of their red grouper discussions, and I can tell you that I don’t know of any of the commercial guys I know that wouldn’t happily lower the red grouper quota. We all think that that increase -- Nobody wanted that, on the commercial side, but we wanted to give some to the recreational side, because they had been closed for one month the year before, and it really hurt the charter guys.

They got closed early, and the commercial guy had excess on his side, and so we examined ways to try and give them some, which there aren’t any, and so, to give some back to the recreational guys, you had to give a proportional amount to the commercial guys, which they didn’t want, and we settled for the most minimal increase in quota.

They offered numbers that -- The stock assessment said you could go up to 50 percent increase in red grouper, and the commercial guys pow-wowed and said we don’t want anything like this, and 30 was the lowest of options that they gave us, and so that was actually, I think, an example of the commercial guys trying to help out the recreational guys.

If the commercial guys could have stayed where they were and helped out the recreational guys, and you took a vote on it, I bet you that a large number of them would have done it, but, even if you cut the red grouper in half right now, you still wouldn’t impact what they caught this year, and so that’s for you guys to figure out how to help, because I don’t think cutting the quota would do it, from where it is right now, but most of the commercial guys I know think the red grouper allocation is too high right now.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Scott Robson, followed by Ms. Pam Anderson.

MR. SCOTT ROBSON: Good afternoon, Gulf Council. My name is Scott Robson, owner and operator of the Charter Boat Phoenix in Destin, Florida, and I’ve been in the business for forty years. I would highly recommend fractional bag limits on the amberjack, one fish per two people.

With this reduction, it should ensure that we have a full spring and a full fall season, and hopefully an increase in the longer spring season, possibly in the future, in April and May. If we also have a split quota, I would like to see a 70/30 split, but my question would be, if 70 percent of that was overfished in the fall, does that come off in the 30 percent of May, and so I’m going to get back to, if that is true, then, to me, there is no reason to have a split quota, because it defeats any purpose of being able to ensure fish for that spring season. If so, I don’t want a split quota on that.

Also, I would like to see a vessel limit of six per vessel. This would give a recreational fisherman a longer season with an additional 15 percent reduction in landings. This, along with a fractional bag limit, would give us a lot less chance of overfishing, which equals a longer season, and, really, that’s all we’re -- I mean, that’s what our goal is there, and you’ve heard many people talk about that’s what they want, are longer seasons.

You have heard some of them talk about they want the one fish. Well, you can’t -- It seems to me, in this world, we’re not going to get both with one fish. We’re going to overfish one part of that season, and, typically, it would look like it could happen in the fall, and there would be none left for into May, and so changing season dates and seasons, calendar years, does not ensure a spring May season in 2019 or future years, and so, here again, I am not sure where we were going to go, because changing that season doesn’t -- It doesn’t give any -- It gives no reduction in the landings, and so starting a season in May would ensure a spring season, and there would be fish left over in the fall, because I think I’ve heard it stated that there probably wouldn’t be more than 40 percent caught at a one fish per person, and so, even with the one per two, if you did fractional, it would be even less.
I would say make historical captains into a regular permit. I am one of them, forty years, and allow federal for-hire to fish their quota, reduce the buffer, and extend the season to at least sixty days in the red snapper fishery.

I want to make one quick comment on red grouper, and I don’t know all the science to it, but it seems like there needs to be some looking. We’re looking into how we’re going to reduce bag limits and so forth, and it seems like there is some red tide issues that seem to account for a lot of the fishery decline, and that’s it.

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

MS. PAM ANDERSON: Thank you, Madam Chair, Dr. Crabtree, and council members. I am Pam Anderson, with Captain Anderson’s Marina from Panama City, and I’m the fishery rep on the Bay County Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for this opportunity to share some thoughts.

I wanted to give you a little bit of history, since a lot of you weren’t here when this catch share discussion started, because there were a lot of questions that came up yesterday that I was surprised that they weren’t known.

Our catch journey needs to stop, be tabled, or postponed. I was present, as were some now CFA leaders, at the first catch share meeting in Sarasota in 2009, and a council member and also a then EDF rep, who may be here today, led the discussion of promoting a catch share program for the for-hire industry that, for those who jumped onboard with them, would certainly reap the benefit of up to a 400 percent profit.

This plan would eliminate the little guys in the industry, while allowing the catch share advocates the advantage of scooping up additional shares. Dr. Jane Lubchenco, who developed this program, stated, in several papers, that its purpose was to reduce overcapacity in the fleet. The EDF rep boasted having $50 million reserved to promote catch shares in the Gulf’s recreational fishery at that time.

I said then, and I will say now, that bankrupting small operators so that we can be more prosperous is not the Anderson way of doing business, and, if it takes $50 million to convince me I’m wrong, I am not convinced.
Fast forward to August of 2012, when this council had over 4,000 emails and public comments presented, of which 95 percent said no to sector separation and catch shares. It was tabled or postponed at that time, and many lost hope in the system. In October of 2013, I believe it was, another 2,000 comments on these issues came in, of which, again, 95 percent said no to sector separation and catch shares.

The council passed sector separation anyway, saying there was a higher percentage of quite vocal advocates for the program than those against who were present for public comment, ignoring the majority of stakeholders who could not attend, but sent comments by email and snail-mail. Rightly stated yesterday, recreational fishing is about access and opportunity for anglers, but, for the for-hire, the more limitations you place on us, such as catch shares, the more business will fail and there will be less access for recreational anglers, many of whom are tourists.

We do not need, nor want, catch shares or the intersector trading that will surely follow. It’s my understanding that the changes in the MSST will remove red snapper into the not overfishing and not overfished category. With that, the accountability measures being stopped will allow more harvest.

In addition, the upcoming red snapper assessment should further increase our ACL and access to the fishery. With measures already in place, such as these and state management, I submit that there is no reason, at this time, to continue developing Amendments 41 and 42. We no longer have overcapacity, if we ever did, and our fishery is growing, and we should be allowed to grow with it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Anderson, are you just about done?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes. I have one more sentence. In business, even when we’ve poured good money into a project, we sometimes have to come to a time when we stop, reconsider, and go in a different direction. Hopefully, with catch shares, you will do the same. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ma’am. Next, we have Mr. Ken Anderson, followed by Mr. Dale Woodruff.

MR. KEN ANDERSON: Good afternoon. I am Ken Anderson, headboat operator from Panama City, Florida, and the husband of the previous speaker. My family started in the headboat business in Panama City in 1935. As you may know, red snapper is the most sought-after fish of headboat customers in Panama City. They’re
a good-sized fish, they’re delicious, they’re pretty, and they’re easy to catch. It doesn’t take an expert angler to fool a red snapper. Our customers love them.

I am going to keep this short and simple. Our customer counts are directly related to the ability to keep red snapper. When snapper season is open, our trips run full, or very close to full. When the season is closed, they do not.

The last three years, we have had a season of forty-five to forty-nine days, and hopefully fifty or more this year. With the information that I have about catch shares, I estimate that our boat would run out of quota after less than twenty days of fishing. Obviously, a forty-something or a fifty-day season is better than twenty. Therefore, I am in favor of keeping the status quo, regulating red snapper with set seasons, a two-fish bag limit, and a sixteen-inch length. I request that the catch share issue be tabled indefinitely.

I would also like to thank the council for opening up gray triggerfish for a limited harvest. There are more triggerfish off of Panama City now than I have seen in my entire life. I do think it would have been wiser to leave the size limit at fourteen inches. In my opinion, raising it to fifteen inches will only result in more dead discards.

I hadn’t planned to speak about amberjack today, but I would like to express my support for all the charter boat captains that came over from our marina to plead their case for amberjack. They really, really need a spring amberjack, as you have heard over and over, and I would just like to add my request that you give that serious consideration. Give them a break and let them have a month of amberjack in the spring. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Dale Woodruff, followed by Mr. Billy Neff.

MR. DALE WOODRUFF: How are you doing? I’m Dale Woodruff, Charter Boat Class Act, and I have the Daddy’s Baby out of Orange Beach, Alabama. I would like to say that it’s nice to see a lot of new faces out here, especially to get up and speak. A lot of people have spoken for an amendment, and I don’t think they really know that they have.

We’ve had a lot of groups from Panama City and a lot of people talk about how much they really like the snapper season. Just a few years ago, nobody wanted that from over there, but now they
like that snapper season, and so what does that tell us? If you’ve been writing it down with the papers, we need to go ahead and lift the sunset on Amendment 40. They like this red snapper season, or at least that’s what I heard from back there.

Amendment 40 has a sunset. If they like Amendment 40, and everybody else likes this snapper season, if we don’t do something with it, it goes away, and then we’re back to square one.

From what I remember, especially with the Alabama Charter Fishing Association, we are not for catch shares with 41 and 42. We are for an allotment of fish. We have never been for intersector trading, and so somebody is selling somebody a bill of goods, and I think we need to get some education out there, especially for a lot of people.

If it’s talked at this Gulf Council -- We have stood up here in front of this Gulf Council from the Alabama Charter Fishing Association and have said, you know, give us some years to fish with reporting, electronic reporting, and then everybody would have what they normally catch, what their normal business models or normal business stuff, but we have never once wanted catch shares. We have never once wanted an IFQ. We have never once, especially for me, and I will stand up here and fight amongst them, if that’s what it comes to, or with them, for catch shares or intersector trading or whatever.

Amberjack, it sounds good. A split season sounds great. One fish, or a half-a-fish, I guess whatever is going to get us a longer season, and I know that will benefit the people with two-day trips, because you can catch a two-day limit of jacks, and so most of our guys, where we’re at, they only catch a one-day limit of jack on the two-day trip, and so that’s going to benefit them. As far as the half-a-fish or one fish, I guess it’s fine, if it’s going to get us a longer season with the half-a-fish.

In Amendment 40, we’ve done good. We have gone under every year since it started, and we have not gone over, and so something needs to happen with Amendment 40, before it goes away, and we need to start now, because we know the council’s snail process, and I really do appreciate the fact yesterday, for some of these guys that stood up for Amendment 41 and 42, especially when people from my own state wanted to try to knock it and table it. I just happened to walk up, show up, and let’s go ahead and get rid of it. No, we’ve been working at it for too hard, too long. Let’s get educated on this. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I just want to say that I agree with you. I made that observation earlier today, when I was hearing people repeatedly come to the podium, which it’s not a static process. People are entitled to evolve and change their minds, but I did note that, many years ago, some of the same people that were essentially bragging on Amendment 40 were against it, and that’s a matter of public record, if anybody wants to --

MR. WOODRUFF: Yes, and I really think that’s awesome, and I don’t really think nobody has caught grass for that, that has come up here and said they really like that fifty-day snapper season, because it’s going to go away if something doesn’t get done, and I don’t know if they know that or not, the people who stand up here and speak about it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Captain. I need clarification. If I interpreted it correctly, you are for Amendment 41 and 42, but you are against catch shares. Is that what you said?

MR. WOODRUFF: Amendment 41 and 42, does it say anything about catch shares in it at this time?

MR. BOYD: It has options for catch shares in it.

MR. WOODRUFF: It has options. It has options in it, and then I do not want catch shares. I think an allotment of fish. If we get electronic logbooks, and we do a few years of electronic logbooks, two or three years, everybody in the Gulf of Mexico with the charter/for-hire fleet, you have data. You have what we have been wanting, and what the SSC needs, and what you all will have to make the proper decision on what we can do.

Then, if that road comes down to where everybody gets an allotment of fish for the year, and next year you might not get that same allotment of fish, but you get the allotment of fish of what you have caught within three years. Is that it? Thank you, and God bless, and go Trump. Roll tide.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. All right. Next, we have Billy Neff, followed by Steve Tomeny.

MR. BILLY NEFF: How are you doing? I am Billy Neff, from Class Act Charters in Orange Beach, Alabama. I would like to see us
continue to work on Amendments 41 and 42. With regard to amberjack, I am in support of a split season and the fractional bag limits of half-a-fish per person, if it gives us a longer season. I am definitely for that. As far as charter boats for hire, I would like to stay with the federal management system and let the states have an EFP. That’s it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Steve Tomeny, followed by Mr. Clarence Seymour.

MR. STEVE TOMENY: Good afternoon. I am Steve Tomeny, and I’m originally from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and I ran a business for over thirty-five years in Port Fourchon, Louisiana. I have been a charter fisherman for over thirty-five years, and I’m also a dual-permitted commercial fisherman and an IFQ shareholder.

I like catch shares, and I haven’t been hearing that too much today, but a lot of it is from a lot of naysayers. If Amendment 42 is a catch share, then, man, I am for it. Amendment 41, it probably needs to have a logbook, electronic logbook, associated with it. You need to know how many boats are fishing, and I don’t think we really know that now, the way the data is collected.

When you get that tuned up, I think some of the formulas that are not working in 41 might make some people happier. Right now, it’s not dead, and it needs to be brought along, but the simple, back-of-your-napkin math will tell you that it’s not going to work out. There’s not enough fish, if you divide the twelve-hundred-and-something permits into the allocation. It doesn’t work too well.

I think it just needs -- We have worked on it for a long time, and we’ve all put a lot of effort into it. We put a lot of effort into getting Amendment 40, and I will switch gears a little and go to the EFPs. I think it’s a great idea to try it for the private recreational, and I am going to be one of the few dissenters in Louisiana that -- While I think Patrick Banks and them have done a great job with the LA Creel, I am not -- I am just not going to bite for the carrot that they’re dangling. I will take our regular snapper season that we’re going to get.

If you heard some of the comments from my hometown Congressman and from some of our legislators, some of the guys that came earlier that were just anti-catch share, and we’re going to run the prices up and all this kind of foolishness, I am just -- In the long run, those guys want to see our fish get in a state management plan, where they can mix it back up, where our
Amendment 40 allocation will be mixed back with the private recreational, and they will overrun us again, like they did over the last twenty years.

We were tied to the dock with 30B, and we were fishing in the federal season and they were fishing in state seasons, always expanding state seasons, and it really cost us a lot, and so we’re happy with 40, and I would like to see these others work out. We’ve got to get a product that people will like, and I will move on to just say that the EFPs are okay.

We are protected under them, but it’s what goes on after that that I am a little scared of, and so things change real quick at our state level. We don’t have a Magnuson Act on the state level, and so, anyway, I’ve kind of gone through, and I had a couple more things to say, but have a good afternoon, and I will do it another time.

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

MR. BANKS: Steve, I appreciate your comments, and I need some help. Somebody back there was a little confused about what state they’re in. We’re LSU Tigers around here, and so please help spread that news back there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Clarence Seymour, followed by Mr. Mike Rowell.

MR. CLARENCE SEYMOUR: Good afternoon. I’m Clarence Seymour from Biloxi, Mississippi, the Charter Boat SYL, a federally-permitted charter boat. Thank you, Madam Chair, and the rest of the council, for having us. Today, I would like to really hit on a -- We’re federally-reef-fish-permitted charter boats, and these guys, the whole group that’s here, and I’ve seen some high-fiving about Amendment 40. In 2022, they are liable to have some grim faces, coming up here wanting to know how we let this happen.

Amendment 41 and 42, it does give Amendment 40 a chance for us to, somehow or other, hash out a great fish management plan that meets the needs of the Gulf of Mexico and all the states, especially the guys in Florida, from Alabama, Louisiana, and from Texas.

I would like to say what a great job that Dr. Mickle did in his presentation for Tails n’ Scales, because I believe we’ve got 100 percent for for-hire for reporting of our catch this year,
which, when that’s validated, that is true reporting, and so that means that, us at the dock, we really participated well with the MRIP people, and we made sure that they counted all of our fish.

Plus we had our observers that gave us the documents, the timeframe, to make sure that we did validate Tails n’ Scales correctly, because the EFP is going to work really well in the State of Mississippi for the private anglers. If we’re at 90 percent of getting the correct data, they should be able to -- If they can tune that in and get us down around 95, the EFP is going to be wonderful for our private anglers, because I’ve got some friends that was wanting to block the marina, throw eggs at us, because we were going to roll out on June 4 without them, but it all worked out, because they got their special season.

Looking at the initial reporting from 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017, the private anglers went over, and we still are not hitting on the issue that the for-hire has stayed within the ACT and the ACL, which we have left a lot of fish on the table, and there is a lot of folks here that has really backed the for-hire industry, for making sure that that is known every year, and, when this EFP can hit off for the private anglers, and we can take all the charter boat industry and keep that same ACL down, ACT, it’s going to be a win-win for the whole industry.

Then, in 2022, we’re going to be wondering how we’re going to high-five again and make sure that our passengers and the American public can enjoy this great red snapper fishery we have, but that’s all I have today, and thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Hang on. We’ve got a question for you from Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Clarence, thank you for taking the time to come over. I appreciate it. Do you have any thoughts on this historical captain thing that we’ve been talking about? I just wanted to hear what --

MR. SEYMOUR: There is two folks that I do know that are historical captains in our permitted area, and having to outreach to them, because I just kind of didn’t quite get the chance to read the document, and so that would put the two folks that I do know very personally, and so one has two permits, and so, being one historical is not going to hurt him.

His business had one, but he was a hired guy, and so he has a historical, but there is still a chance for the other guy to
purchase him a boat and carry on, because he’s been a mate for so long, but he does have historical history, and so I think, if it’s only thirty, the only benefit they have would be that they could still participate in the industry and possibly -- My new word for the year is “millennial” that I found, and the millennials have to have a chance to access the fishery, and we always have to remember that, because -- There is not many in the audience, but hopefully they will start showing up, because we’re going to need them one day, and that’s for sure. Thank you.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mike Rowell, followed by Mr. James Bruce.

MR. MIKE ROWELL: Hello. I’m Mike Rowell, from Orange Beach, Alabama. I’m a charter fisherman. I support the proposed rule to modify the amberjack season to start in August and then maybe get what’s leftover in May of the next year. I think that we need to leave the fish alone while they’re spawning.

I am not for a fractional bag limit. I would like to -- I am a fisherman, and, the more days I fish, the more money I have the potential to make, but I don’t think it’s necessarily good for the fish. If I’ve got ten people on the boat, and I can keep -- Well, I can’t figure out how many right now, five or four or whatever it is, but those other people on the boat want to catch one too, and I’m afraid what’s going to happen is people are going to say, well, we can only keep four, but we’ve got ten people, and let’s let everybody catch one anyway, and they’re biting. Then we’ve got release mortality, and it’s not about -- It’s not supposed to be about me and my boat, because I am just a vehicle to take the recreational angler fishing.

We’re up here talking about the anglers that are either on a private boat, or they’re on my boat, and it shouldn’t be about me and what I care about, which is making money, and so I don’t know. I am kind of mixed up on the whole thing, but I think it’s not fair for the fishermen.

As far as the historical captains, I think, if those guys are still out there and working hard -- Like I said, some of these permits have went away and it’s not going to matter, but I think it was something that we didn’t see coming when we were putting this other plan together, and we did something temporarily, and I think we could make it permanent for them now.
I would like to see us keep going with 41 and 42. There's been a lot of work put into it, and I think we should keep moving with it. I am also against the state management for charter/for-hire, for federal guys. I think the recreational people and the charter/for-hire people have their own different needs, and I think they can be met with two different management systems.

Somebody was saying there is not a lot of fish on some spots, or I forgot what the comments were, but, with the grouper and some of the snapper, they’re going back to places where there is not any fish, and I just talked to some folks today, and I’ve been talking to divers. What is down there is lionfish. They are everywhere, and I know everybody knows about it, but we keep splitting hairs with allocations on certain species, and we’ve got a real bear out there that is eating up everything, and I think we need to keep an eye on those lionfish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. ROWELL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. James Bruce, followed by Mr. Billy Archer.

MR. JAMES BRUCE: I’m James Bruce, a commercial fisherman. Man, why do you all want to mess with something that works? The IFQs work, and we don’t go over our quota. Now you all have finally got the charter/for-hire not going over their quota, and then you all wanted the states to take over. The states, ain’t that the reason the quota was going over, because some of the states started to open the season in state waters?

If you look at the whole picture, the idea of this is to preserve our fish and not to try to take fish and move it from this sector to another sector and then move it all over. Preserve the fish, and it’s about the fish. As far as 41 and 42, they put a lot of work into it, and people come here all the time to it, and you all need to keep working on it. They are finally not going over, and why do you all want to change it?

You all want to start an even bigger mess by trying to auction our allocation, and that is crazy. Who is going to win in that situation? Who is going to get hurt? Somebody like me who has got a little bit of quota and no money to buy no more. That is who is going to get hurt. You want to move fish to help this one and to help that one, and that don’t work.
Think of the fish when you all make decisions. It’s not about one user group or another one, but it’s about the fish that rebuilt since we started the IFQ program. That’s all it’s about, the fisheries. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Billy Archer, followed by Mr. Gary Jarvis.

MR. BILLY ARCHER: Thank you, Madam Chairman and Gulf Council members. Good afternoon. My name is Captain Billy Archer, and I’m a third-generation fisherman from Panama City, Florida. I am going to ask you all to please not table Amendment 41 and 42. We need more time to work on this, these two amendments. Once we get them kind of pounded out and see what everything looks like, we can send them out to the stakeholders and let them have their final say.

I do support the state EFPs. Please leave the charter boats out of them. Our industry needs the protection under Magnuson-Stevens. I support the 60/40 split on the amberjack season, one fish per two anglers, and that would include a May 1 opening.

I heard a gentleman ask a question about working on the groupers in the commercial industry, and my fish buyer is Greg Abrams Seafood, and he showed me a paper of the amount of fish that they left in the water, just red grouper, last year, and it was 122,000 pounds. That’s huge. That’s a lot of fish. If you want to go to the dealers and ask those folks how they feel about a reduction in quota, that would be a good place to start. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Gary Jarvis, followed by Ms. Susan Boggs.

MR. GARY JARVIS: I apologize for reading a lot this time, but I’ve got a lot to cover. I am Captain Gary Jarvis, President of the Destin Charter Boat Association, forty years in the business. That means I’m an old guy.

After the red snapper landing presentation yesterday, we saw the obscene overages by the private angler sector. The use of charter/for-hire allocation to ease the obscene overages needs to stop, and this politicized assumption that the states can manage the resource better than National Marine Fisheries, after last year’s state and congressionally-sponsored special season, it kind of seems absurd, to me.

I agree with the Chairwoman yesterday that it’s time the public,
non-boat-owning public gets their allocation of fish. We have
underfished our allocation, with an average of 35 percent, for
the last three years, and that’s a hell of a haircut.

I think it’s real important that we understand that, in 2008, I
stood before this council, and some members are still present,
and introduced what we called Save Our Sector. What it was, it
led to Amendment 40, and I said then that it would stabilize our
seasons, and it has. I said then that it would increase access
to the non-boat-owning public, and it has.

I said then that it would help the resource, because we would
most likely not overfish our ACL, and it has, and I also said
that it would allow us to develop a data collection system that
would make management decisions more accurate and more certain.
As I stand here, we’re on the cusp of a mandatory electronic
logbook program that is going to make that come to fruition.

Now the question to National Marine Fisheries Service and the
council, who are both sworn to effectively protect and enhance
and work tirelessly to increase our resources, I want to ask you
this question. Why, behind the scenes, and out in the open, are
you working so hard to undermine, inhibit, reverse, and destroy
an FMP that was designed by the industry, passed by the council,
and signed by the Secretary of Commerce?

The discussion about state-by-state EFPs today has made it
evident that the state chairs here, and its angler-rights
representatives on this council, are doing their best to subvert
Amendment 40. Has Amendment 40 lived up to its intent? Has it
lived up to its promise? Has it lived up to the requirements
under MSA? You all know the answer.

You saw the landing presentation, and you heard testimony from
small businessmen, and you know what the MSA stands for, and the
Amendment 40 has met all the ten National Standards under MSA,
and it’s not just my opinion. A couple of years ago, an angler
right’s group sued the National Marine Fisheries Service about
the legality and the intent of Amendment 40, and that third-
party legal system agree with us, and so did the appellate
court.

Here is my ask, that this council begin to support Amendment 40
and its own electronic data collection system and expand the
species of fish that preserve some level of access for the non-
boat-owning public. Leave us out of any state management or EFP
for private recreational anglers.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gary, are you just about done?

MR. JARVIS: That’s fine.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay.

MR. JARVIS: Our federally-permitted fleet have no protections under state law, and they have the right to exist that MSA gives us. My last request is to allow continued industry initiatives to explore the improvement of Amendment 40 and the development of other ideas like Amendment 41 and 42. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Susan Boggs, followed by Mr. Jason Delacruz.

MS. SUSAN BOGGS: Good evening, Madam Chair and council members and staff. Thank you for letting me testify this evening, or give testimony. I submitted a letter to -- My husband, Randy, and I submitted a letter on Monday to all of the members of the council about our preferreds for Amendment 42. Mr. John Sanchez requested yesterday, if we had any preferreds, that we please make them known at this time, and so here we go.


I wanted to, more than anything, thank the nine council members that supported or voted against the motion to postpone Amendments 41 and 42 yesterday. I really do appreciate it, and I think that took a lot of courage on some of the part of the members, and so please know that I appreciate that.

I support the state management EFPs, but I don’t support them for the federally-permitted charter boats. I think that section separation has worked well, as we work to develop our other amendments, and I would like to see that the states proceed with the EFPs without the charter/for-hire industry included.
I have listened to quite a bit of testimony, and I have quite a bit of notes that I have scribbled and marked through, but I would like to make one statement. Amendment 41 and 42 were not intended to privatize the fishery, but to expand the access to the non-boat-owning public, and this is not just citizens of the five Gulf states, but all forty-eight contiguous states and beyond.

As seen in the headboat EFP, nineteen headboats fished over 200,000 anglers, and that was pretty impressive, and so we’re not trying to privatize this fishery, but we’re just trying to give more access to the fishery.

One last thing, and I will be quiet, but I would like to commend -- I listened to Dr. Mickle’s presentation on I believe it’s Tails n’ Scales, but I really liked the plan. I think every state data collection plan has merit, and I would like to see maybe all five states and the federal government all come together and let’s get one plan that works for everybody.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ma’am.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I hear you’re switching places with Jason Delacruz, and so this is Mr. Buddy Guindon that’s going to speak next, and then Mr. Brad Gorst.

MR. BUDDY GUINDON: Buddy Guindon, Executive Director of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance, and I want to talk about options first. The Shareholders Alliance disagrees with NOAA’s determination. In our view, a referendum is required, where a new amendment would modify the scope of fishing privileges issued under Amendment 26.

We were glad to hear Dr. Crabtree acknowledge that the commercial red snapper IFQ program is working well and that National Marine Fisheries Service supports this program. This program is one of the most successful management programs that this council has ever adopted, and the council should be proud of it. The five-year review confirmed the IFQ is moderately to highly successful in achieving its stated goals.

Because of the IFQ program, consumers now have year-round access to a sustainable fishery. Fishermen, their suppliers, and their customers are all better off because the fishery is more stable and profitable. Auctioning off some portion of the quota now would be a disaster. It would destabilize the IFQ program,
disrupt the supply chain, and increase the cost for consumers.

Does the council really want to inject more government controls into the fishery to make it less functional, more inefficient, and more costly for Americans? That is moving in the wrong direction. Auctioning off some portion of the quota would frustrate the objectives of the Reef Fish FMP and Amendment 26. There is no upside to that that could possibly outweigh any of the negative impacts that it would cause.

It seems like the whole purpose here is to throw a wrench into the highly-performing system, merely for the purpose of tearing it down. The idea is misguided and destructive, and the council should not waste any more time considering this. Instead, you owe it to the private anglers to develop a management plan for them that works, and you owe it to the charter and headboat fishermen to finish what you started with Amendment 28.

On the amberjacks, the proposed range of alternatives for the amberjacks isn’t reasonable, because it should include a LAPP option. I am sorry that I had to read today, and I’m not very good at it on this tiny phone.

I would like to speak to Mississippi and their great job they did with their FMP and their data collection system. I would like to implore Texas to do like the rest of the states and reach out to the industry and accept that they do not want to be a part of state management. It’s been the desire of all the charter boats in my area not to be involved, and I am one of them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Buddy, are you just about done?

MR. GUINDON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. All right. Next, we have Mr. Brad Gorst, followed by Mr. Bobby Kelly.

MR. BRAD GORST: Hello, council and Madam Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to be here. I’m from Clearwater, Florida, and I manage three federally-permitted charter boats and a couple of overload boats. I am here to support the EFPs by the states for the private recreational only.

I don’t want to be part of it. I know, in Florida, we’re not, but I don’t think any of them should be forced into it. My personal point of view is I see the EFP as similar to the state management thing, and nobody could come to an agreement on the
allocation back then, and I don’t see it really going anywhere, to be honest with you.

The amberjack, I would like to see trip limits on the commercial side. For Amendment 41 and 42, they don’t need to be squashed here. They need to be looked at further and go with the AP’s preferred alternatives. That’s what it’s for. It’s for the industry, and it’s not for the private recreational. It’s for the private recreational customer, and there is a difference, in my opinion.

As far as red grouper goes, I think that the SSC needs to rerun some numbers on the red grouper from the red tide event, and I am seriously convinced that the red tide did a lot more damage that was previous realized, and I understand that the data showed that, if the fish were there, they needed to give them back, and that’s why the commercial sector got the bump, but I think that those numbers need to be rerun, because of that red tide event.

I travel out of Clearwater, and I run fifty miles north, fifty miles south, sixty or seventy miles offshore, and so one day it’s this way and one day it’s that way, and so you get a real broad feel for what’s going on in places, and the red groupers are not where they typically are, and I don’t think that they’re there because that red tide wiped them out, in their normal migration patterns, from spawning offshore to ending up catching a lot of little ones inshore, but I will say that we’re starting to see some smaller juvenile red grouper starting to show up, and so it’s kind of catching up in its circle. That’s all I’ve got. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Bobby Kelly, followed by Mr. Tom Ard.

MR. BOBBY KELLY: Good evening, council. My name is Bobby Kelly, and I’m out of Orange Beach, Alabama. I will have a little respect for it, because it’s late in the afternoon, and I will just kind of push through this real fast.

I am supportive of the states and their EFPs. It’s a different tool for managing it, but, if you guys will -- Like our great state of Alabama did, they asked us if we wanted to be included in the EFP, and we said no, and they left us out, and that was great. If your states’ charter boats don’t want to be involved in it, let them out. Don’t force them into it. We’re not sure if you can or not.
I heard a lot of talk here about amberjack and people wanting this or wanting that, and that’s fine. In my business, I could go either way, half-a-fish or one fish, but, ultimately, we’ve got to think about doing what’s right. If the fish are as bad shape as they are, leave them alone when they spawn in May. If we’ve got to catch them in the fall, that’s great. Let’s catch them in the fall.

Amendment 41 and 42, did anybody here on the council, did anybody come testify that they wanted 41 and 42 as the way it was? No, and nobody likes the way that 41 and 42 is right now. I don’t either. It scares the crap out of me, but I see the potential, and I think it can be furthered. For you all to just throw away a lot of hard work, I don’t think it’s a good idea. Keep working on it, and keep fleshing it out.

This council, last year, in 2017, you all got a lot accomplished. It was great. You got triggerfish, and you got electronic monitoring, and you got amberjacks, and the 2018 fishing season looks really — It looks a lot brighter than it has for a long time, and hopefully in 2019 also, and so I just wanted to commend you guys for the job and the work that you all did last year on it, and hopefully this year we can further the progress.

I am a commercial fisherman also, and I’m new at it. I’ve only been doing it for a couple of years, and you guys get in there and, when you all reallocated some fish, I lost 6,000 pounds, because I am the new guy. You all get in there and start talking, and I heard something about auctioning some fish off or something, and we’ve already got a system like that.

It’s called a free marketplace. Whoever is willing to pay the most is going to win, and, if you all auction some fish off, I ain’t going to have a shot at it. I can’t compete. I don’t have the same checkbook. I don’t want to be the canary in the mine and keel over first, and so, other than that, you all just think about the little guy when you all start messing with the IFQ system. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Tom Ard, followed by Mr. Bill Kelly.

MR. TOM ARD: Tom Ard from Orange Beach, Alabama. I’m a charter boat captain. I want to touch on something that I hadn’t thought about too much until you all started bringing it up, but the historical captains deal.
When I started out as a deckhand stuff, all my friends and I, I went and bought a boat, and it had a permit on it, and so I had a permit, and a lot of my friends stayed in the deckhand industry until later, and they got their historical captain permit, and they put in for it and they got it, and then they went and bought boats, and one of them owns a sixty-footer, and another one owns a fifty-six-footer, I believe.

They still have historical captain permits, and I think maybe the only thing it messed up, when that was set up, is, when a historical captain bought a boat, that permit should have been permanent right there on that boat, just like mine, but it wasn’t. It stayed historical, and so I don’t know how you’re going to do it, but I believe those permits need to go permanent, and I don’t know how you would do it, but maybe the ones that own boats now, or give them five years to get a boat or something like that, but, to me, as soon as they bought a boat, it should have went permanent. It should be just like my permit.

On Amendment 40, there was a lot of naysayers against Amendment 40 when we were working on it, and you don’t hear that much now about it. Everybody loves Amendment 40, and we have an allocation of fish, and we’ve got a stable season and all that kind of stuff.

Just personal, for me, I will tell you what it has done for me. It has doubled my business. I went from two boats to four boats since Amendment 40 started. I have two multi-passenger charter boats and two six-passenger charter boats. It seems like it’s working. We’re staying under our quota, and I don’t see any negative on Amendment 40.

We’ve got electronic logbooks going, and that should make it better. That could maybe even shrink the buffer and give us longer seasons, and I like it. I think it could be its own fish management plan in itself, and maybe not have much of a need for 41 and 42, and I don’t know, but I don’t think you need to throw that away. Maybe still work on it, but I think 40 is great for the charter industry.

