1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	298 TH MEETING
4 5	FULL COUNCIL SESSION
6 7	Hyatt Centric French Quarter New Orleans, Louisiana
8	
9 10	JANUARY 31-FEBRUARY 1, 2024
11	VOTING MEMBERS
12	Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)Alabama
13	Kesley BanksTexas
14	Susan BoggsAlabama
15	Billy BroussardLouisiana
16	Dale DiazMississippi
17	J.D. DugasLouisiana
18	Tom FrazerFlorida
19	Bob Gill
20	Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas
21	Michael McDermottMississippi
22 23	Anthony Overton
23 24	Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks)Louisiana Joe SpragginsMississippi
25	Andy StrelcheckNMFS
26	C.J. SweetmanFlorida
27	Ed WalkerFlorida
28	Troy WilliamsonTexas
29	
30	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
31	Dave Donaldson
32	LT Carl FuhsUSCG
33	
34	<u>STAFF</u>
35	Max BirdsongSocial Scientist
36	Assane DiagneEconomist
37	Matt FreemanEconomist
38	John FroeschkeDeputy Director
39	Beth HagerAdministrative Officer
40	Lisa HollenseadFishery Biologist
41	Mara LevyNOAA General Counsel
42	Natasha Mendez-FerrerFishery Biologist
43	Emily MuehlsteinPublic Information Officer
44	Ryan RindoneLead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
45	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
46	Carrie SimmonsExecutive Director
47	Camilla ShiremanAdministrative & Communications Assistant
48	Carly SomersetFisheries Outreach Specialist

1	
2	OTHER PARTICIPANTS
3	Anthony Angello
4	Kindra Arnesen
5	Major Dean AucoinLA
6	Ryan Balsinger
7	Tony Barnes
8	Suzanna BlakeNMFS
9	Charles Braat
10	ASAC Terrell BradfordNOAA OLE
11	Ryan BradleyLong Beach, MS
12	Eric BrazerReef Fish Shareholders Alliance
13	Brandon BranchCrystal River, FL
14	William CallisAugusta, GA
15	Laura Chicola
16	Ben ChoiTampa, FL
17	Mike ColbyClearwater, FL
18	Taylor Coke
19	Bruce Cromer
20	Scott DaggettMadeira Beach, FL
21	Bill Dantuono
22	Jason DelacruzFL
23	Tim DillinghamFL
24	Taryn Duong
25	Derek Engle
26	Jessica Essig
27	Jeff Fahrenkopf
28	John Fidi
29	Alex Fischer
30	Richard FischerLA
31	Sonja Fordham
32	Troy FradyOrange Beach, AL
33	Jamie Gaspard
34	Robert Grable
35	Jim GreenDestin, FL
36	Ken HaddadASA, FL
37	Brian Hansen
38	Sean HeverinMadeira Beach, FL
39	Scott Hickman
40	Sean Hodson
41	Chris HortonCongressional Sportsmen Foundation
42	Dylan HubbardFL
43	Jesse HuntFL
44	Michael JenningsFreeport, TX
45	Bradley Jones
46	Caleb Joiner
47	Randy Lauser
48	Jennifer LeeNOAA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Brian Lewis	
12 13	Angalette Parent-Perez	
13	Kelia Paul	
15	Clay Porch	
16	Charlie Renier	
17	Evan Rexroat	
18	Michael RubinoNOAA	
19	Richard RyanFI	
20	Mark Scaglione	
21	Eric SchmidtFI	
22 23	Will Schmidt	
23 24	Chris Smalley	
25	Andrew Smith	
26	Duane SmithNOAA General Counsel	_
26 27	Duane Smith	
27 28 29	Kay SmithRandy SobierajAlex SpringTampa Bay, FI	
27 28 29 30	Kay SmithRandy SobierajAlex SpringRondal Springston	
27 28 29 30 31	Kay SmithRandy SobierajAlex SpringTampa Bay, FIRondal SpringstonStephen Stang	
27 28 29 30 31 32	Kay Smith.Randy Sobieraj.Alex Spring.Tampa Bay, FIRondal SpringstonStephen StangRyan Thillberg	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33	<pre>Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring</pre>	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	<pre>Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring</pre>	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	<pre>Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring. Tampa Bay, FI Rondal Springston. Stephen Stang. FI Ryan Thillberg. Moi Van. Richard Vargas Kyle Varn.</pre>	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	<pre>Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring. Tampa Bay, FI Rondal Springston Stephen Stang. FI Ryan Thillberg. Moi Van. Richard Vargas. Kyle Varn. Donald Veasey. FI</pre>	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	<pre>Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring. Tampa Bay, FI Rondal Springston. Stephen Stang. FI Ryan Thillberg. Moi Van. Richard Vargas Kyle Varn.</pre>	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	<pre>Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring. Tampa Bay, FI Rondal Springston Stephen Stang. FI Ryan Thillberg. Moi Van. Richard Vargas Kyle Varn. Donald Veasey. FI Ted Venker.</pre>	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring. Tampa Bay, FI Rondal Springston Stephen Stang. FI Ryan Thillberg. Moi Van. Richard Vargas Kyle Varn. Donald Veasey. FI Ted Venker. CCF Justin Visconti Naples, FI John Walter. SEFSC Richard Warren.	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	Kay Smith. Randy Sobieraj. Alex Spring. Rondal Springston Stephen Stang. Stephen Stang. Moi Van Richard Vargas Kyle Varn. Donald Veasey. Ted Venker. Justin Visconti John Walter. Signare Wetzel. Gulfport, MS	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	Kay Smith.Randy SobierajAlex Spring.Tampa Bay, FIRondal SpringstonFIStephen Stang.FIRyan ThillbergMoi VanRichard VargasKyle VarnDonald VeaseyTed VenkerJustin ViscontiJohn WalterRichard WarrenGarner WetzelJohnny Williams	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Kay SmithRandy SobierajAlex SpringTampa Bay, FIRondal SpringstonStephen StangRyan ThillbergMoi VanRichard VargasKyle VarnDonald VeaseyTed VenkerJustin ViscontiJohn WalterRichard WarrenGarner WetzelJohnny WilliamsDale Woodruff	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	Kay Smith.Randy SobierajAlex SpringTampa Bay, FIRondal Springston.Stephen StangStephen StangFIRyan ThillbergMoi VanRichard VargasKyle VarnDonald VeaseyFITed VenkerCCAJustin Visconti.Naples, FIJohn WalterSEFSCRichard Warren.FIGarner WetzelGulfport, MSJohnny Williams.Galveston, TXDale Woodruff.AIBob ZalesPanama City, FI	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	Kay SmithRandy SobierajTampa Bay, FIAlex SpringTampa Bay, FIRondal SpringstonFIStephen StangFIRyan ThillbergMoi VanRichard VargasKyle VarnDonald VeaseyFITed VenkerCCAJustin ViscontiNaples, FIJohn WalterSEFSORichard WarrenFIGarner WetzelGulfport, MSJohnny WilliamsGalveston, TXDale WoodruffAIBob ZalesPanama City, FIZach ZistreCrystal River, FI	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	Kay Smith.Randy SobierajAlex SpringTampa Bay, FIRondal Springston.Stephen StangStephen StangFIRyan ThillbergMoi VanRichard VargasKyle VarnDonald VeaseyFITed VenkerCCAJustin Visconti.Naples, FIJohn WalterSEFSCRichard Warren.FIGarner WetzelGulfport, MSJohnny Williams.Galveston, TXDale Woodruff.AIBob ZalesPanama City, FI	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	Kay SmithRandy SobierajTampa Bay, FIAlex SpringTampa Bay, FIRondal SpringstonFIStephen StangFIRyan ThillbergMoi VanRichard VargasKyle VarnDonald VeaseyFITed VenkerCCAJustin ViscontiNaples, FIJohn WalterSEFSORichard WarrenFIGarner WetzelGulfport, MSJohnny WilliamsGalveston, TXDale WoodruffAIBob ZalesPanama City, FIZach ZistreCrystal River, FI	

Reef Fish Committee Report		TABLE OF CONTENTS
Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes	Tabl	e of Motions
Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes Presentations. Update on NMFS' National Seafood Strategy Regional Implementation Plan Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM Opportunities to Advance EEJ in GOM Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application Public Comment Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application Administrative/Budget Committee Report Law Enforcement Committee Report Data Collection Committee Report Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report Education and Outreach Committee Report Supporting Agencies Update Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts South Atlantic Council Liaison NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) Reef Fish Committee Report J.S. Coast Guard Oiscussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities Other Business Litigation Update Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season		
Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes Presentations. Update on NMFS' National Seafood Strategy Regional Implementation Plan Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM Opportunities to Advance EEJ in GOM Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application Public Comment Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application Administrative/Budget Committee Report Law Enforcement Committee Report Data Collection Committee Report Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report Education and Outreach Committee Report Supporting Agencies Update Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts South Atlantic Council Liaison NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) Reef Fish Committee Report J.S. Coast Guard Oiscussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities Other Business Litigation Update Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season	Call	to Order, Announcements, and Introductions
Presentations. Update on NMFS' National Seafood Strategy Regional Implementation Plan. Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM. Opportunities to Advance EEJ in GOM Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan. Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application. Public Comment. Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application. Committee Reports. Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.		
Presentations. Update on NMFS' National Seafood Strategy Regional Implementation Plan. Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM. Opportunities to Advance EEJ in GOM Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan. Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application. Public Comment. Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application. Committee Reports. Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.	Adop	tion of Agenda and Approval of Minutes
Implementation Plan		
Implementation Plan	Pres	entations
Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM Opportunities to Advance EEJ in GOM Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application Public Comment Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application Committee Reports		Update on NMFS' National Seafood Strategy Regional
Opportunities to Advance EEJ in GOM Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan. Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application. Public Comment. Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application. Committee Reports. Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. J.S. Coast Guard. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Other Business. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.		Implementation Plan
Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan. Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application Public Comment		
Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application Public Comment		
Public Comment		
Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application		Discussion of Exempted Fishing Permit Application
Recommendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application		
Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. J.S. Coast Guard. Oiscussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Other Business. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.	Publ	ic Comment
Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. J.S. Coast Guard. Oiscussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Other Business. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.	_	
Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. U.S. Coast Guard. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.	Reco	mmendation on Exempted Fishing Permit Application
Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. U.S. Coast Guard. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.	~	inter Demonts
Law Enforcement Committee Report. Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. J.S. Coast Guard. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Other Business. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.	JOMM.	
Data Collection Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. J.S. Coast Guard. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Other Business. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.		
Shrimp Committee Report. Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE). Reef Fish Committee Report. Sulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. J.S. Coast Guard. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Other Business. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.		Data Collection Committee Report
Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report. Education and Outreach Committee Report. Supporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) Reef Fish Committee Report. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. J.S. Coast Guard. Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Other Business. Litigation Update. Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA. Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season.		Shrima Committee Report
Education and Outreach Committee Report		Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report
Eupporting Agencies Update. Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)		
Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)		
Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts. South Atlantic Council Liaison. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)	gaus	orting Agencies Update
South Atlantic Council Liaison	11	Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts
NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)		
Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission		
Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission		
J.S. Coast Guard Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities Other Business		NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
J.S. Coast Guard Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities Other Business	Reef	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities Other Business		NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities Other Business		NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Other Business	Gulf	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Other Business	Gulf	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Litigation Update	Gulf J.S.	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Litigation Update	Gulf J.S.	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Discussion of Annual Requirement for Red Grouper IA Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season	Gulf J.S. Disc	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
Discussion of 2024 Red Snapper For-Hire Season	Gulf J.S. Disc	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
	Gulf J.S. Disc	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
	Gulf J.S. Disc	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
	Gulf U.S. Disc	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)

PAGE 121: Motion to recommend approval of the exempted fishing permit submitted by LGL, Inc. The motion carried on page 122.