Why would you want to do anything different? We don’t need -- The charter industry, I don’t think, needs state management. I think state management is great for the recreational side, and I think it’s a must for the private recreational side, but I just don’t feel that charter/for-hire boats need to be in state management. We’ve got Amendment 40.
If I was going to do anything to Amendment 40, or start a new amendment, I would add triggerfish and amberjack to it and do the same thing, and you will see the same thing happen. We will stay under our quotas, and it will work.

Amberjacks, I like the fall season, and I am not much one way or the other on the fractional bag limit. I do agree that, in the spring, if they’re spawning and the fish are in trouble, let’s just catch them in the fall when they’re not spawning, and so maybe we’ll have more fish. Then, later down the road, we can get a spring season again, when the stock comes back. That’s just simple, commonsense.

Fractional is fine if we need it. I don’t want to go over, because let me tell you what hurts. What hurts is when we catch too many fish and we don’t have any the next year. This year was horrible, because we caught too many fish the year before on triggerfish, and I sat up here and told you that it was going to happen, and the process takes too long to fix the triggerfish problem, and so we have to suffer and not have triggerfish the next year. Whatever it takes to stay under the quotas, we need to do it. Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Okay. Next, we’re going to have Mr. Bill Kelly, and I think there’s a glitch on the system. Didn’t Mr. Mark Tryon already speak? I think his name is just showing up twice, and so it will be Mr. Bill Kelly, followed by Mr. Eric Brazer.

MR. BILL KELLY: Madam Chair and council members, I’m Bill Kelly, representing the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association. Number one is Spiny Lobster Amendment 13, and our organization has been very heavily involved in the development of that amendment, and we’re quite comfortable with all the action items that are contained therein.

Number two, the lionfish exempted fishing permit, we are annihilating lionfish as bycatch in our spiny lobster fishery, and we would like to make some more room in our traps for lobster, and that’s one of the reasons why we want to address that issue, but, more importantly, we know we could do much more. If it was a directed fishery, the numbers would be absolutely staggering.

Our intent here is to show proof-of-concept, working with South Carolina’s Department of Natural Resources, Florida’s Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, and share that information with all the coastal states that have been infested with lionfish and let
them address the issues through teams that they can develop through their invasive species mitigation funds.

Now, a couple of old songs about two of the most underutilized species in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, and I’m talking about king mackerel and yellowtail snapper. Our gillnet fishery, two days, and so Wednesday and Thursday of last week, and it was 520,000 pounds in two days of fishing. We have 71,000 pounds left, in a voluntary lottery system, and these guys -- We have selected two boats, and they will fish that down in half-a-day, and we have further curtailments on them, trip limits, self-imposed, again, to keep us under the quota.

When we look at that last stock assessment, we have to shake our heads and wonder why on earth are we talking about reducing the quota for next year, and we need some intelligent science on this. We need a legitimate stock assessment, and, while we’ve had Bob Zales that was introduced, and it became the Bosarge plan, refined by Ryan Rindone, and it’s gone nowhere. We’re now asking you for a hard allocation, which is your responsibility, in the king mackerel fishery to the commercial side.

Also, with yellowtail snapper, we served it up, and the industry came to both councils and said, look, let’s do something. Let’s put in some protections here and so forth, and we voluntarily shifted the year, the fishing year, from August 1, so it would end in May and protect those spawning fish.

Both councils jumped all over that, but, when the part of the discussion was allocation, we got absolutely nothing in return. We’ve got over a million-and-a-half pounds of fish, between the Gulf and the South Atlantic, that go unharvested every year, and it’s killing us.

There has been no change in recreational harvest here, either with yellowtails or kingfish, and, again, we would ask you to work with the South Atlantic Council and combine those two stocks that are fished almost exclusively in the Florida Keys and give us a break here.

You go to Monroe County and you throw a chum bag over the side anywhere in that county, in the Florida Keys, and you have the yellow brick road in front of you for yellowtail snappers, as far as you can see, and this is a very important species, and we need to address these issues, and, again, allocation of king mackerel and yellowtail snapper. Thank you so very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Eric
Brazer, followed by Mr. Johnny Williams.

MR. ERIC BRAZER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair and council members and staff. My name is Eric Brazer, and I’m the Deputy Director at the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

First, I would like to thank the agency for its support for the red snapper IFQ program. While the NOAA position on auctions raises some red flags for us, and we look forward to reviewing the letter and commenting on it, we appreciate the agency’s confirmation that the red snapper IFQ is meeting its goals and is considered not just a Gulf success, but a national success as well.

To the point of EFPs, we are generally encouraged to see what’s taking place today, and there is some collaboration happening between the private angler sector and the council and the agency and the states. Allowing different states to develop different plans to meet their needs, that just makes sense, and we should be doing more of that, but we would just urge the council to ensure that these EFPs aren’t forced down the throats of the charter fleet that don’t want them. We believe that NMFS should not, and probably cannot, approve the charter fleets in these EFPs unless the charter and headboat operators in each state are co-applicants on the EFPs.

We also should have some assurances that there is an accurate and timely data collection and reporting system in place, to make sure that these quotas are not overrun, and that’s critical. That’s key to the commercial fleet.

On 41 and 42, you have come so far, and you’re so close to a referendum, and don’t rob these guys of the chance to see this over the finish line. I think there is very little risk to the Gulf Council in keeping this open and giving the fishermen the chance to vote on this.

Choose your preferreds, and put it out to a referendum, and I look forward to hearing more tomorrow on the rationale for why these federally-permitted charter boats and headboats don’t deserve the opportunity to vote on this through a referendum.

Briefly, just to finish up, the issue of reallocation has come up a few times, and clearly that is a top concern of ours, and now is not the time to open this Pandora’s Box. We need to remember how contentious Amendment 28 was and how much air it sucked out of the room, to be honest. Please keep your eye on
the ball. Please focus on making these EFPs work and building out an accountable set of state management plans and getting 41 and 42 out to the fishermen for a referendum. For the first time ever, I am not out of time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Johnny Williams, followed by Ms. Ashford Rosenberg.

MR. JOHNNY WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, or good evening. I am Johnny Williams from Williams Partyboats Incorporated, a third-generation partyboat operator out of Galveston, Texas. I have been involved with the Gulf Council process for about thirty years, and I am really amazed and appalled that a council member made a motion to postpone Amendments 41 and 42 before the council heard public testimony.

I feel this was a tacky attempt to circumvent the process. Thankfully, it failed. People spend a lot of time and money coming to these meetings, with the hotels and travel arrangements, to speak for three minutes. Now, apparently, some people believe they know more than what the public knows or wants.

So that there is no misunderstanding about my feelings, let me enlighten you. I am 100 percent against state management. We had the states that were responsible for the recreational fishermen fishing out in federal waters for eight or ten days a year, and why wouldn’t we all want that, and so I am definitely against state management.

I am 100 percent for Amendments 41 and 42. I was part of the pilot program, and I believe it was an overwhelming success to me and my patrons. The program in 42 is very similar to the pilot program, only it encompasses a few more species, and it allowed my patrons to go fishing on days that they wouldn’t be able to go before, and it allowed them to go at different times of the year.

In the summertime, off of Texas, we get some bad weather often, in the first part of the month, and a lot of people -- They need to go on a Saturday or a Sunday, and there is only about six Saturdays and six Sundays in our season in the summer, and so, if they get shut out of one of these days, because of the weather, they lose their opportunity to harvest red snapper for the year.

The pilot program alleviated a lot of these concerns, and I think it will do better for the fish, too. There was a study
done by Arizona State University that showed that the fishing mortality was actually reduced with our program.

In conclusion, I just want to say that the pilot program was great, and the 41 and 42 will be great as well, and, if the recreational fishermen -- If they want state management, the private recs, I am 100 percent for them. I am not going to try to tell them how to prosecute their fishery, but, doggone, I don’t want any part of it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Ashford Rosenberg, followed by Mr. Donald Waters.

MS. ASHFORD ROSENBERG: Good afternoon, council. My name is Ashford Rosenberg, and I am based here in New Orleans, Louisiana. I am not here to comment on anything specific today, but I’m just here to introduce myself to those of you who may not know me. I am the new policy analyst for the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance, formerly of Audubon Nature Institute’s Sustainable Seafood Program, Gulf United for Lasting Fisheries. I just wanted to say hello, and I sincerely look forward to working with all of you on sustainable commercial fisheries. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Donald Waters, followed by Mr. Troy Frady.

MR. DONALD WATERS: I’m Donald Waters, and, really, I have no dog in the hunt, but I’ve been to these meetings for many, many years, and I had a brief recess, due to illness. What these charter boats and these guys worked diligently, day and night, to bring 41 and 42 to the table, to snatch that out from under them would be totally unfair. I never thought that I would say that I agree with Robin Riechers and Doug Boyd, but I would love to see an auction. Have a good day.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Troy Frady, followed by Mr. Bud Miller.

MR. TROY FRADY: Can I have the rest of Donnie’s time?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Can you be as short?

MR. FRADY: Good afternoon. I am Troy Frady, from Orange Beach, Alabama. I am a charter fisherman, and thank you, Madam Chair and council, for allowing me to speak here. The first thing I want you to do is to think broad and wide, think outside of the box a little bit, and continue to think about new and better
ways of doing things.

You know, we’ve got the EFPs that have been presented to us here, and I am 100 percent supportive of the private recreational anglers having an opportunity to flesh out some of the details through this program that we have been struggling with in Amendment 41 and 42 ourselves. I just ask that you give the states the same respect that you have given us through 41 and 42.

On the greater amberjack, I would encourage you just to continue for a couple of years and let the program run under the new seasons. When it comes to the bag limits on amberjack, I am not really supportive of the fractional bag limits or anything like that. I think, as a fishing guide, as a captain of my vessel, it’s my responsibility to tell my customers what they need and what they have. The fish are not the commodity, with me. It’s the experience of catching fish, and so I think I can control the number of fish my customers really want, at the end of the day.

If they have six people, and if I want to only give them three fish, I mean, that’s my prerogative, to help sell that fish to those customers, and so, as a guide, it’s my responsibility, and I shouldn’t be relying on the regulations to tell me the maximum that I can have, but I just try to be a little bit more conservative with my fish.

Fish descenders, I’ve been using them for years, and I started with the Shelton Fish Descender that was used in California on rockfish. I found new and better items, like the SeaQualizer, to be more effective. I do allow my customers to participate in using fish descenders, and it’s their responsibility. If they catch a fish that needs to be released, they are the ones that have to release it, and then we reel up that five-pound weight, and so they will change their behavior from fishing on the bottom to really fishing higher in the water.

As far as the historical captains, let those guys have a permit. I have known several of them, and it’s been a long time, and they’re not getting out of the business, and I think we owe it to them just to go ahead and convert their permits, to where their ownership goes to their vessel. Anyway, I want to thank you so much, and I look forward to seeing you all soon. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Bud Miller, followed by Ms. Lisa Schmidt.
MR. BUD MILLER: Good evening. I am Bud Miller from Fish and Game Scales, and I formerly owned a thirty-two-passenger federally-permitted vessel. We are the company that brought to the last council meeting the fish kiosk scale and displayed it for you. We didn’t bring it this time, because of parking issues, and I knew what it would be like to bring a truck and a trailer in here, and I didn’t want to bring it, and we’re also reprogramming the scale system right now.

The scale system is a user-friendly way for recreational anglers to weigh their harvest upon returning from fishing, and we’re currently having some reprogramming to address the issues that we have heard from anglers and from state fishery managers.

One was the trip verification number, and we’re going to add that in there and take out the fishermen ID. We’re going to take photos, two photos, one from the top and one from the side, for validation purposes, and we developed this system not to replace MRIP and not to replace anything else, but to help the fishery managers with their apps, for when the MRIP people are not present.

We can’t staff boat ramps for twenty-four hours a day, and it’s kind of dangerous down there on boat ramps, and we don’t want to do marinas twenty-four hours a day, but the scale system will be sitting there, and it will be idle until an angler walks up and touches it and gets ready to use it. This is an effort for recreational anglers to have their input for better harvest, and so we can collect more data from them when MRIP is not present.

People ask me what started me on this, being as I used to have a large vessel, and it was the fact of, for the past six years, I have not been MRIP surveyed one time during red snapper season. I haven’t seen anybody for a dockside survey.

That kind of set me off on a tangent, and I sold all that stuff, and I built this thing and had it patented, and we’re excited about it, and we’re looking to bring it to the state, to where we can put it out, and we’ve had nothing but success.

When we go to set it up, to make our videos, people are coming up to weigh their fish. People want to weigh their fish. Anglers want better data, and here we go. We’ve got it. Here is something new and out of the box, and we look forward to hearing from you guys. You can call us, or you can email us, and we’re on YouTube. Our video is on YouTube. It’s under Fish and Game Scale Systems, and you can look at it there, but we
look forward to working with you guys.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Lisa Schmidt, followed by Mr. Larry Hooper.

MS. LISA SCHMIDT: Hello. I am Lisa Schmidt, and I am the owner of three commercial longline vessels in Madeira Beach, and there are a few important things that I would like to speak to you about today.

First, I was disappointed to hear the determination on the IFQ auctions. Seizing allocation from fishing businesses, only to put it up to auction, is going to put this fishery into chaos. It’s disruptive, and it’s not just going to impact the fishing businesses like mine, but it’s also going to impact the end user, which is the seafood consumer that has sustainable access to fish for 365 days now.

Also, I am encouraged that the Gulf states are starting to come up with an EFP plan for how to better manage the private recreational red snapper fishermen, but I can’t support if it’s going to force the federally-permitted charter boats in the program against their will, and I am also concerned that some of the data collection programs and delays increase the chances that the states will go over their quota, and that needs to stop happening, because, as a result, it usually happens if the commercial fishermen, such as myself, end up paying it back.

I did want to commend the State of Mississippi for their plan that I saw today, because I see that they have built in accountability measures in their program, and, finally, my business is built on red grouper, and I hope the council can find a solution, as soon as possible, to the problem that the quota was set too high for the fishery to sustain.

Speaking to Ed Walker’s testimony, he is right that the red grouper are not out there. My captains are having a real hard time finding red grouper in the places that they fish, and I would have given my 30 percent quota to the recreational sector, to keep them happy, and I too recreationally fish myself, or spearfish, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Ms. Lisa. Next, we have Mr. Larry Hooper, followed by Mr. Jim Green.

MR. LARRY HOOPER: Good evening. I am Larry Hooper, from Venice, Louisiana. I charter fish out of there, both inshore and offshore, and I do have a Gulf reef permit for my offshore
boat.

As far as the accountability of the fish in the State of Louisiana, I commend the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries for the job they’re doing. We get counted, and we get checked, and I get calls and I get emails in the evening, when I am home. It’s very good.

I also heard, on the amberjack, the half-fish deal, and maybe it could work, or maybe it couldn’t. It does sound viable, to where you could get -- If you have an odd person, you get that extra fish.

I noticed that the people in Florida want it open more in the springtime, and the ones in Louisiana want it more in the summer and in the fall. Thus, more the reason why you should have state control of the fisheries and accountability of the fisheries, because they can control the fish in their area that are -- They know how many fish are in their area. What works in Florida does not work in Louisiana, and what works in Louisiana does not work in Texas. They’re all different.

I am definitely against any catch shares at all. I am against 41 and 42. The entire fishing resource is a public entity, and you have managed to make a private entity, with the way you have dealt out your fish, and the commercial snapper at thirteen inches, the recreational snapper is sixteen inches, and they take the smaller fish, and they’re not allowed -- They’re taking the fish that are not allowed to reproduce that much. They are taking them before they have a chance to breed.

In the State of Louisiana, our fish are so darned big, our red snapper, that we’re catching. We used to have to measure for a sixteen-inch fish. Now we just turn around and we say, okay, you’ve got a good one, and we never measure it. I very seldom -- In thirty feet of water, I very seldom see one under twenty inches, and we do have shallow water that we pick them up. I don’t have to go that deep.

If anybody worries about the venting of the fish, the SeaQualizer does work. I have used it, and it does work. You might want to require something in your accountability of your fish. Venting of them, if it’s not done properly, it’s not going to work. If you poke a hole in the bladder, the fish goes down, and it swims away, and you know what happens.

I think that the triggerfish is another thing, and Florida and Alabama have got their triggerfish fishery. In Louisiana, they
are not targeted at all. They are there, but they are not targeted. Another thing, for the state to take over control of the fisheries. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Larry. Next, we have Mr. Jim Green, followed by Mr. Scott Hickman.

MR. JIM GREEN: Chairman and council, thank you. I am Captain Jim Green, and I’m the Vice President of the Destin Charter Boat Association and CFA, and I’m here on behalf of the DCBA and its seventy-plus members.

For the Destin fishing fleet, the two months that are the most important, concerning amberjack, are October and May, and we are requesting either a split quota or a reduction in bag limit, one fish per two anglers, or whatever you have to do to ensure that the season runs through the projected dates.

This is very important to our fleet, because we need the backend of the season. We stand with our fellow fishermen, and we understand the importance of a fall season for the western Gulf, but we ask that you put us in the best position as possible to get through the projected season. Let’s have a year without a seasonal closure.

On data collection, please continue to push to implement our industry’s electronic logbook program. We have asked for it for over a decade, and we’re getting close. Please stay resilient. This will go a long way with not just validating catch, but also the amount of effort that is actually on the water for the for-hire sector. The split that occurred with red snapper in the recreational sector proved what identifying the universe did, and now let’s see what specific catch and effort data does for our access.

Please maximize our season, concerning the red snapper for the federally-permitted vessels. We now have data that should give confidence in allowing more days for our industry that showed continued underharvest, and please maximize our season, so we can catch the allocation that we fought so hard to acquire.

As far as the state EFPs go, the DCBA wants to thank Florida for keeping us out of it. We have an allocation with management that has kept us under our ACL and ACT. With that said, we support and are glad that the states are attempting to create a better management opportunity for the private recreational angler.
On Amendment 41 and 42, these amendments have evolved very much, and they’re a testament to the hard work that has been invested in the exploration and development of a rights-based system for our industry. If you table it, we won’t know what the will of our industry is, and to just take that off the table is disheartening, after all the work our industry leaders have put into the development. Please keep them on the table, and I appreciate the time.

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

MR. SCOTT HICKMAN: I will try to make this quick. I know everybody wants to go get a cold beer. Madam Chairwoman and esteemed members of the Gulf Council, first off, I would like to clarify, to Robin Riechers about -- He had asked a question to our new Galveston Professional Boatmen’s Association about being associated with CFA, and the GPBA is a new association for Galveston County only. It does have some similar membership in both organizations, but it’s a Galveston County membership of charter boats and commercial anglers, commercial fishermen.

I would like to keep the Texas charter for-hire fleet, and many of our folks at home would like to stay out of the state EFP, even though myself and many others think that it’s a step in the right direction to do something for Texas anglers. We think it’s the right direction, and please keep moving forward with that and pass it, but just leave us out of it.

Amendment 41 and 42, I have sat on multiple APs, and we’ve traveled all over the country, and we have worked on this thing and worked on it, and I think we can get pretty close to some kind of a project in a short timeframe. Go to a referendum and let the industry decide whether they want to do it or not. We may not want it. We may not like the final product, but we may like it, and so let us decide that.

I support the Gulf aquaculture project that we saw earlier, and I was on a trip with Leann and some others looking at aquaculture in Maine, and we’re going to have seven-and-a-half billion people overall, this year, in the world, and that’s a lot of folks. We’re going to have to feed them, and people like to eat seafood, and so we’re going to have to start looking at some alternative ways to get protein for these folks.

I don’t support a fractional bag limit for greater amberjack. In Texas, through October would be a great time for us to catch those fish. We have been locked out of the amberjack fishery,
and we don’t want to kill them in those spring months, when
they’re spawning. It makes scientific sense and biological
sense.

The historical captain permits, I have got some of those guys in
my port, and they’ve been in business for a long time, and we
should give them those permits, to make them permanent. Those
permits are worth about $22,000 now, and so we get into that
talk about gifting things to people, and it’s a pretty nice
gift, to get a $22,000 permit, and I got mine for $70.00 or
whatever, back in the day, when I first got my permit. That’s
what it was annually, but they have worked hard, and they should
have that permit. That’s all I’ve got to say, and you all have
a great evening, and enjoy that cold beer.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next is going to be Jason
Delacruz, followed by Mike Jennings.

MR. JASON DELACRUZ: Thank you for the opportunity to speak.
Everybody pretty much knows me, but I think I’m going to step
back and try to give some better context of why, and don’t take
this the wrong way, but you should pay closer attention to what
I say.

I own Don’s Dock, and it’s a recreational marina. It’s arguably
one of the top-five, probably, in the Gulf, as far as volume.
On a good weekend, I sell 10,000 gallons of gasoline, 5,000
gallons of diesel, and tons of ice and bait and the whole nine-
yards. I also own Wild Seafood Company, and it’s a wholesale
seafood company, and it buys fish from boats and sells it all
over the United States, and I supply -- Almost every state, at
one time, I have sold fish to.

I also part of Brickyard Fishing, with a partner, and I own
three commercial longline boats, three spearfishing boats, and I
just have my hand in every spot of what this council does, every
single spot, and I also newly own now a charter fishing vessel,
Early Riser, with a good friend of mine that I partnered up
with, to run out of my dock, and so I think the words -- The
times that I come here and I give my opinion, I think I truly
have a clean reasoning for why they happen, and it’s motivated
by money. I want to be able to be able to make money from each
direction, and so I want access to be as good as it can be in
all sides, without hurting each side.

I don’t think people take that as serious as it can be, and I
went over and spent my time on listening to the red snapper
recreational ad hoc panel the other day, because I wanted to see
what was going to happen. I wanted to see what my customers were -- Who was here to advise this council on how my customers could get better access.

Man, that was -- It was almost useless. I mean, it really was. It was good, because we educated the people there, but all they wanted to do was point fingers at everybody else and blame everybody else for the reason that they’re where they are. It was we need to take it from them or take it from them, and, fortunately, Dr. Crabtree was there, and some other great people, that helped advise that group and educate them, but I really think you guys need to pay attention, and, when you propagate some of these panels, put people on them that have a pure motive.

I am not advocating for somebody because I have a job to advocate for somebody and I get paid whether I succeed or not, but I am advocating because I need access for my customers to be able to go out and enjoy the resource or catch fish or take customers out fishing or sell them ice or something or other, and I think that’s important, that everybody starts to pay attention to people’s motivations when they come to this podium and why. That’s it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next is Mr. Mike Jennings, followed by Mr. Shane Cantrell.

MR. MIKE JENNINGS: Hello. I know it’s late, and I will try to make it as short as possible. I’m about ready to get out of here as much as everybody else is. I am Captain Mike Jennings, and I own and operate two federally-permitted charter boats in Freeport, Texas.

I am also the managing partner of Gulf Coast Marina. It’s a 134-boat marina, and it’s funny that Jason just stepped down, and I was actually wanting to make some of the same points that he did. Out of that 134 slip-marina, my occupancy fluctuates, like any other, but, out of that, I’ve got seven charter boats, and the rest of them are private recreational fishermen, and I also have a vested interest in how much those private recreational fishermen go and fish and their access, and some of those are family and friends, and they have become family over the years, and, from an association standpoint, I am also, like I said, the President of the Charter Fishermen’s Association.

Going back to what Gary Jarvis said earlier on Amendment 40, and I won’t go back through all of those as separate issues, but it’s done everything that we said it would do, and I was also
one of those standing alone.

Well over a decade ago, there was about five or six of us, when the SOS, Save Our Sector, and sector separation thing came about, and those have been the words that we’ve been saying from day-one that it would do, and it has done it. We ask you to not throw away the thousands of dollars that have been spent on time and effort and money by ourselves and by the agency and the staff and the council on Amendment 41 and 42. Let’s move those things forward and let the industry make some decisions in a manner that was set up by Congress and set up by Magnuson.

On the state-water EFPs, I will run over it real quick, and then I will be quiet. We support the EFPs for private recreational anglers. We support it for private recreational anglers only. We want to be left out of those EFPs, as far as the charter boats. Our association, to the man, that I polled and have personally talked to, wants out.

We are questioning the issue of forced participation in these EFPs, and that’s the way we look at it. It’s forced participation, and we are concerned with the legalities of that forced participation and whether Magnuson was ever set up in a manner that an EFP was not what we’ve always thought about it, as a small pilot program to look at management options, yet as a blanket way of subverting the FMP and then forcing that on the entire industry, and that’s exactly the way we’re looking at it.

We could argue the merits of that one way or the other, but we would like to at least have a choice, and, at this point in time, we are not interested in it, and we’re also concerned about issues like overfishing. If one state doesn’t play by the rules, what happens to the other states?

What happens at the end of year-two, if any overfishing occurs and how it affects us after we roll out of this EFP and back into whatever scenario that we may be in at that time, coming up on 41 and 42 and the sunset, and we all know the different aspects that would play into that at the end of year-two, and so, anyway, those are the points that I wanted to make, and I appreciate your time, and I have actually done it without the red light coming on. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, and I think we have a question from Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Thanks, Mr. Jennings, and I appreciate the comments. Considering the strong words that you said about being left out
of the EFPs, and I have heard that from other folks from your
state, but the strong words that I am hearing from guys like you
in my state is that they want to be in our plan, and I am just
trying to understand how you guys can feel so differently than
the guys just right across the border in Louisiana, and can you
give me some insight as to why you don’t want anything to do
with state management, but yet our guys want everything to do
with state management?

MR. JENNINGS: I can’t speak for your guys. They are going to
have to speak for themselves, but I can say that, within CFA, we
have a shade over, last time I looked, 600 members. Within
that, we’re in excess of 200 permitted charter boats, and we
have some members in Louisiana.

Those members that we have in Louisiana, you have ever heard
from a couple of them up here today that don’t want the state
management, and so, to say that all of your guys want state
management, I am not seeing that, but I personally stated the
reasons that I am skeptical of state management in my public
testimony. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Shane
Cantrell, followed by Mr. Nick Derbes.

MR. SHANE CANTRELL: Good evening. I am Shane Cantrell, and I
am a member of the Charter Fishermen’s Association and a
founding member of the Galveston Professional Boatmen’s
Association. I really appreciate you all’s time and hearing
everything that people have had to say today.

I appreciate the comments that I’ve been listening to out there
in this not giant room, but the first thing that I am most
concerned about is these state EFPs. As we saw, five different
proposals came up, and they are proposing to do things five
different ways, and there is a huge opportunity to not exceed
the quota, which is the number-one focus of charter boats and
recreational anglers across this whole council.

The one thing that I didn’t see was the same level of
understanding among those states and a lack of clear vision for
the people responsible to those anglers, and I haven’t heard it
yet, and I haven’t seen that outlined. I have heard a lot of
different ideas of what worked best for my state, or someone
else’s state, but, overall, the only clear vision that I have
heard was from Dr. Crabtree, and that regarded what they can do,
but, for the five people around this table responsible to their
states, we need a clear vision for these recreational anglers.
The only opportunity that I see is to have five states responsible for their private recreational anglers, and you have heard charter boat after charter boat come up here and say that they enjoy Amendment 40, and that has not always been the case. I think we need to take an honest look at that and do something for these private anglers, because they are the ones being left out. We need to take care of that.

We need to allow the charter boat industry, myself included, and I’ve been on that AP since it was first constituted, and I spend roughly thirty to four hours, per AP meeting, talking to other people to find what is most important for different regions, to be able to come to a good recommendation to bring to this council, just often to see it go away.

We need the chance to get this to the industry and not let seventeen people around this table decide what the industry wants best, and that’s what Magnuson has a referendum for. You all vote on it, and we’re going to help you all get a product, and let’s bring it to the industry, and then you all have a real decision to make.

Concerning the commercial part of my business, I have heard conversation after conversation to do one thing, and that is to destabilize the commercial fishery. I have not seen a lot of honest intent, and that jeopardizes my ability and my future, and not the guys that have been doing this for a long time, but you all are dealing with my future. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Nick Derbes, followed by Mr. Ryan Bradley.

MR. NICK DERBES: Thank you. My name is Nick Derbes, and I’m an avid recreational angler from St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana. I am fishing primarily out of Venice, Louisiana. I am very much in favor of a state management solution to red snapper.

Some environmental groups and others here at this meeting have claimed that state fishery agencies are somehow less capable of managing fish than the federal government, which is dishonest. Our extended season last year did not result in recreational fishermen even hitting their allocation in Louisiana. Further, our state elected not to open a state season in the fall, to finish the quota, while we waited for reports from other states, to ensure overfishing did not occur Gulf-wide.

I personally have been interviewed by the LA Creel surveyors
each and every time I hit the dock. The level of data
collection is far superior, in my opinion, than other methods
currently used. Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries are well
equipped to manage these fish sustainably, to ensure that we
have appropriate access to Louisiana’s vast public resources.

It makes sense that the state manages our fish, given how vastly
different our fisheries are Gulf-wide, and the current federal
management does not work for recreational fishermen. We need
state management. As a recreational fisherman, I noticed that,
although there are not many others here representing Louisiana’s
thousands of recreational fishermen, I am glad that I took off
of work to be here and to voice my opinion. This isn’t a
business trip for me, as it is for many that favor further
privatizing public resources. Thank you for your time.

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

MR. DIAZ: Mr. Derbes, thank you for taking off of work, and
it’s very valuable for us to get to talk to you, and we just
haven’t had that many recreational fishermen here today, and a
handful, but not a lot. There has been a fair amount of
comments about amberjack, and do you ever fish for amberjack?

MR. DERBES: Not necessarily. To be honest with you, we catch
so many snapper that we don’t have a chance at that. They’re in
the way, and, like Larry Hooper had mentioned earlier, we don’t
throw any fish back. All of our fish, not even three-and-a-half
miles out of Northeast Pass, are less than sixteen inches, and
most are well over twenty inches, but, yes, we don’t catch many
amberjack, because of how many snapper we’ve got.

MR. DIAZ: My question was is there’s some talk about a
fractional bag limit, one fish for two people, and do you have
any thoughts on that?

MR. DERBES: I will tell you this. I mean, I don’t have any
thoughts specifically on that, but I will say that I support any
limits that are based in good science, and, if the science is
telling us that the amberjack are not in abundance, as they
should be, then, yes, I do support having a lower limit.

Now, half a fish a person, that doesn’t sound like a good deal
for me. If I’ve got to incur at least $150 in gas to go out
into the Gulf, then catching a half-a-fish isn’t going to do it
for me, but, like you said, going out there to catch two red
snapper, that doesn’t really do it for me, and that’s why we’ve
had to switch up and catch a lot of mangrove snapper as well.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Derbes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we have one more question for you, Mr. Derbes. Mr. Banks has a question for you.

MR. BANKS: Thank you, Mr. Derbes, for being here, and it is helpful to hear from a recreational angler, and I appreciate you taking time off to come and do this, because you’re right that some of us get paid to sit here until eight o’clock at night, and you’ve taken a big hit to do that.

When you talk about being managed by the state, I am thrilled to hear you say that. What kind of season would you want us to put forth for you as a recreational angler? What works best for you? At one point, we were trying to decide whether weekends only is better or seven days a week.

Last year, our commission, against what our survey had shown, voted against a weekends-only season, and they went seven days a week, but then, when we came back with this extended federal season, it was weekends only, and so do you have any ideas of which one works best for you guys and your sector?

MR. DERBES: That’s a good question, and I’m glad you asked me, because I am very much against the weekend-only thing, and I will tell you why, and it’s because there is a pretty significant expense to go offshore and fish, and, a lot of times, we try to make a long weekend out of it and go like Thursday through Sunday. Well, Thursday, we’ve got to go fish trout, because we can’t fish snapper, and then it’s a mess.

Then I also know a lot of retired guys who only fish during the week, and it doesn’t make a lot of sense, to me, that we all go and pile up on the rigs on the weekend. Spreading it out is much more favorable, to me. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Ryan Bradley.

MR. RYAN BRADLEY: Good evening, council. I’m Ryan Bradley, Director of the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United. I guess it’s only fitting to save the best for last, but I will try not to offend everybody here at one time, as I address some of these issues.

First off, on this EFP that was -- I guess Congress had asked
NOAA to solicit that from the states, but I just want to put things in perspective for you guys and girls. The commercial reef fishery, especially the red snapper fishery, is the last great commercial fishery that we have in the Gulf, and the shrimp fishery is in decline, and the oyster fishery in every state is in decline, and that’s the two big commercial fisheries, and that’s all that is left, is this red snapper fishery, and it seems you all are determined to allow the recreational sector to continue to overfish, every single year.

In looking at the numbers, 170 percent they overfished this year, and I think that’s with Texas not reporting, and so it’s safe to say that maybe they go 200 percent, and we’re going to keep doing this every year, and it’s crazy.

The reason I bring that up is because I represent a lot of young fishermen and fishermen from Mississippi, commercial guys, that are not doing well in the shrimp and the oyster industry, and they’re looking to get into this reef fish fishery, and they’re looking at investing a lot of money into permits and quota, and it’s hard to do that when you’re looking at the other side and it has continued to be overfished every year, and so just keep us in mind on that.

One thing that was discussed earlier this week was the carryover of unharvested quota, and I would like the council to consider — I know, Dr. Crabtree, that you had spoken, at prior meetings, about quota set-asides for the commercial sector, and I think it would be a great idea, if you all ever decide to carryover unharvested IFQ quota, to maybe put it in that set-aside. I think that would be a great way to assist folks.

I want to remind you that, in the Magnuson-Stevens, Section 303A, in the limited access section, Section (c)(5)(B), one of the things is the development of policies to promote the sustained participation of small owner-operated fishing vessels and fishing communities that depend on the fisheries.

Then, further, in Section C, right underneath it, it says to include measures to assist, when necessary, in the appropriate entry level and small vessel owner-operators, captains, crew, and fishing communities through set-asides of harvesting allocation.

Also, on the dead zone, I hope you all really write a good letter for the dead zone issue, and that’s a big problem, and I think the recreational and commercial sectors can benefit from some good work there, and I want to give a shout-out to
Louisiana.

We had a good meeting in Wisconsin, with some farmers, on some ideas that we can do, and Commissioner Smitko brought up a lot of seafood, and it really touched the hearts of those farmers, and it made them want to do better, when we talked about what we were seeing down here, and I think maybe some of those funds can go to some more of that. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am glad to hear somebody mention the dead zone. Thank you.

MR. BRADLEY: One last thing. I would like for the AP, for the IFQ AP, and can we think about convening that in a central state? Some of us that aren’t on it may want to attend that. When that time comes around, see about having that in Mississippi or Louisiana or Alabama. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. All right. That wraps us up. If you will give me half-a-second though, I’m just going to call a couple of names, just to make sure. Mr. George Huye, who I believe was sick, and Mr. Kory Freed. Are you in the audience? No. Then that does it for the day, and I will see you all in the morning.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on January 31, 2018.)

---

February 1, 2018

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

---

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Hyatt Centric, New Orleans, Louisiana, Thursday morning, February 1, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: You should have both your Reef Fish Committee Report and Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report in your inbox. If anybody is still having trouble getting those, and we have been told they’re kicking out and going to spam, for some people, for some reason, but, if you have any issues, just let staff know, and we can always get you a paper copy. Good morning, by the way. Mr. Diaz.
MR. DIAZ: Sorry. Am I cutting you off on your introductory remarks?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: No, and go right ahead, but I do need to take my hat off, because I do need to get serious. Go ahead, Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I was just going to say, looking at the agenda for today, it seems like, for a couple of reasons, it makes sense to do Sustainable Fisheries before Reef Fish and early in the day, for a few reasons, and so I was just wondering if you would entertain that suggestion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and I would actually prefer that, because we did those lionfish EFPs in that committee, and I know we have Mr. Kelly in the audience right now, and he was one of the applicants for one of those, and there is a few things that we will go over with that, and I would like to do it while he’s here in the audience, and so I would definitely agree with that, but does anybody else have a problem if we do Sustainable Fisheries first?

I did check flight schedules with everybody, and I think everybody is good, and they’re going to be here all day. If there is no opposition to that, we will move Sustainable Fisheries to be the first report on the list.

That means Dr. Mickle. This should be -- Momentarily, it should be on the website as well, if you want to just go to the briefing book on the website. It will be there in just a second. You’ve got to give staff just a minute to get it there.

DR. MICKLE: Madam Chair Bosarge. Does everyone have the committee report, or almost? Shall I proceed?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Everybody but Doug is good or nobody has it? All right. Hold on then.

DR. MICKLE: Madam Chair Bosarge, as a friendly suggestion, I think everyone has the Administrative/Budget Committee. Could we do that one first, to allow everyone to acquire the larger document?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, that’s fine.

DR. MICKLE: Is that okay with everyone?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We’ll knock that out, real quick. Go ahead.
DR. MICKLE: That might be efficient. Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair Bosarge. The Administrative/Budget Committee Report, January 29, 2018, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab G, Number 1, and minutes of the August 2017 Administrative/Budget Committee meeting in San Antonio, Texas, Tab G, Number 2, as written.

Review of Ad Hoc Advisory Panels, Tab G, Number 4, in 2015, the council requested to review the existing ad hoc advisory panels annually, at its January meeting, to determine if any of the advisory panels needed to be discontinued or re-advertised for new members.

Staff presented the list of current ad hoc APs, the number of meetings held since creation, and the list of members. After some discussion, the committee decided to not make any changes to the existing list of APs or membership.

Discussion of SSC Organization, Tab G, Number 5, staff noted that convening the Standing and multiple special SSCs has been a challenge, both financially and logistically. Staff presented four restructuring alternatives to reduce the overall size of the SSC for council consideration.

By a unanimous vote, the committee recommends, and I so move, to make Alternative 3 the preferred. Alternative 3 is reduce only the size of the special SSCs and add two additional special SSCs. Keep the current size of the Standing SSC at eighteen members and reduce special SSCs to three or fewer people, plus add two additional special SSCs for Stock Assessment and Ecosystem Modeling.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think, when we were having this committee, there was some discussion about whether or not the special committee was going to be titled Ecosystem Modeling or just Ecosystem Committee, and my preference would be to call it an Ecosystem Committee.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We have a couple of slots on the
Standing SSC for ecosystem, and, by making that change and taking the word “modeling” out, it would broaden the potential applicants, because not everybody working in ecosystem management are modelers, and so it would give us an opportunity to get more people involved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir, Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I agree with that, and so do I need to make a motion to make that change?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, you will need to make a substitute motion, which I’m assuming would be pretty much that motion, but without the word “modeling” in it.

DR. FRAZER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is that what you want to do?

DR. FRAZER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We will give staff a minute to get that up on the board. Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: I don’t know if Dr. Frazer is anticipating -- He may or may not choose to do it and include it in his motion, but I was going to remind the council of the discussion we had around this issue regarding the notion of also a stock assessment SSC. After visiting with staff, there was -- The whole notion for that was not as much to create a special unit to deal with stock assessments as it was to maybe create a larger pool of those people to attend those other meetings.

I am not certain that that helps us, if they’re not really engaged on a regular basis at those other meetings, and so at least, in my mind, maybe I think I would like to try the new organization structure without setting up the special stock assessment folks, because there still should be in the neighborhood of seven or eight people on that committee, at the standing level, that would more or less, and not all of them are going to be stock assessment gurus, but they are going to have enough knowledge to attend those meetings and help with those other functions that go on, and so my thought would be to also remove them, but I definitely agree with the ecosystem change that you are suggesting, Dr. Frazer, and I will let you go ahead and make your motion, but I just wanted to remind people of that conversation, and I may try to come in and adjust that as well.
DR. FRAZER: I guess I am okay to make an additional adjustment and limit this motion to one additional special SSC, and so the motion then would read: Keep the current size of the Standing SSC at eighteen members and reduce special SSCs to three or fewer people, plus one additional special SSC for ecosystems.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Refresh my memory of exactly how many stock assessment people do we have on the Standing?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: In our SOPPs, we have designated that we want at least seven or eight.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: But we are getting participation, like at the different meetings that we’re asking them to go to, and we’re going to be okay, right?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Yes, we’re fine. That idea just came about three years ago, when we were appointing people, and we have made this special socioeconomic one, and the stock assessment people just suggested that maybe a special would be helpful, and so I was just exploring that, but the SSC really didn’t speak up one way or the other when we presented it to them a couple of weeks ago.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Dr. Frazer, is that your motion?

DR. FRAZER: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s been seconded for discussion. Let me read the substitute into the record. The substitute motion is to make Alternative 3 the preferred. Alternative 3 is reduce only the size of the special SSCs and add two additional special SSCs. Keep the current size of the Standing SSC at eighteen members and reduce the special SSCs to three or fewer people, plus add one additional special SSC for ecosystem. Change the SOPPs to read: Each special SSC will consist of no more than three members. That is your motion, sir. All right. Is there further discussion? Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: Tom, I agree with the amendment to the motion, but, going to an ecosystem committee, we’re going real broad. We’re backing off a very specific discipline of ecosystem modeling and backing up to potentially folks that study benthos, which is important, but I think it would be in the best interests to have a true ecosystem modeler within that committee, and I don’t know if we can demand that, or just to keep it somewhat diverse and focused on our prize, right?
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I know this does not formally resolve that issue that you are concerned about, but the thing that came about three years ago was that we had some ecosystem — We had an Ecosystem SSC, and we were trying to merge them, and some of the people did not want to commit to five meetings a year, and so the creation of a Special Ecosystem SSC that would not meet every time the SSC meets is more attractive, but, even without that, I have two people on my list that are ecosystem modelers that want to get on the committee, without this change even, and one of them just reminded me, earlier this week, wanting to know when the advertisement was going to come out, and they really wanted to get back involved. At least one or maybe two people have expressed strong interest.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any further discussion on the motion? All right. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the substitute motion carries. Dr. Mickle, do you want to carry on?

DR. MICKLE: Thank you. Change the SOPPs to read: Each special SSC will consist of no more than three members. The Special Socioeconomic SSC will be comprised of two economists and two anthropologists/sociologists.

Moving on, the Marine Resource Education Program 2018 Workshops, Tab G, Number 6, the MREP is conducting two fisheries workshops, and a single council member is invited to participate. The first workshop is on fisheries science, and it and will be held in St. Petersburg on April 24 through 26, 2018. The second is on fisheries management in Tampa on November 1 through 16, 2018.

MREP has also organized a new aquaculture educational program and invites five to six Gulf Council members to participate. The aquaculture program involves a tour of Maine aquaculture operations on May 15 through 18, 2018, and an aquaculture workshop on June 12 through 14, 2018, in New Orleans, Louisiana. Interested council members who want to participate in either the fisheries or aquaculture workshops should provide their names to the Council Executive Director. MREP pays all travel costs. No committee motions relevant to this request were made.

Under Other Business, staff requested guidance from the committee on whether we should conduct marine violation background checks on SSC applicants. The general consensus of the committee was that background checks were not needed. Madam
Chair, this concludes our committee report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. All right. Now, if you will all check your inboxes, I think -- I see it in Johnny’s and in mine, and you should have your Sustainable Fisheries Committee, and we got you a printed copy too, Doug, and so everybody should have that Sustainable Fisheries Report, and so, let’s keep moving on, sir.

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. MICKLE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report, January 29, 2018. The agenda was approved with the addition of an item under Other Business, and the minutes of the October 2, 2017 committee meeting were approved as written.

Review of Mackerel Landings and Bag Limit Analysis, Tab E, Number 4, NMFS staff presented a summary comparing king mackerel landings in the 2016/2017 season to preliminary landings in 2017/2018 for the commercial and recreational sector.

The council requested an update on recreational landings since the bag limit increase from two to three fish per person on May 11, 2017. Despite the bag limit increase, a comparison of landings during May through October in 2016 versus 2017 shows fewer fish being taken in 2017 and a smaller proportion of trips landing either two fish or three fish. However, 2016 was an unusually high year for recreational landings, and so this result may not be very meaningful until more years of data become available.

A committee member asked when the last and next stock assessments were. After checking the SEDAR schedules, the last assessment was SEDAR 38, a benchmark assessment in 2014 using landings through 2012. The next assessment is proposed to be another benchmark assessment, to be conducted in 2019, using landings through 2017.

Continuing on, Options Paper, Carryover of Unharvested Quota, Tab E, Number 5, Dr. Kai Lorenzen, the SSC representative, presented a summary review of simulated scenarios for periodic underharvest of red snapper and king mackerel.

For red snapper, the simulations indicated that underharvest of up to 20 percent, with the full underharvest carried over to the following year, did not impede the rebuilding program, and it may speed it up slightly. For king mackerel, the carryover had
no effect on the future status of the stock.

Due to different selectivities among fleets, these results hold only if the underharvest carryover is fleet-specific. Also, scenarios incorporating underharvest greater than 20 percent, or periodic overharvests, were not modeled and may produce different results.

The SSC commented that carryovers are likely to be appropriate and effective only when the underage has occurred due to regulatory action. Carryovers would be problematic if the underage had occurred due to a stock decline.

Staff reviewed the Draft Generic Amendment for Carryover Provisions and Framework Modifications. Action 1, Eligibility for a Carryover Provision for Managed Finfish Species in the Gulf of Mexico, staff recommended that Alternative 4, do not apply carryovers to stocks without sector allocations, be moved to Considered but Rejected, because there did not seem to be a reason to exempt stocks without allocation from carryover and because Table 2.1.1 indicated there was a large overlap in affected stocks with Alternative 3, and that is do not apply carryovers to stocks that did not have an ACL closure.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to move Alternative 4 to Considered but Rejected. Alternative 4 is apply a carryover provision to harvest the unused portion of the ACL for any managed finfish species in the Gulf except those which are currently managed under a stock ACL, meaning an ACL which is not subdivided by sector allocations. Any unused portion of the ACL remaining at the end of a fishing year for those species will not be carried over to a successive fishing year.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: 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.

DR. MICKLE: Staff requested editorial license to revise the wording of the alternatives in this section to be less confusing.

Action 2, Parameters for Applying the Carryover Provision to Species Managed Under Individual Fishing Quota, it was noted that carryovers would be applied to the entire ACL, to be proportionately divided among IFQ shareholders and not to individual quotas. Committee members felt that this action provided a reasonable range of alternatives.
Action 3, Establishment of a Fixed Buffer between the Acceptable Biological Catch and the Overfishing Limit, staff noted that, under the current ABC control rule, the buffer between OFL and ABC is already smaller than the minimum buffers in some of the alternatives, Table 2.3.1. For those stocks, this action was inconsistent with the control rule ABC, since the carryover provision with a minimum OFL-ABC buffer would decrease rather than increase ABC the following year. However, without a buffer, ABC could potentially be set equal to the OFL.

The National Standard 1 Guidelines state that ABC should be no higher than, and generally less than, OFL. A motion to move Action 3 to Considered but Rejected was made, but was subsequently withdrawn.

Action 4, Adjustments to Carryover Provisions, Acting Science Center Director Clay Porch felt that Alternative 2 amounted to double counting natural mortality, since natural mortality is already accounted for in the assessment. However, some committee members questioned whether it was accounted for in future projections.

It was pointed out that the simulation runs presented to the SSC assumed that the full underharvest would be carried over. Dr. Porch suggested that there would be no harm over a period of years, as long as the cumulative catch did not exceed the cumulative ACL each year.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to move Action 4 to Considered but Rejected. Action 4 is Adjustments to the Carry-Over Provision. Note that Action 4 is only valid if an alternative other than Alternative 1 is chosen in Action 1. Alternative 1, no action, do not reduce the amount of the unused portion of an ACL to be carried over. Any amount of the unused portion of the ACL to be carried over, as specified in Action 1, would be applied in full to the following fishing year, contingent on the alternative selected in Action 3. Alternative 2 is reduce the amount of the unused portion of an ACL to be carried over by the mean natural mortality rate of the subject species as used in the most recent accepted quantitative stock assessment. Alternative 3 is reduce the amount of the unused portion of an ACL to be carried over by an amount which accounts for management uncertainty. This amount would apply to any species for which a carryover is considered. Option 3a is reduce the amount of ACL to be carried over by 5 percent. Option 3b is reduce the amount of ACL to be carried over by 10 percent. Option 3c is reduce the amount of ACL to be carried
over by 15 percent.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board, which, in Action 4, would remove Alternative 4 from the document, to Considered but Rejected. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Mara.

MS. LEVY: Just to clarify that I think this motion moves all of Action 4 to Considered but Rejected.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: You are correct. That’s what it says at the top of the page. It’s all of Action 4. Is there discussion on moving all of Action 4 to Considered but Rejected? Seeing no discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

DR. MICKLE: Action 5, Modify the Framework Procedures for Gulf Council Fishery Management Plans, the action contains alternatives to allow carryovers to be implemented either through a closed framework, with no council action needed, or through an abbreviated documentation process for changes that are routine or insignificant.

Alternative 4 does not address carryovers which are already allowable under this process, but it would revise the wording so that there is consistent terminology among the framework procedures for FMPs.

Public Hearing Draft Amendment 49, Modifications to the Sea Turtle Release Gear and Framework Procedure for the Reef Fishery, Tab E, Number 6, staff reviewed the purpose and need and reminded the council this document impacts commercial and charter/headboat reef fish permit holders.

The Law Enforcement Technical Committee provided feedback on the alternatives in Amendment 49 at its October meeting, and staff summarized the comments. Staff has prepared a public hearing document and plans to hold a webinar public hearing before the April council meeting.

Staff noted that the document has been updated to include additional information and photographs of the new sea turtle release gear, as the Law Enforcement Technical Committee recommended. The committee selected the following preferred alternatives for Actions 1 and 2.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 is
modify the regulations for vessels with commercial or charter vessel/headboat Gulf reef fish permits to allow the use of the new collapsible hoop net, dehooking device, and small hoist to release incidentally-hooked sea turtles.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries.

DR. MICKLE: The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2, to make Alternative 2, Options a and b the preferred. Alternative 2 is modify the reef fish framework procedure to include changes to release gear requirements and handling protocols for sea turtles and other protected resources through the abbreviated documentation process for open framework actions. Release gear requirements and handling protocols that could be implemented or changed would include Option a, release gear requirements for sea turtles and other protected resources, and Option b, handling requirements for sea turtles and other protected resources.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries.

DR. MICKLE: The committee was informed that staff would prepare a document for final action at the April council meeting. Draft Policy and Outreach, Descending Devices and Venting Tools, Tab E, Number 7(a), (b), and (c), staff reviewed a draft policy statement that encourages the use of venting tools or descending devices, as appropriate, when releasing fish, and it provides background information on barotrauma and effectiveness of release devices.

Information in the statement regarding survival of fish released using descending devices came from rockfish in the Pacific. Dr. Stunz stated that there are studies of descending device effectiveness for the Gulf, and he would communicate with staff at a later time to discuss this information.

One committee member asked if there was information about total discard rate in numbers of fish and not just the discard mortality rate that could be provided at the next meeting. Staff responded that, for the recreational sector, MRIP Type B catches represented fish that were caught and released, and it was from this classification that NMFS calculated the number that die. Also, MRIP data is only available for waters off those states that participate in the MRIP program.
Staff reviewed the outline of a proposed outreach program for the venting and descending policy. One committee member stated that charter boat operators instruct clients on proper release methods and that these operators should be included in the organizations mentioned for network utilization via direct contact.

Committee members also felt that the O&E Technical Committee would be a valuable asset for implementing this outreach program. A suggestion was made that the O&E Technical Committee be convened before the June council meeting. One committee member suggested that milestones, or a timeline, for implementation be established and that the outreach program include a means of determining its effectiveness.

Another council member suggested that the council establish a partnership with organizations that distribute release devices. Other suggestions included creating YouTube videos and promoting the policy in magazines such as Florida Sportsman and Louisiana Sportsman.

The committee reviewed a draft letter to the Chair of the Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group supporting outreach programs that encourage a more widespread use of release devices, including distribution of descending devices, followed up by research on the utility of the devices and resulting fish survival. After reviewing the draft letter, the committee passed the following motion.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to forward the letter to Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group regarding the use of descending devices and venting tools to increase survival of released fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Would this be an appropriate time to bring up some points concerning descending devices, or do you want to let him finish the report first?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: No, it’s perfectly appropriate. Go ahead.

DR. STUNZ: Okay, and I just wanted to get a little bit of clarity, and I think also that Mr. Atran was going to provide us
with some more information on some discard mortality, which I
would be interested in seeing, but my first point is I didn’t
feel -- After the meeting, I discovered that at least I, and
maybe others, didn’t have a better feel for when we expect this
policy to be released, and, in my mind, I was envisioning this
would occur before most of the real season gets started this
year and that kind of thing, and so my question is are we on
that timeline? Then I have a follow-up to that.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We will incorporate whatever
suggested changes the council has here, and, if the council
approves the policy, we will make it public immediately.

DR. STUNZ: Okay, and so the next -- But that would be after our
April meeting coming up that we see it again, or do you mean
sooner?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: If you’re happy with the way it’s
written now and say it’s ready to be released, we’ll do it now.

DR. STUNZ: I am not necessarily unhappy with the way that it’s
written now. I think that there is some minor factual things
that need to be corrected, and, at the committee meeting the
other day, I wasn’t going to -- I mean, we could go through that
here, I guess, or I am happy to work with staff to fix a couple
of those things.

The other thing, regarding some of the language, is -- I mean, I
think it’s fine, but maybe, like Emily or some of the other
outreach staff, they might want to look at it. I don’t quite
feel like it is conveying to just general everyday anglers
really what we’re trying to accomplish in a real kind of -- In
other words, the language could be improved some, to make it
more of a what are we really trying to accomplish here document,
but I don’t want to work outside of the committee, and so I
don’t know if that means that it needs to come back or not, but
I think there is just a few relatively minor improvements that
could be made before we go out, and I don’t want to hold it up.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I think you communicating with
staff between meetings is fine on this, because our target
should be then to bring something back to the council in April,
with the intention of it being approved as a final policy and
ready to go, and so any help you want to provide, or any council
member, in the meantime, is more than welcome.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.
MR. RIECHERS: Greg may have some specific things in the policy, but what I think he is also hitting on is that there is the difference between the policy and then the outreach and education materials that are going to be produced and the additional timelines that were brought up there, and I think what we did was have a -- As I am recalling, it was a list of things that we wanted to do, but there were several people on the committee that also suggested that we flesh that out a little bit more, with some kind of details about timelines and how we might go about that.

If that could be available at the next meeting, I think that’s important, because that’s really the -- It’s one thing to create a policy and kind of throw it up on the website and say we have supported this, but the real issue is how we get it out there.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: In my mind, they are two different things. One is a policy statement that we put on the web, and there would be a press release and that sort of thing. As far as products that we’re going to produce, the main thing we’re going to do is coordinate with our partners, because this is not a new subject.

Florida Sea Grant has been working on this for probably ten years or more, and other organizations -- FWC has got a very extensive thing, and so it’s not like we’re going to produce a video if those videos are already out there. If we can complement what’s being done, that’s what we’ll look for, and that effort hasn’t been made in a determined and thorough manner, but that’s what we’ll do. We are basically -- In my mind, we’re jumping on the bandwagon, but we’re not creating a new trend here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think, too, a lot of that will get fleshed out when we have that meeting with the O&E Technical Committee, AP, and we do have one staff member on maternity leave that’s a big part of this, and so we’ll have to kind of look at all that scheduling and see, but hopefully we can get that in, maybe before the next meeting, and I think that would give us a lot of feedback too, because all those partners are on that technical committee, and they can tell us that we have this that we can pull from and that we can pull from and we can use this to leverage.

DR. STUNZ: Just to clarify, to make sure I’m hearing this right, there is some minor technicalities and things to work through on the policy, which I am happy to contribute to, and then the separate thing is that list of outreach activities that
we want to do to put forward this policy, and it would be great
to have some general implementation dates. I don’t think anyone
is necessarily going to hold anyone to them, but just the
general timeline, so we know what we can expect, moving forward,
with building these into the fishery.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I have Mr. Riechers, and then
we’re going to have Mr. Anson and Martha and Dale. Mr. Riechers
passes, and so Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Just I’m sure staff made notes, but I thought,
during the conversation during the committee, part of that extra
information was actually going to be some more quantitative
information, as far as the actual numbers of fish that were
being estimated to be discarded and the current mortality
associated with that, assuming no descending devices are used,
and then some information as to impact that would have.

If it’s causing a 50 percent decrease in discard mortality, what
might that have on the assessment and improving access, and I
think that was -- I thought I recall some of that information,
and, whether or not it can be accomplished before the April
timeline, I don’t know, but certainly to try to add more
information to what is already in the table, just as far as
percentages, but actually relating that back to numbers.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Atran.

MR. STEVEN ATRAN: Mr. Anson is absolutely right. I have that
in my notes, and we will see what we can get out of the MRIP
database. I actually thought that I might be able to get it in
time for this meeting, but my time has been taken up writing the
committee reports.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: If we don’t have sufficient information from
that database, that might be something that could go before the
SSC, and they could give us some feedback there, if we can’t
pull the information we need, and so there’s a couple of ways to
get at that. Mr. Diaz was next.

MR. DIAZ: I just wanted to point out public testimony
yesterday, and, if I get the name wrong, I apologize, but I
think Mr. Dylan Hubbard gave some really good testimony
yesterday about practical ways that he is trying to educate
people, and, if he would be willing, I think he would be a great
resource for somebody like maybe Emily to reach out to at some
point in the future and to just get some practical advice from
somebody that is out in the field doing it right now and trying
to educate the public. Anyway, I enjoyed his testimony, and I just wanted to make a point that I thought that that was very worthwhile.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The most important thing he said, from my perspective, is don’t prescribe what a venting tool is and don’t prescribe what a descending device is. We don’t want to have to have a definitive list that has to be approved by an amendment or a framework procedure. Just encourage us to do it, and we can be innovative and make it happen.

I also want to point out, on a different matter, both the Sustainable Fisheries and the Reef Fish Reports are on our website now. If you have opened the website earlier, just refresh your website, and they will pop up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Was there any other discussion before Dr. Mickle moves on? Okay. Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Are we clear yet as to when the letter is going to be sent out to get this moving?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I don’t think we’re quite there yet. We just sort of paused after the discussion on venting and descending devices, so that we could have that discussion, and I think Dr. Mickle is going to pick back up with his committee report. Staff is just ahead of us there. They’re getting ahead of the game.

DR. MICKLE: Review of EAFM by the Gulf Council and Other Regional Approaches, staff presented the committee with information about ecosystem management in other regions and the Gulf. The Gulf Council is the only council without a formal fishery ecosystem plan (FEP) or policy, either completed or in progress, but has been incorporating ecosystem considerations into its management decisions.

The committee discussed what an FEP or ecosystem document would look like and discussed previous Gulf Council ecosystem products. Staff highlighted that an FEP, or other type of document, can be tailored to be Gulf specific, and that the goal is not to determine an ecosystem model, but a more comprehensive document that identifies ecosystem components that are important for considering in management.

Staff also presented the timeline for the Regional EBFM Roadmap document. The committee discussed if it would like to proceed with an ecosystem document, briefly outlining what could be
included in an FEP or policy and determined that it would like
to wait until the regional roadmap is complete. The committee
made the following motion.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to
develop a document that outlines the component parts of an
ecosystem plan.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any
discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition
to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries.

DR. MICKLE: Reef Fish Charter/For-hire Permit Transfers and --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Paul, hold on just a second.

DR. MICKLE: I apologize.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That is okay. I think we just skipped one
paragraph at the end of -- We started a discussion, and can you
go back, at the top of page 5, and where it says “the committee
reviewed a draft letter to the Chair of the Open Trust”, and
would you read that paragraph for us, and then we’re going to
read that motion that’s right below it, and we will let the
council vote on that motion, please, sir.

DR. MICKLE: I apologize. I started at the wrong spot. I
apologize. Thank you. The top of page 5, the second paragraph.
The committee reviewed a draft letter to the Chair of the Open
Ocean Trustee Implementation Group supporting outreach programs
that encourage a more widespread use of release devices,
including distribution of descending devices, followed up by
research on the utility of the devices and resulting fish
survival. After reviewing the draft letter, the committee
passed the following motion.

The Committee recommends, and I so move, to forward the letter
to the Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group regarding the use
of descending devices and venting tools to increase survival of
released fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion on the
board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Dr. Stunz, wasn’t this the letter that you were
referring to, with maybe some technical things that you want to
consider?
DR. STUNZ: The letter that I was referring to was more for the policy statement that was coming out of what our council policy is regarding descending devices, and please correct me if I’m wrong, but I think the letter we’re talking about here is going to more RESTORE activities about how they could potentially use some of that money to help us implement that initiative into the fishery by whatever funds that they have to promote mortality reductions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Thank you for the clarification. Any further discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. Dr. Mickle, that will bring us back down to the bottom of page 5, on reef fish charter/for-hire, and is that correct?

DR. MICKLE: Yes, and we’ve read the following paragraph into the record, and so I would begin at Reef Fish Charter, as you specified.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you. Reef Fish Charter/For-Hire Permit Transfers and Potential Management Actions, Tab E, Number 9(a) and (b), transfers of federal for-hire reef fish permits were evaluated in response to the council’s concerns that some operators may time permit transfers to fish during the federal and state recreational red snapper seasons.

The analyses presented evaluated monthly transfers and the effective dates of individual permit transfers. The analyses performed did not reveal patterns suggesting that strategic transfers were taking place.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Mickle, I think, if you will pause for just a second, Mr. Boyd has a question.

MR. BOYD: Yes. The key word here is “strategic transfers”, and I think there are transfers taking place, and I think that they are planned, and they’re an annual event. We have quite a few charter boats and headboats that take south Texans, winter Texans, out, and they go into state waters and fish those reefs that are down there, the artificial reefs.

I think it is taking place, and the word “strategic”, I guess, to me, means it’s a strategic plan throughout the sector, and I think it is a strategic plan for several boats, and so I don’t want the committee to think there is just nothing going on, because I believe there is. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for that feedback. All right. Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: Environmental Assessment and Exempted Fishing Permits for Lionfish Trap Testing in the Gulf and South Atlantic, Tab E, Number 10 (a) through (e), NMFS staff reviewed three applications for exempted fishing permits to evaluate the use of various trap designs for targeting lionfish, plus an environmental assessment prepared by NMFS. The EFPs were submitted by: Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association, requesting 400 traps; Keys Fisheries, requesting 1,500 traps; Reefsavers, requesting 5,000 traps.

The traps would be set in locations around the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. One committee member asked for more information about the proposed location of the fish traps, out of concern that they not interfere with shrimp trawling. Bill Kelly, Executive Director of the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association, stated that his organization was working to develop markets for lionfish, and that the proceeds from the sale of lionfish caught under the EFP would go into each state’s mitigation fund. Following discussion, the committee passed the following motion.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend that NMFS move forward with the implementation of the three lionfish EFP requests and to add a one-year update reporting requirement. Madam Chair.

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

MR. SWINDELL: It states that -- The last statement in the paragraph above is the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association stated that this organization is working to develop markets for lionfish and that the proceeds from the sale of lionfish caught would go to the states’ mitigation funds. Proceeds, is that sales value, and is that total sales, or is that profits after expenses?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, I don’t think they can go backwards on it, and so I would imagine that they’re going to have to cover their expenses somehow, but I think, in their EFP, and I hope that I remember correctly, but I think what they’re going to do is just pay the fishermen like a daily rate to go out and catch them, and then the proceeds, after that, would go -- The fuel and things like that, I guess would go, but we have Mr. Bill
Kelly here, and, actually, I was going to have staff pull up some of the maps that Morgan was kind enough -- When we went through three EFPs in this committee, I was a little concerned that the big map that they showed, that NMFS had in their presentation, it was a little hard to tell exactly where these traps were going to be dropped, and I wanted to make sure that we weren’t going to have any user conflicts between -- Let’s call them trappers, in this case, I guess, and shrimp gear, because that gets kind of testy out on the water.

NMFS was kind enough to blow those maps up, and Morgan was kind enough to try and overlay it with the shrimp effort that we have, and so I would like to look at each EFP, very briefly, on this map and make sure that we don’t have any conflict with the shrimp fleet and where they are dragging.

On this map, and this is the map for where the traps in the first EFP are going to be placed, and that’s the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association EFP, and we do have Mr. Bill Kelly in the room with us.

You see those two green lines that sort of parallel the Florida Peninsula right there? They are going to drop their traps in between those two green lines and then down in very south Florida. Down there by the Keys, there is two small green lines that are parallel to each other, and they’re going to drop their traps there.

The purple and white that you see on the screen, that is historic shrimp trawling effort in these areas, and so Mr. Kelly was kind enough to come and talk to me, and I asked him -- That more inshore green line, I asked him if he could shift that out to about a depth of about 165 feet or so and drop his traps outside of that, and so drop them in water that is deeper than that 165 foot, and he said -- He talked to some of the other fishermen that are going to be working in that EFP, and they said that that shouldn’t be a problem, and I think that that will eliminate any conflicts that he might have had with any shrimp trawl gear and that we won’t have any issues. Mr. Kelly, I really appreciate you working with us on that. I think yours is going to be just fine, with that minor amendment, and so were there any other questions on Mr. Kelly’s EFP? Did you want Mr. Kelly to come up and speak to the proceeds?

MR. SWINDELL: I just think that we should be clear what the council is looking for here, whether or not you’re going to be asking the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association to take all the cost associated with doing this on their own back
or are they going to be able to take some of the proceeds from
the sale to recover their cost. I don’t know what the right
thing is to do here, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, I don’t think anybody works for free,
and so I’m sure they will have to take a little -- They may have
some funding as well, and I think anything that they can give to
that Florida fund will be amazing, and I’m sure Florida won’t
turn that down. Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: I just don’t want us to get into a situation
where we get complaints that these people are making some profit
from it or that they are recovering their costs, but yet they’re
not recovering their costs, because, as the wording says, the
proceeds from the sale, and that, to me, means the whole gross
price that you receive goes to the mitigation fund.

The guys that are out there doing all this work to help us
understand this lionfish issue, they’re going to be stuck with
the cost that is taken in to put these traps out there and
monitor them and get them back in and get the lionfish and keep
going. I don’t think that that’s right, and I think this ought
to be something -- I don’t know how, from a business standpoint,
how to really state it so that these people are not spending all
of their money in trying to just help us and, at the same time,
help themselves develop a business, but, at the same time, help
us control the lionfish issue.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I think Mr. Kelly is here, and why don’t we just let
him come to the mic and speak to this issue, and then at least
everybody will be clear on how it’s working.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Kelly, would you mind just coming forward
just for a minute and reassuring us that you are going to be
able to cover your costs and that you won’t go backwards?

MR. KELLY: Madam Chair, Bill Kelly, Florida Keys Commercial
Fishermen. Council members, when we initiated this project, the
operational budget was $933,000. It was a substantial number of
non-profit organizations that are very well known
internationally that were prepared to fund this thing.

We have held them in abeyance for a rather long period of time,
as we work our way through the EFP process and the licenses
required to test in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.
The reason that we did that is we didn’t want to get into a
funding cycle and have these institutions and organizations make a financial commitment and then we wouldn’t be able to perform in that calendar year, and so I can offer you my assurances that these people are still very much interested in this program and very much aware of the problem and the scope of it, around the entire Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic, as far north now as Long Island.

We also have some interested funding partners. As I mentioned in some of my comments, we missed a $200,000 funding opportunity, through Saltonstall-Kennedy, because of delays that we encountered right in our own backyard with the National Marine Sanctuary.

The way the program is scheduled, our fishermen would go out and they would receive a per diem that would be commensurate with what they would normally make in the area and if they were engaged in regular fishing activities.

The proceeds, proceeds from the sale of any lionfish harvested, would go back into the program to cover the costs of operation, and it was then hoped that we would take this information to the individual coastal states and show them proof of concept.