PAGE 123: Motion to accept the proposed changes to the SOPPs in Section 2.5 related to the SSC. The motion carried on page 123.

9 PAGE 124: Motion to accept the proposed changes to the SOPPs with 10 the removal of "without cause" in Section 2.5.2. The motion carried on page 128.

PAGE 132: Motion to approve the proposed activities for Phase II of the Inflation Reduction Act. The motion carried on page 132.

PAGE 133: Motion to approve the number of recreational council members to be increased, at the Chair's direction, from two to three (two private and one for-hire). The motion carried on page 135.

PAGE 140: Motion to direct staff to include Motions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 11 from the January 2024 Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data Collection Advisory Panel into the charter-for-hire electronic data collection document. The motion carried on page 142.

<u>PAGE 148</u>: Motion to support the Shrimp Futures Project. <u>The</u> motion carried on page 148.

PAGE 150: Motion to approve the updated allocation review
schedule. The motion carried on page 150.

<u>PAGE 172</u>: Motion in Action 1 to add an Alternative 3 to remove wenchman from the midwater snapper complex, but remain in the Reef Fish FMP. The motion carried on page 172.

PAGE 175: Motion to write a letter to NOAA's Office of Science and Technology and the states escalating the review and evaluation of the recreational effort extrapolation methodologies between MRIP-FES and state effort programs. These findings should be presented to the Gulf SSC and council as soon as possible. The motion carried on page 180.

43 <u>PAGE 183</u>: Motion to stop work on Draft Options: Gag Grouper 44 Management Measures. The motion carried on page 183.

46 PAGE 184: Motion to make Option 2 the preferred. The motion

carried on page 185.

Motion to approve the Abbreviated Framework Action: PAGE 185: Modifications to Catch Limits for Gulf of Mexico Lane Snapper and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and The motion carried on page 186. appropriate.

PAGE 187: Motion in Action 1 to add an Alternative 4 to require a commercial reef fish permit to maintain an account. The motion carried on page 187.

PAGE 189: Motion to request the SEFSC work with Gulf Council staff to outline a proposed action plan for revising aspects of the SEDAR process and planning to be presented at the spring SEDAR Steering Committee meeting to include consideration of state surveys becoming fully integrated replacements for FES, consideration of conducting assessments of some stocks outside of SEDAR, and the potential for utilization of other methods, such as interim assessments, for some species towards implementation of more responsive approaches. The motion carried on page 196.

PAGE 199: Motion to accept the proposed changes to the charge for the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP. Revised Charge: To evaluate and make recommendations relative to requirements for participation in the red snapper and grouper/tilefish individual fishing quota (IFQ) programs considered in Reef Fish Amendment 59 and to modifications to IFQ shares and annual allocation distribution approaches proposed in Reef Fish Amendment 60. The motion carried on page 199.

<u>PAGE 200</u>: Motion to readvertise and repopulate the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP. The motion carried on page 201.

<u>PAGE 201</u>: Motion to direct the SSC to include consideration of the Great Red Snapper Count in the terms of reference for the planned benchmark assessment of Gulf red snapper. Consideration should be sensitive to the concerns expressed by the peer-review team during the SEDAR 74 Review Workshop. <u>The motion carried on page 203</u>.

PAGE 216: Motion to request the Regional Administrator reopen the red snapper for-hire fishery the Friday before Thanksgiving, if it

1	is determined that the red snapper for-hire	ACT	has	not	been	met
2	The motion was withdrawn on page 221.					
3						
4						
5						

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Hyatt Centric French Quarter in New Orleans, Louisiana on Wednesday morning, January 31, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.

CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON: Welcome to the 298th meeting of the Gulf Council. My name is Kevin Anson, chair of the council. If you have a cell phone, or similar device, we ask that you place it on silent or vibrant 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 room. Please be advised that alcoholic beverages are not permitted in the meeting room.

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

The council has seventeen voting members, eleven of whom are appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and include individuals from a range of geographical areas in the Gulf of Mexico with experience in various aspects of fisheries. The membership also includes the five state fishery managers from each Gulf state and the Regional Administrator from NOAA's Southeast Fisheries Service, as well as several non-voting members.

Public input is a vital part of the council's deliberative process, and comments, both oral and written, are accepted and considered by the council throughout the process. We will welcome public comment from in-person and virtual attendees.

 Anyone joining us virtually who wishes to speak during the public comment should register for comment online. Virtual participants that are registered to comment should ensure that they are registered for the webinar under the same name they used to register to speak. In-person attendees wishing to speak during the public comment should sign-in at the registration kiosk located at the back of the meeting room. We accept only one registration per person. Public comment may end before the published agenda time if all registered in-person and virtual participants have completed their comment.

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

5

7

- 6 MR. J.D. DUGAS: J.D. Dugas, Louisiana.
- 8 MR. BILLY BROUSSARD: Billy Broussard, Louisiana.

9

10 MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE: Chris Schieble, Louisiana.

11

12 **GENERAL JOE SPRAGGINS:** Joe Spraggins, Mississippi.

13

14 MR. DALE DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.

15

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

18

19 MR. MICHAEL MCDERMOTT: Michael McDermott, Mississippi.

20

21 MR. DAKUS GEESLIN: Dakus Geeslin, Texas.

22

23 DR. KESLEY BANKS: Kesley Banks, Texas.

24

25 MR. TROY WILLIAMSON: Troy Williamson, Texas.

26

27 MS. KERRY MARHEFKA: Kerry Marhefka, South Atlantic Council liaison.

29

30 LT. CARL FUHS: Carl Fuhs, U.S. Coast Guard.

31

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

33

34 MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck, NOAA Fisheries, Southeast 35 Regional Office.

36

37 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Clay Porch, NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Fisheries 38 Science Center.

39

40 MR. BOB GILL: Bob Gill, Florida.

41

42 DR. TOM FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.

43

44 DR. C.J. SWEETMAN: C.J. Sweetman, Florida.

45

46 MR. ED WALKER: Ed Walker, Florida.

47

48 DR. ANTHONY OVERTON: Anthony Overton, Alabama.

MS. SUSAN BOGGS: Susan Boggs, Alabama.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Carrie Simmons, council staff.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: As many of you know, we had a couple of individuals who were very much involved with the council process that passed away last year, and so I would like to take a couple of moments to talk about them.

The first is Dr. Robert, or Bob, Shipp, and his impact across marine fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico is hard to quantify, because it was so multifaceted and far-reaching. He influenced policy at the council for eight terms, which is twenty-four years, and he served as chair and vice chair multiple times during his tenure.

While Dr. Shipp produced vast amounts of science throughout his career, his signature research was focused on the value of artificial reefs for the production of red snapper and other key game species. His work can be partially credited for Alabama's first-place standing as the state with the largest artificial reef network in U.S. waters.

He was a mentor to countless students at the University of South Alabama, where he spent much of his career as a professor and researcher. Bob also served as a liaison between the scientific community and the fishing public, bringing awareness to the species and science unique to our region. He served as the head judge for the Alabama Deep-Sea Fishing Rodeo for years, and he published Dr. Bob Shipp's Guide to Fishes of the Gulf of Mexico, a comprehensive reference on finfish in the Gulf.

Dr. Shipp had a knack for translating complex science into easily-understandable information appropriate for audiences that range from everyday fishermen to members of Congress. As a friend, Bob was always quick with a kind word and prepared to share a tale of adventure on the high-seas. His loss is a great loss for the entire Gulf of Mexico.

The next individual that I would like to recognize is Mr. Charlie Bergmann. Charlie was a dedicated professional whose passion for fisheries and marine conservation was unparalleled. Charlie's career spanned decades of impactful work in fisheries management and conservation, throughout a variety of roles, working for the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources, NOAA Fisheries, and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

Charlie served on the council's Reef Fish and Coastal Migratory

Pelagics Advisory Panels for many years, where his insights and leadership were invaluable. He regularly attended council meetings, and he always shared a valuable perspective and contributed helpful advice. Charlie's contributions have been recognized with numerous awards, including the Director's Award from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and multiple bronze medal awards from the United States Department of Commerce, highlighting his commitment to innovation and excellence in his field.

Beyond his professional achievements, Charlie will be remembered for his unwavering passion for the wellbeing of our marine ecosystems and the communities that depend on them. His legacy lives on in the policies that he shaped and the lessons that he imparted to many of us in this room. Thank you. Next is the Adoption of the Agenda. Are there any changes that need to be made to the agenda? Dr. Simmons.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could we add a short discussion of the annual request for interim analysis on red grouper?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Yes. Added. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I would like to add a discussion about the red snapper charter-for-hire 2024 season.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I would like to see if Ms. Levy could give us a litigation update.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I think that is on the agenda. Yes. Anyone else? Is there a motion to accept the agenda with the added items? We have a motion by C.J. Is there a second to the motion?

MS. BOGGS: Second.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Next up is Approval of the Minutes from the last Full Council meeting. Are there any changes that need to be made, or comments made on the minutes? Is there any opposition to accepting the minutes as written? All right. Seeing none, the minutes are approved.

48 That will take us to Presentations, Tab A, Number 7, and we have

an update on NMFS' National Seafood Strategy Regional Implementation Plan, and it will be presented by Dr. Rubino. Are you online, sir?

DR. MICHAEL RUBINO: I am, yes. Can you hear me okay?

PRESENTATIONS

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We can hear you just fine. Go ahead, please.

UPDATE ON NMFS' NATIONAL SEAFOOD STRATEGY REGIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

DR. RUBINO: All right, and I will ask to have slides advanced as I go, and so thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and to the whole council for having me on to provide you with a little bit of background and a preview of what this National Seafood Strategy Implementation Plan is about and where we're going with it.

We all remember that, in 2020, really our world turned upside down with COVID, and seafood markets in the U.S. were severely disrupted, with a loss of revenue, and, yes, we've come back gradually from that, during the past several years, but, in the past decade, we've also been dealing with the effects of changing climate. In some parts of the country, you've got moving stocks, stock collapses, and, in your part of the world, there's certainly been some intense storm events that have disrupted the seafood industry, infrastructure, docks, working waterfronts, and it has made life difficult, in terms of rebuilding efforts.

During that process, both internally, in terms of our leadership team and staff consultations, and also talking to a wide variety of people in the U.S. seafood industry and our partners, we have been thinking about and gathering ideas on, well, how do we deal with climate change going forward, and how do we get ready for the next market disruption, and, in the longer-term, how do we build a more resilient commercial U.S. seafood production industry?