We have got something that here is what works and here is the device, and here is the baiting techniques and so forth, and now we will be able to assist you in training a team to go out and do exactly what we’re doing, and you can help mitigate this invasion. Will we wipe them out, no, but I think that it’s certainly possible that we can contain them in sufficient numbers.

As I pointed out just briefly yesterday, if we were engaged in a directed fishery right now, I am not sure there is enough zeroes on your computer to show you what we would harvest. We are already catching hundreds of thousands of lionfish annually in our traps as bycatch, and we’re very comfortably selling them at $5.50 a pound to $6.25. The only thing we would like to do is get them out of our traps, so we can make more room for lobster, that sell for $10.25 or more per pound, and so, unless somebody has some other questions, that is pretty much the scheme of things.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Bill, I am kind of curious. The $5.50 to $6.25, is that rough? Whatever you’re getting for the lionfish, is that at the dock rough?
MR. KELLY: Yes, and that’s ex-vessel, and that’s actually whole weight. The lionfish are very susceptible to barotrauma, and the numbers -- Where there are really considerable numbers is in deeper water, and, when I say deeper, it’s 120 to 300 feet of water, and so, when we pull these traps with mechanical haulers and so forth, the lionfish void themselves of their stomach and digestive tract contents and so forth, and it’s quite simple, but we’re catching fish up to three pounds, which is at growth, and that is interesting that it hasn’t taken a very long period of time to get to that point.

The other thing that we’ve seen, that was discovered by one of our fishermen, Gary Nichols, who is harvesting roughly about 10,000 pounds or more annually, is that, about three years ago, he was going to fillet some lionfish for himself for dinner, and he really thought this guy has got an irregular stomach here, and what on earth has he been eating, and so Gary had a batch of them that were caught in a particular area, and he started gutting them, and they were full of juvenile lionfish, and so that raises a very interesting point. Heretofore, they were not necessarily recognized as being cannibalistic, and so what’s going on here -- The issue is that they are probably exhausting food supplies and forage fish in those areas, and so they become cannibalistic.

It was interesting, because you have a certain area where Gary is fishing, and he sees clear evidence of that, and then, other areas that might be five or ten miles away or so, where they are not cannibalistic, because they haven’t exhausted the food supplies in those areas.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Kelly. Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: From that discussion, it seems to me that what we’re talking about here is the net proceeds of the sale of the lionfish. Just as long as NMFS and those that have to work with this understands that they’re going to have to do some accounting, to make darned certain that it’s done properly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We do have a motion on the board that approves all three of these EFPs at once, and, if the council
agrees, I would rather take them individually, because each one of them has a little bit different movements that are going to be involved.

Like Mr. Kelly’s would be approved with the understanding that they will shift that one line out to about 165 feet, and so would that be okay? We would have a substitute motion to approve the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association lionfish trap EFP with the discussed amendments.

MR. BANKS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It is so moved by Mr. Banks. It’s seconded by Mr. Greene. I like that. To recommend that NMFS move forward with the implementation of the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association lionfish EFP request with the recommended modifications to the sampling area and to add a one-year update reporting requirement. Mr. Banks, is that your motion? Yes. All right. Wonderful. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? The motion carries.

Staff, if you don’t mind, would you pull up the map that we have for the second EFP for lionfish, which is the Keys Fisheries EFP?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I have got a question for National Marine Fisheries Service. Have you all evaluated the three proposals and have any recommendations? I mean, they don’t all seem to have the same thought put into how they’re going to operate, and the Reefsavers one, in particular, seems quite problematic, if you’re going to try to handle 5,000 traps from a sailboat.

DR. CRABTREE: I agree that some have been better thought-out than others, and we’ll resolve some of those issues down the road. I think the main thing we would want to hear from you guys is just what you’re getting at, is concerns about where the traps can be placed to avoid fishery conflicts, and what would be a value from you is to recommend to us that this is okay, but in this area, and that’s what we’re doing now, with respect to the Reefsavers.

I agree that there are a number of concerns there, and, if you want us to get more information and flesh that out more and then come back to you with it at the next meeting, we can certainly do that.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Well, we haven’t -- I mean, we were hit this meeting with nine EFPs, and that’s been overwhelming, and the other two, Keys Fisheries and Reefsavers, we haven’t heard presentations on, but we have now queried Mr. Kelly twice on his proposal, and it’s just -- They are not being handled equally, it seems like.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: This is the map for the second lionfish EFP, which is the Keys Fisheries, and I will go back and mention that, the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen EFP, that had 400 traps. This one has 1,500 traps, and so this is a zoomed-in map of where they are going to drop their traps. The only place that I can tell, from what we’re presented here, that we may have a conflict with other users is right down there at that south end. You can see that their gear is going to be in our pink shrimp fishery grounds, right down there.

For the NMFS side of the house, we would like that adjusted, so that do not drop traps where there is shrimp effort in the southern portion of where they are recommending down there. For the record, yes, we are catching lionfish in our trawl gear. Some fishermen are even selling them, and they’re catching enough of them. Some of them, we just eat. We will need to adjust that, and is that enough information for NMFS to make that adjustment?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and usually what we do is, after you guys make your recommendation, you would write us a letter saying these are the motions approved, and, if you want to give us some coordinates, some specifics, there, that would be very helpful.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I haven’t been able to talk to the applicants that are submitting this one, but I did ask Mr. Kelly, and I had a little bit of comfort in the fact that these are commercial fishermen that have been working down in those areas for many, many years, and so I feel like they will probably do a good job.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I would agree with that, and I would agree with you too that the Reefsavers is the more problematic one of them, and it raises more concerns, but I would agree that Mr. Kelly’s, the Monroe County one, and this one as well, seem pretty straightforward. They are professional commercial fishermen, and they’re already out there catching lionfish in their traps, and I think, with a little tweak down in the lower corner of this, we can make this one work.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s hard to see on this map, but you may need to tweak it just a hair for that HAPC that I see down there
in the bottom corner as well. We just have to make sure that we avoid those. Okay. We would need another motion, and it would be essentially the same motion that we just made, except that, instead of the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association, it would be the Keys Fisheries. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: So moved, with those edits.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Do we have a second for the motion?

MR. DIAZ: Does that part in there that says, “with recommended modifications”, apply to this one, too?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, it does, because, right now, the area that they were trying to permit to drop those traps, you see that they’re going to have to adjust it slightly at the south end for the HAPC and the shrimp effort, and so there would be modifications to this one as well.

MR. DIAZ: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so it’s seconded by Mr. Diaz. Is there further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any -- Let me read the motion in the record first. To recommend that National Marine Fisheries Service move forward with the implementation of the Keys Fisheries lionfish EFP request with the recommended modifications to the sampling area and to add a one-year update reporting requirement. Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

If staff would pull up the last map, which is for the Reefsavers lionfish EFP, please. This one, if you see the red lines, especially in the northern Gulf up here, and you see the two red lines, and I wouldn’t call it parallel, but I’m not sure how else to describe it, and so they would be dropping their traps in between those two red lines. That is sort of like the shrimp interstate, and so I don’t think this is going to work. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: What I would suggest to you is let us go back to Mr. Glass about this one and talk to him about it, because obviously that’s a lot of issues there, and let us see if we can’t work out some modifications to it, and then we can bring back a revised zone to you at the next meeting, and you guys can see if that meets your concerns.

Then there were questions raised about it, and I recall
something about a sailboat, and my understanding is that he’s
not using a sailboat, and so we can clarify -- If there are
other concerns like that, we can clarify those with the
applicant as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The other comment that I had during the
committee was the sheer volume of traps involved in that one. I
know, in the big scheme of things, it’s not a huge number, but
we have recommended to move forward with an EFP for 400 and for
1,500, and this is for 5,000. That is a good many traps, and
it’s also very encouraging if someone involved in the EFP
actually has some commercial fishing experience with traps, so
that you don’t have that huge learning curve to hurdle, just how
to deal with that gear and successfully place it and retrieve it
and everything else, and so that is always a good thing to have.
Any other comments? Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I was wondering -- Maybe, Sue, in the EFP
application for this one, did they talk about -- I mean, would
these be deployed with the float at the surface the whole time
while it’s soaking, or was there going to be some sort of metal
or some twine or something that would go away after a few days
and then allow the float to come up right before they are
intended to go out and retrieve it?

DR. CRABTREE: My understanding is they would be fished in
trawls, and so it would be multiple traps, but I think there is
a line at some point that they would come up, and I don’t recall
if they are specific about how many it would be, but we
certainly have concerns about vertical lines and entanglements
with marine mammals and things like that, and so that is
something that we’ll be consulting with our PR staff on and
making sure that it’s not going to create issues.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sue.

MS. GERHART: I just wanted to point out that the 5,000 traps
are for both the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and so what you’re
seeing there wouldn’t be 5,000 traps. This is also for the
South Atlantic areas as well. They are in trawls, and, for
those people who don’t know what a trap trawl is, it’s a single
buoy line with the traps on it, and it’s not a trawl like a
shrimp trawl.

Another thing is that the environmental assessment that we are
doing is looking at the impacts of this level of effort, and so
it’s possible that we may conclude that that’s too much, in
terms of the impacts, but we’re working with our Protected
Resources people and all as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Matens and then Mr. Greene.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Once again, I am curious. Does anyone know what the criteria was to draw these lines? Was it depth or was it --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Maybe we will get some more feedback on that when they bring it back to us. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: My question is back to what Sue was talking about. These lines that float to the surface, are they going to be marked? I guess they’re going to have a buoy on them, but are they going to have some type of light on them, affixed, or some type of AIS indicator or something, because, in some of these areas, there is a lot of nighttime fishing that goes on, and boats moving all over the place while they’re offshore fishing, and entanglement of that would be a severe deal for a lot of guys, I would think.

DR. CRABTREE: We would certainly be able to require some type of marking, and I am sure that we would, and so, in the event that something happened, we could identify it. We might be able to require some kind of light or something like that, but I don’t think -- Most traps that are out there don’t have that sort of thing, but we’re able to look into that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: It’s hard to tell, from the scale of this map, just how close to shore these lines, these traps, will be along the coast of Louisiana and Mississippi. Is there any way that we have a better definition of just where these are?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We can ask NMFS to bring that back to us as well when they come back, and we’ll try and get some zoomed-in maps, so we can see a little better where they’re at, and, obviously, there is a slight issue -- Just for the record, there is a slight issue with the permitting area over off the coast of Florida right there. It’s very similar to the Florida Keys permit, and the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen did agree to shift that line to a deeper depth contour, somewhere around 165 feet, to get out of that shrimp effort over there. Ms. Gerhart.

MS. GERHART: To let you know, they actually have already received a permit from Louisiana to fish these traps in state waters, and so they already have that permit going in those
shallower waters. To clarify, these are -- The type of traps that this group is using are the FAD-based collapsible traps. These aren’t lobster traps, in this case, and so the ones that Dr. Steve Gittings had designed, and that’s the type of trap that we’re talking about here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: To that point, these traps are not very heavy, correct? Okay. So, if you’re going to have -- I am very familiar with some of this area, but, if you’re going to put traps in sequence that are not very heavy in deep water, and then you’re going to run a float up 300 or 400 or 500 feet, that current is going to drag those traps all over the place. When you’ve got 500 feet of water, there is a lot of current and stuff that flows in there, and the lack of weight is a concern.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and so they’re going to have to be weighted with enough weight to hold them in place. That is likely to vary from place to place, depending on the currents and things.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Then what happens when we catch them is they won’t go through a TED, and so they plug up the net, and then they tear up the net. Anyway, we’ll get there. Do you have enough information, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: I think we do, and clearly the big issue is these lines are going to need to be adjusted to avoid interactions with the shrimp fishery, and so I wouldn’t worry too much about where the lines are now, because they’re going to need to move to work this out.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Hopefully some demonstrated experience in commercial fishing somewhere along the line. Ms. Gerhart.

MS. GERHART: Again, to reiterate, the applicants have said they are willing to change their locations. Those locations they chose was, one, because of certain ports to go out of, and so those were the areas, and then they were long depth contours that they thought were most likely for lionfish, but they are very willing to move those areas.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. All right. Any further -- Dr. Crabtree, do you need a motion in order to go back to the -- I don’t think so. We recommended to approve the other ones.

DR. CRABTREE: I would just suggest, in your letter, that you lay out your concerns that you would like us to evaluate, and
then we’ll do that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We’re not requesting that you move forward with implementation on the third one. We are requesting that you go back and hopefully adjust some things and then bring it back to us. All right. We had a motion on the board, and we dispensed with that with a substitute and made another one, and so where does that leave you, Dr. Mickel, on your report?

DR. MICKEL: Do I continue with the discussion on the dead zone?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, if we’ve finished all the EFP discussion, then, yes, sir. That sounds great.

DR. MICKEL: Thank you. Discussion on Dead Zone Regarding RESTORE Act Activities, Glenn Constant discussed ways in which the council could provide input into the funding of projects related to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill regarding the hypoxic zone. This included funding from the RESTORE Act as well as the Natural Resource Damage Assessment program.

The Fish and Wildlife Service decided that, when voicing support for restoration related to reducing the size of the Gulf of Mexico Dead Zone, it made sense to rely on advice of our partners that are already connected to restoration actions associated with the entire Mississippi and Atchafalaya River basins.

A large part of our support for those projects is coordinated through the Gulf of Mexico Alliance, or GOMA, and would likely be an asset in helping the council direct its support for prioritizing Deepwater Horizon funding. Laura Bowie, the Executive Director, could not make it to this council meeting, but is willing to speak to the council at a future meeting.

GOMA has a strong connection to the national effort led by EPA through its Gulf of Mexico Watershed Nutrient Reduction Task Force. The task force publishes its nutrient reduction strategies in the Hypoxia Task Force Action Plan that that is periodically updated, the last time in 2008.

The national plans are implemented locally through the state nutrient reduction plans that provide pertinent local methods and opportunities. One effective way for the council to get involved is by supporting the implementation of those state plans. The council could write letters of support to Laurie Rounds, the Chair of the Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group, as well as to Scott Pruitt, the EPA Chair of the Gulf
Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council, or his designee.

The committee chair asked if there was any opposition to having staff draft a letter of support for funding dead zone reduction proposals. There was no opposition to the proposal. However, one committee member noted that the hypoxic zone issue includes farm runoff and affects more than just the Gulf States. He suggested that the letter include suggestions or ideas on how to proceed.

Greg Stunz noted that he had been contacted by a group of scientists from NOAA and NOS about participating in the Fisheries Monitoring Workgroup and Workshop intended to better understand hypoxia. Dr. Stunz could not attend the initial workshop, but another workshop is being planned. He will let council staff know when he has more information.

Other Business, staff presented an overview of the National SSC VI meeting, which was held in San Diego on January 16 through 19, 2018, and was attended by SSC members Joe Powers, David Griffith, Bob Gill, and by council staff Steven Atran.

The theme of the meeting was management strategy evaluation, or MSE. MSE is a process for evaluating tradeoffs between alternative management strategies through an iterative process of model simulations and stakeholder participation. The council has applied a partial MSE approach to evaluating catch limits for data-poor stocks in SEDAR 49, and council staff have completed an MSE approach to evaluating deep-sea coral habitats for possible designation as HAPCs.

Each of the NMFS Science Centers has hired or is in the process of hiring an MSE specialist to assist the regions in implementing the process. A comprehensive report on the National SSC Workshop in being prepared by the Pacific Fishery Management Council and will be published later this year. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Is there anything else that anybody wanted to bring up under the Sustainable Fisheries Committee? Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. I didn’t bring these up earlier, because they don’t affect the motions, but they probably should be changed nonetheless, and they are under Action 4 on page 2. First, I am not the Acting Center Director, and so maybe we could just put “Center Representative” or something like that.
Second, if you would, add the words “each year” to the last sentence under Action 4, and so it would end with, “as long as the cumulative catch did not exceed the cumulative ACL each year”. That’s an important distinction.

**AD HOC RED SNAPPER AND GROUPER-TILEFISH IFQ AP APPOINTMENTS**

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, sir. Dr. Porch was asking that we add “each year”, and it’s on page 2, at the bottom, just for the record, for staff. It’s the last paragraph on page 2, to add “each year” after that, and then maybe don’t give him a promotion just yet. All right. I think staff has that, and we can make those changes, and so noted. Thank you, sir. Anything else for Sustainable Fisheries? Okay. Let’s see what’s next on our agenda.

We can circle back around and pick back up with Reef Fish, or we can go ahead and knock out. We’re probably going to be here all day, by the way, and so you will get a lunch break, and don’t worry. Let’s go ahead and knock out the Ad Hoc Red Snapper and Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP Appointments, if you don’t mind, so that I don’t get overwhelmed later, when we run over.

That would be my report, and so the council did go into closed session, and we formed our AP, our Ad Hoc Red Snapper and Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP, with the following members: Jane Black-Lee, William Copeland, Jason Delacruz, Jonathan Floyd, Keith “Buddy” Guindon, Scott Hickman, David Krebs, Harris Pappas, Dennis Parker, Franklin Parker, Todd Rosetti, Nick Ruland, Lisa Schmidt, Jerri Smitko, James Swindle, Theodore Tomeny, David Walker, Wayne Werner, and Jim Zurbrick.

In closed session, we also did discuss the hiring of a replacement Executive Director, because our beloved Doug Gregory is going to retire soon, and we did decide to extend the recruitment announcement to four weeks, and so, for any of you that have been following that, that will not close until February 9. That is the end of that report.

I am going to look for some feedback here, guys. It’s about ten o’clock right now. Would you like to try and get through our Reef Fish Report before lunch, or would like to try and get through our vote on exempted fishing permit applications before lunch? I am not sure what the lesser of the two evils is. Mr. Diaz.

**MR. DIAZ:** I think there might be some good reasons to go through exempted fishing permits first. My personal opinion
would be to do that, but whatever the council wants to do is
fine with me.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Frazer.

**DR. FRAZER:** I agree with Dale. My inclination is to kind of
move forward with the EFPs at this time.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Any heartache on that? You can
have a short break. We’ll take a fifteen-minute break, and then
we’ll delve into that. Thank you. Fifteen-minute break, and
let’s come back here at about 10:20, let’s say.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

**VOTE ON EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** We’re going to go ahead with our vote on
exempted fishing permit, EFP, applications. We were hoping to
pick that back up -- We had to cut our discussion a little short
yesterday, and we were hoping to maybe pick it back up before
public testimony, but we didn’t really have enough time, and so
I’m just going to open the floor to discussion, and we’ll see
where we go from there. We saw all of the presentations from
each of the five states, and do we have any further comments or
questions or discussion? Let’s go. Mr. Banks.

**MR. BANKS:** I would like to make a motion to recommend approval
of all of the EFPs.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, that will certainly spur discussion.
It’s been seconded by Mr. Boyd, and so we have a motion by Mr.
Banks. Do you want to repeat it, Mr. Banks, for staff?

**MR. BANKS:** Motion to recommend approval of all EFPs, for each
state’s EFP.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. I saw a hand by Dr. Mickle.

**DR. MICKLE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a procedural
question. Again, the EFPs come in front of the council to
address concerns towards the resource and towards the user
groups, and I’ve just been reading the regulations of how EFPs
exist in our realm here.

I am in favor of this motion and letting NMFS do what they do to
work through the issues that we discussed yesterday, but the
user concerns were brought up, and I thought, for the most part,
were addressed, and the major concerns were from the policy side, from how I see it, and so I’m in favor of this motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I certainly don’t want to stand in any state’s way of getting their EFP approved, but I do recognize that I think there are still some hurdles that need to happen and things that need to be worked out. Like, I think to include for-hire or not to include for-hire is an issue.

If we end up in a place where some states include for-hire and some don’t, I think what I would prefer to see here is the for-hire industry that is not covered under an EFP, that they continue to have the season that they were going to be projected to have and they’re basically not impacted by the states that include them, if that’s the route we go, but I don’t know if the council has a recommendation or a discussion on that, but that’s kind of what I would want to see out of this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I would echo that sentiment, and, for states that don’t have -- That they’re not including their federal for-hire component, that I think, and you all know this, and it shouldn’t be a surprise, but we should proceed with 41 and 42 and try to get those to where we can bring those to a vote and find the answer to the age-old question of do they really want these or not.

Take that to referendum, and then I don’t know. I don’t have a crystal ball, but, maybe down the road, some of those folks in 41 may look at their state’s plan, as it evolves, and they may or may not think it’s better to go one way or the other, but we’ve given them the choice to do that.

We haven’t kind of forced something down their throats, so to speak, and so, to that end, I would support this, and I would hope that I would get some support in moving forward on furthering 41 and 42.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess what I would like to do is to ask NMFS a couple more questions, as a follow-up. It was unclear to me yesterday, in the discussions that we had, what were the consequences of each state either including or not including the charter/for-hire sector in the various EFPs and
how you might deal with that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: There are two main issues that I see with it. There will be a federal for-hire season, and it will start on June 1, and it will be Gulf-wide, and any federally-permitted for-hire vessel is able to fish in the EEZ during that season, and so it seems to me, unless the states can either get the for-hire vessels to voluntarily agree to some other scheme, or the state would need to have their for-hire season run concurrent to the federal for-hire season. That is one issue.

Then the other is the amount of fish that gets credited to the state for their EFP, and, if you credited the amount being requested, that would shorten days of the overall federal for-hire season, because the request is based on the historical timeline, and it’s a greater amount than has been caught in the most recent years.

In order to do this in a way that doesn’t affect the other charter boat seasons, that amount of fish would have to be reduced down to a level that is consistent with what’s been caught in 2016 and 2017, the most recent data we have, and that’s the two real issues that I see, and did that get at all of your questions? If you have some specific ones, I will try to answer them.

DR. FRAZER: The way that I understood this yesterday, when we were talking about it, is, in order for the states to move forward with the EFPs as proposed, NMFS would essentially close the recreational season, including all sectors, if the charter/for-hire component was -- Both the private recreational and the charter/for-hire component. Then the EFP would allow the states then to fish on top of that, right?

DR. CRABTREE: That is what we would do with the private recreational component, because that’s -- Everyone is doing that through the EFP, and so we would close the EEZ, but then we would exempt vessels fishing under the various state EFPs from that closure.

We can’t do that with the for-hire vessels though, because the majority of the for-hire vessels aren’t going to be under an EFP at this point. Florida and Alabama aren’t requesting that, and so that means we have to have a federal for-hire season, and we don’t have any authority, under an EFP, to have anything other than a Gulf-wide federal for-hire season, and I don’t believe we
have any authority to tell charter boats in one state that you
can’t fish it, and so they can all fish it.

If we give each state the amount of fish that we think their
charter fleet will catch during that federal for-hire season,
it’s not clear to me what is gained by including the charter
boats at that point, because there is not likely to be anything
left outside of when they fish in the federal season, and so
it’s definitely more straightforward to do this if the charter
boats are just left out, and, personally, that would be my
preference, but that’s the -- We would have a federal for-hire
season, and everybody could fish it, and then, if a state got
the amount that we thought their charter boat fleet would catch
during that season, but for some reason their charter boat fleet
didn’t catch it, then I suppose the state could allow them some
additional days, in which case the EFP would exempt them from
the closure.

That might work for LA Creel, because they have a short
turnaround on their numbers, but, with Texas, I think it’s going
to be largely projection-based, unless they have some way to get
some notion of what’s being landed on a more real-time basis.

The counter side of that is that, if LA Creel, for example,
showed their charter fleet was catching more fish than
anticipated, I don’t see how the state could close them down
until the end of the federal season, and they might end up
catching more fish than we projected, and that would have to
come out of the private component’s share, and then they would
have to be shut down earlier than they otherwise might.

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

DR. FRAZER: Roy, that helps me quite a bit, but it seems to me
then that it might be worth considering, at this point, and I
appreciate, and I am going to direct this to Patrick for a
second, what LA Creel is able to do, but I don’t think all of
the states are in the same position at this point.

It might be worth some discussion here to think about modifying
this motion to recommend the approval of each state’s EFP for
the recreational component only, and the reason I say that is
that then it’s, I think, logistically easier to deal with the
for-hire sector as a group, logistically, but it also means, and
I think there might be an opportunity, moving forward, for the
for-hire sector to follow-up with a separate EFP that allows
some time for each of the states to work with that sector to
come up with a similar type of a plan that’s going to work for
all of them.

In my mind, that accomplishes a couple of things, and why I was hoping to have this conversation about the EFPs before Amendment 41 and 42, because that allows, if it moves forward, for the charter/for-hire industry to start to -- You could use a data collection protocol that is developed by the states, and that would put us a little bit ahead of the ELB game that we’ve been playing with, and it seems to be a bit of hurdle, and it would allow the charter/for-hire industry to begin to develop a catch history, and so it just -- I think it steps back and it allows us to move forward in a very progressive way.

At the same time, it allows us to step back and take a peek at some of the key elements of 41 and 42 that I think were very important to move us forward in a very positive direction, and so I guess I would open it up for discussion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Banks and then Mr. Diaz.

MR. BANKS: A couple of things to Roy’s concerns, and I certainly respect those concerns. I think yesterday, Roy, and I appreciate this, but you did your best to walk me through ways in which you all could help us get it done with the charters, and that’s huge for us, because you were able to show us some ways.

Now, you did show that we have to take the hit to keep charters in, and I think, even with that reduction that you talked about, I think we would prefer to still have them in, just so that we can show how we can do state management with our entire recreational sector, and so I would ask that you work with us to stay in.

The second thing I want to say is that of the concern over not being able to keep the federal for-hire from fishing federal waters if we were to close that season here. The way we would do it, to -- We probably couldn’t keep them from fishing, but what we could do is, in our state season regulations, we could prohibit possession of red snapper in state waters, and so they could go out there and fish all day long, but, if they came back into state waters with red snapper, they would be in violation of our state season.

Now, some may try to get through there and run the gauntlet, and I don’t know, but that’s one way that I think that we could address that concern that you had, and it’s a legitimate concern. If we closed federal for-hire after thirty days, and
you all are still open for twenty more days, technically you’re right. Their permit allows them to go out there in federal waters and fish for twenty days, but I think we could address it by a possession regulation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, not being a lawyer, I can’t give a legal opinion, but I often do anyway. It’s not at all clear to me that a state has the authority to prevent a federally-permitted vessel from landing fish legally caught under their permit in federal waters, and I believe there have been cases where that sort of thing was challenged, and I don’t think the state prevailed in those. Now, you guys clearly can do what you want, and you have your own attorneys, but I think there could be some legal issues with that, if that’s how it went.

MR. BANKS: There may be, Roy, but I am just trying to figure out a way to address your concern. Certainly, we have put regulations in place that have been challenged before, but, by and large, I think that our federal for-hire guys, by and large, would follow that guideline and that we would have very little problem.

DR. CRABTREE: You may well be right about that. They might be willing to do it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I had Dale next.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am kind of struggling with how to vote on this motion right here, but I am very supportive of the EFP concept, and I view the EFPs, as we’re looking at them, as this is a trial run for the state management programs that we’re developing.

I have always thought, for state management, that flexibility was a good thing, and the states should be able to set the programs up like they want and try to accommodate the citizens of their state to the maximum benefit that they could do that, and I am still supportive of that, but, having said that, I do not want the EFPs to negatively affect any group, and so I don’t want to pass something that penalizes a group that is not participating in the EFP, and that’s what I am struggling with.

I am trying to get all of this straight, but, anyway, that is what is going through my mind. I am very supportive, and I want them to happen, and I’ve got a lot of faith that it’s going to work good, but I am extremely concerned about -- I do not want
to vote to negatively impact anybody because of these EFPs.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I’ve got a whole list of people, but I am
going to cut in line for a second. I think I agree with you.
Patrick, I think you’re bringing up some things that could maybe
work, but I agree with Dale. We haven’t seen the numbers yet on
what you might reduce it to for your for-hire guys, so that it
would fit, and there’s a lot of unanswered questions about could
you actually stop them from fishing or are we going to approve
something that’s going to essentially allow an overrun of a
quota, because we really don’t have it all nailed down how it’s
going to be fleshed out and work.

I do want to help you help your guys, and I might could be in
support of allowing that for the second year of the EFP, like
Dr. Crabtree talked about yesterday, and that would mean, in the
first year, you would only do your private recreational guys,
but, in the second year, once we have some time to really flesh
out the details and how we’re going to make sure that we don’t
overrun that portion of the quota, because we had a big overrun
last year, and I’m tired of these overruns, year after year.

It is going to impact all the user groups, and so that might be
an option too, that we could amend this to allow the option to
include the for-hire in the second year of the EFP, after you
all have time to get back with NMFS and bring it back to this
council and let us actually see how this is going to play out,
to make sure that we’re being accountable for everything. I
have Robin next on the list.

MR. RIECHERS: Well, I am going to hit a couple of points, the
first of which is, personally, I would support the motion the
way it is now, realizing that we -- All of us understand, and
certainly the state directors and National Marine Fisheries
Service understand, that this is still somewhat of a work in
progress, because, as indicated yesterday, and I don’t mean this
to be negative in any way, because we’ve all been working
through this in a cooperative fashion, but we got some numbers
yesterday that changed the makeup of what we thought the season
lengths could possibly be and the way we had constructed our
particular EFPs, and we’re going to have to work through that.

I’ve got to go back and talk to my leadership and my commission
and work through that, one way or the other, and that’s
certainly understandable that a state would have to do that, if
they have just now received numbers that was different than what
they thought they were getting, and so that’s number one.
The other part is I want to go back, and we’ve got laws on the books right now, and we join Patrick’s state there at Sabine Lake, and we have landings laws that suggest that you have to abide by state landing laws when you come over to our side, and we send a bunch of people to the Sabine side, so they can launch there, and then they come back over to our state and live and play as well at various times of the year, but they go to that side so they can land more fish sometimes.

We have done that with mackerel as well, and so I don’t know -- I think there are ways to control it, Patrick, and I believe you’re correct. I am not certain whether they would completely hold up if someone challenges them, Roy, and I think they do, because we’ve had them for a long time, whatever is more restrictive, and so I think that’s a hurdle that we can overcome.

I think the whole notion here is, really, are we as a council conceptually supporting this EFP concept, because all of it is not nailed down. There is still a question as to whether you could have every state have their charter boats in, and we know states don’t want that, but, as Dale said, it’s also a precursor to what may be coming up, and so, is there a point where we start having that dialogue in a way that actually starts letting you preview what you may be able to do?

I don’t know, because I don’t know where I’m going to end up next week, but what I do know is I think I would want you to leave us with the most flexibility that you could leave us with at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Dale, when you’re talking about a group, are you talking about a group of charter boat fishermen? What are you referring to of a group that you’re concerned about?

MR. DIAZ: Yes, sir. I am talking about -- I wouldn’t want -- The states that choose not to include charter boats, I wouldn’t want the charter fishermen in their state to be penalized with a shorter season, by virtue of approving EFPs for the states that do want them in. I am trying to look at writing a substitute motion a different way, to maybe satisfy that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Just to clarify, our plan is fully accountable for
something like that, Dale. I mean, if the charter goes way over our allotted pounds that we have asked for, or if our private recs go way over, I mean, we pull that off of the next year. In my opinion, it shouldn’t have any impact on the other states at all.

Now, I would hope that Roy’s calculations would show the same thing, but that’s what we’re willing to do in year-two, is to be fully accountable and pull that off. Now, I don’t see a lot of chance of that happening, in terms of going over, but we are accountable.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think what Dale is speaking to there though is --- There is two states that want to include the charter boats, Louisiana and Texas. That projected season, for the whole fleet next year, they look at their catch rates and what they caught last year, and that’s how they are going to project the season for next year.

The only way to be fair about what we carve out of next year’s catch and next year’s season, for this EFP for Texas and Louisiana, is to look at what their projected landings for next year’s seasons would be, and that’s the amount they get. Do you see what I’m saying?

Because you’ve got to have apples and apples. You can’t go back to the 1980s and make these guys have a season, these guys in the audience, that are not going to be in the EFP. For those of you on the webinar, I am pointing, but, anyway, make them live with a season that is based on last year’s catch rates and then let somebody else have a season that is based on some average from the 1980s and 1990s, because what that does is shortchange the guys that aren’t in the EFP.

It sounded like you sort of addressed that earlier, and you think that, even with that lower amount, whatever that is, that your guys would still be okay. Texas, are your guys going to be okay with that lower amount?

MR. RIECHERS: I have just shared with you that I have to go talk with my folks, my executive leadership team, about how we would want our EFP to look. We already heard, from some of our fishermen, that they don’t want to be in, and we know that, but as far as what Texas is going to submit as an EFP, I do not know the answer to that right now.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and this kind of just writes a blank check, and maybe that’s okay for the five state directors that
are going to be part of that process, but I have no control over
or discussion in that process, and I’m not able to give my two-
cents, and so I’m not real comfortable writing a blank check
like this right here.

Mr. Riechers: As a follow-up, I’m going to follow-up on
Patrick’s point. What we saw yesterday was a reduction in
poundage, and that’s what Roy has suggested, and, since all the
states weren’t going to go back and use these same time series
and the same allocation method, and, thus, the same decision-
making framework of how we go forward on pounds, the two states
that want to have them in are actually losing pounds here.

As Patrick said, there is a question as to whether or not we
should be the only states doing that, because there is an equity
question over that time series, because that has shifted, and
so, in reality, the persons, or states, or EFPs, that lose are
the two that are wanting, possibly, to keep them in at this
point in time.

Now, is there a way that a discussion can be had amongst the
state directors and National Marine Fisheries Service that would
maybe make that less impactful between now and next week? I
don’t know the answer to that question, and so, while you say
it’s writing a blank check, it’s somewhat writing a blank
deficit check at this point in time, meaning we’re the ones
taking the hit, as we have this conversation and the way we’re
having it.