Over the past several decades, we've done a huge amount of work together under Magnuson, putting together management plans and rebuilding plans for all of our fisheries, and we've heard, loud and clear, that the survey work, and the allocations done through the fishery management councils, continue to be a critical and essential service that the Fisheries Service provides to the U.S. seafood industry, but we've also heard, in the face of climate change and market disruptions, that that's no longer sufficient to maintain a healthy industry, and that we, as an agency, need to work with all of you on refocusing and strengthening the industry services part of what we do as an agency, and I'm going to give

some examples in a minute, as well as to work across federal and state agencies to leverage sort of a whole-of-government approach to strengthening the seafood industry.

This is sort of the overview, and I think it gave you an idea of where we're headed with this. There's no new money to do this, with a few exceptions, and so partnership and leveraging are going to be key, as well as highlighting and building on what our existing capabilities are.

Just a review of what the objectives of this strategy are, and I mentioned resilience. We want to get greater value from production, and we want to increase seafood production, both from wild-capture and aquaculture, where possible. In the face of some of the consolidation and global pressures, we also want to make sure that we maintain a diversity of opportunity in the industry, and we want to put more U.S. seafood on U.S. plates.

As I said, this has been a year or two-year process, with wide discussions, and we've got over a hundred -- I think actually 150 individual comments on the seafood strategy itself, including from the Southern Shrimp Alliance, the Reef Fish Shareholders, and others in the Gulf region, and so thank you very much for all of your comments and suggestions. Most of the comments we got were that the seafood strategy itself was great, but the comments focused on what are we going to do in terms of implementation, and what are we going to focus on, and so that's what we're working on right now.

The seafood strategy is divided into wild-capture, aquaculture, the market access, both international and domestic, and then a catchall on the blue economy, how do we support infrastructure and workforce development through economic and market analyses, and, today, I just wanted to sort of slice the pie a little bit differently and give you a preview of the kinds of activities we're thinking about, but grouped by sort of action or activity, and the first one is the socioeconomic analysis.

This is the one place where we actually have a little bit of new money to work, and that acronym "CEFI" stands for climate and ecosystem fishery initiative, where our scientists are, over the next three years, going to build a variety of regional climate change models, looking at potential scenarios for what climate does to various fisheries stocks.

Well, to that, we're going to do economic, market, and social science analysis as well, and so what kinds of costs are involved here, and how is industry going to shift in the face of climate

change, and what does that do to markets? How do we recapitalize the fleet, or change gear type and so on, and so bringing this kind of data, and analysis, to councils, to the council process, to stakeholders in general, could be a critical, and a relatively low-cost, way to provide additional information, so that you as councils, and as an industry, can make decisions going forward in the face of all these uncertainties.

Another grouping of activities that we do is we don't act alone, and we need to do a better job of leveraging federal, state, and other partners and participants in the seafood industry. Yes, we work collaborative with Sea Grant, and our seafood inspection program provides a lot of the specifications for USDA's seafood purchase programs, food assistance and school lunch programs, but we've also got the Economic Development Administration, the Department of Transportation, other parts of USDA, the Rural Development Program, the Agricultural Marketing Service, and how can we work more closely with them to bring their assets and resources to bear to support the seafood industry?

We've also got an aquaculture program that works with the Army Corps and EPA and states to get, you know, oyster farming permits through the permit process, as well as looking longer-term, and, in your region of the world, the aquaculture opportunity areas, and so looking at the best places to do aquaculture and to get the environmental type of analyses out of the way before permit applicants come in, and so that's an -- Those are just examples of coordination and leverage that we would like to focus on.

We also want to tell the story of U.S. seafood, and to tell that story better, and, you know, we often hear that U.S. producers aren't getting credit in the marketplace for all the good work that we do collectively under Magnuson, and we're not getting a price premium for sustainability, or shelf space for U.S. products, and so how do we communicate that to consumers, to opinion makers, to key decision-makers, that maintaining a healthy and sustainable U.S., both wild-capture and aquaculture sectors, are important to this country, and to tell that story?

We then also have a variety of other program tools, and all of those acronyms are the program or headquarters offices that work with our regional offices and science centers, and so the international -- You know, we live in a global marketplace, and so both leveling the playing field for U.S. producers, in terms of the Seafood Import Monitoring Program, which is undergoing a whole rethink at the moment, to assistance on exports.

The Seafood Inspection Program is important in terms of, if you

want to export to markets in other countries, or have your product processed in another country, the Seafood Inspection Program can help. As I mentioned, the Seafood Inspection Programs work with USDA buying programs. We have an in-house bank, the Fishery Finance Program, which provides loans, and it wants to get more creative of how to do so-called blended finance, working with other investment providers in the seafood industry.

Spatial planning is another tool, particularly that the National Ocean Service provides, and the ocean reports, which initially was developed for aquaculture, is now being used for offshore wind and working with the fishing industry to sort of locate offshore wind facilities in a way that disrupt, or works with, fishing and aquaculture, and there a number of other tools that we have going forward.

 Artificial intelligence, AI, is much talked about, and we're all trying to get our heads wrapped around that, in terms of what that does to both complicate and simplify our lives, and we have grant programs.

Those are examples of our existing capabilities and how we would traditionally go about working on industry services and working with you on strengthening the seafood industry. We can also think about this on sort of a cross-sectional basis, where we can bring a variety of capabilities together, and a variety of federal and state agencies together, to work on particular challenges in the seafood industry, and, on Monday, I believe, John Walter provided -- He had a presentation to the council on the Shrimp Futures Project, and so shrimp, in the Gulf and the South Atlantic, is a case in point, where, if we don't do something collectively over the next several years, the difficulties, both in terms of import competition and high fuel prices, some of the infrastructure disruption from hurricanes, and how do we get out from under that and maintain and build on a very good product coming out of the Gulf and South Atlantic? At the moment, shrimp is, I think, about 6 percent of the U.S. market for shrimp, and how do we get that back to 10, 12, 15, 20 percent?

By bringing a whole variety of activities to work together, economic, leveraging the other agencies, telling the story, working with retailers and wholesalers, doing economic and social science analysis, and is that something that maybe we can do collectively, to focus on a particular challenge, and there are other examples in other parts of the country.

At the moment, we're putting together a short implementation plan, basically a report to all of you on how this all fits together and what we plan to do. We will welcome stakeholder and partner comment on that going forward, and this will be a living document, and it will help to inform our activities going forward, and so let me stop there and see if there are any questions, and thank you very much for listening.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Dr. Rubino. Do we have any questions from the council members? General Spraggins.

 GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I appreciate your presentation, and I understand and agree with you, and I understand the shrimp industry, where we're at, is desperately hurting. I know that, when you're trying to get sixty cents, and eighty-five cents, you know, a pound, when it gets to the processor, that person can't go out and spend five-dollars for diesel per gallon and be able to upgrade, and I know that the USDA has come back, and I just saw the latest, where they're going to buy some of the frozen that's in stock, and be able to put it out, and that's helping some, but, you know, we can band-aid this thing all we want to, but, until we do something to stop the imports, I don't think we're ever going to be able to fix this industry.

If we don't fix it shortly, we may not have an industry, because there's only so many of them still in it, and, when you're losing money every day, it doesn't take you long to figure out that you need to do something else, and so I really appreciate anything you all can do to help us. Is there some way of putting some type of tax, or embargo, or whatever on shrimp coming in? Is there some way of putting something to be able to help the shrimpers, and so I appreciate it.

DR. RUBINO: Well, as I said, John Walter had a presentation related to all of this, and you've got Dave Donaldson, who is there with you today, who has been involved in some of these discussions, and we would very much like to get the advice of the Gulf Council, and the South Atlantic Council, on how to proceed with all of this.

The Sea Grant programs are standing by to help as well, and our International Affairs Office, and the Seafood Inspection Program as well, are thinking about this, and so I very much look forward to working with all of you on shrimp and as an example of something we can do together under this rubric and the seafood strategy.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My comments are exactly those of General Spraggins. On the last page here, it says that imports dominate U.S. market prices, due to lower -- Or U.S. market due to

lower prices, and that's the real issue here. These other things may be helpful, to some extent, and I'm not sure that it's the purview of this particular project, but I have to chime in here as well that the imports are what is killing our guys, particularly our shrimpers, and a tax, or a tariff, on imported shrimp, from this layman's perspective, seems like it would be helpful, and I obviously understand that might be outside the purview of this project, but that's the -- With people where I live, that's viewed as the number-one problem.

1 2

DR. RUBINO: Well, I think we're all aware of that, and it is the purview of this project, in the sense that, yes, other federal agencies make decisions about tariffs, or import restrictions, or quality decisions about imports, but we, as an agency, working with you, can provide information, and advice, to those agencies, in terms of economic and market analysis, and so our International Affairs Office plays that role, and the Seafood Inspection Program plays that role, but we can also, I think, work on -- In the meantime, not give up on the U.S. market. There are buyers in the U.S. for U.S. shrimp, and it's a great product when it comes out of the water, and how do we get that shrimp into premium markets, as well as mainstream markets, in the United States and continue to do that in the face of these price pressures? It's not easy, but there's a willingness to work with all of you, and, once again, I mean, we've had this challenge now for some time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Dr. Rubino. I appreciate the presentation, and I think you kind of answered most of what I was going to ask here, but I would like to reiterate what General Spraggins said, and Mr. Walker. From Louisiana's perspective, the price has just plummeted, and, obviously, we know these things are —— We talked about it with Dr. Walter's presentation on Shrimp Futures during the Shrimp Committee, and that will probably be on the AP agenda, and it would be good if, I think, this presentation would be available to the Shrimp AP meeting as well, coming up in March.

I believe we're also going to ask for some information to be presented at our upcoming March 6th Shrimp Taskforce meeting on all of this strategy for our shrimpers locally, but, if it wasn't for the USDA purchasing of shrimp over the past couple of years in Louisiana, I don't even know if our fleet would be in the current status that it's in, and that has helped tremendously, and I would encourage future purchasing of shrimp product in that manner, until we can get this situation of dumping of imported shrimp controlled, at least from the federal level. The states just don't have the

resources, at the time, to handle that, and I think we need as much help as we can get. Thank you.

DR. RUBINO: A shoutout to the agency's Seafood Inspection Program there, and, I mean, certainly congressional requests helped, but the Seafood Inspection Program has been working tirelessly behind the scenes with USDA on the specifications and the inspection of the seafood that's purchased by USDA for those programs, and I just wanted to make sure that everybody realizes that we're working hard behind the scenes on that one.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins.

 GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir, and, if I could, another quick appeal, and, you know, you talked a little bit about education, and you talked a little bit about marketing, in a sense, and, you know, obviously, getting people in America to understand what they're buying, and, when they buy something from a grocery store or whatever, what are they really getting, and is there a way that we can put a lot more emphasis on it?

I mean, obviously, the shrimp that's coming from imports is not the quality of shrimp you're getting from the Gulf of Mexico, or other parts of the United States, and what I'm getting at is, you know, we try to put it on -- I saw where Alabama is trying to pass a law that you have to put where it came from, the origin, and I know Louisiana, I think, has that. Mississippi is trying right now, but the point is, is the USDA going to back it?