I am not necessarily -- If you don’t want to vote for it, that’s
fine. We will continue to work through this over the course of
the next week or so, and my goal is to have answers pretty
quickly, because, obviously, if we’re going to publish this on
February 15 or thereabouts, all of this has to happen pretty
quickly.

I think one of the questions that can happen here is what
happens if one state doesn’t go in, because that’s the other
question that gets flipped on its head here, if you end up with
four EFPs and one that doesn’t go in, and that is still possible
until the moment -- That is possible after the public comments,
and that is possible somewhere down the road, and so I think
that’s just a risk with an EFP and the process that EFPs work
through. You’re either going to have to be comfortable with it
or not.

Chairman Bosarge: Dr. Stunz.
DR. STUNZ: I want to speak in favor of this motion, and again -
- Not the blank check thing, because I don’t quite see it that way. I mean, it is a two-year EFP, and, being a scientist, of course, I see this as a real experimental trial. This gives the states the ability to show how adaptive they can be or what type of creative management styles or schemes that they can come up with to handle what their allocation is.

I also want to bring up, and I don’t know exactly how much this is, but we talked about -- I seem to recall, from our discussions the other day, that there is still 4 percent left on the table, and that gives us a little bit of breathing room, if there are some things that move here or there, but I think that the states seem to want this. I feel, of course, that everyone is going to work in good faith to make this happen, and so I speak in favor of this motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Martha.

MS. GUYAS: Just a procedural question. I know, Sue, you went through the timeline yesterday, and so these would have to be published -- Robin thought like February 15, and I am trying to back it all up here. You said there was a comment period that is fifteen to forty-five days, and you were hoping to have the final product released in mid-April, and so I guess my question is when does this all really have to be resolved? I assume before it goes out to the Federal Register for comments.

MS. GERHART: Right. What we put in the Federal Register needs to be as close as possible to the plan we expect. Obviously, we’re taking public comment, and so there is ability to do some little tweaks, but it shouldn’t be substantially different from what we approved. Our intention is to do a thirty-day comment period, and so we sort of did that timeline of mid-April to get this done in time for the states to set themselves up for June 1.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, it’s not going to have calamitous consequences if it shifts a little bit, but, clearly, with the fishery open on June 1, we need to get -- Then the conditions of the stay, of the litigation, are that we agreed to come back to the court with our season by I think the end of April anyway, and I can’t remember the exact date. If this is what we’re going to do, that’s going to be a part of what we have to explain.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: A follow-up, Martha?
MS. GUYAS: I am not suggesting that the April deadline needs to move, because I think you’re right. We need to know what’s happening mid-April, because it doesn’t stop there, right? Each of the states will have to go back, and they’re going to have to do what they need to do. We need to let people know that this is happening.

We have this issue every year with red snapper, where everybody wants to know what’s the season, what’s the season, what’s happening, what’s happening, and one of the biggest criticisms that this council has gotten, or the Fisheries Service, just the collective fishery management, is that we don’t let people know in time. A month is not enough, and so I’m just trying to understand, I guess, how much time we have to solve what I -- I mean, it seems to be a big problem with these EFPs. I mean, we need to know what is happening here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. Exempted, experiment, whatever, but what I’m hearing is there are some fundamental issues here that need to be addressed, and, given the timeliness, the more I hear, the more I listen, I like Leann’s suggestion of leaving the for-hire federal fleet out of this for year-one. Then, we can revisit this and push it along as we go forward and let this experiment start to take shape.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Camp next.

MR. MATENS: Thank you. It’s not a surprise to anyone here that this is kind of a big deal for Louisiana. I am not speaking to any other states, but I think there are ways that we can solve this problem. Patrick’s commission can make the EFP season, if that’s the right term, coincident with the federal season, and we can work this through our charter boat guys, so that they would catch whatever we have on this thing, 317,000 pounds.

If those don’t work, I think that the private sector, that I speak for, would be willing to, if that happens, and the charter guys would go over the 317,000 pounds, should that be approved, would be willing to take the hit on the backend, that we would reduce our days, and we could agree to make them up with our charter fleet. We could agree to adjust that in 2019, and so I like this motion as it exists.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Johnny. Mara, is it to that point? No? Okay. Johnny, go ahead.
MR. GREENE: Yesterday, in conversation, and I think again this morning, it was brought up about, in the context of Louisiana and Texas and their charter boats, having some sort of a binding agreement with the state. Has that ever been done before? Is there a precedent for that? Is that legal? I mean, I am trying to kind of grasp this.

DR. CRABTREE: I will let Mara deal with the is it legal, but, in terms of has it ever been done before, I am not sure if it has or hasn’t in this exact context, but, when we did the Headboat Collaborative, everybody who got into the Headboat Collaborative signed a binding agreement that was that they were going to fish under the collaborative, and, if they dropped out, they couldn’t then turn right around and start fishing in the other season.

I do think that’s a bureaucratic, difficult thing, and, from a practical standpoint, I don’t know how workable that is. Based on the testimony that I heard yesterday, I don’t think Texas is going to get their charter boat fleet to all agree voluntarily to be part of this, and I don’t know about Patrick, but I think you could do it, but I don’t think it’s -- From a practical perspective, I don’t think that’s really the solution here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I am going to cover a couple of points that have already been discussed, but I just want to make sure that I was on the record for it, but Martha mentioned earlier that she wanted to make sure that the decision that was made, relative to the federally-permitted vessels, didn’t impact their vessels, or the vessels that wouldn’t be participating, particularly for her state, and that occurs for my state too, and so I don’t know how -- Obviously, we have discussed it, and there has been council members that have mentioned it.

I don’t know how we can address it, whether or not the motion needs to be amended or not, to reflect that, or just as long as the Service knows that those are some concerns, and then they can deal with that in their decision-making process.

To the other point, I am also very supportive of the states and the idea of having some flexibility in plans, and so it’s a little bit of a quandary, because there may be some potential for those states, or even Alabama maybe, to get to a point where we can include those, but I just go back to the comments that were made during our conversations and meeting with the federally-permitted charter boat guys that -- They didn’t have
guarantees.

There wasn’t, they felt, a comfort level there, if they were to be included in the state season, and so there may be some opportunities here to kind of, as you suggested, Leann, is to have a pause and allow the private recs to go through in the first year and then allow that agreement, the plan, a more further-defined plan and such, that could be worked out in year-one. Then that could be carried over in year-two, in the spirit of, again, trying to show flexibility in providing some more opportunities for a state to manage the entire fishery.

I don’t know, and I was very happy, prior to coming to this meeting, that the states did come up with plans, and they came to an agreement regarding allocation and distributing that, and so I don’t want to lose that momentum and that good feeling, if we can avoid it, but those are just my concerns.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I had Mara, if you still want to speak.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. Well, just to the point about the idea of the states that have not asked for their federally-permitted charter vessels to participate and the idea that there is some sort of time series that could be agreed upon to distribute it back and forth, really what you’re talking about there is an allocation decision.

The problem with doing that in the EFP context is that the states that haven’t asked for the charter vessels to be included haven’t asked for an allocation, and so they’re just not including them, and the agency has to set a federal season for those vessels that is consistent with the regulations and consistent with what their permit allows them to do.

Definitely, in your regional management plans, there can be an allocation discussion about what years are appropriate and what averages are appropriate and whatever allocation the council comes up with that the council has decided is fair and equitable and meets all those other considerations, but doing it in the EFP context, when the states haven’t even asked for an allocation, do you see what I’m saying? It makes it difficult to say that you can come up with an allocation decision, because that’s not even part of the equation when it comes to say Florida and Alabama’s plans.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Dale.

MR. DIAZ: Well, I am going to throw this out there anyway,
although what Mara just said might make us have to wordsmith this a lot. I am just trying to figure out a path forward here, because I agree with Kevin. I am optimistic about these plans, and I want to find a way to make them work.

I am going to recommend a substitute motion, and it would say:
To recommend approval of each state’s EFP, with the condition that EFP allocations are set to assure that no user group is penalized by the EFP implementation. If I get a second, and if it needs to be wordsmithed, based on what Mara just said, I surely would be -- I would welcome any assistance.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a substitute motion to recommend approval of each state’s EFP, with the condition that EFP allocations are set to assure that no user group is penalized by the EFP implementation. Is there a second for the motion? It’s seconded by Dr. Frazer. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I think, Dale, saying “no user group is penalized”, boy, that is pretty broad in how you define it, and I don’t know any management thing that someone doesn’t perceive that they were disadvantaged.

The truth is, inherent in regional management, it’s going to be -- States are going to have different seasons, and so, if you’re in a state that has a shorter season than the other state, you could argue that you are disadvantaged, and I think, if your intent is with respect to the for-hire season, I would word it more specifically to say such that, if charter vessels are included in any state’s EFP, it’s done in a way that it does not affect the overall Gulf-wide charter boat season. That, I think, we could deal with, but I just think, inherent in regional management, is somebody is going to be -- They are going to have a different season than another, and so it’s a little too broad, in my judgment.

MR. DIAZ: Roy, if you would be willing to help me wordsmith it. I mean, what you’re describing is what I’m trying to accomplish, and my wording just might not be correct.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I would just say, “such that, for states which may include the for-hire fishery in their EFP, NMFS needs to ensure that that inclusion doesn’t reduce the Gulf-wide for-hire season” and let’s see if staff can get that in a way that makes sense, and, Mara, help me out. You know what I am trying to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: While Mara is thinking about that, I have Dr.
Shipp on the list, and I am going to let him go ahead.

DR. SHIPP: I like the substitute motion, but I like the original motion even better. I think we’re drifting away from the spirit of giving the states the flexibility to do what they want to do, and I agree with Roy.

Somebody is going to feel better about it and somebody else is not, and I think we need to remember our original intention here, and that is to give the states the responsibility and the flexibility to come up with something, and they have done an amazing job. I think all five states have done an amazing job, and so, no deference to you, Dale, but I’m going to vote against your substitute, and hopefully we go back to the original.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. They are still working on wordsmithing over there, and so, Dr. Frazer, and then I have Martha, I believe.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate what you said, Bob, and I guess I would look to Patrick again and say is the substitute motion something that you feel that Louisiana could live with? That’s the first step, right?

MR. BANKS: Well, just the way I’m reading it right now, it’s what I already said in some of my testimony here, is that we’re going to ensure that it doesn’t impact the other states. Camp feels like his subsector would be willing to shorten their season to account for any overage from the charter/for-hire, and we feel like that, even if it goes over in this year, we can pull it off of next year, such that it doesn’t impact everybody else, and then, of course, our charter/for-hire or private rec, whomever, would get a much less season in the following year, because of our accountability measures, and so I think what this is describing, or at least the spirit of it, we’re already planning to do, and we’ve already described such. I personally don’t think it’s necessary, but I don’t really have a problem with the concept at all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha.

MS. GUYAS: I’ve got a couple of things. Patrick, to what you just said, I think, when Roy was speaking yesterday about this, and it’s been brought up again this morning, it’s not just that issue, but it’s also the issue that -- If I understand it correctly, the allocation you have requested in your EFP would give charter/for-hire in your state a larger proportion than what they’ve been catching, right, and so then that is going to
impact the Gulf-wide season elsewhere, and so I think part of what Tom also was asking is are you willing to cut that down to be more commensurate with what they have been catching in recent history, so that other Gulf state charter boats are not affected? That is part of my question.

MR. BANKS: I understand that, and, the numbers that Roy put up yesterday showed that. I don’t want to commit to something like that long-term, but, to make this work and to be able to prove this state management process, I am willing to take the level at what Roy described yesterday.

Again, that is just -- To do that for a long, long term, like a state management plan, it just doesn’t seem -- I don’t think that’s the way to calculate allocation, but we’re willing to work with you guys to try to make this work, but I will say again though that it doesn’t seem fair to make Texas and Louisiana be the only ones who have to give a little bit to make this work, but we can certainly do that.

I will say this also, that this whole -- We are all worrying about overages, and I appreciate that, but what you’re asking me to do is make our charter/for-hire guys pay, in the end, for a 212 percent fishing season last year by the private recs. That is unfair, in my opinion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha, you had another piece of that question, I think?

MS. GUYAS: Yes, and this was not to that point, but more back to the discussion about the headboat EFP and how -- I believe how those were set up is all those vessels were listed in the EFP, and I am kind of wondering, if a state kept their charter/for-hire in there, if that would be the same -- It would have to be set up the same way, and so then maybe, in that case, if a state kept their charter/for-hire fleet in there, I think you would have to explicitly list that these are the vessels and these are the captains, and then I’m wondering, if you do it that way, if there is a way to get an agreement from those vessels, kind of like with the headboat EFP, that, okay, you’re in this EFP and this is your season, and you don’t get to fish this other season, because that seemed to be how it worked with the headboat one, but maybe I am missing something or oversimplifying.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: I wanted to chime in, because, when Roy said that
a moment ago, his statement, at the end of his comment, was that you would have to get them to agree to be in the system, and that was a little different than what he had explained to us on a call. The truth of the matter is that you have to get them to say that they won’t fish in the federal season, as I understand that, and, if you have evolved in your thinking on that, let me know.

DR. CRABTREE: No, and I think that’s really only an issue if you were to want to have the federal for-hire season at some other time. Let’s say, for example, a state wanted the charter boats included, but they wanted to have the charter boat season be in the wintertime.

Well, that’s a problem, because they can fish during the federal season in the summer, but, if they all agreed and committed not to, and if the state felt like they could hold them to it, then that might work. Now, if the state is going to run their season concurrent with the federal season, then that is not so much of an issue.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

MR. RIECHERS: I think that basically leaves us at a point, and whether it’s this motion or the previous motion, is there is still, again, things that have to be worked out here. What this motion tells me is that you’re basically ensuring that the numbers that Roy showed before, gave us yesterday, and I want everyone to be clear, and, Roy, again, there is no mark against when I got those, but I had not seen those until yesterday, and you know that, and you will confirm that.

It makes a difference in how we look at that combination of those people being in, as opposed to them not being in, and Patrick’s numbers were a little bit less than ours, and so part of my question is does my recreational fishery want to support that kind of subsidization?

In a bigger concept, Patrick and I are having the equity discussion about how much subsidization do we do for the entire group, because we’re not all using the same metric of how we got here, and some people are using their last ten years, and that works better for their percentage, and some people used a biomass calculation, and that was what they chose to try to do. Others of us took Amendment 39, where we were at before, and tried to make some reasonable approach to -- I am not saying you all are unreasonable, but we just took that as a reasonable approach to creating a percentage that we thought we were going
to get and manage.

This is evolving, and it has evolved this week, and we’re trying
to work through it. I am highly likely to abstain on any of
these motions, just simply because I need to go back and, as I
said, work through the numbers and work through what it means to
both the seasons that I will be looking at and work through the
decisions of how that plays into the state management decisions
moving forward, as well as any other decisions that the council
may be making in this regard, because, as you suggest, Tom, and
even John, this in fact impacts further decisions down the road,
or could impact it. It shouldn’t, and it’s temporary, et
cetera, but we all know that it will be used as a point to make
moving further down the road.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: John.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Given the discussion, I
would like to make a second substitute motion to recommend
approval of each state’s EFP, but leave the federal for-hire
vessels out of it. If there needs to be some legal
wordsmithing, I would encourage that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a second substitute motion on the
board to recommend approval of each state’s EFP, but leaving the
federal for-hire vessels out. We can wordsmith it and have it
all be in the positive affirmative, and have it be private rec
only, but we’ll get there, if legal and NOAA need it. All
right. I had a couple of hands. Do we have a second for the
second substitute motion? It’s seconded. All right. Is there
discussion on the motion? I have Mr. Banks and then Mr.
Swindell.

MR. BANKS: I have got to speak against the motion. I think I
recognize where John is going. He hears the concern, and I know
I hear a lot of concern around the table about we don’t know
that it can work with it not being consistent, and I would just
ask that you guys, rather than assuming that at the outset and
then saying, well, we can put your charters in it the next year,
let us try it this year, and then we can take the charters out
next year, if it doesn’t work. Let’s don’t assume that it can’t
work. As I said quite a few meetings ago, let’s don’t assume
there is a monster in the closet until we open the door, please.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Mr. Swindell and then Mr. Boyd.

MR. SWINDELL: Is there any way to leave out, to suspend
perhaps, the license, the federal license, for the charter/for-hire in the federal waters, since it’s going to be under total state management for that period of time of the EFP? Why not have it all state managed and without the federal interference there?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree, to that point.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, one, I don’t know that you could suspend it through an EFP, and, if you did suspend it, then anyone would be able to start running charter trips in the EEZ, and I don’t think you want to do that, but I don’t think we can do that under an EFP.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: My comment would be to both of these substitute motions. Both of these move us further and further away from allowing the states to come up with a plan to manage themselves in the way that they want to manage their state and their fishery for recreational fishing, and so I can’t vote for either of the two, because I want to see each of the states have the opportunity to manage their own recreational fishing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I have Paul Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: I think my point is -- It should have been made a little while ago, but I didn’t want to interrupt the conversation, but we as a group were focused -- We all have a lot to account for, and there is a lot of people that we have to represent and make sure that we include in our decisions, but it feels like we’re making a lot of conversation toward a single uncertainty with this EFP.

I am still making my list, and so please jump in of the others, and the certifications that are supposed to happen, which Roy seems very confident, and I seem confident and Kevin seems confident, but, if the certifications don’t go through, we are going to blast it out of the water, and let’s just lay it out there, right?

Year-one and year-two, we are not in agreement upon that completely, and we’re coming up with more ideas to deal with year-one and year-two, and let’s assume the risk we take on year-one, of Patrick’s suggestion just a minute ago, and, the final numbers coming out on 2017 harvest, we don’t have those. We don’t have our numbers in yet.
We haven’t talked about any of this with our commissions, and there is a lot more moving parts than we’re focusing in on here, but my question, which I will bring up again, which I did thirty minutes ago, is, if we approve the EFPs with the substitute motion, and not the second substitute motion, there are still moving parts that can be accounted for once it goes out for public comment, and am I wrong in thinking that? It does not get finalized when we pass this motion. It has to go back through NMFS and public comment.

Moving along and keeping it moving, and everyone still getting what they want, occurs with the substitute motion. Wait. I have got too many motions. Let me read the second one. I would say the original motion. Excuse me. The original motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I had Johnny. Well, wait a minute. Patrick, do you have a question from thirty minutes ago that you need answered? Paul. Did I call him Patrick? Paul.

DR. MICKLE: I ended strong there, but the substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Dr. Crabtree, to that point.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I just want to say that I -- I don’t agree that, if the certifications don’t happen, that we’re going to blast the quota out of the water. I see no reason that, if all parties take on responsibility for staying within the quota, that we can’t stay within the quota. We have stayed in the quota for any number of years with MRIP, but, if those certifications don’t come true, then we’re going to have to take a more conservative approach to setting the season and thinking about buffers and things, and that part is true.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Finally, I have Mr. Johnny Greene, patiently waiting.

MR. GREENE: No problem. I’ve been trying to kind of sit here and be as fair and as neutral as I can about this, and I supported, initially, letting the Louisiana charter boats be part of the Louisiana state plan, when that came out, and I am in favor of the exempted fishing permits, and I think that we need to do something.

I haven’t heard anybody come up to the microphone and really speak against an EFP, from the recreational standpoint. Now, when you mix in the charter boats, I have heard some in favor and some against it. It seems like that, when you leave the charter boats in, we’re coming up with a number that’s going to
be greater than 100 percent, and so, to reduce that, somebody is
going to have to lose somewhere.

If we simply just make it for the private recreational guys, let
those states do whatever they think they need to do for that
particular industry, I think that’s a very clean and simple way
to go. I am intrigued by some of the other conversation that we
have had this morning, but I think, at this point, I am going to
speak in favor of the second substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I am still in favor of the original motion, and the
reason is that we’re kind of falling right back into this
Amendment 39 trap, where we started off with. It lets the
states do their thing, and then we keep adding on more caveats
and more things, to where it begins to erode that away. Again,
my point is it is a two-year EFP. Let’s see what the states can
do, and I still support that original motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am in favor of the second substitute. I
like the substitute motion that was up there, but it didn’t
address one major concern that I have. I don’t have a huge
qualm with Louisiana taking and managing their charter/for-hire.
They want to be managed by you all, and I think you have a data
collection in place that could manage them.

I have a qualm with writing a blank check, in the sense that we
have not come to a decision on what your piece of the pie would
be for this season, this year, a couple of months, and make sure
that it’s not going to harm the people that don’t end up going
into this EFP in the for-hire sector. That, I had a qualm with.

The other qualm I have, and I’m sorry, Robin, but I don’t think
the Texas charter boats want to be in that EFP, the federal part
of it, and, if I had voted for that substitute motion, I am
recommending approval of a plan that includes them against their
will, and they don’t, overwhelmingly, seem to want to be in
there. Because I am not a state rep, I have to think about
everybody, and so I could not support that.

I think the second substitute motion, although it does not
include your for-hire, I don’t think that prevents you though
from starting to work on something that you could bring to this
council to try and get us to get comfortable with a set-aside
for your for-hire for year-two, but we would have to bless that.

If Robin goes back and his for-hire guys have a change of heart,
and they decide, okay, with those, it might not be so bad, he could bring forth the same thing, and we could take a look at it. If Kevin goes back and his guys -- Everybody could bring that in, and we could actually have that discussion, open and around this table, and not in an office sometime between now and next month with NMFS, and it’s not very transparent as to how it all goes down, and I just don’t think that’s the way to do that and to manage that.

Yes, this wouldn’t give you for-hire immediately, but I would definitely encourage you to bring something back, and let’s see if -- You’re going to have a report that comes up for the end of the first year anyway, and so let’s see if we can’t work together and do that, and it also gives the states a chance to get started with state management, because I think that’s extremely important.

We have got to pass -- At a minimum, we have to pass the private angler portion of these EFPs, and that is important. They want it, across-the-board, right. It’s not unanimous, though, on the for-hire side, and it complicates things tremendously. It adds uncertainty, and it adds a possibility of overrunning the quota for them, which they have worked so hard to stay under and prove that they can be accountable.

There is just too many ifs in it for me, but I am comfortable with the second substitute. We will get started on state management of private anglers, under an EFP, and see if we can finally make that thing work. That’s my two-cents, and I have Dr. Shipp.

DR. SHIPP: I call the question.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion to call the question.

MR. SWINDELL: I second it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s seconded by Mr. Swindell. The motion is to call the question, and it’s been seconded. All right. Are you ready? All those in favor of the motion to call the question. We have had a request for a roll call vote. We are calling the question, and there is no roll call vote. All those in favor, raise your hand, in favor of calling the question. The motion is to call the question.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Raise them high and keep them up, please, until I finish counting. Fourteen.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Two. The motion to call the question passes fourteen to two.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. That means that we have to go back and vote with no discussion on the second substitute motion. The second substitute motion is to recommend approval of each state’s EFP, but leaving the federal for-hire vessels out of the program. Camp Matens has called for a roll call vote.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Greene.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Are you confused? That’s what you just said.

DR. FRAZER: For the record, I am confused.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The second substitute motion is -- This substitute motion would essentially say that the council recommends that we are going to approve each state’s EFP, and so all five state EFPs, but leaving out the federal for-hire vessels out of those EFPs, and so we would be approving each of the state’s EFPs for the private recreational angler sector only. Does that clarify things a little bit? If you vote yes for it, that is what you would be doing. You would be approving it for private anglers to go forward with these state EFPs.

DR. FRAZER: Yes. I would like to vote yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. All right. Dr. Frazer has voted yes. We are definitely going to lunch after this.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Captain Greene.

MR. GREENE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: No.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Shipp.

DR. SHIPP: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: No.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We have got seven yes and ten no, and the motion fails seven to ten.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so that brings us back to our first substitute, which is to recommend approval of each state’s EFP, such that, if federal for-hire vessels are included in any state’s EFP, this will not impact the length of the federal for-hire season. We won’t get to see these EFPs again, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, you may see them, but they may already be approved when you see them. I don’t think you will have another opportunity to comment on them in a meaningful way, and so I think this is when you need to get your comments made.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead, Robin.

MR. RIECHERS: Because you had the floor and then we had the call, the call for the question, and so does the call for the question now, Doug, apply to the whole string of motions, or are we now back open for discussion?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I am not sure. Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: I would actually have to look in my handy-dandy book. It’s for the previous question, and so I feel like it’s for the immediate question before you, which was the second substitute, and so I think you could do it again for now, for the immediate question, and I don’t know that it would apply all the way back, but, if you want an official answer, I have to look in the book.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so then I guess, just for the record, since NMFS is going to be working on trying to approve these without us getting another chance to comment on it, and I love you, Robin, but I think we’ve got a lot of work to do on yours.

I do have big issues with trying to include people in an EFP that want no part of it and trying to force that issue. There needs to be an answer, as far as not passing down that allocation and making sure that each one gets to fish their allocation, and I am a little concerned that I saw presentations
from each state, and so that’s what I think they’re going forward with, and, when it actually plays out, it’s going to be something completely different than what was presented to this council, and so I think, if there are drastic, drastic changes to an EFP, that wasn’t what we approved, and we need to really have a discussion about that. That’s all, for the moment, because Texas is ready to crucify me, and so go ahead, Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: I move to call the question on this first substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so we have a motion to call the question, and it’s been seconded. All those in favor of calling the question, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Seven.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Nine. The call the question fails seven to nine.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Now you get to crucify me, Robin. Go ahead.

MR. RIECHERS: Well, I just want to say, on the record, a couple of things. First of all, you suggested closed-door meetings between us and National Marine Fisheries Service, and EFPs are what they are. Just like you suggested the other day with the gear and how that was going to be hooked up and that they were still working through that, those are things that occur with an EFP.

We turned our EFPs in, and we received comments back, and we worked through those, and I think my call with National Marine Fisheries Service and those folks, where the reservation about charter boats occurred, if I’m recalling correctly, was two Fridays ago, with subsequent calls going to occur to Louisiana and maybe Mississippi. Again, no fault of my own, I didn’t see those numbers until yesterday.

Does that change the makeup and what that EFP looks like? Yes, it does. Should I have the opportunity to go back and talk to my commission, who directs the agency and determines how we move forward in these sorts of things? Yes, we should have that opportunity.

I am sorry for the timing, where it’s such that you don’t think you’re going to get to see it again in its final form. That’s
not my timing. I didn’t create that timing. I apologize to the
fact that you think that somehow we’re trying to hide the ball
from you. We’re not trying to hide the ball. We’ve given you
everything that describes what we were going to do, as of when
we turned it in, and our methods are all described in great
detail in the two attached documents.

If you don’t like something about one of those, then you need to
be more particular and come to me and say that here is something
that I might suggest. Whether or not I change that or not has
to do with a whole host of things that may occur. It may be
money, or it may be the problematic portions of the other
survey, or it may be biases that that change could cause in a
survey that it wouldn’t do it if we did it the way we did it,
but those should all be things that we can have a conversation
about, but suggesting that somehow my commission and my
Executive Director and myself and National Marine Fisheries
Service is in any way trying to do anything that is not
transparent here is just wrong and not factual. While that may
be your feeling, it’s wrong and not factual.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Just to point out that this might be the council’s,
as a body, sort of last opportunity to give consensus council
comments on it, but there will be a Federal Register notice that
is published, and that will include whatever modifications
happen or whatever they talk about doing, and so we’re going to
publish what we propose, potentially, to approve, and that’s not
to say that there can’t be any slight changes between publishing
the Federal Register notice and actually issuing the permit,
because we’re requesting public comments, but, presumably, this
stuff will be out there for the public to comment on, and all of
you, as members of the public.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to go back to
what I think Dale was trying to say when he initiated this
substitute motion and the point also that Paul made, and I think
all we’re doing is -- I think everybody on this council is in
favor, in some way, of trying to move an EFP forward that helps
everybody, and I don’t think that’s the issue.

There are some complications in part of the sector here, but the
council is -- Whatever we decide today, it’s simply a
recommendation. It’s advisory to the agency, and I think the
intent of this particular motion, really, is to allow the agency
to work with the states, with everything at their disposal, to
try to do the best thing possible. To the extent that they can
do that, you have to have faith in the agency and realize the
intent of the council when you vote for this particular
substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARSE: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Dr. Frazer. You said that a lot better
than I could have, and so I appreciate you saying that, but that
was one of the things that I wanted to say. The only other
thing that I want to address is a comment earlier about the
public being confused whenever they go to comment about what the
numbers might be.

Out of the two motions left, I think this, in my opinion, this
would give the public a little bit more comfort, because what
we’re trying to say is we’re asking you to do this in a way
where don’t negatively impact anybody’s season length, and so,
hopefully, by this being a little bit more prescriptive, it
might help with public comments and not hinder public comments.
Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARSE: Okay. Is there further discussion? Mr.
Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am sitting here thinking
about this thing, and, in the first regard, this substitute
motion, in my mind, does not in any way address whether a state
has or doesn’t have its for-hire sector within the program. If
I understand this correctly, all it does is try to make some
assurance that Louisiana, for example, doesn’t impact the length
of Florida’s for-hire section.

Additionally, vis-à-vis, and I’m going to speak for Robin a
little bit, but, vis-à-vis Robin’s decision as to whether he
puts the charter/for-hire section in Texas’s EFP, it’s incumbent
upon Robin. He has to go to his people, and not just the people
that were here in New Orleans. He has to go to his people and
make a decision, just like we did.

We didn’t do this lightly, and there were some people that
disagreed, but we have the numbers. We know what they are. I
am a little confused. The concept, I get here, but I’m a little
confused how it shakes out, and I guess, sooner or later, I’m
going to have to make a decision, but I sort of would vote yes
on this. I know there’s only two choices, but, if there’s some
more discussion, I would appreciate it.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, I think I have put my qualms on the record. I mean, I will probably vote in favor of it as well, with the notation of what my issues were with one of the state plans. All right. Dr. Shipp.

DR. SHIPP: I am not sure how the substitute motion could be applied, but I really don’t think there is that much difference between the two motions, but I still go back to the philosophical position that we’re trying to give the states maximum flexibility, and that is the original motion, and I can’t believe that I am not going to vote with my colleague, Mr. Matens, but I am going to speak against this motion, primarily to give the states as much flexibility as possible.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: To that point, Dr. Shipp, I agree with you, and I agree with the flexibility part of it, but it’s just trying to reword it, and it’s just to -- I want each state to have flexibility, but I don’t want another state to be penalized for it in any way.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion? Seeing none, we are going to raise our hands. The substitute motion is to recommend approval of each state’s EFP, but such that, if federal for-hire vessels are included in any state’s EFP, this will not impact the length of the federal for-hire season. All those in favor of the substitute motion, signify by raising your hands.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fourteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Two. The motion passes fourteen to two with one abstention.

MR. RIECHERS: Please note my abstention, for the reasons I stated earlier, in the earlier discussion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: With one abstention by Mr. Riechers. All right. That brings us to a close on the state EFPs. We have one more EFP, but I don’t think that I have it in me before lunch, and so let’s see what our lunch schedule was supposed to be. I was going to give you all a whole hour. It’s about 11:45 right now, and we will take a lunch break after we hear from our South Atlantic liaison. Yes, sir, Mr. Charlie Phillips, go
MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am going to be leaving early, and so I wanted to thank you for the hospitality, and Brian is going to send you our report for our December meeting, but I will just say, quickly, that we have, on our agenda in March, to talk about some rock shrimp fishing boundaries on the east coast of Florida, which has been long in coming, and it is going to be on the agenda.

We’ve got some assessments coming up for black sea bass and red grouper and vermilion, and some look good and some not so good, and then we’ve got cobia coming up, which may change the boundary off the east coast of Florida, which could possibly affect what you’re doing, but it looks like cobia is on the road to being turned over to the states, so they do most of the landings there, but you can always pick Brian, in the back, and we’ve got two staff here, who are also learning, and, again, thank you very much for your hospitality, and I very much enjoyed being here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thanks for being here, and we have a comment from Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Charlie, for coming. Just real quick, did you have, in your visioning document or process, discussions about electronic reporting within the recreational fishery?

MR. PHILLIPS: What was that now?

MR. ANSON: During your visioning process that you did a couple of years ago, I think it was, did you have in there a discussion or outcomes related to electronic reporting for the recreational fishery?

MR. PHILLIPS: We are like you. We discuss everything, and maybe a little calmer, but we discuss it all. I am just saying. Yes, I think we’ve got some apps coming along, and we’ve got our citizen science coming along, and so we’re looking to try to figure out what kind of data can be collected and how it can be collected and how the Science Center can use it. The Science Center being a partner and telling us how to use it is key. I am going to let Brian tell you.

DR. BRIAN CHEUVRONT: I am just trying to help Charlie remember
that we have an action in a snapper grouper amendment that looks at recreational electronic reporting. Right now, it’s being discussed under red snapper, and so, yes, we do have an active action that is under consideration by our council to look at that, and we have a pilot program, test program, going on looking at that as well that we used with our short red snapper season this past fall.

Actually, it worked really well, for those who participated, because it helped to be able to project another weekend opening, because of bad weather, and so everybody was really happy with those test results that we got from our pilot.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Just real quick, and Charlie mentioned it briefly, but the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council is doing some citizen science work that I believe is very good, and I know Mr. Phillips is the Chairman. At some point in time, I think it would be good to send your staff person over here to give a presentation to the council on the progress that you all are making on citizen science, and I am thinking that maybe June might be the time, but I will leave that up to you, if you could work that out with Mr. Phillips, Ms. Bosarge. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, I agree, and your data collection in general, and so hopefully we can maybe get you over here for a presentation at some point or another, and we’ll look at our agenda and see when we can make it happen. All right, and so anything else for Mr. Phillips? Okay. We’re going to go to lunch, and it’s almost twelve. Let’s come back at 1:15. I will give you an extra fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on February 1, 2018.)