Are they going to turn around and do anything about it, whenever there's a restaurant and they don't put anything on it, or they don't serve it the right way, and is there a way -- You know, the education level is there, and we need to get the education to the people, and we also need to back it, and we need the United States government, and NOAA could help us with this, so that they could be able to back this and be able to tell people that you have to put -- You have to back it, and you have to tell the truth, but I believe, if you got enough information out there to the public, of how bad that shrimp is coming from other places, you might change some things anyway.

DR. RUBINO: One very quick example of the kind of outreach and education we can do is -- I'm here in the Mid-Atlantic, the Washington, D.C. area, and there's a grocery Mid-Atlantic -- Actually, a national grocery chain that features domestic shrimp, and they work with a local wholesaler that sends trucks down from North Carolina all the way to Florida, depending upon the season, and they truck fresh, headed, on-ice shrimp to their supermarkets

overnight, and they feature that, and it tells a great story, and so we're thinking about doing some videos, with short video clips, around that, so it could make it on Instagram and Facebook and so on, for people to see how it goes from the boat all the way to a supermarket, and it's fresh, literally within hours.

DR. PORCH: Thank you for the presentation, and, as you mentioned, the agency doesn't have a lot of funding to put towards this initiative, and so we're going to leverage the capacity of other organizations, and, besides the issues that have already been brought up, one of the big issues, in our neck of the world, is the loss of working waterfront. As people get priced out, commercial fishermen can't afford to keep their boats anywhere where it's convenient. Having said that, I noticed, and I think it was Slide 8, that you mentioned DOT's Port Infrastructure

Development Program, and I wonder if you could elaborate on that, how that might help.

18
19 **DR. RUBINO:** It sounds like that was Clay Porch.

DR. PORCH: Yes, it was, Mike.

DR. RUBINO: We've got a couple of colleagues who are learning about what the Department of Transportation does in the field of supporting the seafood industry, and we're a little more familiar with the Economic Development Administration and some of the things they've been doing recently to support towards seafood infrastructure, through some of their grant programs, their business development programs.

I can get back to you in the future with more details about the Department of Transportation, and we're in a learning mode with them. We've come a little further with EDA, as well as with some of the USDA programs, both with the agricultural marketing service and rural development and their loan guarantee programs, and so that doesn't quite answer your question, but that's where we are at this point.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Dr. Rubino, for the presentation. I have some planning questions for you, regarding the slide that's up, for spring of 2024, where it says regions identify potential pilots, and can you tell us a little bit more about that, and how you see engaging with the council, the APs, and what we should be thinking about during this process, because that's not too far away.

DR. RUBINO: So far, it's been informal. The Shrimp Futures Project sort of grew out of a series of discussions that John Walter and others have had, with Dave Donaldson and Sea Grant and myself, and that's one example of identifying a regional initiative, or a pilot project, or whatever you want to term it, but there are others that could emerge, and other parts of the country are thinking about things too, and so we don't have a formal process, but, if there's something in particular the council would like to work on, and work with the agency under this umbrella of a seafood strategy, and if the seafood strategy umbrella would provide an additional impetus for doing something that you want to do, we would be happy to talk about that.

I think, for the shrimp initiative, it would be great to have the councils engaged, with the commission and the Sea Grant programs and the agency, on whatever is going to come out of that, so that it -- Because you're in close touch with many of the industry, in terms of what the key issues are.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you for that information, and I would just bring up to the council that, when we convened the Spiny Lobster AP, and I think it was last year, they brought up many of the same concerns regarding imports and tariffs and labeling and that kind of stuff, and so I don't know if the council wishes to also engage that industry or not.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Food for thought for the future. Does anyone else have any questions for Dr. Rubino? Seeing none, Dr. Rubino, thank you for being here today and presenting.

DR. RUBINO: Thank you very much, and I look forward to the meetings in March that were mentioned.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Next on the agenda is an update from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management on wind energy development in the Gulf of Mexico and Ms. Lynckner. Hello and welcome.

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

MS. LISSA LYNCKNER: Good morning. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. Good morning, everyone. My name is Lissa Lynckner, and I'm with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. My title is Chief of Staff, and I like to say that nothing is not my job, including, lately, co-leading outreach and engagement for the renewable energy program in the Gulf of Mexico.

I would like to also note that I'm born and raised here, and so I

was born and raised on the water. My family are commercial fishermen. My father was a shrimper and a crabber, and I think he was a little disappointed that I didn't want to run one of his shrimp boats, and I decided to go the science route, and I studied blue crab migration, and so thank you for having me.

Two takeaways from today is that collaboration and continued communication, now and into the future, is going to be crucial, and so we have a lot of work ahead, and so thank you for this opportunity. We are grateful to continue to be able to present our process and show you where we are.

One thing I wanted to note upfront is that, while it might appear that our process has changed over the last few years in the Gulf of Mexico, and that's due to our commitments to the Inflation Reduction Act and timeframes and things like that, which I will get into, but one thing that has not changed is our commitment to hear you, to listen and to incorporate important information, your information, into our process and our decision-making.

Our mission is the offshore development and exploration for energy and minerals, and that is three miles out for most of the states, and it's nine miles out for Texas and Florida in the Gulf of Mexico. One thing that you can't see here, but it's important to note, is I'm talking about wind today, but we have four mission areas that are happening in the Gulf of Mexico.

We have over 2,000 active leases for oil and gas, and we have our wind program, with our one lease, and then we have marine minerals, and we are in the process of doing analyses to understand the potential for carbon storage and carbon sequestration in the Gulf, and so, while we're talking about wind today, it's important to note our process internally for looking at all of these happening at the same time, as well as coordinating with the other uses in the basin.

This slide is really busy, and this our national renewable energy process, or our status, and so the takeaway on what you see here is we've had twelve lease sales, total, nationwide, with one being in the Gulf. We have thirty-four active leases, one in the Gulf, and we have an administrative goal of thirty gigawatts by 2030, and that is only six years away. We currently have about six projects approved, and we would need about ten more, within that six year period, to reach this administrative goal, and so there's a lot of work coming, and we don't have all the answers. It's meetings like this, and it's coordination and cooperation, that's going to get us across the finish line.

 Focusing on the Gulf of Mexico, I want to give a background on how we got to where we are and an overview of our process. In the interest of time, I'm going to touch on some of those, and, if we have further questions, I can certainly follow-up, because the nugget of our talk is where are we today and where are we going in the next year or so.

Where we started. In 2020, the Governor of Louisiana requested a taskforce, and so, later that year, we responded with recommending a regional taskforce, and, in just a six-month time period, we turned around our inaugural intergovernmental taskforce that includes Texas -- That includes Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas.

It's important to note that the Gulf of Mexico -- There are many advantages for why renewable energy would be advantageous here. The proximity to the supply chain, but not only the supply chain, but the workforce and the rich history of data and studies and science we have here as we develop the program.

There are some challenges, and they're not insurmountable, but the windspeed is one, and the market price is one, and also designing technology that can withstand hurricane winds, turbines and rotors that can withstand that. It's not insurmountable, but opportunities.

Looking at our process for renewable energy, there's four parts. There is the rigorous planning and analysis phase that happens in advance of the federal government allowing a company to get a lease, and that's where we've spent the last -- Most of our time here in the Gulf of Mexico, and then, outside of that red box, and I will get back to the red box, but the next phase would be site assessment, and we have a rigorous site assessment analysis phase before we would allow a company to go in and construct and operate, and so, looking at where we are in the Gulf of Mexico, we're inside of that red box right now. We're in the planning and analysis phase for Gulf of Mexico II, and, for Gulf of Mexico I, we are right on the edge of the box.

We had our first lease sale last year, in August, and we had one lease, and so we're in the process of communicating with them, and they will be providing their communication plans to us.

For Gulf of Mexico Wind II, we are -- We have finished the area identification process, and so which areas could be considered for leasing areas, and our next step would be, if given the go ahead, to publish leasing documents that would offer leasing siting areas for comment.

This is a more detailed version of that process, looking out from the onset of our process all the way through installation, and so the takeaway for this is so how do we gather input throughout our process? I want to note, and I'm going to walk through each of those tan boxes briefly, but our process to gather input is ongoing. We are internally developing our strategy, and it's getting better each month, on how to continue the conversations regularly, and so we would like to understand the concerns, and begin to develop solutions, before we get to timeframes where we have a formal comment period, a formal stake in the ground.

We want to -- By the time we get to say our first step, which would be request for information, where we're trying to understand the range of industry interest, and so our call for information and nominations, and what are the concerns that we should be considering in this large leasing area. In the area identification process, where we're now winnowing-down, and we're saying, okay, we heard your comments in the call, and now here's a subset of smaller areas. Before we even get to these formal comment periods, we want to have this relationship ongoing, and, when we're putting things out on the street, no one is surprised.

There are some things, schedule-wise, in what we're allowed to communicate, as far as timeframes on things, and decisions on things, and those are mostly out of D.C., but we will let you know as soon as we can, and those continued relationships, and communication, will help make sure we're all -- That we're not surprised by things.

This is just a real quick rendition of our process. We found it beneficial, from looking at years of success from operations and lessons learned in the Gulf of Mexico for programmatic, getting the big picture right there, getting all the players at the table that have some interest to understand their perspective and to understand their concerns, and so starting larger, taking comments, and winnowing to a smaller area, to a smaller area, to a smaller area, and so, by the time that we get down to where a lease would actually be, these are highly deconflicted, and they are well communicated.

How do we do that? Well, a comment that we received in one of our comment processes, the call for information, somebody recommended that we partner with NOAA and using their spatial planning model, and we call it ocean planning. There's a few different names for it, but this has been — This has been a journey for BOEM, and so we started in the Gulf of Mexico, and using a spatial model, where we are taking all of the data that we have in the Gulf and

overlaying it, and I have some examples in subsequent slides, but this has now been adopted by all the other regions, and so this is an example of we create a suitability -- It's a suitability model, and so we're looking at which areas are most deconflicted, and we target those for wind, and the conflict span the range.

We have fifty-four datasets, and those include anything looking at economic factors, looking at logistics factors, fisheries factors, industry and operations, and so looked at the presence-absence, and also the quantification of those -- Of the data in determining which areas were up to 95 percent deconflicted, and so this is an example of a data layer.

On the left, we have shrimp data, and on the right we have pelagic bird data, and so this is -- Basically, this is showing how we are assessing things, and we want to minimize overlapping areas that we're planning wind where we would see there would be impact with these resources.

From this process, the ocean planning process, we were fortunate. We have a very large area in the Gulf of Mexico. Other regions in the nation don't have the large span to be able to assess and do this programmatic approach, but, from there, we wanted to assess what are the best locations for wind, and these thirteen areas, which we're calling wind energy options, came out of the model, and that was the starting point for us to begin the further winnowing, to where we could offer a lease.

Bringing us to our first lease sale, we finalized two wind energy areas out of those thirteen options, and that was Wind Energy I and Wind Energy M, and then we further partnered with NOAA and the National Center for Coastal Ocean Science team, NCOS, and we winnowed further to determine where the best lease siting areas are, where we have the least impacts on fisheries and shrimping, on birds, on shipping, on port access, et cetera, and they identified three areas that we offered in the last lease sale.

One significant comment we received from industry is that they had to be at least 100,000 acres, and so each of the three that we offered in the last lease sale, two south of Galveston and one south of Lake Charles, they were greater than 90,000.

Another thing that we wanted to note today, and I think we mentioned this before, but we offered two bidding credits in the last sale. One bidding credit was a 20 percent bid credit for contributions to workforce training and supply chain development and then a 10 percent bid credit for contributing to a fisheries mitigation fund, and this was to be comparable to the fisheries

mitigation fund that is required by OCSLA, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, similar to the oil and gas program.

The takeaway for this is we found it necessary to incentivize this type of mitigation, but BOEM does not administer the funds, and BOEM does not manage this process, and so the developer is responsible for applying for it, and they're responsible for either finding a third party or, like in the Northeast, they have gathered together in a coalition to help manage this fund, but BOEM does have oversight and review, but we are not administering it.

Looking at the sale, fifteen companies qualified, two companies bid, and one company won our one lease off of Lake Charles, and that was RWE.

What does that mean? It was \$5.6 million, and, you know, if the uptake becomes electricity, it can power over half-a-million homes, and so this was a success, in our opinion, not only to have our first lease sale in the Gulf, but because of the process and the community built along the way. We did this together.

Looking more closely are where we are with that specific lease, we have gone through -- All the way to issuing the lease, and, like I mentioned earlier, we're working with them for their communication plans, and, within the next few months, we will begin working with them on their site assessment planning. Following that, they would move into site assessment surveys, and then submitting a construction and operation plan that we would review and conduct environmental analyses.

So where are we going? What does our future potential look like? As I mentioned earlier, we had thirteen wind area options, and two were finalized in our first sale. We had eleven remaining options to consider, starting last summer, and so, in June of last summer, we were given the directive to look into what a second sale in the Gulf of Mexico for renewable energy would look like, and, again, we went back to our stakeholders, our federal partners, our tribes, and we wanted to industry, and to industry, what of these eleven make sense for you, and do you have additional concerns? Are there things that we missed? We started with these eleven, and we started our engagement process again, and we are daily talking to everyone, trying to understand what of these eleven should we move forward with.

We were looking for new data or information to consider, and we had just finished a very extensive outreach and engagement for the whole entire area that resulted in the thirteen areas, but now we were -- Again, six months to a year later, we're looking more

closely at the remaining eleven, and were there additional space use conflicts that we hadn't considered?

This time, we ran into -- We were continuing our outreach and engagement, but we are now going to consider comments for winnowing further in our proposed sale notice, if that comes out in -- You know, there's still not a decision on it, but if that comes out in the next few months or so. The takeaway for this is we went back to everyone, and we asked them again, you know, and these are the specific questions we asked. We sent them out to our stakeholder list, and we had a roundtable in August of last year, where we heard back in-person, and we heard back in writing, and that information was brought forward and helped us narrow down the final

wind energy areas that we put out last fall.

In October of last year -- From June to say August, September, October, we were heavily talking to everyone. Again, we do not have all the answers. We talked to the Coast Guard, and we talked to the Southern Shrimp Alliance, and we talked to industry, et cetera, and which areas should be on or off the table as we consider our second sale, and the input that we received, some substantive input, is 100,000 acres is significant, and so that eliminated a number of the areas that were less than 100,000, and then industry was interested in east of I, and so that also eliminated.

We worked closely with Southern Shrimp Alliance, and there was some issues with one of our wind energy areas that had mid to high shrimping activity in it, and we knocked that WEA off the table, or wind energy area, and so we came down to what we thought was a well-informed four remaining areas, and that was J, K, L, and N, and they're tiny on there, but it's essentially everything -- The WEAs that were east of the ones we had finalized last year.

Now there is a total of five, because, when we had the sale last year, two of the leases in I did not sell, and so we have a pool of wind energy areas, and that's what we're considering as we look at Wind 2. This does not mean that every wind energy area is going to have a lease area in the next sale, and it just means that we done extensive analysis, and outreach and engagement, on these areas, and this is what we have, and this is our pool to consider.

 What are our next steps? Internally, we have worked with the NCOS team to look at siting for lease areas in each of those final five wind energy areas, and we have prioritized them, and we are now internally in the process of recommending them to our leadership. No decisions are made whether we're going to have a sale, and no decisions have been made whether we're going to put a proposed sale notice document out, but we are working on it, and we will be

ready.

The point of the proposed sale notice would be to minimize, again -- We're going to take the comments, and inputs, that we would receive during that comment period, and we would minimize any potential impacts to our leasing areas, within our leasing areas, would have, within that timeframe, with intergovernmental taskforce, along our small working meetings, and we don't say this too often, but you can call us anytime, and we will set up a meeting, and so we're always -- We're interested in comments, and feedback, at any time.

Again, we don't have a decision on a sale, and we don't have specific timeframes, but, if you do some math, and you use the requirements from the Inflation Reduction Act, we had our last oil and gas sale on December 20 of last year, and our leases for wind would have to be signed by December 20 of this year, and it's about sixty days to get that done following an auction, and so, if you back-calculate, we would have some leasing documents coming out in the spring and summer, and potentially an auction in the early fall, but, if we don't have a sale this year, we would have an oil and gas sale next year, in 2025, and that was recently put out in the national program, and we would have a year from then, and that is what I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Ms. Lynckner, for the detailed presentation, and, to respond to your initial comments, before you got into the presentation, we certainly appreciate all of the outreach that you have done, and the information that folks from BOEM have provided to us, and the openness of the process that you all did ultimately choose to do the wind energy here in the Gulf of Mexico, and so, again, just we really appreciate your willingness to come and provide us this information. It's very helpful, and so thank you. Do we have any questions? Mr. Schieble.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Ms. Lynckner. I appreciate BOEM coming and updating us at each of these meetings. I think it's good to see how the timeline progresses forward and where we are in the timelines, and it's been a long process, and so it helps to update, and, also, I appreciate BOEM sending us someone local, that knows Louisiana, who understands Louisiana fisheries, to present this stuff to us, and I think that's important at each of the regional meetings.

I actually have a bird question for you, believe it or not, and so I'm not the bird guy, but I venture out into the fourth floor of our building once in a while, and talk to the wildlife guys, and some of their concerns, with these wind leases, are the migratory

birds that come through in those areas on the Gulf, and I noticed the slide show talks about pelagic bird consideration of twentyfour species, and was there consideration also for migratory birds, even though this is a Gulf fisheries council, but bear with me.

MS. LYNCKNER: Thank you, Mr. Schieble, for your question. Absolutely, and so we worked really closely with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and they provided data to us to -- Actually, I can't remember what slide it is, but the example that I showed you was a dataset from them, where we worked with them, and we actually implemented buffers to minimize the overlap of the migratory bird pathway with our plans for where we put the windfarms, or allow the lease that could potentially be a windfarm, and so, yes, absolutely, and we are always open, as more information is coming out, if we need to adjust our analyses. Thank you.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Okay. Good. Thank you. I appreciate the answer.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ms. Lynckner, for coming. I have commented before, but I very much appreciate, echoing the comments that have already been made, you all's frequent appearances at council meetings and getting the word out and keeping everybody up-to-speed.

My question is looking down the road, unfortunately negatively, but the sale from Number 1 was, as I understand it, disappointing to the agency, and what are BOEM's thoughts relative to Sale Number 2, if they're similar or worse, in terms of response to your lease sale? Are you thinking, for example, of moving forward with a third iteration, or what are your thoughts, if things go south of where you're planning to be, of what steps you might take?

MS. LYNCKNER: Thank you for that question, and so I would have to actually say that we were pretty ecstatic, even though we had one lease, and we moved pretty quickly in our leasing process, due to our community we have here in the Gulf of Mexico, the community of collaboration we already have, and some lessons learned that we pulled from how to get things done in the Gulf of Mexico, and so, when looking at the timeframe from the initiation of our first taskforce to when we got a lease issued, we are -- It was only like two-and-a-half years, and we're pretty ecstatic about that, and it's a stake in the ground, and it's a starting point.

Even though, yes, we would have liked a greater turnout, and we spent probably the better part of the last fall trying to understand what happened, and there's some macroeconomics in

there, and there's some inflation issues, and we've learned a lot about what happened, per se, but, looking forward, as we continue to talk to industry, consistency is really important.

One thing we've learned is, when we were putting out annual lease sale schedules, something they could plan on, it was helpful to them, and so, whether or not this is the perfect time for a second sale, we know that our consistency, over time, is going to help everybody understand, and so, as we move forward with putting that potentially next sale, the second and third, we're looking forward to creating that same kind of framework that industry, and our resource partners, have looked to for planning and consistency purposes, because we asked industry what's a good time for you, and they were like, well, and not that we're basing it all on that, but it's like when would the timing be, and they can't give a good answer, and so we can do what we can do, which is provide consistency.

MR. GILL: Thank you for that, and so, if I read between the tea leaves here, barring hitting the jackpot on Lease 2, there is a likelihood of continuing follow-on lease sales until you get to whatever goal you're trying to achieve, and is that a fair statement?

MS. LYNCKNER: I would say we're definitely looking ahead and planning. The decisions haven't been made, and not only are we - You know, we're collaborating according with the state, and those are key partners in helping some of this, and, when they make -- Like Louisiana has administrative goals of five gigawatts by 2035. When they come out with things like that, as we can coordinate with them, other states of Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas, all of that -- It's all a piece of the puzzle, and so, yes, we're definitely -- We have a positive outlook, and we -- It's going to happen, but it's just getting it all -- It's just getting us all in the same room for years to be innovative and make it happen.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Ms. Lynckner, for being here. It's great to meet you in-person, and I appreciate all the coordination you've had with my office. I was going to ask a similar question to Bob Gill, and so I won't ask that, but I just want to, I guess, use the time to say thank you. You know, going forward, obviously, we're interested in working very closely with you on the Gulf Wind 2 wind energy areas and lease siting, and we had provided, obviously, a comment letter, and we appreciate all the coordination

that's going on with the shrimp industry in particular, and it's great to know that they've been really onboard, and you've been engaging them heavily, and certainly the marine spatial planning process has been super helpful in deconflicting things.

Obviously, from the Fisheries Service, kind of the trust resources that we manage, we see better and worse areas for lease sites, and so we'll, obviously, want to weigh-in and look at, obviously, the next steps, but I look forward to continued collaboration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Last question, Dr. Porch.

 DR. PORCH: Thank you. Well, I wanted to reiterate Mr. Strelcheck's comment commending BOEM for adopting the marine spatial planning approach and the habitat suitability modeling that NCOS spearheaded, and, just in case any of you don't know, both the Southeast Regional Office and the Southeast Center, you know, worked very hard to construct several of the data layers that were included in there, including working with the stakeholder, and so I think it's an extremely powerful tool, and it's one of the best examples of proactive deconfliction we have, and so great job on that one.