- - -

February 1, 2018

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

- - -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Hyatt Centric, New Orleans, Louisiana, Thursday afternoon, February 1, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: When we left before lunch, we did still have
one EFP application that we have to go through, and that’s our
aquaculture EFP. We need to give -- If you will remember, I had
a lot of questions for the applicant, and there were some things
that I was hoping that he could bring back to this council, or
his company, via NMFS, could bring back to this council and give
us some more information on.

I think that, at this point in the game, probably the best way
to summarize those comments would maybe to ask staff to write a
letter summarizing all the different things that we asked to
have a little more information on and the drawings and the
anchoring system and things like that, and formally just send
that to NMFS, so they will have a good, solid list of what we
would like to see.

Two things, and we need to -- If there is other things that we
didn’t mention yesterday that we do want to see when they come
back before us, we need to get that on the record and talk about
it. Then, if we feel like we listed everything that we need to
see next time, in our discussions yesterday, then we will need a
motion to write a letter to NMFS, have staff write a letter to
NMFS, summarizing our questions and concerns and asking for a
follow-up presentation of some sort addressing those, and so I
will open it for discussion. Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Roy, I understand the
permitting process for aquaculture is somewhat different, and
this, due to a lot of people’s interest in D.C., maybe
aquaculture has been accelerated a little bit and has had more
focus, and there is nothing bad about that. I am in favor of
aquaculture, but why was this proposal brought to us in such a
preliminary state? In other words, why weren’t -- That looked
like a pretty sophomoric presentation of something that is
really complex, and was there a more detailed presentation to
somebody else?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, there is the application itself, which is
in your briefing book, and we had run into some concerns with
the shrimp industry about the siting and all, and I knew that
the council would have a lot of input about that too, and so it
seemed like it was better to come in earlier, rather than later,
and try to resolve some of those.
I think what Leann is talking about, in terms of get your questions down in writing, is I think we can bring those back in and provide some answers to it. Generally speaking, EFPs, when the applicants submit them to us, they are variable, in terms of what is in them and what is not, and it’s an iterative process, back and forth, with the applicant to try and address all of the concerns that are raised.

Because these aquaculture projects tie up some bottom space, there is always concerns about which fisheries and who are they interacting with, but I will say that these applicants have been very willing to work with us, and they are very willing to make modifications to the project, and they really want to do this with the support of everybody, including this council, and so that is kind of why -- It’s always a judgment, with an EFP, of do you wait, and then it could be said, well, why didn’t you come to us earlier with this? That was the thought process.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I don’t know if this is an item for the letter, but, because this is occurring off of Florida, and it’s going to trigger a coastal zone management review, these guys are going to have to work with the State of Florida sooner or later, and I would recommend that that would be sooner, because they are going to have multiple agencies to deal with. There is extensive regulations dealing with aquaculture that they’re going to need to be consistent with in Florida, and so I don’t know if that’s something that we would want to just remind them of in this letter.

Then, also, it seems like, based on what they have presented, that we have data that they don’t have that they’re looking at for these sites, and so, if they’re looking at other sites, like we discussed the other day, we probably would -- They would want to coordinate with us on those as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: We will, Martha, get them in touch with you. I am sure you’re aware that one of the applicants is a former FWC employee, Dennis Peters, and so I’m sure they would be happy to work with you guys and try to address whatever concerns there may be.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Dr. Crabtree, I know you haven’t had many
applications, and you may not for many years to come, but, for
the application you have received, what is your sense relative
to the EFP? It’s a pilot project, and what if it is successful
in the eyes of the company that is bringing forth the plan, and
it’s successful in the eyes of NOAA and the eyes of the council
and the public, and it becomes a viable venture?

Are you kind of getting a feel for these businesses, when they
come to see -- Is this where you want to set up shop,
Essentially, and, after the EFP is over, you’re going to come
back with the same locations, or are you going to look at
different locations? There might be different or better markets
for them, regionally or across the Gulf, that might lend to
maybe fresh market type of things.

I am just wondering because of the conversations we’ve had so
far relative to impacts to other user groups. The earlier in
the process that that can be determined, if they are looking at
expanding the footprint, if you will, outside of the EFP, that
we get those engaged sooner than later, and so it’s not this
kind of mad dash, and so I’m just wondering, again, if that
conversation is being had and whether or not there is any
utility. Again, you have a limited number of permits, and so we
kind of handle them as a case-by-case basis right now, but,
going in the future, it might be different.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I mean, we have talked to them about the
aquaculture permitting program and the FMP, and they are well
aware of that, and my hope is that, if this is successful, that
it will help spur someone to come in and apply for an
aquaculture permit to do this more on a longer-term scale.

There are some groups that are interested in doing that, and
maybe these guys will be one of those, if this succeeds and goes
forward, and we’ll have to see. I think the overall -- I think
what needs to happen with the Aquaculture FMP and the
aquaculture permitting process is we need to get the litigation
resolved.

That is all before the court now, and I think it’s been briefed,
and I have no knowledge of when the court may come to a
decision, but I think that is a -- That is something that
everybody is watching, and I think some parties may be reluctant
to make the investment until that is resolved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion? If not,
we need a motion to write the letter, to ask staff to write the
letter. Dr. Frazer.
DR. FRAZER: I am happy to make that motion, and so I would make a motion -- With regard to the aquaculture EFP, the council directs staff to draft a letter with concerns regarding the EFP request and forward to the National Marine Fisheries Service.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree, will that be good enough for your office? Based on that, we will draft you a letter, and we will try and summarize the questions and concern that we have, or that we had, during that discussion and also emphasize that they will need to work with the State of Florida, as Martha suggested. That way, you can get with them and see what can be accomplished and bring something back to us at a later date.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, that’s fine, and our goal will be to come back at the next council meeting and try to address all of the questions that are there, and hopefully we can move forward at that point.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sounds like a plan. The motion has been seconded. Dr. Frazer, is that your motion?

DR. FRAZER: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so we have a motion to direct staff to draft a letter outlining concerns regarding the aquaculture EFP request and forward the letter to National Marine Fisheries Service, and we do have a second. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries. That does finish up all of our EFP requests. Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Madam Chair, have we given staff enough information as to what the, quote, concerns are from the council for someone to do the drafting? Do we have a --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Kilgour.

DR. MORGAN KILGOUR: As most likely the letter writer, yes. I am going to go back through the minutes and listen to the discussion again, so I can make sure that I outline all of those concerns that you addressed during the discussion yesterday and then Madam Chair will, obviously, review it before it’s sent to the National Marine Fisheries Service, if that’s acceptable.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.
MR. SWINDELL: Just so long as you feel comfortable that you have enough information to give a good letter with enough reasonable concerns to express, so that NMFS and the applicant can address them properly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so that wraps up our EFP discussion, and so let’s circle back around and pick up with Reef Fish. Then we will follow back up, after that, and do our Spiny Lobster. Mr. Greene, are you ready with your report, sir?

MR. GREENE: Yes, ma’am.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Let’s go for it.

COMMITTEE REPORTS (CONTINUED)
REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. GREENE: The Reef Fish Committee Report, the agenda was approved, with the addition of items under Other Business. The minutes of the October 3, 2017 committee meeting were approved as written.

Review of Reef Fish Landings, Tab B, Number 4, National Marine Fisheries Service staff reviewed preliminary reef fish landings for 2017. Commercial landings of IFQ stocks were all below their respective ACLs, with red grouper, gag, and shallow-water grouper aggregate landings at just 36 percent to 41 percent of their ACLs.

For non-IFQ stocks, gray triggerfish and greater amberjack had quota closures on November 17 and June 20, respectively. Both of these stocks were under reduced ACLs, due to overages in the previous year. However, both closed below their quotas in 2017, so there will be no overage adjustments in 2018.

Preliminary recreational landings are based on MRIP/MRFSS and headboat landings from January 1 through October 31, 2017; Waves 1 through 5; LA Creel landings from January 1 through December 31, 2017; and Texas Parks and Wildlife data for 2017 are through May 14, 2017, the low-use season, at this time.

Gray triggerfish and greater amberjack were subject to overage adjustments and closed on January 1 and March 24, respectively. Recreational landings for each stock exceeded its adjusted ACL by 137 percent and 142 percent, respectively. For gag and red grouper, landings were just 21 percent and 24 percent of the respective ACLs.
For recreational red snapper, the for-hire component’s landings have been below both the ACL and ACT from 2015 through 2017. The private angling component exceeded its ACT, but was below its ACL in 2015. For 2016 and 2017, both the ACT and ACL were exceeded. In 2017, the private angling landings were 213 percent of the 170 percent of the ACL, respectively.

Committee members discussed the timing of the recreational landings data. The final landings are expected by April. National Marine Fisheries Service anticipates that the for-hire component will get a longer red snapper season in 2018, since this component of the recreational sector has been below its ACT.

Ad Hoc Private Recreational Red Snapper AP Summary, Tab B, Number 5, staff provided a summary of the Ad Hoc Red Snapper Private Angler Advisory Panel meeting held January 18, 2018, in Tampa, Florida.

The committee reviewed the AP summary and discussed their recommendation to continue investigating the impacts of illegal red snapper fishing from foreign vessels. The committee discussed the magnitude of the removals. Dr. Porch stated that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center has provided some review of the methods used to estimate illegal harvest and determined that the methodology used to estimate illegal harvest is reasonable. He supports continued dialog about this problem, including further discussion to determine if it is appropriate to consider incorporating these removals in future stock assessments.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was going over the notes of the Ad Hoc Red Snapper Private Angler Advisory Panel, and thank God we didn’t have an acronym for that, and one of the things that I noticed -- They did a great job. There was a whole bunch of stuff they worked on.

One of the things that I noticed was a recommendation to look at allocation, and, accordingly, at this point in time, I would like to introduce a motion. The motion is to direct staff to develop a scoping document to evaluate the allocations of red snapper, taking into account previous deliberations in Amendment 28 and any new information, and consider a broad range of social, economic, data collection, and management factors. That is my motion.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Do we have a second for the motion? It’s seconded by Mr. Boyd. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Matens, would you like to give your rationale?

MR. MATENS: Yes, ma’am. As we all remember, Amendment 28 was a little complicated, and it was a subject of a lawsuit, and that lawsuit was determined, but there was no remedy ordered, and, as I understand this correctly, the judge kind of kicked it back to the council. I am trying to do that right now, and the differences in what went up there and now is the Amendment 28 was really a data correction issue, and this is not that. This is to consider all of the factors and to make certain that we include social and economic factors, which I understand we’re bound to do so.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is there further discussion? Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Just a question, probably for Mara, I guess. Is that, as you all understand it, the way the judge had instructed for us to work on it some more?

MS. LEVY: I wouldn’t say there was an instruction to work on it more, but the judge found that particular rule violated National Standard 4, and so we reverted the allocations back to the way they were before Amendment 28, but it doesn’t preclude you from looking at the allocations again and going through the process and deciding what you believe the appropriate allocation is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: That issue with the impact of the APAIS port sampling change and the impact on landings, that is still there, and then we have shifted to a mail survey methodology for estimating effort this year, and, if the pilot studies bear out, it’s expected that will produce higher estimates of recreational landings.

I expect we will get a calibration factor on that by summer some time, but, at some point this year, there will be a recalibration of the historical landings of red snapper, and, since the current allocation is, at least in theory, based on historical landings -- I mean, there are a lot of issues that -- We dealt with a small fraction of that in Amendment 28, and there are going to be even larger issues by the end of this year, and so, as painful as it may be, I think it is something that we are going to have to deal with.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: A scoping document, with this wording, would be -- We would just go to the public and say here is the allocations that we currently have, and here is our analysis of the social and economic basis for the current allocation, but there is no goal or direction to go in, and so we’re expecting the public to provide us those directions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Doug, I think we would rely on staff to give a professional opinion, or a suite of opinions, about where we might be able to go with this and deal with that at a later meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: I am a little confused. Doug, are you saying that that should say to develop an amendment? Would that be different? To me, this is a lower-level beginning than starting an amendment. This is starting a scoping document, which we would fill in alternatives and have discussion and come out with a suite of alternatives and then have that go to the public.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Then the council needs to develop that suite of alternatives. Staff can’t do it. If it didn’t say “scoping document”, I would look at it like a review, like the five-year review that we just had of IFQ. We would review the current allocation and analyze it. Staff is not capable of seeing where the council wants to go with this and coming up with a suite of alternatives. I mean, they could be infinite, and so we need guidance. If this does lead to a document, we need to develop the purpose and need for the document.

MR. BOYD: Wouldn’t you do that in the scoping document? I am just trying to get clarification on what is the correct procedure to look at allocations.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Well, we have to have something to take to the public, unless we just take a general thing that says what are your opinions on the allocation of red snapper, give us some ideas. The council is concerned about the allocation, and what are your ideas on what we should do, and then we would solicit that from the public and bring that back to the council, and then you all can develop the alternatives and the direction you want to go.
MR. BOYD: To that point?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Can we go to Dr. Diagne real quick?

MR. BOYD: Sure.

DR. ASSANE DIAGNE: Thank you, Mr. Madam Chair. I think, if I understand correctly, at the heart of this matter, really, would be the purpose and need for action. Let’s say, for example, we have a stock assessment, and it is pretty clear why is it, for example, that a rebuilding plan is needed, but where, perhaps, as staff, we need the council’s help and guidance, is exactly why is that, as a council, you want to reallocate.

I mean, one of those, of course, would be the idea that Dr. Crabtree mentioned about the recalibration, and that is pretty self-explanatory, and another thing would be economic efficiency, which, as we all know, cannot be the sole basis for a reallocation, but those are the things that are implied in this motion, and more information, somewhere along the way, from this council would be needed to help staff know the direction in which we should go. Essentially, reflect your intent, and that’s the part that is missing, is more information on the council’s intent, and that will help us go towards a purpose and need for action, if you would.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Did you want to follow up now, Mr. Boyd?

MR. BOYD: Yes, and it sounds to me like both Dr. Diagne and Mr. Gregory are saying that this ought to be started as an amendment and that would flow into all of the document that you want to create.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead.

DR. DIAGNE: Thank you very much. Mr. Boyd, there is no problem with the procedure or requesting a scoping document. That is the usual way of doing things, but, typically, we are directed to start a scoping document to do X, Y, and Z, with a very clear intent in mind, or at least some idea as to the intent. What we are requesting is perhaps more information as to where it is that this council is trying to go with reallocation, or a potential reallocation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree and then Mr. Matens.

DR. CRABTREE: There is a NMFS policy that came out somewhere in
the last couple of years, and it’s essentially a policy on, and, Mara, help me out here, things to consider and evaluate when determining if allocations are appropriate or not, and it’s called “Recommended Practices and Factors to Consider When Reviewing and Making Allocation Decisions”, and so, what I would suggest, Doug, is that staff go through that and look at the factors that should be considered, and the question to take out in the scoping document would be are the allocations meeting this factor? Are we achieving these?

I haven’t reviewed this lately, and I assume, somewhere in there, changes to the historical perception of landings is among that, but, if it’s not, that is the other piece of this. I think, if you take those factors and take that document, you could easily put together a whole host of items that we want to review, and the scoping document would be asking the public what they think about that and what they think the council ought to do.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Roy covered what I wanted to say.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The only thing I think that’s probably missing from that, if you’re talking about a purpose and need, is we always have to look at the biological side of things and the conservation side. I mean, that is kind of the purpose of the council, right, to keep everything healthy. That is going to need to be part of it, which I am sure it will. That’s always part of what we do. Is there further discussion? Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I just want to make sure I’m clear before I vote. I never am against looking at anything, but I am worried about the timing of this. I think the recalibration that Dr. Crabtree is talking about is pretty important, and I would hate for us to get a scoping document out before we had some idea what that was going to look like, because we would be going out to the public maybe ahead of where we’re going to have some pretty critical information, and so I am just trying to figure out how the timing of this might work, if anybody could speak to that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree, when will the recalibrations be ready?

DR. PORCH: Presuming that we get the peer-reviewed calibrations done in maybe late summertime, we should have them done in the fall.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So we would see them maybe in October or in January of next year, one of the two, depending on when in the fall you get them done. Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Kind of, I guess, in sync with Dale’s question then, I assume what is going to happen is we’ll come back at the next meeting and review whatever has been done here, assuming it’s done by the next meeting. If not, it would be the following meeting, and then we would be receiving this other information sometime shortly thereafter, and maybe have a meeting to sync some of those up, or to have that kind of convergence of those two issues.

Obviously, some of this is already in -- Or was in the past Amendment 28, at least from a perspective of some of the discussion elements, et cetera, and the data recalibrations in that.

I understand, court case notwithstanding that whole issue in 28, but it seems like those can mesh up, Dale, is kind of how I’m seeing it. I mean, given that, as we all know, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on where you’re at around the table at any point in time around here, nothing here happens fast, and so that’s kind as I was -- As they talked through it, Dale, that’s at least what I’m kind of seeing, possibly. It could slow up or it could speed up, but that’s kind of where I am seeing the sync-up occur, is sometime in the fall. I will let you know, Madam Chair, that Assane is trying to get your attention again.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Diagne.

DR. DIAGNE: Thank you, Mr. Riechers. Just to be clear on the scope of this, because the motion says the allocations, plural, of red snapper, and so this is, obviously, recreational versus commercial, but we also have another allocation, meaning between the components of the recreational sector. What is your intent for us to look at? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Well, Assane, I think we ought to look at all of it, all three. I hate to -- We already argued about where there was sectors or not, but let’s see what the social ramifications have for the charter/for-hire and the private also. Is that okay?

DR. DIAGNE: Yes, understood, and I guess we may consider then a
sequential approach by which you would look at the intersector allocations of recreational versus commercial, and then, in the second tier, within the recreational sector itself. Thank you.

MR. MATENS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I am trying to skim through the NMFS policy, and that was published in February of 2017, and it talks about authorities, responsibilities, and triggers, and it says that the Regional Offices and the Science Centers will help with this development.

It does say that these triggers, triggers for reevaluating allocations, these triggers should be identified within three years, or as soon as practical, from the finalization of this policy, and so that seems to be a good starting point, and it talks about a three-step process.

One is you identify that a trigger is met, and the trigger could be based on public input to the councils. Then a check for changes in social, ecological, or economic criteria is required. Then Step 2 is a fisheries allocation review, and it says, at this stage, in-depth analyses are not required. However, to ensure transparency, a clear articulation of how the objectives of the FMP are or are not being met and a clear rationale to relevant factors, and so maybe a good starting point would be for staff to start working on something based along the guidance of this allocation policy, which would then probably lead to a scoping document.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: Well, I would just note that that trigger document was one part of the allocation policy, and it followed the policy that Roy mentioned, which talked about the factors to consider when making allocation decisions, and so we can talk about what guidance and directives there are out there, but that’s one of a couple.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Could we also -- I am getting a little nervous about our allocation discussion that is going to happen in a few minutes, and so is it possible to also do allocation evaluation of an east versus west Gulf, with the line being the border between Alabama and Mississippi, or would that not be
appropriate in this one?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: You can certainly look at that, and, if you were to decide that you wanted to change the fundamental management of red snapper from managing it as a single stock to managing it as two stocks, east and west, that would certainly force you to come back in, because you would have to respecify all of the allocations and things, and so, to me, that is almost a more fundamental question than this one, because, if you did split them into two stocks, my guess is the western Gulf would be predominantly commercial and the eastern Gulf would clearly be predominantly recreational, and that would really be a very fundamental change. It seems like, if you’re wanting to go down that path, that would affect everything we’re doing with red snapper.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Any other discussion? Seeing none, let’s vote. All those in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign. We have one abstention.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It passes sixteen to zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We will do our best.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: State Management Program for Recreational Red Snapper, Tab B, Number 6, staff reviewed the actions and provided the recommendations from the Law Enforcement Committee and Ad Hoc Red Snapper Private Angler AP.

Dr. Farmer presented an approach to estimate red snapper biomass off each state. The approach will be used in one of the alternatives for allocating the red snapper quota among the states. Dr. Farmer discussed data challenges with using recreational trips as an allocation metric. Staff presented the decision tool for examining the various allocation alternatives, and the SSC comments were provided. Staff noted the data issues with using the 2010 landings in the historical landings time
series, and the committee passed the following motion.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2, to make Alternative 4, Option 4b the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Ms. Gerhart.

MS. GERHART: The intent here is to exclude 2010 from all of the alternatives, correct, and that’s why it’s picked as preferred? I think, for staff, what we would prefer is, rather than -- If that’s picked as preferred, we still have to analyze everything both with and without 2010, and so what would be better for us is not to have it in this alternative, but to remove it from all the other alternatives as part of the alternative. Then our analysis can only be without 2010, and does that make any sense?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, ma’am, it does. Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I will make that motion. That makes sense to me. I think that’s the intent anyway, if staff could help me with the wording.

MS. GERHART: I think Dr. Lasseter can help put something up there for you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: There will be a substitute motion. I think they are getting the gist of it. Add language to all alternatives that the 2010 landings will be excluded, and I think that’s what you’re trying to say, that essentially you will explain, in each of the alternatives, in the body of it, that 2010 is excluded, so it’s clear. I’m thinking that’s what you’re trying to say. Ms. Gerhart, is that clear enough instruction, that you would be able to take that back and accomplish something?

MS. GERHART: Yes, I think that’s what we want. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Banks, is that motion suitable for you, sir? All right. Do we have a second for the motion? It’s seconded by Dr. Frazer. Is there discussion on the substitute motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: The alternative including biomass and recreational trips does not specify which years to use for trips. The committee then passed the following motion. The committee recommends, and I so move, in Alternative 6, to evaluate
recreational trips utilizing the range of years from Alternatives 2 and 3.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there discussion on the motion? Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I would like to make a substitute motion. I will read it when it gets up there, but, essentially, it would just add two other options to this. It would add 2c and 3c, which would incorporate the later time series as well.

My substitute would be, in Action 2, Alternative 6, evaluate recreational trips using the following range of years from Alternatives 2 and 3, and so it’s 2a, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3c, and 3d, instead of just 2a and 2d and 3a and 3d.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion on the board. Do we have a second for the motion? It’s seconded by Mr. Sanchez. Is there discussion on the substitute motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Staff then reviewed --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: While we’re on the issue of this allocation stuff, I would like to make a motion, and I sent it to the staff earlier, to try to pick a preferred for allocation. If I can get a second, I will give some rationale.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s been seconded, even though we haven’t really seen it yet. The motion is to make Alternative 2d, the 50/50 calculation and --

MR. BANKS: Well, now we can remove the language about Alternative 4b, because we already did that just a second ago.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. It will be to make Alternative 2d, the 50/50 calculation, in Action 2 the preferred alternative.

MR. BANKS: You can take out the 50/50 calculation. That was more just explaining to the staff which --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So we would know which one it was. All right, and so this has been seconded by Mr. Swindell. Are you okay with that change that we made to it, Mr. Swindell?
MR. SWINDELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: He’s okay. The seconder is okay. Your rationale, sir?

MR. BANKS: Here is my rationale, and I recognize that we’re just now starting to look at things like biomass and trips and things, but I am more concerned about timing and making sure that we have these state plans moving forward, and so that we can also have these state plans moving forward to the public, so they can have some time to look at it as well.

If I recall from the last meeting, the staff advised us that, if we didn’t have preferreds, we couldn’t go out to the public in enough time to get it on the books for the 2019 season, and I recognize that, maybe with the EFPs, it’s not as much of a necessity now, but my concern is that, if something happened to the EFPs, if NOAA gets sued and says that we’re trying to circumvent the overage last year and you can’t do the EFPs, something happens, then, all of a sudden, we’ve lost 2019 too, and so I want to make sure that we keep these going.

The reason for this particular alternative was it’s the last expression of acceptance, as I stated in my original motion way back, of this body. Now, I recognize that not everybody agreed with this particular calculation method, but it was at least passed by this body in Amendment 40, and it was at least accepted while Amendment 39 was around, and so it was at least the last expression of acceptance, and it also considers a long time series, as well as some of the concerns we always hear from Florida about the most recent shifts in landings, and so I think it’s fair, in that respect.

Ultimately, this is a state plan for three years, and so, if we all look back at it in all of the states and we say, you know what, we thought this might work for us, us included, but it really doesn’t and it doesn’t make sense, and it just doesn’t give us enough fish, or we can’t catch the amount of fish it gives us, we can all come back to the table, and so I think it’s fair, in that respect, and I don’t think we should be too awfully concerned, because it’s a three-year plan, and, again, I think it’s the fairest way to go about it.

I would love to have biomass in there, but I’m not so sure that that’s able to be worked out at this point, and so, at this point, I think our preferred alternative, so that we can get this thing on the road for public comment and all, that we can
move forward with this as our preferred, please.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I am going to speak against the motion, I think for a couple of reasons. I think the EFPs and where each of the states came from on those -- I mean, they illustrate that we’re not there yet on this allocation, number one, and so everybody is kind of coming from different places still.

We have some new alternatives in here that we’re still tweaking and working on. I will say it now, and I will say it again when this comes up in 41 and 42, when we’re talking about allocations, that past precedent of using a set of years, that’s not really good enough for me. I want to know exactly why those sets of years are appropriate, and that’s the same reason why I voted down John’s motion to set allocations in whichever amendment, 41 or 42, that we were talking about earlier this week.

I think there is a lot of discussions to be had on this still, and we’re not there, and so that’s just my quick thoughts on that, other than my usual issue about how this is not really representative of what’s happening now, and so thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is there further discussion? Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Patrick, being a western Gulf member with you in so many ways, I do want to support the motion, and I certainly understand the need to move it along. You and I were having this conversation before we sat back down at the table, and I really want to see some of the biomass alternatives fleshed out a little bit more, and I’m not even against including those trip alternatives, because I think they all do play in, Martha, and I agree, but I just do know this is something that we’ve got to come to grips with pretty quickly, as a body, and so I probably won’t support it today, but you sure might get my support next time around.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: Thank you, Madam Chair. It’s difficult. I want to support the motion, but what Mississippi has been through and the federal fleet going out in 2005, with Katrina, it’s just we haven’t gotten them back, and this scenario doesn’t completely play out to what I -- You can understand our position, as our state, but, again, this hybridization approach is going to get us there, and I am very strong in feeling that way, and I am
really glad that we’re having these conversations.

I know it got heated with the EFPs, but it’s going to get worse before we get there, and so I just want to say that it’s hard to support this motion at this point in time, but I do like the motion, and am I allowed to say that?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Well, I think I’m going to be in favor of this motion, simply for the fact that I do believe it does most closely follow our current allocation policy, and we have that for a reason, and I think that that’s something that we should adhere to, unless we go and amend our current allocation policy. We have it in place for a reason, and I think it should be used.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: This does beg a question, and maybe Roy knows the answer, and maybe we can explore the answer between now and the time we come back to another meeting, and I’m sure we’re not the first council that has dealt with this, and I know Boyle’s Law is kind of how we got 2d there, where we’re weighting it, but the whole notion is we’re trying to find some historical rationale for the system, but also taking into account more recent events, taking into account historical events, and possibly now taking into account biomass or trips as well.

Is there another council that has dealt -- I mean, other than the Boyle’s Law from the South Atlantic, and I am not minimizing that, and that was a good effort, but do you know if anyone has tried to do a biomass/trips, and is there anything that we can look at from another council that just may help us as we look at this more closely?

DR. CRABTREE: I really don’t, but I would say the Mid would be the place to start, because they have substantial recreational fisheries, but I have never really reviewed how they have set allocations very carefully.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to applaud Patrick for bringing this up and trying to push this along, and part of me wants to support the motion, because I want it to move along, and I do want us to start moving this at a little bit better clip, and I guess I am worried if the EFP falls apart and we don’t make 2019, but I don’t have a crystal ball to know if
that’s going to happen, but I have always thought of this that, really, for this piece of the puzzle, the states have to be in consensus.

Because the states aren’t in consensus, I am not going to support it today, but, at some point in the future, I might have to change that mindset and try to pick the best of the options that is before us and try to move something along, even if we’ve got to deal with conservation equivalencies, but my hope is that the states will work together in the very near future and try to resolve this biggest issue, so we can get these things going. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  Mr. Anson and then Mr. Banks.

MR. ANSON:  I will just echo a couple of the comments around the table.  Patrick, I appreciate your efforts to try to move the issue of state management along.  I might be a little bit overly optimistic, but I am hoping the EFPs will go through 2019, and so it appears we may have bought a little bit of time, in that regard, but, either way, the clock is ticking, whether it’s 2019 or 2020.

I think we need to get something in place here, and, if it is contrary to our allocation policy, Johnny brings up a good point of that we might need to address that, but, really, and Mara could tell me if I’m wrong, if she were here, but, if there is nothing definitive that we can’t look at other things besides landings history as the only means of distributing allocation, then we ought to amend it, but, again, we’re trying to get to a point where the states have comfort and feel good.

If we can look at maybe some other different metrics that provide a little bit more option, I guess, to the states, so that we can kind of come to an agreement, because it is negotiation, and negotiation means you may not get exactly what you want, but you get something.

You get something, and hopefully that something is better than what you’ve got, is how you come out of it, but I am not going to be in support of this action to make this the preferred alternative at this time, only in as much as waiting until the next meeting, so that we have some time to look at the analysis of the new alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE:  The complexity that I see with this is the
historical landings are getting ready to all change, and the calibrations that we just talked about will change the historical landings. If Snapper Check is certified and we get a calibration factor for that, that will again change the historical landings, and so there is a lot of stuff getting ready to happen, and, whatever analysis we have of this historical landings right now may produce different results as we move forward, because it will change the interplay of these landings yet again, and so I just point that out, but I would be pleasantly astonished if we could get this in place by 2019, because I think it’s going to -- I think 2020 is, more realistically, the best we can shoot for.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: We can always go back and change a preferred at the next meeting. I hear what Dale is saying, and Dale has been somebody that I’ve had a lot of respect for for many, many years, but, in this case, with all due respect, Dale, and, yes, I’ve only been here for two years, but we haven’t come to this agreement.

We can’t even get all five states to hardly sit down and talk about it, and that’s not -- I am not passing judgment on any state, but that’s just the fact of the matter, and I think that’s the fact that we live in, and, at some point, we’re going to have to move forward, and I know you recognize that, and I just don’t think waiting another meeting, or two meetings, is going to change anything, and that’s why I think we need to move forward now. That’s my thought.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Perhaps, to provide some clarity, or at least remind those that are at the table, relative to the clock, Dr. Crabtree, if we were looking at trying to get a state management plan in place by 2020, when would be the time that the council would have to approve that, in order to go through the appropriate administrative steps to do that?

DR. CRABTREE: I would say no later than your June 2019 meeting. You would need to take final action then and submit it to the Secretary, and that would be pushing it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I hope we have 2018 final numbers by then. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: What it sounded like Dr. Crabtree said was that
there’s not a lot of time, and so that’s moving quick, in the
council process. Patrick, again, I appreciate your exuberance
to try to push this along, but it is a difficult topic, but
there is a time certain. I think that we all need to come to
the table and realize that we need to do something. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: This might should be brought up after the motion is
dispensed with, but I am wondering if maybe, sometime in the
future, if the council could support a workshop for the five
states, and it would have to be a public meeting, I’m sure, but,
if that was doable, if all the states could have time to get
with their commissions and talk to them about the complexities
of dealing with the situation and commit to sending somebody
with the authority to make a decision to the workshop, and see
if folks just can’t get in a room and come to some type of
agreement, but, like I said, folks have to have laid the
groundwork, and it has to be people with the authority to make
some decisions there.

If not, we’re just going to waste a meeting and everything, and
I don’t know if that could even be done with commissions, and so
I might be asking for something that is impossible, but, anyway,
I will throw that out there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Any further discussion? All right.
We have a motion on the board. In Action 2, to make Alternative
2, Option 2d, the preferred alternative. All those in favor,
signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Five.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ten. The motion fails five to ten.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Thank you. I do have a question for Mr. Gregory,
along those lines, but I didn’t want to enter into the
discussion on that. Haven’t we, in the past, gone out with a
scoping document that didn’t have all the alternatives have
preferreds? We don’t like that, but we’ve done it before,
haven’t we?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: There is the scoping process, and
then there is the public hearings. The council likes to have
preference at public hearings, but not necessarily always, but just to give the public some insight as to where the council may be going.

At a scoping process, that’s the very beginning. That’s like the brainstorming session, where we might say the council has concern about so and so issue in the Gulf of Mexico and what do you think, public, and do you have any ideas to address this issue. Then we bring those back, and that becomes an options paper, and we bring it back to the council. Scoping does not have preferred of anything, but, public hearing documents, the council tends to want to have at least some preferreds in that when we go to public hearing.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thanks for asking the question, Doug. I go back to the question that I asked Dr. Crabtree, and that is when we would have to vote to send it to the Secretary, and he said the drop-dead meeting would be June of next year. Ideally, I think we would want to plan for April of next year, just to make sure that things went smoothly and we at least had June.

Then, backing up, Doug, when do you think we would need to have a public hearing document with the preferreds identified with some reasonable -- Seeing that it would take at least a meeting, and obviously we would have to do one meeting, but maybe even two, and we probably are looking at, potentially, as soon as the June meeting to get the public hearing document out?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: June of this year?

MR. ANSON: Correct.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The sooner the better, because the real unknown is how long the council will deliberate after the public hearing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I realize that, and that’s difficult to determine, but, if we -- I guess I am trying to do the timeline in my head, and I am looking maybe at June of this year, and we have the August meeting and the October meeting to kick it around, or, actually, we would have four meetings then at that point, I guess, if we were able to complete the public hearing process in
between meetings, between the June and the August meeting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:  Well, let me defer to Carrie.

MR. ANSON:  Okay.

DR. SIMMONS:  Thank you, Madam Chair.  That’s been our intent, is to work this towards a public hearing draft.  We are still a little concerned about the delegation alternative and trying to get a good understanding about what the states and the council wants in that delegation alternative.

That would be really helpful, if we could get that fleshed out, and then we can work on the analysis in the document, and so, if we could get some assistance with that, that would help a lot.  We do have Chapter 3 developed, if you look at the documents online, and so we’re working in that direction, and so we could have a rough draft possibly in April, a nice solid draft in June, if we can get that guidance.

You can look at it and approve it, possibly, and have those hearing locations maybe selected at the next council meeting, so we have some time to plan them.  Once you approve it, we could try to have them before the August meeting, if there is time.  That’s a tight timeline, but definitely before the October council meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS:  I am not advocating one way or the other for when we would want to have public hearings, but something that we might want to think about, since we potentially are going to have this basically pilot of state management occurring this year, would be to wait until the public has actually experienced that, to some degree, because that is probably going to influence their judgment as to whether they would want to move forward with this.  I mean, we can cross that bridge when we get there, but I figured I would plant that seed now.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  That was kind of that comment that I made about I hope we actually have landings from the first year of the state EFPs before we have to -- I don’t know that we really will, before you’re trying to make a decision on this to get it implemented in time.  Is there further discussion?  Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS:  I sent a motion to the staff, to try to get all this delegation information into the document, if they could bring that up, please.  If I could get a second, I will give some
rationale, although I think Dr. Simmons already did such.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so we have a motion on the board to instruct staff to assess requested delegation items from the Mississippi, Florida, and Louisiana letters and determine, through the IPT process, if there are any items that cannot be delegated and incorporate those items that can be delegated for the next iteration of the individual state management amendments. Do we have a second for the motion? It’s seconded by Dr. Shipp. Do you have discussion, Mr. Banks?

MR. BANKS: I appreciate the staff helping me word that, because I didn’t exactly know how to word it, but we always -- At least I have a question all the time about, okay, what does delegation mean to each of the states, and so we’ve got the letters, but I think we’re going to need to have those in the documents, certainly for the public, at some point, to understand that as well, but me as well, and so I was hoping we could get it into the documents.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Ms. Guyas and then Mr. Anson.

MS. GUYAS: I guess just a question for Kevin and Robin. I wouldn’t want to exclude any letters that they’re sending from this motion, and so I don’t know if there are letters coming or if we need to generalize this or what, but I will let --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: As I recall the conversation from Tuesday, it’s that there would be some document, whether it would be incorporated in the amendments or not, but there would be a summary of what the states have provided. In fact, I think there was a table, or a summary of that, given during Tuesday’s committee meeting.

I think, at this point, just to keep them uniform, and that’s the question I was going to ask Patrick, is if the individual state management amendments refer to all five or just the three of the states that have submitted letters.

MR. BANKS: My intention was to take what we have submitted in our letters and put it into our individual plans, but that may not be the appropriate place. It may be more appropriate in the umbrella document, and I don’t know, and maybe staff could help us with that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy, and then we’ll go to staff, if they have any input.
MS. LEVY: My suggestion would be to take the list that we made from the three letters that we got and decide if there is anything that just can’t be delegated, based on those lists, and not include them. Those that can, put them in each state document as options, and so every state has the option to pick what they want, so that the documents are uniform, but they still allow the states to decide what they want delegated, because, at some point, we’re going to have to know what states want what type of management measures delegated.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: That’s what my hope was, I guess, at this point, was to just kind of include them all. Then there is the option, when we get to that point, of that process that we can pick and choose. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Certainly I want to work off the fine work that you all have done by submitting your letters in a timely fashion. If we can, I am kind of like Kevin. There is no reason for us to submit a letter saying the same thing, but, once we have a chance to look at that, if we see a gap that we need to fill, we would try to fill that at that point, but we would have that opportunity, because I haven’t even had a chance to look at Paul’s. I know it came through on Tuesday, I think, but I didn’t have a chance to really take a good look at it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Are you saying that -- Robin, are you saying that whatever they end up putting into options for those three state plans, based on their letters, that you would also like that to go ahead and be listed in Texas’s state document as well, as options that you can choose as preferred or not to --

MR. RIECHERS: What I heard Mara saying was she assumed that it would go into all the state documents, and I was just assuming that was the case. Then it would go into all state documents, and then we would look at those as we came back at the next meeting, yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so you’re agreeing with Mara. All right. Is staff clear? Yes, staff says they’re clear. Kevin, you’re good with that, too, right? I’ve got a thumbs-up from Kevin. All right. So, we have a motion on the board. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.
Is there anything else before Chairman Greene picks back up with his committee report? Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: For the Mississippi plan, what I was hoping to go ahead and do, and I am hoping what just happened didn’t negate that, but -- For the Mississippi plan, in Action 1, to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so we have a motion on the board, and do we have a second for the motion?

DR. MICKLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s seconded by Dr. Mickle. Dale, could you remind us what Alternative 3 is, since it’s not part of the motion?

MR. DIAZ? Alternative 3 is establish a management plan that delegates management authority in federal waters to Mississippi. The scope of the authority to include in the delegation to Mississippi must be defined. If the Mississippi red snapper harvest plan is determined to be inconsistent with the requirements of delegation, the recreational harvest of red snapper in federal waters adjacent to Mississippi would be subject to default federal regulations for red snapper.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Is there further discussion on the motion? Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: I am just going to make a suggestion. Right now, there are two alternatives in there that deal with delegation. One says bag and season and one says undefined, but we just had a motion to add sort of a list, and I guess the way I envisioned it was to not have two delegation alternatives anymore.

We have one delegation alternative with a list of options underneath it, and then the states would pick what they would want delegated, which would include the bag, the season, and whatever else we determine from that list can be delegated, and so it seems like it would be easier to wait until we come back with that new structure, and then the states can pick their preferreds for what types of things they want delegated. Right now, this alternative doesn’t say anything. It just says delegation as to be defined later, and it’s not super helpful.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.
DR. CRABTREE: It does seem a little premature, to me, to select a preferred when the preferred doesn’t define at all what it even is. I tend to agree with Mara. One delegation alternative that lays out what you’re delegating makes a lot more sense, to me.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: I am trying to treat this as clean as I can, because it is confusing, but the Alternative 3 is clearly stated, and this is a separate amendment from the others. It seems that NMFS is really wanting to join all of these, and the State of Mississippi has given a letter requesting its delegation, what delegation is, and I am picking -- I would like this to be the preferred, Alternative 3, and then, the next time the -- Maybe we should change the motion to be an alternative with our letter request.

DR. CRABTREE: Tell us where in the briefing book is the letter, and what tab is it? I am trying to find it.

MR. GREENE: It’s Tab B, Number 6(e).

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Mara, can you clarify one thing for me? Alternative 3 in each of the state documents is the one that, when we come back at the next meeting, you will have a lot of sub-options underneath it of things that the states can pick and choose from?

MS. LEVY: My thought was that we would merge 2 and 3 together. I don’t understand the point of having a Number 2 that delegates two things and a Number 3 that has a list. We should just have one alternative that has the list, and then you pick from that list what you want delegated to your specific state.

I mean, if the intent is to do that in the Mississippi document, and I guess I read, from this motion, that Mississippi would like the preferred to be what’s in the letter, but the thing is that we don’t really have that structured right now, and so it’s hard to vote on it when you don’t have it laid out like that. I mean, you can vote on this, but it just doesn’t really tell you anything until we actually define what’s being delegated.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think that’s okay though. I mean, I guess, the way that I saw this coming back, is you would have all of those sub-options under Alternative 3, when it comes back, based on the letters, individual letters, and so we would have a Preferred Alternative 3 when it comes back, if we vote this up,
and then we will start looking at all the sub-options and decide which ones we want to include in that preferred as preferred sub-options. Ms. Levy.

**MS. LEVY:** That’s fine, as long as there is the understanding that there may be some things in the letter that don’t get under there as options, because they are not delegable, meaning one of the things in the Mississippi letter, and I don’t know if another state had this too, was a delegation to modify the delegation, and so I don’t think we can do that. If we’re going to modify the delegation, the council has to modify it, and so that probably would not be included in the list of options.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I think that was understood in the last motion. Mr. Anson.

**MR. ANSON:** I am getting a little confused here, myself. I thought we just passed a motion, a previous motion, that said that we were going to combine all the letters and then take the elements that passed the IPT and put them in each of the amendments, and so it’s not going to be a reference to a specific letter from a state in your state amendment or anyone else’s, but it’s just going to be a summary of all the state letters that have been submitted, of those items that the IPT reviews and determines are okay, or acceptable, to be included in delegation.

Then that would be under the alternative, and then I agree with Mara in that you’re going to choose some combination of those, and so, if you choose one of the six items, let’s say, that’s some, and so all you’re doing is you’re the same action, or the same process, in Alternative 3, which identifies the range, I guess, or the available delegable items. Then doing the same thing as in Alternative 2.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, eventually, Alternative 2, those couple of things that are listed in Alternative 2 -- Alternative 2 will probably go away and those couple of things are going to be listed as sub-options under Alternative 3. I have Dr. Crabtree and then Mr. Riechers.

**DR. CRABTREE:** Looking at Mississippi’s letter, the only difference that I see between Alternative 2 and Mississippi’s letter is they have added size limit in. Otherwise, it seems to me that it’s Alternative 2 with size limit added.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and, staff, is this the last motion that we voted on? Yes, and so if we could -- I just
wanted to make sure everybody is clear what motion we’re -- It’s the Mississippi plan, right, and so this is the Mississippi state plan, and, in Action 1, to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative, with the understanding that, when this document comes back, when all the state documents come back, Alternative 3 is going to have some sub-options on it, and so we would have some more work to do at that point, and is that right? Am I on the right page? Okay. Mr. Anson.

**MR. ANSON:** Just because I kind of agree with some of the points that were made relative to a preferred on an action item that doesn’t have a lot of meat to it, I am just wondering if -- Paul, do you want to still go with the motion? Do you still want to go forward with the motion? I mean, I will support it, but I just wanted to see if you still wanted to make it the preferred at this time.

**DR. MICKLE:** Yes, I would like to proceed.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Great. Mr. Riechers, and then let’s get to a vote on the Mississippi amendment.

**MR. RIECHERS:** I agree with that. I guess my question is to the states. Are you really going to end up, at the end of the day, not choosing to have as much authority as you can have as you move forward with your plan, when we really see that suite of things? My suspicion is that everyone is going to want, really, all that authority.

What I am hearing is that, and I don’t know if we have it in a future part of the report, and I don’t think we did, was that Alternative 2 is going to go away and we’re going to just be with Alternative 3, or at least that’s what I thought I heard from Mara, in some respects, and, Leann, I will let you correct that, and maybe we need to make that as a motion. Either way, Paul, I am voting for your motion, because it may hurry us along, because that’s the one we’re going to end up wanting in our plans anyhow.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Let me clarify. That was me that said that. That was me looking into the future and seeing, when we get this document back at the next meeting, we’re going to say, hey, it makes sense to just get those two items out of Alternative 2 and put them in as sub-items under Alternative 3. Dr. Mickle, you get the last word.

**DR. MICKLE:** I think it will be a question. Is it cleaner and easier if I ask for a friendly substitute motion, and I’m
asking, and I’m not making it, to make Alternative 2 the preferred, with Mississippi adding the size change delegation ability? Isn’t that accomplishing the exact same thing, but a little bit cleaner, or am I off base?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: How about we vote on this one?

DR. MICKLE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Everybody in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The motion carries. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: We had a second motion to pick a preferred for Action 2. In Action 2, to make Alternative 2, Option 2a, the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion coming up on the board. In Action 2, to make Alternative 2, Option 2a, the preferred alternative. Is that your motion, Mr. Diaz?

MR. DIAZ: Yes, ma’am.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Do we have a second for the motion?

DR. MICKLE: I second it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s seconded. Is there discussion on the motion? Any discussion on the motion? Dr. Mickle.

DR. MICKLE: We are trying to move it along, and I want to pick preferreds, and we want to keep this thing moving, and the for-hire captains have voiced -- I think the accountability and our ability, with our landings system, has been made clear, and so we’re capable of doing this. I don’t think it impacts the other states in any way, and I just want to keep my document moving. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.
Now, let’s go back to Action 1, just for a second. Here is what we’ve got right now. When the document comes back, whatever delegation authorities are approved via the IPT that the states could take over, those are all going to be listed as sub-options under Alternative 3.

Now, Alternative 2 has two options in it that can be delegated to the states. The cleanest thing would be to take those two options, which are seasons and bag limit, and move them into Alternative 3 and get rid of Alternative 2.

**DR. LASSETER:** Basically, the way Alternative 2 is already written up in the document, it includes more than just bag limits and seasons. It says those are the specific things that would be changed in the regulations, but it goes on to discuss that there are other things that the states could do, such as setting regional seasons, and that’s also one of these added delegation items.

Alternative 2 in the document is already broader than that. We added that Alternative 3 based on a motion that was made, that we still needed to flesh out. The way, as staff, I understand your previous motion about adding in the list of items from those letters, those are redundant with what’s already in Alternative 2, and so I would interpret the two motions you’ve made as, by nature, collapsing those alternatives.

Otherwise, you have two alternatives -- You have Alternative 2 doing the exact same thing as Alternative 3, Option 3a, b, and d, and so I understand that already as collapsing them, which is why, now that you have a new preferred Alternative 3, essentially they’re going to both be Alternative 2. Staff understands that perfect. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and there is a lot of nodding of heads. I think we’re all in agreement, and it doesn’t matter what number it comes out to, but we understand that we’re going to have all those sub-alternatives underneath that one alternative. Everybody seems to be pretty clear. All right. Dr. Crabtree.

**DR. CRABTREE:** This is something I am confused about. Paul’s preferred, just chosen, implies that the states management is going to include the for-hire vessels, right, because wasn’t that implicit in 2a? I am trying to figure out where in these documents do we indicate -- It seems, to me, in the overarching document, it says, for a state with an approved management program, the state will choose whether to manage its private
angling component or not.

How does that work? If it’s a delegation, it seems to me, in
the delegation, the council has got to say are you delegating
authority over just the private or over the for-hire, and I’m
not sure how the choice works. How does the state go about
choosing? Are they choosing on an annual basis that they’re
going to choose one way, and they get to choose differently the
next, so we could have the for-hire popping in and out? I think
we need to nail this down a lot more cleanly, and it would seem,
to me, if delegation is where folks want to go, it seems to me
this is part of what is delegated, but I don’t think that’s in
here anywhere.

This is going to be the most controversial part of this, because
we’re going to get this whole battle going again about are they
in or are they out, and then, if we decide that some are in and
some are out, we’re going to have a lot of complexities to
figure out exactly how that works and how we enforce it and
things, and so I’m not sure exactly what the best way to handle
that is, but it seems to be an issue that we need to deal with.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Couldn’t it just be another action in this document?
It would just be another action that states -- It could be in
all documents that states take private rec only, would be a
preferred, and then another option below it would be
charter/for-hire. If you picked both of them as preferreds, you
would get them both. As far as whether they go in or our
yearly, that’s something I hadn’t thought through.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Right now, that decision is made in the
overarching document, correct, Dr. Lasseter? Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: In theory, but, when you look at the document, it
just says the state chooses, and that’s almost like there wasn’t
a decision made, and that is what is bothering me. It seems, to
me, that we have to decide as a council whether we are
delegating it to them or not, and I don’t know how leaving it --
At least we need to specify some process that, when the state
chooses, it means they notify somebody or -- It just seems too
loose, to me. We’re going to get all this feedback over this
from the for-hire guys, and it seems like, the way this is set
up, we never really made a decision about it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.
MR. BANKS: I am fine to add an action in our plan to identify such, to identify which component we want to include in our plan, if that makes it easier, and I’m really looking at staff. Maybe Ava can help us, to see if that’s appropriate, or if something that is already in there specifies it. I do see what Roy is saying. The only way you sort of know that the state wants to manage both of them is through some of these other actions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Let’s give everybody some time to chew on that, and let’s keep making progress. I think it’s clear that we’ll have to do some more work there, but I’m not sure that, right this second, that we’re going to be able to clear up what that work is.

Were there any other motions on the Mississippi amendment? We’re done with Dale’s motions. Okay. Did any other state want to go through their amendments and make some motions? Okay. All right. Chairman Greene, do you want to pick back up?

MR. GREENE: Staff then reviewed the individual state amendments. Staff compiled a list of the management measures included in the states’ responses to the council’s letter regarding expanded delegation and requests guidance on the delegation alternatives.

Update on Implementation of the Generic For-Hire Electronic Reporting Amendment, Dr. Nick Farmer provided an update on the Southeast For-Hire Implementation Team that is tasked with developing the framework to implement electronic reporting in the southeast region.

He emphasized that ACCSP has been selected as the data-housing provider and that the remaining aspects of the program are under active development. The remaining details of the implementation process will be completed in the coming months, but the implementation timeline has not been finalized.

Analysis of Red Grouper Indices of Abundance, the previous red grouper assessment, SEDAR 42, provided indices of abundance through 2013. The SSC representative, Dr. Lorenzen, reviewed a presentation provided to the SSC by National Marine Fisheries Service that updated the indices of abundance through 2016 or 2017, depending upon the index.

The updated indices showed that there was a peak in 2013 and a decline in the indices in the subsequent years, with the indices for 2016 at about half of 2013. It’s possible that the decline
could have been triggered by a red tide event in 2014, but recruitment trends have shown cycles of peaks and valleys since the 1990s.

Without more information that could be provided by a stock assessment, the SSC could make no conclusions about the cause of the decline and had no scientific basis to make any recommendation to the council. Dr. Crabtree noted that, under authority he will be granted when Amendment 36A is implemented, a portion of the commercial IFQ quota could be withheld at the beginning of the year, while awaiting assessment results. The next red grouper assessment will be conducted in 2018, with final results available by February 2019.

Amendment 41, Allocation-Based Management for Federally Permitted Charter Vessels, staff gave an overview presentation of the actions in Amendment 41 and noted current council and AP preferred alternatives. The committee then made the following motions. The committee recommends, and I so move, to add a new Action 5.4, Reclamation of Latent Shares.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Staff is getting the motion up on the board. There we go. To add a new Action 5.4, Reclamation of Latent Shares. Is there any discussion on the committee motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the committee motion? No opposition, and the motion carries. Chairman Greene.

MR. GREENE: The committee noted how setting a share cap in Action 9 would interact with the redistribution of shares in the adaptive management process. The committee then requested that staff prepare some options for X percentage in Alternative 3 of Action 9.

The committee discussed the potential for discrepancies in average fish weights from dockside sampling that would be used for converting pounds to number of fish. The committee then made the following motion. The committee recommends, and I so move, to add a new Action X, Units of Measure for Quota Distribution and Reporting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Dr. Stephen discussed the current Action 4 in Amendment 42, which addresses an endorsement or permit for landings history vessels and the need for a similar action in Amendment 41. The committee then requested that staff draft a
similar action for inclusion in Amendment 41.

The committee discussed their previous selection of a preferred alternative for Action 6, given that Action 6 was not applicable under the current preferred PFQ program. The committee requested staff remove the preferred alternative notation for future drafts, and no objection was raised.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I am going to have some motions for 41 before we leave the document. Here is my rationale for this set of motions. We had a vote to table this amendment, and I understand why folks would like to table it, but I voted not to table it yet, because I really want to see it go to a referendum, so that I can know what the people want.

I voted to keep the document going, and then I was part of the group that sat around and didn’t keep the document going, and that’s embarrassing to all of us, and so, to try to keep the document going and trying to get it to a referendum, I would like to offer some preferreds. **I will start with a motion to select Alternative 5, which is the AP preferred, in Action 3, as the preferred.**

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Staff is getting that on the board. In Action 3, to make Alternative 5 the preferred alternative. All right. Do we have a second for the motion? It’s seconded. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: If we’re going to go through and pick alternatives, I think we need to have the document up, and so I would like to wait for a minute, for at least for me to get my document up and get to it. I think it’s important that we go through these in the document, so we’ll know what the other alternatives are.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: If you don’t want to wait for staff to get to the different sections of the document, it is on our website, in our agenda, and you can load it on your own computer and scroll through it as you please.

MR. BOYD: Patrick, can you tell me what page this is on?

MR. BANKS: I am trying to find that page as we speak. It’s page 32 of the document is Action 3.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.
DR. CRABTREE: I am not sure who on the staff to address it to, but there is -- If you look at Alternative 5, there is the asterisk there, and it says “until 2022”, and I know that’s when sector separation sunsets, but wouldn’t this document, if we approve it and go down this path, sort of keep -- It would keep sector separation in place at that point. Isn’t this really establishing sector separation for the three species that are included in it without a sunset? Maybe Mara knows.

MS. LEVY: I think, if the agency implements this, then you are obviously giving out the shares and allocation to these particular vessels. I think maybe that is at least how I read it, is to note that this percentage of the for-hire quota, or ACL or whatever it is, only applies while sector separation applies. There is no percentage -- The charter vessels don’t have a percentage, necessarily, of a separate for-hire quota if there is no sector separation, but I think you’re right that, once you implement it, then they would.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: As I am recalling, this was some level of confusion in the committee meeting, because this table, in some respects, doesn’t show the preferreds of the option prior, and so I think what your motion is saying, but I am not completely certain, Patrick, is that it’s only applying to red snapper, greater amberjack, and gray triggerfish, based on the previous preferreds. I think that’s what the intent is here. I am not necessarily in agreement with that even, but I think that is what the intent is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I think Mara brought this up, kind of along those lines, in the committee. Again, this does establish sector separation, or continues it, for red snapper, and so it really makes sense here to look at this not only from the for-hire perspective, but also the private anglers, and so these tables need to break down -- This is private anglers, and this is what they would get, and this is what the charter boats would get, and this is what the headboats would get. Then they will have to all come into agreement.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we had that discussion during committee. It was a suggestion that we made to staff, if they could expand that table, and it would make things a little easier, and so maybe, in the next go-around in that draft, we’ll be able to see all of that. Dr. Diagne.
DR. DIAGNE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Perhaps there is a line that is missing from this table, essentially, and I guess more explanation. What it shows is it shows the percentages. The first percentage is a percent of the federal for-hire component, meaning the 42.7 that is allocated to them, because that is what you decided under Amendment 40.

After 2022, presumably, if that goes away, the percentage that is shown below is the percentage of the total recreational ACL. Essentially, that’s the difference, but, as Dr. Crabtree and others have mentioned, these amendments would continue with sector separation, but what changes is the percentage allocated to the component pre-sector separation, I guess during sector separation, and after. Perhaps, at the bottom here, we will make it clearer.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. All right, and so we have a motion on the board. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I am not going to support this motion, Patrick, because I don’t -- For some of the reason that Martha brought up, and I’ve got some conflicts that I haven’t resolved for myself with this one, but I am going to try to help pick some preferreds in the document today, and this is one that I am uncomfortable with, for a couple of different reasons.

There is something else that has been going through my mind on this motion. A few meetings back, we had a lot of fishermen come in here and say to move 41 and 42 at the same pace and keep them similar documents, and we’ve got three species here, and we’ve got five over there.

We’re not keeping them the same, and the rationale for pulling the groupers out, and I understand that from the folks on the west coast of Florida, and I understand why they think that way, but, if you use that rationale, some of these other species are more prominent in certain areas of the Gulf than others, and those people there would have the same argument for those species.

I haven’t come to terms with how to deal with that, and so I’m going to vote against moving a preferred at this time on this motion, but I will support moving some preferreds on some other ones. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any further discussion? Mr. Boyd.
MR. BOYD: I want to ask Dr. Diagne -- Did I understand correctly that this would be, in the case of red snapper, 68.7 percent of the entire recreational, including the private boats? Is that what you said?

DR. DIAGNE: My apologies, and maybe I didn’t say it clearly. Here, what you see is it says percentage of for-hire, and the asterisk says until 2022. As you recall, Amendment 40 did allocate, I believe, 42.7 or so percent of the recreational quota to the federal for-hire component.

41 and 42 are subdividing that allocation between the charter and the headboat, and so this is 68.7 percent of the 42 percent of the federal for-hire quota. The reason why this says until 2022 is because that is, presumably, the expiration of sector separation, but, past that point, the second line would allocate 35.9 percent of the entire recreational quota to the charter/for-hire. There is a similar table in Amendment 42, which gives the shares of the headboats.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: As the seconder, if the maker of the motion -- In the interest of going forward and picking some preferreds, maybe we, unfortunately, started on the most complex one here, and maybe we should withdraw and then just move forward, and hopefully things go a little smoother, and then, in the interim, next time we meet and view this document, we’ll have some of this information available that we might be looking at, or thinking we would benefit from.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Diagne.

DR. DIAGNE: This is one of the actions in the document for which both Amendments 41 and 42, obviously, would have to be in sync. It is the same preferred alternative that needs to be picked, and so, if Mr. Banks, who I believe made the motion, agrees, he can wait until the discussion on 42, and we will put the same table, with the proper footnote, and remake his motion at that time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I will withdraw the motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so the motion has been
withdrawn.  Do you want to move on to your next motion, Mr. Banks?

MR. BANKS:  Sure.  Maybe.  Keeping with that, in Action 4, the AP picked their preferred, and that was to select Alternative 4d in Action 4.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  I hear it’s page 38.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:  It’s page 38 in the document, but you can get confused if you look at the PDF pagination.  It’s page 48 with the PDF.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  Patrick, will you repeat the motion for us, please, so everybody will be onboard here?

MR. BANKS:  In Action 4, a motion to select Alternative 4d as the preferred.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  There we go.  All right.  We have a motion on the board.  Do we have a second for the motion?  We have a second.  Is there discussion on the motion?

MR. BOYD:  I would like to make a substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  All right.  A substitute motion from Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD:  In 2.4, Action 4, I would like to make Alternative 5 the preferred.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  Okay, and so the motion is for Alternative 5 to be the preferred, which is to distribute the charter quota by auction.  All eligible participants are allowed to place bids, and it’s been seconded by Dr. Shipp.

MR. BOYD:  Do you want me to give a little bit of rationale?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:  Yes, sir.

MR. BOYD:  We heard, this morning, or yesterday, and I can’t remember when now, from General Counsel, and they gave us an opinion that anything above a certain level could be put up for auction if the council decided that’s what they wanted to do.  In other words, it’s a policy decision.

This is a policy decision before we ever get to a referendum, and so they would go in knowing exactly what it is.  I am going
to talk about a white paper for rents in a little while, and I was going to do it when it came up, and so this is a little premature, and I didn’t realize we were going to do this right now, and so I’m out of order in the way I was going to do things.

I would like to have an in-depth discussion about what royalties and rents are and how they operate and what the procedures are and how they’re defined and how they’re used across the nation, but I can’t let an alternative be picked as a preferred until we have that discussion, and that’s why I am submitting this as a substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: This is just a difficult issue, as we deal with this as a whole, and I’m going to take a step back just for a moment, and it’s going to be speaking to this particular attempt to pick preferences, but maybe a little broader.

We all know this is a very contentious issue, and we’ve all worked through this, basically, with sector separation being selected almost three years ago, and a lot of people at the mic were saying it had a lot longer history, but the selection was about three years ago.

This has been in process since then, at some level, and I agree with Patrick, to some degree, that we do need to either say and signal that we’re either going forward or we’re not going forward. I may not agree with what that signal should be with everyone around the table, but I think we need to do that, and we need to do that fairly soon.

I am a little concerned, as we go through and pick preferreds, that we’re also signaling things that we may not truly be ready to do, at the end of the day, and I am concerned about that. I have been tossing around an idea, and I’ve tossed it around to a few people, about is there a way that we could step back with this group and move away from kind of where they’ve been headed with this document, and basically a quota distribution system, and you can call it IFQ, or you can call it some other type of quota system, but that’s what it is.

Get back to the original intent of some business flexibility for them, but not basically granting them that quota share in perpetuity, and, while I realize that’s a big step, and I don’t know exactly how we get our arms around that, or how we ask them to get our arms around it, but I think that was, when we started
out this process, some of what we were trying to achieve, and I heard Tom speak to some of it earlier in a motion, if we could maybe take a step back, and there just might be an opportunity to do that.

I know other people feel like they’ve worked on it long enough and they want to go, but I’m just trying to -- I mean, it’s obviously highly contentious, and we’re not making a lot of movement on it, and I am not certain that just picking some preferreds today are going to help us, and I am trying to say that maybe there is a way to step back and look at this a little differently.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Sanchez and then Dr. Crabtree.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. I hear what you are saying, Robin, and I don’t know about the stepping back. It seems like we’ve been stepping back from this for the last three years. We are trying to move forward on it, and there seems to be some sentiment to move forward like a house on fire on the state plans, but then, when it comes to this, to take a step back always. Either it’s the logbook or either it’s -- It’s always something.

We’re just trying to get preferreds, and this system, unlike say a state management system, it has some additional safeguards in, where, at the end of all of this, it’s going to be taken to a referendum. Then we’re going to find out the answer to that age-old question of does this industry really want this or not.

Picking preferreds today, and, in this instance, speaking right to the motion, before it was substituted, 4d was the preferred picked by the AP. I mean, they didn’t arrive at it lightly. They have gone through several AP meetings together and hashed all this out as a whole.

Us wanting to move quickly, I mean, I wouldn’t think three years, or three years and change on this, is moving quickly at all, and it always seems to be kind of the same folks that are saying let’s slow down, let’s slow down, but then let’s go fast in another direction, and so I don’t know.

Let’s do whatever anybody wants to do, but I think it’s time that we kind of do something with this, because this group, unlike other groups, we just went through the whole asterisk of the 2022, and they’re the ones with their backs against the wall. Maybe, if that wasn’t there, maybe there wouldn’t be a rush to have to go through and pick preferreds, because this is moving at a snail’s pace.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha and then Kevin.

MS. GUYAS: I hear what Robin is saying, and I certainly hear the concern about this slowing down. To me, I have a problem with the alternatives in this action, not necessarily because — I don’t know that we need to slow them down, but I just feel like, based on what I have been hearing from people that would be affected by this, these are not going to serve them well.

I mean, they have some legitimate concerns, and I think, if we took a little bit of probably time thinking about these, and then I think there is other things that are coming down the road that are going to make some of these decisions a lot easier, probably, for the council, and they will also make them a lot easier for the industry, where they can be a lot more comfortable with what they’re going to get out of this, but I am hearing a lot of concerns.

I am not prepared to pick a preferred on this one either, and I’m not trying to slow things down for the sake of slowing them down, but I am legitimately concerned about where this is going to leave people.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I am with Martha. We have put a lot of work into this. Staff have put a lot of work into the document, and we’ve put a lot of work into trying to flesh out some of these things and provide some clarity in the different action items, but it’s a complex document, and, based on the lack of discussion that we had during the Reef Fish Committee, that you pointed out, Patrick, there is not probably a lot of comfort level here around this table of picking preferreds, because there is this issue of complexity, and, granted, it may have been a biased sample from the podium yesterday, but, if you were to go down all the people that commented to this, these two different amendments, and that was reflective of what the referendum would be, it would not pass.

Now, would it not pass because of all of the stuff that’s in the various documents they just don’t want to deal with, and they don’t like, or is it because we haven’t picked a preferred and, the various suite of preferreds that we have picked among all the different items, they don’t have a sense to make a value judgment based on that?

I just think we need to step back, as Robin mentioned, and we
need to go back and do some outreach back with our folks at home and get an idea as to where they really fall on these different action items and what their comfort level is. Then, at that point, we can come back, and we will be much more educated as to what direction the majority of the folks that are out there feel about it.

Rather than just doing something to say we’ve done it and check the box and send it to referendum, and I think that’s a waste of time too to everybody, if we just pick preferreds without having really any time for it to be vetted, and it will probably be dead on arrival.

I think we ought to take a step back and maybe set a goal for ourselves as to, within a couple of meetings or something, to be ready to discuss it in more detail and pick preferreds at that time, but I am just not comfortable going through the document here at 3:30 and trying to pick preferreds just to say that we picked preferreds.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: What stage is this document in? Can somebody remind me?

DR. DIAGNE: This is a draft document. We are working our way towards the next step.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is it a public hearing draft?

DR. DIAGNE: No, it’s just a draft, because, in a public hearing draft, we will have a full analysis in Chapter 4, but, because actions and alternatives are still being added, we cannot really proceed to that stage yet.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: In order to go out and get the public’s input on what they want, we really need to pick preferreds, and then we take it out to public hearings, and we let them tell us that I don’t really like that, because of this and this and this, and then we come back in and we look at it, and we make changes, and maybe we pick different preferreds, and then we send it out to referendum. Then we really find out what they want, but, if we sit here at every meeting and never pick preferreds, we certainly won’t find out what they want, if we don’t get the document to a point where we can take it to them and ask them if they like it.

We have a motion on the board, and a lot of the discussion -- We’ve got to keep it towards the auction. That’s motion on the board right now. We have the substitute motion to distribute
the charter quota by auction. All eligible participants are allowed to place bids. Dr. Crabtree.

**DR. CRABTREE:** I know the statute says that we have to consider auctions and royalties, but it also tells us that we have to do a number of other things, and I have a difficult time seeing how we meet the test of the statute if we auction it all off, and so, Doug, since it’s your motion, I would ask you to explain to me how auctioning it all off ensures that the initial allocation is fair and equitable and how it ensures consideration of current and historical harvest and how it ensures that it considers investments in and dependence upon the fishery and how it would ensure current and historical participation of fishing communities. Explain to me how just auctioning it all off makes sure that all of those things will happen, because the statute requires that in the initial allocation.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Boyd.

**MR. BOYD:** I think that’s part of the discussion we’ll have when we get further into the document, because it’s in 41 and 42.

**DR. CRABTREE:** Okay, but shouldn’t we understand how an alternative meets the requirements of the statute before we select as a preferred?

**MR. BOYD:** Well, like I said a minute ago, I am sorry that we’re into picking preferreds like this, because I was going to submit a motion to explain royalties and rents to us, so we get an understanding of exactly what it is and how it operates and where it’s being used in the United States, and I will do that later.

Madam Chairman, I have heard around the table that there is some discussion about we should postpone taking any action on preferreds. If the maker of the motion would like to postpone, I would be happy to withdraw my motion, if he is planning on postponing picking preferreds.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** No, we’re going to vote on this motion. I am ready to move on. Dr. Crabtree.