Then I also wanted to thank BOEM, and one of those data layers was a protected resources data layer, and BOEM is interested in continuing the funding for the aerial survey, and other surveys, for large whales, Rice's whale, et cetera, and so that's going to be very important, since these are sited in areas where we see a variety of whales, and so we need that baseline, and so thank you for your interest there.

I did want to ask you kind of a follow-up question on the potential for unsolicited lease requests, and whether that will follow some similar marine spatial planning process, and if you could elaborate on that a little bit, and what's the process for evaluating suitability of these unsolicited proposals?

MS. LYNCKNER: Thank you for bringing that up. That's one thing that I didn't touch on, and so there's two avenues to obtain a lease, and one is through our formal leasing process, where we actually have a lease auction, and then there is the ability to come in and put a proposal in for an unsolicited lease.

I think that we've heard there's a perspective that this looks like it's going around, and I can see how that sounds, or it could sound like that, but it's important that I communicate that we would absolutely use the NCOS model for every unsolicited proposal

that comes in, and so that's our plan at this point. It is not a go-round, and it becomes its own individual formal process, and so there are some ways of -- If it's within areas that we've already done NEPA, and we've already done consultations, that could shortcut some things, because we can do determinations of NEPA adequacy and things like that, but, if it's in its own area, outside of what we've already studied, it's going to get the full-blown analysis.

We have a few that have come in, and we have looked at -- We have actually worked with the NCOS team to analyze -- They were actually east of our current call area, and we have worked with them, through the NCOS process, and we actually reported back to the company that you wanted this big area, and we find this area most suitable, based on the model output, and so we absolutely find working with the team beneficial, and we look forward to continuing that, even on these unsolicited proposals.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you again, Ms. Lynckner, for being here and giving the information today. We really appreciate it.

MS. LYNCKNER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We are scheduled for a break at 12:15, and we have an hour-and-fifteen-minute break for lunch. We're currently, or at least as of a little while ago, we have enough people registered to go through to five o'clock, and so I'm anticipating that maybe a few more will trickle in, and so I'm trying to keep our time schedule for lunch, to make sure we start on time, but we do have two agenda items before we get to lunch at 12:15, and so, Andy, I'm guessing -- Looking to you, do you want to try to do both, and do you think you have time? I think there is something under the exempted fishing permit applications, and so I don't know if that needs to be done first, before public comment.

MR. STRELCHECK: My concern is that we really want to spend some time talking to you about the equity and environmental justice presentation, and I feel like we would be rushed if we try to cram that in, but we also have staff here that have come in to give the presentation in-person, and I don't know their schedules and where we can move that to on the agenda, and so we need to factor that in. I think we could certainly talk about the exempted fishing permit.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Then we will proceed with the next agenda item, and that is Opportunities to Advance Equity and Environmental Justice in the Gulf of Mexico Fisheries through the Southeast EEJ Implementation Plan, Tab A, Number 9. Mr.

Strelcheck.

2 3 4

1

5

6

7 8 9

10 11 12

13 14 15

22 23

24

29 30 31

36

37

38 39

40 41 42

43

48

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

DR. SUZANNA BLAKE: Good morning, everyone. My name is Suzanna Blake, and I am an anthropologist with the Southeast Fisheries This project is a collaboration between the Science Center. Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the Regional Office, and so I co-presenting today with Dr. Christina Package-Ward, and so I'm going to go right in, because we are pressed for time.

As a reminder, NOAA Fisheries released its first national equity and environmental justice strategy last May. This strategy establishes a national framework for advancing EEJ across all facets of our mission-related work. While the framework helps to promote consistency and clarity in our objectives and approaches across the nation, it also emphasizes a regional approach, and so it specifically asks each region to develop a joint Regional Office and Science Center implementation plan, and this plan is due this coming April.

The emphasis on the regional approach is meant to recognize the particular circumstances and challenges, as well as opportunities, that each region faces. For the Southeast, it's essential to tailor our approach to our communities and their particular circumstances. Last year, in August and October, Andy updated you on our efforts to engage the Southeast communities and to develop our regional implementation plan, and he also talked about some of the key insights and takeaways from our first engagements.

Here is a brief recap of the several different strategies we have employed to engage communities. We conducted twenty focus group meetings with underserved community members and liaisons across the region, including eight focus groups around the Gulf of Mexico. In Panama City, Florida, Hurricane Idalia disrupted our plans for a focus group, and so we conducted an informal scoping meeting there.

In addition to focus groups and scoping meetings, we also solicited broader stakeholder input through public requests for information, which was published in the Federal Register on July 21 and closed on September 30, and we also organized a virtual multilingual listening session that was conducted in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese, and this was the first engagement of this kind in the Southeast, and our goal was to ensure that nobody had barriers in terms of attending and listening to our information.

2 3

I will briefly present on some of the key things we've learned through this effort. First of all, I want to mention that organizing these initial conversations with underserved communities was extremely challenging, and this was mainly because we didn't have much information on these communities, and we didn't know who they were, and we have learned that we need to learn more about the challenges they face, and we need to learn about their culture and history, to be able to better engage them.

 Some of the things we've heard are that we need to further diversify our communications and outreach platform. We should think about things like where they live, their language, their education, and how they use technology is very important. We heard that communities would like us to be more present, by working with people they already trust, like port agents, field staff, Sea Grant, and community NGOs. This is to share information better, to build trust, and, most importantly, to ensure that the work we do at NOAA Fisheries is grounded in the realities that these communities face.

We also learned that we have to act fast, and we've heard some of that conversation today in relation to the shrimp situation, and some of the issues, like those affecting fishing community survival, are urgent, like the IFQ and other infrastructure-related challenges, and the message was clear that, if we don't act fast, there might be no fisheries, or communities, left to save.

We also heard that many underserved communities don't feel their perspectives, and their viewpoints, are understood, considered, or presented, because they don't see themselves, or someone like them, at the decision-making table. They also feel that big industries and federal projects harm their communities and the resources they depend on, and, lastly, we learned that they want us to focus on solutions. They are counting on us to work together, and not just within our group, but also with other state and federal agencies.

Now I will turn my focus to some of the steps we have been taking to formulate our original implementation plan. We heard many, many ideas from our communities across the Gulf, and across the Southeast region, about the things we could do to help address and identify barriers and advance our national EEJ objectives. I want to pause for a second to acknowledge our SERO colleague, Heather Blough, who has coordinated this massive effort, and she's done a tremendous job.

Since Andy briefed you last fall, a small team of Regional Office

and Science Center staff has been working to compile this information into a list of potential items, action items, that we could incorporate into our regional implementation plan. We also developed some corresponding metrics.

To organize this information, we decided to bin the items by national objectives, and also to incorporate several sorting and ranking criteria to support efforts to prioritize inclusion of these action items, and we color-coded them to distinguish several different types of categories of issues that were identified from the process.

For example, some action items, like translating more information, are seemingly straightforward, things that we can do right away to increase access and opportunities to decision processes. Other action items, like addressing market challenges in shrimp and IFQ fisheries, and to create a more level playing field, would require partnerships to accomplish them. We adopted, from our national strategy, several action items that seemed appropriate to include in our plan, considering our regional context, and we also highlighted other actions, and issues, that we have commonly heard throughout this process, but that we don't believe are best addressed in an EEJ implementation plan.

The result of this work was more than 300 specific action items, which we then consolidated to about 170, and the substantive items we've included in our briefing book for feedback are those that are most relevant to the work that we do, that you do, and they might include some items that communities asked us to consider that we may determine to be inappropriate or unfeasible, for reasons like the fact that they are outside of the scope of this effort, or they're not really in our purview to address, or because they require resources that are not readily available.

Many of the items we've included are not funded, but are being retained at this point so that we don't lose sight of them. If we determine that work is needed, and additional funds become available, then we have the list there. We can also use this information to leverage resources, if we need to make it happen.

We understand that there is a lot there to review and provide feedback on. Dr. Package-Ward will provide a preview of the types of things that we are considering under each objective on the remaining slides, and we will be asking for your feedback, at the end, on the more specific items on the list we've provided, and, just to guide some of the feedback, some of the questions, that she is going to be asking, is are you seeing things there that resonate with you, that you would like to support if you had the

funding to do so? Have we identified any actions that you feel you could support with existing funding? Are we considering anything that concerns you or that you would like to discuss in more detail, and are you already doing work in a particular area that you want to make sure we capture and acknowledge in our plan?

Now I will let Dr. Package-Ward go through some of the action items that we've identified in our region under each national strategy objective.

DR. CHRISTINA PACKAGE-WARD: The research and monitoring objective in the national strategy aims to broaden the research and monitoring work that we do to identify and characterize underserved communities, so that we can better understand and address the impacts of our decisions on their livelihood and culture.

These are some of the types of actions that we're considering under that topic, and our first area of focus is the identification and assessment of the needs of these communities. This includes a thorough analysis of the barriers and challenges that they encounter in engaging in both fishing and aquaculture. Another item is to assess equity across the entire fisheries value chain, which means examining equity issues from seafood consumers to commercial fishermen.

Also included were a number of topics regarding impact assessments, such as the projected versus actual outcomes of management actions and the effects of climate change, offshore wind developments, and seafood imports. We have action items focused on better integrating local and traditional ecological knowledge into the decision-making process, including the coproduction, and codevelopment, of stock assessments, and then we have identified additional research topics, like diversification, literacy issues, and addiction.

The national outreach and engagement objective aims to ensure our communication platform, and languages and outreach activities, effectively reach underserved communities. For example, that we write and speak in plain language, that our documents are translated into appropriate primary languages, and that we share information about the work that we do in a way that is understandable and clear, and the council is already doing some really commendable work in this area, including offering constituents the ability to provide public testimony virtually and recording council meetings and public hearings for those who aren't able to join at the scheduled time, and those are just a few examples.

Throughout the engagement process, we heard a lot of kudos from people that we spoke with in the Gulf about Emily's great work engaging with and communicating information to stakeholders, such as the work that she and Carly described yesterday and today during the Outreach and Education Committee.

Additional action items we're considering under this topic would explore additional approaches and strategies that could be employed to reach communities with language, technology, and other communication barriers. For example, we heard that some communities could benefit from more traditional communication mechanisms, such as paper, rather than Fishery Bulletins, as their access to digital resources is limited, and that we have more work to do to improve our ability to use simple, plain language.

 There are some action items that focus on developing proactive and tailored approach outreach strategies for rural areas and target underserved populations, such as women, and on establishing or better using existing community liaisons for direct interaction. We'll be organizing a Sea Grant workshop on this topic later this year.

We were also called to review our approaches to adapt to all education levels, and leveraging local insights for more effective outreach is a key focus area here, based on community suggestions, and probably one of the most simplest, and most effective, ways to better reach some of these communities, if we had the funding to is to translate more of our information products into primary languages and appropriate incorporate multilingual liaisons to ensure seamless communication, and then, lastly, under this topic, we have also included actions to expand educational opportunities and the use of language that emphasizes that we're listening to you and considering community challenges and issues. Moreover, we're looking into forming partnerships for addiction and mental health support, acknowledging the significant role that these play in community wellbeing.