**DR. CRABTREE:** I just want to say that I -- In theory, I don’t disagree at all with auctions, and I actually think some of the quotas in limited access programs probably ought to be auctioned off periodically, but I have a difficult time seeing how we ensure all the things we’re required to do happen if, at the initial allocation, we just auction it all off. That, to me,
seems to go too far.

If you auctioned off some of it, and then you gave some of it out based on historical participation, dependence on the fishery, and all of those things, I could see how then you could argue that you had met the test, but it seems to me, if you just do it by an auction, you really don’t know who is going to get all the quota and where it’s going to go and how it’s going to affect fishing communities, and that seems, to me to be somewhat problematic.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a substitute motion on the board. I will throw my two-cents in before we vote, real quick. I heard a lot of public comment on auctions last night, and it kind of made sense to me that the person with the most money is going to be the one that gets that quota, and so some people think we have issues with consolidation in the commercial catch share program, and I feel like, if you go down this route, that would take the commercial and just totally exacerbate the problem that some people think we have there. You are definitely going to pick some winners and losers, and the people with the most money are going to be the winners.

All right. Let’s vote on the motion. **All those in favor of Alternative 5 being the preferred alternative, to distribute the charter quota by auction, signify by raising your hand.**

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Five.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ten. The motion fails five to ten.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so that brings us back to the original motion. That was, in Action 4, to make Alternative 4, Option d, the preferred. Alternative 4 is distribute the charter quota based on equal distribution, passenger capacity, and historical landings by region, using one of the following, and Option 4d would be the preferred, which is a 25 percent for equal distribution, 25 percent for passenger capacity, and 50 percent historical landings by region. **All those in favor, signify by raising your hand.**

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Eight.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Eight.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It’s a tie, and the motion fails. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Again, I want to reach out to Patrick a little bit and say I appreciate your motivation. I really do, and I also said earlier that I realize the people around the table here are relatively uncomfortable with making these decisions, and I am not a huge fan of necessarily postponing these, but what I am wondering is, rather than postpone them, can we just -- I am questioning here whether or not we can make an action to put this, very explicitly, on the agenda for the next meeting, to pick preferreds, rather than just saying that we’re going to discuss Amendment 41 and 42.

That way, people should come into the next council meeting very prepared and not with all this confusion. They have got a job to do, and it shouldn’t be a surprise to anybody, and we should be able to have a very constructive discussion and move effectively through the process. That’s my preference, if we could do that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: That would work for me, if we could set some time certain, and obviously, if this is any barometer, set an adequate amount of time, and let’s get into this. I mean, if not, we’re just going to keep kicking the can until the cows come home, and that doesn’t seem right to the public either, and so that would work for me. I could support that approach.


MS. GUYAS: Way back in time, when we were talking about -- I think it was this amendment and not 42, but there was a discussion about kind of a decision tool, where you could see, based on allocations and how we distribute quota, where people kind of end up, and I would love to see something like that before we’re going down and picking preferred alternatives.

I think people need to understand what they’re getting into, because I don’t know that we have that really right now, or at least one that we can manipulate and play with. That is something that I would like to see before we seriously go down this road and start pushing these amendments.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Maybe staff has a way to do that, but, in my mind, we have nothing to judge it by. I mean, we could probably take the fleets and calculate the percentage based on say 4d or whatever, but we don’t have any historical landings to say if they would be increasing or decreasing their catch.

MS. GUYAS: Right, and so people would have to kind of do the math for themselves, but say, okay, the quota for 2018 is this. If we end up with this allocation, which would break it out this much for the charter boats, and then we end up dividing that among the boats, using this formula, people can kind of do the math and be like, okay, and so this is probably what I would get, under this scenario today, and then they can compare that. They know, relatively, if it’s going to work for them or not, and so that is something that I would like to see for this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I have a whole list of people, and so we’re going to go to Dr. Freeman.

DR. MATT FREEMAN: Dr. Stephen had initially prepared a tool for red snapper, and she was in the process of working on it last fall for the additional species, and a little bit of that got delayed, with Irma and other issues, but I can speak with her and see what stage she’s at with that and when she would be ready to present that to the council.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sounds good. Next, I have Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I wasn’t voting against 4d. I was voting against choosing something when I had no clue, and maybe it’s just me, but what really the effects of all these different options are, and it would be presumptuous for me to try to make a choice when I don’t know what I am making a choice on, and so that’s my dilemma. How do I get my hands around what 4d really means and what 4c really means?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any further comments? Mr. Riechers and then Mr. Sanchez.

MR. RIECHERS: John, I will go back to your comments about being ready to go, and I think we are ready to go, and I would say, on this one, I share Martha’s, but there should be an equal distribution column that has here is what you get, based on this number of vessels, and there should be then the various passenger capacities that then say here is what you get, and then the historical landings by region, and I’m assuming they’re doing region by state here, and here is what you get. Then
there should be a poundage that gives each of those people the
alternative to see what they are going to get.

I am going to go back to the bigger comment, because, John, I
appreciate your sentiments, and, again, we’re just on different
sides of this fence, and I always appreciate your comments, but
I am going to try again, because I’m going to say, while I know
you want to go forward with this document, I think there is a
lot of us, from a policy perspective, that just aren’t seeing
that this is the tool that we need to go forward with.

I am still trying to work at what is the tool that gives them
the flexibility that they want. Sector separation helped,
because it got them days and a longer season, but is there
another tool, other than the tools we have in here, where we
could add an alternative and we could think about a different
way or approach to do this, that still basically gets us away
from a nine-to-eight vote on Action 1, which is where we will
start the next meeting, as to where there is no action or
whether we move forward.

I don’t know the answer to that, and I’m just trying to say, is
there a way to pull back and really talk to people and see if
there is an approach that may get us to where we want to go, but
not create this -- Basically, it’s an IFQ system. It’s a
further privatization of these resources, on multiple species,
and, when we started contemplating this, it wasn’t even that,
and so, like I said, I throw it out there, and it’s an olive
branch. I am trying to work here, and I’m trying to figure out
a way.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: To Robin’s point, I mean, after sector separation
passed, I talked several times about traditional management
measures, and that really kind of fell flat, but that’s what I
had thought might be a good first step.

It’s something easy that we could have done a long time ago if
charter fishermen wanted it, and I know there is only a few
things that you can look at there, but, still, if they were
willing to go to one fish, that gets you 42 percent more fish,
and the split seasons got them a few more days, and I think
there might have been one other thing that had a small increase,
but there were a few options there, but that’s enough. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. So, we’re going to bring back a
decision tool, or ask Dr. Stephen if she can bring that back, and there will obviously be a lot of different decisions in that tool that will have to be answered to see what you get. Then I think another thing that might help too is, when this is on the agenda at the next meeting, to have it so that we go through 42 first. Do you see what I’m saying?

42 is the one that is more streamlined, and I think, if we can wrap our heads around some things in 42, and then get to the more complicated one, which is 41, that may be helpful, too, and so we’ll try and do that. All right. Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Robin, one of the things that you need to understand is that, in the front of this document, which I just go through reading some of it, it says the preferred selected method is a PFQ program and not an IFQ, which, as you understand, is the permit program, which is a little different, the way it’s handled and the way it comes out.

There are a couple of preferred options already chosen in the document, and why we can’t come to terms with some of these other preferreds that we are positioned here to make choices, and waiting on other people to make those choices before we get here is just absolutely absurd.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. John, did you have one more comment? Then we will let Johnny carry on with his report.

MR. SANCHEZ: I don’t want to beat the cat. It’s flat. I just kind of want to say that I appreciate us being on different sides of this and being able to disagree without becoming completely disagreeable.

That said, I also appreciate everybody’s sentiment to try to come back with a willingness to try to look at this, maybe with some of the information that might help foster a little more willingness to move forward on some of this, albeit it’s not going to be palatable to everybody, but we didn’t arrive at these things haphazardly, and, while we’re looking at data, and it will be more challenging for 41, without historical landings, but I don’t think 42 would be as challenging.

I think we have the logbook program, the headboat program, where you can benefit from some of that, and we can figure out some of those. If we do this, it results in that, and all of that, and so I think we can look at some items going forward, and I appreciate the willingness to do that.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Chairman Greene.

MR. GREENE: I have a question for Roy or Mara or whoever. If we go down this path of exempted fishing permits, in the past, one of the hurdles we have always wrangled with has been the 407(d) part of Magnuson that says, when we reach a quota, we have to shut the fishery down. Is that still going to be the deal now, I mean being that we’re looking at a multi-EFP system for the recreational system?

DR. CRABTREE: Absolutely. That’s the law of the land, and, if we had everything that showed the quota had been caught, EFP or no EFP, the law would require us to shut everybody down.

MR. GREENE: In essence, that may very well come into a hindrance with the five states trying to manage their fishery as they see fit. If you have a fishery that’s constituted early in the year, they are certainly going to benefit, but, the fishery that’s going to be constituted later in the year, going into it knowing that they could be shut down early, because the quota has been projected to be met, and am I correct?

DR. CRABTREE: It’s conceivable that if one state just blew the quota of the water completely, and went over by millions, and if they had a real-time -- Let’s say it was Patrick, for example. Because they have a relatively real-time quota system, we had the landings data that said all the quota has already been caught, and I don’t know how we would have an alternative but to shut it down.

Now, I know my good friend, Mr. Banks, wouldn’t let that happen, but, in theory, that could happen, but recall that was a big concern when we went into sector separation, that it wouldn’t work because of 407(d), and there was all of this, but the reality was that that’s never really been a -- It has never really interfered in the success of sector separation, and so it’s still there, until Congress removes it, but I don’t know that that means the EFPs aren’t going to work out fine.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: It sounds like folks are willing to commit to coming back in the near future to pick this back up and attempt to move forward with the document. In light of Dr. Crabtree’s comments regarding auction that Mr. Boyd provided in his motion relative to Alternative 5, I am wondering -- Maybe Doug can do his homework too, in the meantime, and is Alternative 5 a viable alternative, based on all of the requirements that you mentioned
that auctions have to pass through?

I mean, does there need to be a lot of the things in Alternative 5 that help address those items, or is it not even a viable alternative, as it stands, without much more information?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I’m not going to say it’s not a viable alternative right now, but it would be much easier for me to see how we would meet these tests if, for example, 60 percent or 50 percent of the quota went out based on historical participation and those kinds of things and then some other amount of quota was auctioned off periodically.

My issue with it, and how I have a hard time seeing how it meets the other requirements, is because -- It seems to me, in this alternative, that all of it would be auctioned out, and then it seems like just the people with the deepest pockets get it all. I don’t know how then we could be sure that we achieved all of these other things. It seems more viable, to me, if it was in combination with something else.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Doug, I would like to take a break and then pick back up, but go ahead.

MR. BOYD: Thank you. It’s to that point. Roy, I agree with you. We’ve gone through these documents, and no one, staff or council, has addressed rents or royalties. Nobody has put an A, B, C, D down there, like you’re talking about.

We have asked for a full suite of alternatives, and we don’t have it here, and so I will commit to you to work up a suite of options for the rents, and I will work with staff, to the point that they will work with me on this, and we’ll have several alternative options at the next meeting for 41 and 42 in rents and royalties.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Diagne.

DR. DIAGNE: Thank you, Madam Chair. If I may, both amendments, 41 and 42, include a suite of options detailing percentages for auctions. I am looking, for example, at 42, and Dr. Freeman can give you that, and we have auctions starting from zero, 25, 50, 75, and 100 percent. It is in both documents, and those will be analyzed, as well as equal distribution and the proportional based on catch histories for 42. Of course, in 41, they don’t have that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for the clarification, Dr. Diagne.
All right. Chairman Greene would like to take a short break, and I think I concur with him, and so let’s take a fifteen-minute break and we’ll come back, and so four o’clock. At four o’clock, come on back.

(whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are going to pick back up with the committee report and get us out of here before five o’clock, I hope.

MR. GREENE: Reef Fish Management for Headboat Survey Vessels, staff gave a presentation on the management actions and alternatives included in the amendment. The presentation highlighted the revisions requested by the council during the October meeting. Committee members noted that the council could select preferred alternatives during Full Council.

National Marine Fisheries Service Response Regarding Referendum Requirements for Auctions, Dr. Crabtree informed the committee that NOAA General Counsel has determined that a referendum would not be required to consider the distribution of red snapper IFQ shares above 4.65 million pounds through an auction. Dr. Crabtree will provide a letter to the council including this determination.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. This the point that I was talking about a while ago that I would have hoped that we got to here before we started picking preferreds. I think I have already introduced this, but we talked about the possibility, now that we can look at rents and royalties, and that we have had a ruling that says that, above that particular level in the initial IFQ, we could look at it.

What I would like to do -- Several of the council members last time, when we started talking about this, said basically we haven’t ever really studied rents and auctions and we don’t know what it’s all about, and we don’t know what the ramifications are, and so I have a motion that I would like to present, and I will read it.

I move that council instruct staff to start a white paper exploring rents and royalties in the Gulf commercial red snapper fishery for allocation above 4.56 million pounds. The white paper should include, but not be limited to, a definition of rents and royalties, examples of rents, of resource rents, rent
collections in the other public resources, a calculation of Gulf red snapper rent and royalties value, alternative methods of rents and royalties, collection and alternative methods for redistribution of shares.

I tried to do exactly what Dr. Diagne said a while ago, and I tried to give him the charge of what we’re looking for, and I tried to give him some specifics about what we would like to have in it, but not limit it, so we could understand more about what rents and auctions are.

I very purposely said white paper, because I think we have to understand what this is, and we have to be more educated on it before we go any further, to do any kind of an options paper or scoping document or anything else. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Do we have a second for the motion? It’s seconded by Dr. Shipp. All right. Is there discussion on the motion? Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Doug, I am just curious. What is the significance of 4.56 million pounds?

MR. BOYD: The original allocation plus a little bit. I have been told that the original allocation was lower than this, but we’ve always used, since I’ve been on the council, 9.12 million pounds as the initial allocation. That’s the number that’s been thrown around again and again and again.

I understand, from staff, that it was a little bit less than that, but I picked 9.12 because I wanted to be above the initial allocation when we asked for the opinion. I didn’t want there to be any confusion about we were trying to get into the original allocation or get really close to it, and so I wanted a buffer in there, basically, so that when we got an opinion, it was a pure opinion and not clouded by anything that had to do with the original allocation. This 4.56 is half of the 9.12, and that is the number that was in the opinion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is there further discussion? I have a question. What is the very last part of the motion? How is that germane to rents and royalties, alternative methods for redistribution of shares?

MR. BOYD: Well, in one of these documents, we talk about redistribution of shares. We talked about it in several of APs, in the charter/for-hire industry, and using a cyclical reallocation over time to redistribute shares. Then we talk
about the quota bank that could be established by shares that are latent or have not been used, and they could be redistributed. I included it in here so that we could look at it.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** But I don’t understand how it connects to rents and royalties is what I am saying. If this is a white paper on rents and royalties --

**MR. BOYD:** I think the simplest answer to that is, if you have a million pounds of allocation that are not being fished right now, that are in latent permits, if it was decided by the council that that million pounds goes back into a quota bank, how do you distribute that? You could distribute it auction, or you could distribute it by giving it to somebody, or you could distribute it by a random drawing, or you could do all kinds of things, and so I think it lends itself to rents and royalties.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** It seems like two totally different subjects. We should define rents and royalties and explore that, and then, if you want to talk about latent permits at some point or looking at shares and how we originally distributed them and then redistributing, I mean, that’s kind of a whole other topic, to me.

**MR. BOYD:** Well, I didn’t -- That’s why I didn’t include any discussion of any amendment in here. All I did was talk about the possibility of redistribution in any form.

**MS. LEVY:** Just a question. I think, in 36B right now, there is an action that some of these sort of concepts in it about doing a redistribution of a certain amount, like you were talking about the quota bank and different ways, and I don’t think we included an auction, for the obvious reason at the time, and so what you’re saying is maybe take some of those concepts from that and include it in this type of white paper thing.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mara.

**MR. BANKS:** In my opinion on this, while I can understand where Doug is going in looking at things like this, this is another attempt to take our attention away from the problem at hand. The problem at hand is managing -- Doing a better job to help the recreational sector, and this takes our attention away from that and makes the staff spend time on something that is on a system that’s working very well.
Yes, maybe it needs to be tweaked, and maybe we would like to see options, but the commercial red snapper fishery is working, from a management perspective, and I can’t vote for this, because it takes our attention away from the needs at hand.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: To that point, anything we do takes our attention away from something else, anything we do, because we’ve got a lot on our plate. This is coming at a time when we have a ruling from the NOAA attorneys, and it’s perfectly in line to look at this, and so I guess you vote against this if you don’t want to gain information and be educated about the topic.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I don’t so much object to doing this, but Patrick has a point. I mean, at some point, we’ve got to tell staff that let’s work on these priorities. We can’t work on all of this simultaneously.

We need to finish a few things, and we’ve got all these amendments that are just dragging on for years, but we don’t seem to be able to make a decision one way or another and move on to the next one, and so we end up expending all our time at these meetings rehashing all of this stuff, but we don’t really get anywhere.

I don’t mind looking at this, Doug, but I think, right now, we’ve piled so much on staff that they’re really not going to be able to get to this by the next meeting, because we’ve got a -- I don’t know when they’re going to get to it, but I suspect we’ve got a -- We’re going to do reallocation of red snapper, and so you want that before this or after that, but we can’t do everything at once, and we’re just about out of time today, and so I don’t guess we can get into the priorities, but we need to decide what are our priorities and then finish some things, so we can get to some of these other things.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Shipp and then Mr. Sanchez.

DR. SHIPP: Just a comment. The fact that it’s a white paper really doesn’t detract significantly from other activities. That is something that Assane could knock out in a day or two, and it is an issue that we’re going to be facing further down the line, and so I just don’t see the rationale for avoiding it.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I guess, if we’re going to look at this, in the interest of white paper and look at it, we should also add to that to look and see what this would do to the effect -- How it would affect consumer prices for red snapper.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Doug, just what do you hope to get out of it that is going to help us work on this management document that we have for snapper? I mean, just what is it going to do to help us make the decisions on things like the rationale for dividing up the snapper and so forth amongst the charter boats? I am just trying to understand where is the white paper going to help us. Thank you.

MR. BOYD: Well, hopefully, it would be informational enough to educate you what rents are and how they’re operating in the United States now and what the value of a red snapper share would be at an auction or if it was a royalty. This is an education process.

I would say to you that part of the reason that we need this is because we have the possibility, and we saw it a while ago, that a preferred could be some type of a rent or an auction, and, if you want to make a good decision in one of these documents, 41 or 42, and you have no knowledge of it, you can’t make a good decision, and so I would say that we need an education, and we heard that around the table last time. People said -- Two or three times, people said, well, I don’t know that much about that, and I would like to know more about that, and that’s what this motion is trying to get at.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion? We have a motion on the board. Doug read it into the record, and we have a second. All those in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Eleven.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Five.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The motion carries. Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Just while we’re on the topic, for clarity and for
accuracy, potentially, Doug made the comment that he used the 4.56 because it was referenced in the summary determination that Dr. Crabtree went over, but it’s 4.65 in the report, and so I just wanted to make sure which number is correct, or are they both correct, as they are now?

MR. BOYD: I used that number because it was half of the 9.12. I want to use the number that was in the report back from the attorneys, whatever that number is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So 4.65.

MR. BOYD: Then we need to change that to 4.65.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, because it’s 51/49.

MR. BOYD: I was already doing a reallocation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I could tell, and that’s why I said it was 51/49. All right. Is there anything else before Chairman Greene carries on? All right. Chairman Greene, go ahead.

MR. GREENE: SSC Summary Reports, Dr. Lorenzen summarized SSC activities that were not reviewed under other agenda items. A summary of the items discussed is provided in the Reef Fish Committee Report, which I am not going to read, but it is in there for you.

Which brings us to our next item, which is Presentation on Greater Amberjack Commercial Fishing Year and Trip Limits, and Recreational Vessel Limits and Split Quotas. Staff presented the potential options to modify recreational and commercial management measures for greater amberjack, reviewed recent management actions, and summarized analyses completed for four potential alternatives that were requested at the October 2017 meeting.

Staff described options to modify recreational bag limits, implement a recreational split quota, and measures to modify the commercial fishing year and trip limits. The committee discussed the merits of these options and directed staff to continue developing these management actions for review at a future meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I know it’s late in the day, but, Dr. Crabtree, I want to ask you a question. Several people at the public
comments yesterday brought up an idea that I thought was a pretty good idea. They were talking about split seasons and assigning some percentage to each season, and then, if there was an overrun in that particular part of the split season, then, the following year, the payback would come off of that section, and so, if the fall had 60 percent, and they caught over that 60 percent, that would be paid back the next fall, instead of the next spring. I just wanted to get your thoughts about if that was something that maybe we could work on and if you thought that was doable. Thanks you, Madam Chair.

DR. CRABTREE: I cannot think of any reason why you couldn’t do it that way. It would just be a change to how the accountability measures work, but I don’t see why you couldn’t do that.

MR. DIAZ: Is it good enough, at this point, to just ask the staff to include that in the document, or does that require a motion?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, we didn’t pass motions in another situation, and we do this with amberjack every time. We didn’t pass motions in committee on exactly what we wanted to see in the document, and we were fairly flexible.

I think the only thing that I mentioned was not seeing a change in the opening date of the commercial season unless we heard something in testimony that spoke otherwise, and I didn’t really hear anybody get up, and you all correct me if I’m not remembering correctly, but I didn’t hear anybody get up and say, yes, we really need to change the opening date of the commercial season, but, other than that, I think we were open to all the other items that had been presented to us going into the document. I see some hands. Let me make sure I’m correct. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I think that’s accurate, and I didn’t hear much about the commercial fishing year yesterday, but I did hear a lot about the recreational, and I guess it’s probably worth noting that, since that’s a proposed rule that’s out there right now, that people can comment to the Fisheries Service, potentially, on that, if that is something that they have an issue with. That is kind of the stage we’re at. The council has kind of passed that on.

I like the idea of looking at accountability measures as part of the split season thing, if that’s what we want to look at, and so, if we need a motion to formalize that we want to work on all
of these things, let’s put one together, but, if we feel like we’ve got that covered, then that’s okay, too.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: If there is no objection to looking at that, putting it in as an alternative to do it that way, versus taking it off the top, we can do that. I think that’s clear, from the discussion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Sanchez, you had your hand up.

MR. SANCHEZ: Just I guess I want to be clear. I heard a couple of things during testimony. Some folks threw out some different start dates for seasons and concerns with moving the calendar year from where it was to what we’ve done recently. Will all of these things be considered without, at four o’clock on a Thursday, getting into making motions and all of that? Will that be looked at, all these -- I can be more specific, if you want me to.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think you’re speaking to the opening date for the recreational sector.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I would discourage you from revisiting the recreational fishing year. We haven’t even implemented the last change you made to it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I don’t know what you’re looking for, as far as direction and a motion, but there were a few people that talked specifically to the commercial trip limits, and the 500 pounds seemed to get the most votes, if you will, or notice, during the four or five people that commented, as I recall. That would be something that we might want to look at, is the varying trip limit levels.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and I think that was mentioned in committee, too. I think the only thing we said that we didn’t want to look at in committee was the opening date for the commercial side, but everything else should be there. John, don’t muddy the waters, but go ahead.

DR. FROESCHKE: I am trying to clear them up. In the
presentation, we discussed four actions of fractional bag limits on the recreational side and then the commercial trip limits and the fishing year and then there was one other one of split seasons. You have mentioned getting rid of the commercial fishing year, and then so you want us to bring a document with the other three actions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We want a document with everything you talked to us about except changing the commercial fishing year.

DR. FROESCHKE: Yes, and so that’s three actions. I guess the one thing I would like some guidance on is, if you were to look at fractional bag limits, that would extend the season. What the decision tool suggests now is there is enough fish to cover the season as it would be implemented in August through October and May. If we went to less than one per person, theoretically, we wouldn’t catch the quota. Would we just look at it or -- I am trying to think about how that might work.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I think it probably would make sense to look at that somewhat and maybe figure out, if we have more days, where we would add them on the calendar. Maybe we end up in a situation where the season gets projected every year or something. The other thing to add to your list that Dale brought up would be the accountability measures.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any further feedback for Dr. Froeschke? Are you good, John? All right. Thank you, sir. Go ahead, Chairman Greene.

MR. GREENE: Other Business, Historical Captain Charter Vessel/Headboat Reef Fish Permits, when the for-hire vessel permit moratorium was created, a historical captain endorsement was also created for captains who were long-time participants, but did not own the boats they operated.

There are currently thirty-two reef fish for-hire permits with historical captain endorsements. A committee member asked the council to consider converting these endorsements to fully transferable for-hire vessel permits, in order to allow the operator greater flexibility. Staff noted that there are similar endorsements for coastal migratory pelagic vessel permits.

The committee, recommends and I so move, to instruct staff to begin development of an action in the appropriate document that
considers removing the historical captain endorsement to reef fish and CMP permits and allow those permits to be fully transferable.

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

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you. Dr. Crabtree, did you say, earlier in our meeting, that, if those permits were issued, that they would be six-pack permits?

DR. CRABTREE: That will be up to the council to decide. My understanding was that the historical captain permits didn’t have passenger capacities on them, and I have since heard different from that, and so I’m not sure if they do or not. If they do have passenger capacities, you could issue them permits with whatever passenger capacity they have, and so I am going to have to -- We’re going to have to look into that and see.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: To that point, Roy, I was surprised. There were some large capacities, like seventy-five and stuff like that. Were those relief captains on overnight boats?

DR. CRABTREE: We’re just going to have to look into it. This isn’t anything that I came prepared to look at. It just came up at this meeting. We can do it, but it is a different situation if you’re issuing really high-capacity permits. Number one, that brings a lot of new capacity, and, number two, they’re worth a lot of money, and so we’re just going to have to look at it and see what the distribution is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I am breaking my own rule. I swore I wasn’t going to speak again. However, to Mr. Matens’ point, these guys are already running these boats. There is not going to be any new added pressure to the fishery. These are just simply granting them.

I think, if they are currently operating a vessel that has a seventeen-passenger capacity, perhaps we should look at a way that they could declare or prove that over the last several number of years, that they have been operating a vessel of this size, and we should let them go, because that vessel has participated in the recent landings history, and all that stuff will be there, and it’s not going to be any change.
Now, the one thing that I would not want to have happen is for someone to think, well, whatever, and they run out and buy a giant boat and change that landings history, but, in the context, I don’t think there is going to be any problem.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I have a motion on the board. Any other discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Chairman Greene.

MR. GREENE: Other Business, Red Snapper Research Review Off of Alabama, Kevin Anson notified the committee that the Alabama Department of Marine Resources will be hosting a workshop to review red snapper research conducted off Alabama during the last ten years. The workshop will be held on March 22 in Mobile. If anyone is interested but cannot make it in person, the meeting will be streamed over the internet by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Just one editorial in that last paragraph, under Other Business. It’s the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Marine Resources is just a division within the department, and so Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. That is going to bring us to our Spiny Lobster Committee Report.

SPINY LOBSTER COMMITTEE REPORT

MS. GUYAS: Staff reviewed the landings summary for spiny lobster. The spiny lobster fishery exceeded the ACT in the 2016/2017 fishing season. In June 2017, the council had approved Regulatory Amendment 4, which would increase the ACT to 8.64 million pounds. Thus, the committee and NMFS felt that a review panel at this time was unnecessary.

Joint Draft Options Spiny Lobster Amendment 13, staff reviewed the actions and alternatives in Spiny Lobster Amendment 13. There were several items that staff will need to address in the public hearing draft. In Action 1, staff will reword the alternative so that it is clear that a bully net gear endorsement from Florida is required and not a separate federal endorsement.
In Action 3, there was discussion on the length of time that a degradable panel would take to degrade. It was clarified that the length of time is dependent on location and ocean conditions, but it was within the range of one to two years.

There was concern on the need for Action 4 in federal waters, and noted that the wording of the alternative would need to be specific to the EEZ off Florida. The committee discussed the procedure outlined in Action 5, and staff will amend the language, as recommended by FWC and NOAA GC. Staff will also possibly amend the timeline to be more consistent with the federal rulemaking process, if necessary.

The committee was provided the LETC comments, which indicated it approved of making state and federal regulations consistent. Staff intends to bring the revised options paper with the three new actions to the Spring LETC for comment before the April council meeting.

Lastly, the committee discussed the timeline of the document, and determined that a webinar and video will be sufficient for public hearings, since the document would be discussed at the June council meeting in Key West. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I like it. Supporting Agency Reports, we have already had our Coast Guard, and Charlie gave us an update before he left. Dave, do you have anything for us, sir?

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATES (CONTINUED)
GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MR. DONALDSON: Just a couple of notes. Our spring commission meeting is scheduled for March 13 through 15 in Panama City Beach, Florida. You can go to our website and get details. As always, everyone is welcome to come attend.

In terms of aquaculture, we went through our second round of oyster aquaculture projects, and we funded seven projects, totaling about $375,000, and we’re in the process of getting those out the door and work beginning on those. At our spring meeting, our first round of projects, they are going to come and present the results, which will be part of our commission meeting in March.

Then we’re also -- This year, NOAA Fisheries provided some money to the three interstate commissions for regional pilot projects, and the RFP was out on the street, and it actually closes today,
in about thirty-five minutes, and this is focusing more on offshore aquaculture. We have received nine projects so far, and probably maybe a few more since I have talked to staff this morning, but there are several that have focused on finfish, including cobia and Atlantic croaker, and also Caribbean king crab, which I didn’t realize was a real thing, and I had to Google that.

The aquaculture EFP folks also submitted a project. I was informed, this afternoon, that they submitted a project as well, and so I will -- The letter, I will make sure that our reviewers are aware of the concerns from the council.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: You said offshore. Is this going to be in state waters or in federal waters?

MR. DONALDSON: It’s focused on federal, but it’s going to be offshore waters. We are not focusing on inshore and oysters and things like that, although we did receive several oyster projects.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I was just curious. Are these going to be more EFPs, if there is permitting process in federal waters in place yet? I am just wondering how they interact.

MR. DONALDSON: I am not quite sure. I mean, if they are actually doing real projects, in-the-water projects, they’re going to have to get the appropriate permits for either offshore or inshore, and so the state or federal permits, and so that will be part of the whole process and evaluation of those projects.

Then, lastly, some good news. Biosampling, we received some -- We are going to receive some funding through NOAA Fisheries. That will be available in 2018, and the problem is the timing on that, but we’re going to be able to reinstate recreational biosampling.

Each of the states will receive funding to do this, and we’ll collect the biological, otoliths and whatnot, from the recreational fishery, which is very important to assessments, and, unfortunately, we were unable to do that in the past year, but we are going to be able to reinstate that, and so that concludes my report, and I will answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Any questions for Dave? Mr. Constant, did you have anything else that you wanted to update us on, sir?
MR. CONSTANT: No, Madam Chair. I’m good.

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so that brings us to Other Business, and I only had one thing under Other Business, and it’s really quick. It’s just for me to vent a little frustration.

You know we have electronic logbooks in the shrimp fishery, and I went ahead and told Dr. Porch, before he left, because this really kind of falls on his plate, but, about a year or two, or maybe three years now, we changed that system, and we changed the hardware, and so it’s a whole different set of hardware than what we used to have, and we are having hell out of that hardware.

The maintenance and upkeep is -- I mean, we are constantly having to replace antennas and mail modems back to Galveston, to try and troubleshoot what’s wrong with them, and then they’re mailing them back to us, and it’s getting -- Of course, you know, if it’s not functioning, then we can’t renew our permit, if it happens to fall during permit renewal time, and so it’s really causing a lot of headaches for the fleet.

My understanding was that that system was changed to this new hardware because it would be a more timely distribution of the data to NMFS, but, at this point, I am not sure if that’s really being accomplished. The old system worked well, and we very rarely had any maintenance issues out of it, and it just wasn’t all that timely, but you did get the data, and so, if we could work on that somehow. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: We will look at it. Part of the reason for the switch in the system was we didn’t have the money to continue with the old system, because this one was supposed to be more cost-efficient, from the agency’s perspective, and not necessarily from the industry’s perspective, but that’s a good issue to bring up with the new Science Center Director, and my hope is that, by the April meeting, we will have one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The cost of their FedEx bill at this point may be outweighing the cost of the old program, and so hopefully we can take a look at it.

DR. CRABTREE: We’ll see, but I have one thing, real quick.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

DR. CRABTREE: We have worked on some draft hurricane impact studies, and we have worked with Texas Parks and Wildlife and with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission. We have one for Hurricane Harvey and one for Hurricane Irma, and I expect those will be available very soon, if you are interested.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: They had sent me that note this week, and we’re kind of in the process of reviewing it, but I think he’s right that it will probably post next week, and thank you for those efforts on that. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I don’t know if Dr. Crabtree can answer this question, or any other members around the council table, but I am wondering what the status is, through NFWF, of re-upping pilot logbook program that was a partnership with CLS America with the charter boats, or a proportion of some of the charter boats throughout the Gulf, and is there anyone here that has the status of that, as to whether or not it’s going to be renewed for this year or next year, or is it done?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Kevin, I saw something on the NFWF webpage, and you might want to look at it, about the funded projects. I think the one you’re talking about was funded for a million-something dollars, I think, something like that. Would that have been it?

MR. ANSON: That might be it. I will take a look. Thank you.

MR. DONALDSON: Greg, I believe that’s true. I think they’ve got some funding.

DR. CRABTREE: I think I saw that as well, but I’m just not sure.

DR. DONALDSON: I don’t know the details.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Anything else from anybody? Our next meeting is April 16 through 19 in Gulfport, Mississippi. I will see you all there. Meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on February 1, 2018.)