The national policies and plans objective aims to incorporate EEJ into our policies in a way that helps us better serve communities that have been under or unserved in the past. Specific topics related, that were identified through engagement activities, focused on ensuring equitable access to offshore aquaculture and cooperative research opportunities, as well as fishery disaster assistance, seafood and permit markets, and fishery management decisions.

So, for example, you will see several action items aimed to address market inequities in the shrimp and IFQ fisheries through the

national seafood strategy for shrimp, supporting your ongoing work on Reef Fish Amendments 59 and 60 for IFQ, and then other related activities. The Gulf Futures Project that John Walter briefed you about on Monday, and then Mike Rubino talked about today, would be a key component of this.

7 We 8 ob 9 ob

We included several actions that we would like to explore with our observer program to improve cultural awareness in fishery observers. For example, developing new policies on training, perhaps address the feasibility of taking cultural issues into account when assigning observers to vessels, things like that, and then, finally, other policy-related actions focus on enabling us to better incorporate community feedback into our data collection, science and management processes, and simplifying survey and fishery permit requirements.

The national benefits objective aims to more equitably distribute benefits among stakeholders by increasing opportunities and services to underserved communities and identifying and addressing any systemic barriers, for example complicated grants processes, that make it challenging for those with limited capacity to apply for funds.

The types of actions we identify to achieve this focus on supporting communities include identifying staff, or partners, who can provide technical assistance with applications for grants, fishing permits, and fishery disaster assistance, establishing or supporting existing vocational training programs, as well as scholarship, internship, and mentorship programs, providing financial assistance through grants, or possibly by collaborating with our Fisheries Finance Office to explore options for increasing access to capital, and then there are several other action items under this objective focused on infrastructure, wind, and more general access barriers.

The national inclusive governance objective aims to ensure that all stakeholders are equally welcomed and encouraged to participate in the decisions that affect them. The action items that we're considering to advance this objective would explore new strategies for increasing access for public meetings and input processes, including both feasibility of collaborating with partners to establish local hubs to support community participation and virtual meetings and the potential to provide financial assistance to support engagement efforts.

 Other action items aim to further diversify our various advisory bodies and committees, to ensure a broad range of perspectives are considered in decision processes, and we're considering the

feasibility of working with educational programs, like MREP, to address some of the educational needs we identify through this process.

The empowering environment objective of the national strategy essentially directs us to create the support structure for all of this work that we talked about previously, and so action items intended to achieve this in the Southeast include providing specialized training for observers, port agents, and grant reviewers that is specific to their job duties, plain language training for all staff, and training all regional NMFS and council staff, as well as the various advisory panels and committees, on our regional EEJ objectives and implementation plan.

Organizing interagency workshops to facilitate information sharing, leveraging resources, and forging partnerships to address more complex cross-jurisdictional challenges, like the imports challenge reported by shrimp fishers, and, finally, pursuing the resources that would be critical to support this work, including additional social scientists and EEJ coordinators throughout the region.

How can you help? We're currently completing a series of internal staff-level conversations designed to help us review and refine the consolidated list of funded and unfunded actions and related performance metrics that we've developed, and then, most importantly, identify those actions that we have or can create the bandwidth to take on to demonstrate our commitment to this effort. These are also the issues that we would appreciate your feedback on related to the items that we've included in Tab A, Number 9(a) of your briefing book.

Because our implementation plan is due to Headquarters on April 5, we're looking to receive your input by March 15. Specifically, we're looking to receive information about what the council already does to support EEJ efforts, and we did hear a lot, you know, of the great work that Emily is doing, Emily and Carly, and feedback about whether the additional actions identified are realistic or achievable if adequately funded, how you would like to prioritize the actions, and anything else the council could do to support EEJ efforts.

We'll do our best to integrate and address any feedback you provide into the plan by our April 5 deadline, but it's important to note that this is a living document, and we'll continue to adapt and modify it in response to new information and lessons learned along the way, and we look forward to continued collaboration with you on this initiative. We would like to say thank you, thank you for

listening, and thank you for any feedback that you might provide on our action items.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Do we have any comments or initial feedback? It's a little tight for us to provide some comments, but does anyone have any initial thoughts on this? Mr. Schieble.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: Well, since the timeline is not ideal for us to do this, but I was thinking we could come back in April, and we could provide a motion with a list, a prioritized list, or something like that, but how do you see this going forward now, now that we can't do that, and do we just give you a list?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: They mentioned they have an April 5 deadline, and I don't know if that can be moved, or pushed back.

DR. PACKAGE-WARD: It's a national deadline, and so I think it's pretty set, but I'm sure we could incorporate things later on too, if that --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Go ahead, Chris.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I will just throw two things out and see if they stick to the wall here somehow, and, obviously, the IFQ situation, as you mentioned, and I think that would be a top priority for equity and justice within that system that we're working on currently, and also the shrimp situation, with imports, and those would be my top two priorities that I would suggest, if anybody else has any input.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just to make a few comments, first, thank you for the presentation, and the whole EEJ team for the work they've done, and it's been a monumental effort. It really has, and they've taken well over 300 ideas, concepts, issues and reduced them down to about 170 priority activities, which is still a tremendous amount.

 I hear the concerns about providing detailed input, given the short time schedule, and they're correct that there is a national deadline, but I would still encourage the council, if you want to provide input, that we could discuss this in April, and we'll continue to, obviously, use this plan as kind of a living document going forward.

47 Carrie and I spoke earlier in the week, and I know, Carrie, you 48 spoke with some of the EEJ team about some of thoughts and

reactions that you had, and we are very open to also having phone calls, you know, verbal conversations, to just get your input in this shorter period of time, and so I think there's a number of mechanisms and opportunities to provide feedback going forward.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I briefly talked with Dr. Simmons, and it sounds like it's a living document, as it was described, and so certainly, you know, these are important issues, and there's been a lot of work that's been put in, and so we really want to give it the appropriate amount of time, you know, for council members to really be able to digest this and think about these things and offer some information to answer the questions that have been asked of us today, and so I think that's what we'll shoot for, is to put it on the agenda for the April meeting, and then provide those comments, but certainly, you know, I guess, if you have an individual comments, you know, to help them, you can go ahead and do that, but I think it would be best maybe if we wait until April and have more of a unified message, potentially. Anyone else have any comments? All right. Well, thank you again for being here. We appreciate it.

That will then take us to our next agenda item, and I'm looking at the time here, but we'll try to get the exempted fishing permit in as quick as we can, and so, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't know if Jenny -- Jenny Lee is going to present on this, and I'm not sure it will take very long, and so hopefully it can be a short discussion, as we're standing between lunch.

DISCUSSION OF EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT APPLICATION

 MS. JENNIFER LEE: Good afternoon. NOAA Fisheries received an application for an exempted fishing permit from LGL Associates. Dr. Peter Mudrak is in the room, if you have questions after I share a brief summary. The EFP would allow LGL to test post-release mortality of bycatch in the Louisiana menhaden purse seine fishery, by retaining up to 400 individuals per species of federally-managed red drum, Spanish mackerel, and king mackerel. The research would start in mid-April, and the EFP, if approved, would be valid through December 31.

LGL's goal, in conducting the activity under the EFP, is to assess the impacts of Louisiana commercial menhaden fishery and what it may have on management of federally-managed species in the Gulf. The research is funded by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. State commercial menhaden purse seine fisheries target menhaden and other clupeids, and previous studies indicate

that the federally-managed species of red drum, Spanish mackerel, and king mackerel have been incidentally caught.

 If you're not familiar with the fishery, it uses three techniques to remove bycatch, a roller bycatch reduction device, which is a hose cage designed for excluding very large species, an excluder grate that sorts menhaden and bycatch that passes through the hose onboard the vessel, and then a dewatering screen bycatch incidental -- Bycatch for incidental catch.

The proposed research would evaluate the short-term condition of fish bycatch when they occur in the purse seine fish excluder grates, dewatering screens, and release chutes, with the goal of quantifying the survival of bycatch by species after quantifying the fish bycatch occurring in each exclusion method. LGL scientists would serve as observers on selected fishing trips throughout the course of the 2024 LA menhaden fishing season, characterizing the bycatch.

Again, bycatch fish, including red drum, Spanish mackerel, and king mackerel, would be tagged and held in large flow-through tanks onboard boats used in the commercial sector for twenty-four hours, to assess the survival rates before being released, and the EFP would also allow LGL to lethally sample up to 200 individuals per species, to determine the sex of those captured federally-managed species and determine if the purse seine menhaden fishery may selectively catch one sex more than the other and what are the potential management implications.

The fish that have already died during normal fishing operators, or that die in the survival study would be preferentially sexed, to minimize any additional mortality attributed to the study, and then additional fish would be lethally sampled, only as needed, to provide adequate sample sizes, and, if issued, the EFP would exempt the applicant from the following prohibitions: holding within a twenty-four-hour limit condition, the harvest of king mackerel and Spanish mackerel by purse seine, vessel limits of king mackerel less than twenty-four inches fork length exceeding 5 percent, and hopefully you know all your regs, possession limits of Spanish mackerel less than twelve inches fork length exceeding 5 percent, and then it would authorize the applicant to basically use the prohibited gear for harvest otherwise prohibited, and then, again, harvest, possess, offload, sale, or purchase of red drum, king mackerel, or Spanish mackerel in excess of the seasonal harvest limitations, but they're not planning to sell any of the catch. That is a very brief summary of the EFP that we're looking at.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any questions? I understand -- I don't see the

applicant, or is Dr. Mudrak -- He's raising his hand. Okay. Do we have any questions? Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Just one real quick one, and so the menhaden fishery -- Is this -- I'm curious the amount of time that will be spent potentially interacting with the offshore reproductive stock of red drum out there, and I'm just curious along those lines, how much the menhaden fishery interacts with that between state and federal waters.

MS. LEE: I do not know the answer to that question. Would it be all right if I asked, or would we want to -- Is it okay to ask Dr. Mudrak to answer it?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Yes. Welcome, Dr. Mudrak. We appreciate it.

DR. PETER MUDRAK: The primary goal is just to quantify the total number of fish caught by season, and we're going to sample 400 net sets, split up by month, and so, when they do interact with those fish, they should show up in the study, and we'll get a better picture of when that's occurring, but I suspect they're going to catch red drum throughout the whole fishing season. I believe it's October, towards the end of the season, when the fish are actually in the spawning condition.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Geeslin.

 MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've got a couple of questions. I presume we're identifying some data gap here, and what I heard you say is we're wanting to quantify the numbers that are caught during this fishing activity. If that's the case, I question why we're doing all this survivability kind of post-catch experimentation, and I also note that we're excluding both -- No reef fish or sharks, and is there a reason we're excluding sharks and reef fish?

 DR. MUDRAK: Well, reef fish are -- About once a decade, there have previously been bycatch studies, and there have not been, previously documented, any reef fish inshore, in the shallow, muddy water, and so, if we do happen to come across a reef fish, we'll -- We don't think we'll have enough sample size to assess survival, and we'll just weigh and measure and release that fish.

Sharks, the original RFP did request that we assess survival, and so fish that go through those bycatch excluding devices are released alive, and, based on my limited experience on these boats, the first step -- If they don't go through the hose, like those fish at first glance appear like they could have very high

survival, and so that is very important, the management, if say 99 or -- If 90 or 100 percent of those fish are surviving, versus 5 percent.

The intention is to hold them in some large flow-through tanks for twenty-four hours. We did not request sharks, because they are large, ram-ventilating species, and we figured that trying to keep them alive in a tank for twenty-four hours was not going to be ——It was not going to give us an accurate survival estimate, and you can sex them externally, and so we don't have to lethally sample any to determine sex ratios on sharks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I may have missed it, but I presume that the result of this work under this EFP will be provided to the Science Center?

DR. MUDRAK: I believe so. The study is being directed by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, and we are supposed to try and actually produce some publications out of the results when it's over.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

DR. MUDRAK: Peer-reviewed publications.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I want to clarify the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission is the one that has -- I mean, you're doing this study for them?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dave.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so this was actually a request by the Louisiana State Legislature, and we worked with LDWF and said that, on their behalf, we would send out an RFP and conduct this study, and so the funding actually came from the State of Louisiana, and we sent out RFPs, and we reviewed the proposals, and then LGL was selected as the organization to conduct it, and so that's kind of the background of this.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: My understanding, because it's hard for me to read, is this is to determine the post-release mortality rate of these fish?

 MR. DONALDSON: Correct.

1 2

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that the council recommends approval of the LGL EFP.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Maybe let's wait until Full Council, in case there's any public comment, and we can take that into consideration before we make the motion. I mean until after public testimony. Then we'll take it up. Thank you. All right, and so I think that will do it. Thank you very much. I appreciate it, and we are just -- We're fifteen minutes behind schedule. We're going to probably need an hour-and-fifteen minutes, but we will start promptly at 1:45.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on January 31, 2024.)

January 31, 2024

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

VEDNESDAT AFTERMOON SESSION

- - -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Hyatt Centric French Quarter in New Orleans, Louisiana on Wednesday afternoon, January 31, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Good afternoon, everyone. Public input is a vital part of the council's deliberative process, and comments, both oral and written, are accepted and considered by the council throughout the process.

The Sustainable Fisheries Act requires that all statements include a brief description of the background and interest of the persons in the subject of the statement. All written information shall include a statement of the source and the date of such information.

Oral or written communications provided to the council, its members, or its staff that relate to matters within the council's purview are public in nature. Please give any written comments to the staff, as all written comments will be posted on the council's website for viewing by council members and the public and will be maintained by the council as part of the permanent record.

Knowingly and willfully submitting false information to the council is a violation of federal law. We will welcome public comment from in-person and virtual attendees. Anyone joining us virtually that wishes to speak during public comment should have already registered online. Virtual participants that are registered to comment should ensure that they are registered for the webinar under the same name they used to register to speak. In-person attendees wishing to speak during public comment should sign-in at the registration kiosk located in the back of the meeting room. We accept only one registration per person.

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

If you have a cellphone or similar device, we ask that you keep 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, and please be advised that alcoholic beverages are not permitted in the room. Please note that public comment may end before the published agenda time, and that won't happy today, and so we will go ahead and start, and I'm going to rotate. We've got, of course, two groups of people. We've got virtual, and we have in-person, and so I'm going to start with the in-person list, and then I'm going to go next to the first person, or the next person, on the virtual list, and then I will come back to the in-person list. First up then for the audience, or the public folks here in the audience, is Patrick Neukam.

PUBLIC COMMENT

 MR. PATRICK NEUKAM: Good afternoon. My name is Pat Neukam from Madeira Beach. I'm a charter fisherman, and I'm a recreational fisherman, and I'm a commercial fisherman with my son. My son has entered the commercial industry, and I wrote all of you an email, and I finished it with "a fisherman and a concerned father". If you have any questions about that, please ask me at the end, or email me or call me at another time.

Right now, I want to -- I'm not going to yell at you, like everybody else is, about MRIP, and we know it's wrong. Everybody in this room knows it's wrong, and what I am going to talk about is SEFHIER. You want to make a system that you can have real-time knowledge of how the fishery is doing, the health of the fishery, and you will see it by SEFHIER.

The reason I say that is you're going to have a group of fishermen, after it's established, that you will know the biomass of what the fishery is with this set of numbers, and, unlike the commercial guys, a charter trip is a segment of time, and so a commercial trip goes out there, and he catches 5,000 pounds of red grouper in a small period of time, or a large period of time, and that may not be caught as well, and documented as well.

With the SEFHIER program, if you set it up right, you will know that he left there, and he caught fifty-seven red grouper, and he caught it in eight hours, seven, eight, ten, whatever the limit was, but they were legal-sized fish. You take that year over year, and, analytically, you should be able to tell what the recreational fishermen are doing and what the commercial fish are doing with the age comparison. That will give you -- With the right tool, and the right equation, it will give you an exact condition of the health of your fishery at the time.

Okay. The biggest thing you've got to remember is these guys are experienced. They know what they're doing, and they know the fishery, and so, when you utilize that tool to reference it, it's the same people, year after year, and so, when you see a decrease in gag grouper -- For example, if you would have had this system up, and you would have seen that, look, half of our charter guys aren't limiting out, and they're not catching forty-seven gag on a trip, and they're catching thirty-two on a trip, that information is going to be there, and you will see that within months.

You will be able to break it down week after week, year over year, compared to -- On October 1 through November 1, year after year, and we cannot -- We cannot dilute the system, but we have to make it simple, so that you get all their involvement, and they want to do this, because our side wants this fishery to be there. I want this to be here, and I want it here for my grandson, and I want it here for my great-grandson, and so this tool needs to be implemented correctly, and we need to do it quickly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Neukam. We have a couple of questions. Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Patrick. You did not mention the word "economics", and what is your opinion on that portion?

MR. NEUKAM: I believe, if you want to know economics -- I'm worried that that is going to be your biggest nemesis, and so do we do commercial? Do we do the economics on everybody every year? Why not do an annual select group, and you get drawn, just like

you do in commercial, and, in my mind, I think that would work, because, if it's voluntary, it's skewed, right, and everybody agrees that voluntary information is skewed, but, if it's required by a certain percentage, on annual basis, it's not a continuous issue.

The other option would be to do an annual report at the end of the year, because, if you look at economical, and I'm going to use the guy down in the Keys that's running a Freeman, my boat, and my boat cost a tenth of what his does, and so, if we look at this for economic disaster relief, his cost to keep his business running is going to be \$10,000 a month more than it is my business running, and so I believe — I believe we need to really watch how we look at economics.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: So, in your letter you sent to all of us, it was discussing what you felt were the best alternatives for the IFQ program, and you listed your four priorities, or goals, in there, and could I ask you a question about that? Do you feel like doing that? I know you only get three minutes.

MR. NEUKAM: Yes. Go ahead.

MR. SCHIEBLE: So you listed cheaper access to the fishermen, remove public investment, reduce cost for the next generation, assist in removing outside industry influence, but you didn't mention the permit requirement. Any particular reason?

MR. NEUKAM: So I didn't. We currently do not have a permit, and what I was saying our goals should be -- That is what our goals should be, and a permit -- I agree 100 percent that a permit should be required. To make that clear, a permit should be required, yes, but those were the things. The goal for the fishery, those were what I saw as most important, but, yes, a permit is --

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you. It stuck out to me that it wasn't included, and so that's why I wanted to ask.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Neukam, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Next up, we have Donald Veasey.

MR. DONALD VEASEY: Good afternoon, council. My name is Donald Veasey, and I am going to yell a little bit about MRIP, or not really yell, but anyway. I reside in west-central Florida, and I'm a recreational fisherman, and I fish primarily from headboats

and charters in the Gulf of Mexico. My comments today are concerning the suspect MRIP data that came out for both red grouper and gag grouper in 2023.

There are glaring inconsistencies that need explanation from NOAA science before the entire industry sees job-killing restrictions and limited recreational opportunities to target these species. I was going to go into the actual data, but, after listening to yesterday's reef fishery presentation, it was apparent that the council is aware that there are glaring inconsistencies in the data being received from NOAA.

We have to have better data, and we have to stop basing catch on such small numbers of intercepts. I personally would like to see NOAA also somehow figure out how weather affects the effort, as the high wave numbers occurred at the same time that the recreational fishery was experiencing bad weather last year, especially in west-central Florida.

It's obvious, to the fishing community, that our access to the resource is in danger of being limited based on erroneous data, and it's unfortunate, because it reinforces narratives that agencies have agendas that aren't in the public's interest. I don't personally fall into that camp, but I do recognize how those narratives come about, based on issues like this.

I call on the council to push back on NOAA's data, to make them accountable for how they came by these numbers, before we deny fishermen access to the resource and hurt jobs in the industry. Do not harm should be our overall guiding principle, and those are my comments for today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. I don't see any questions, but thank you. Next, we have Ken Haddad.

 MR. KEN HADDAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and council members. My name is Ken Haddad, American Sportfishing Association, and from the Big Bend area of Florida. First, we want to make you aware that, for the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, staff have indicated that a final rule will be released soon. You all made comments to the sanctuary on the proposed rule, and the council expressed concern about the implications on the protocol and the council's charge to manage fishery resources.

We're concerned that the final rule, being imminent, is still unclear how the protocol for cooperative fisheries management may change and affect fisheries management, because no -- There is no opportunity for public review or comment.

Because the council was a signee to the protocol, we ask the council to discuss the status of this document, perhaps at this meeting, and, if necessary, agenda in an in-depth public reviewed protocol for this -- For looking at this issue, and I have provided some information to several of you.

We are okay with halting work on gag grouper. We're anxious to see the landings data for gag and red grouper and how that is resolved. Emily, we support the submission of the framework action on lane snapper, and the glass is half full, but we do recognize that, since MRIP-FES data are used, it will likely mean a revisit, if MRIP is ever sorted out.

On MRIP, you have the FES survey issues that are undergoing a multiyear look, with a possible 30 to 40 percent overestimate in landings, and you have the red and gag grouper anomalies that made it out of S&T, and the red snapper SEDAR has sent the assessment back to the drawing board, because of the incomprehensible variables in the model, and there's probably things that we don't know about, and we can only conclude there is a systemic problem in the system, and it's failing your management, and so we hope that the council, and NOAA leadership at the highest levels, realize how serious this really is at this point and take action to understand that there is, at this point, a total lack in confidence in MRIP-FES.

We did send you a letter asking to rescind the motion that was discussed yesterday in Assane's presentation. We do, based on what Mr. Strelcheck said, and I think confirmed by staff, that there are not going to be any FES conversions for OFL and ACLs, but we still think you should look at that motion and make sure it's relevant. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Ken. Any questions? No questions. Thank you. Next, we have Ben Choi.

MR. BEN CHOI: Good afternoon, council members. My name is Ben Choi, and I'm a recreational and commercial spear fisherman out of the Tampa Bay area. I've been fishing, and spearfishing, offshore for over twenty years, and the comments I'm making today are regarding the recent data used to make regulatory decisions in red grouper, gag grouper, and other reef fish fisheries.

 Council members, I believe we've come to a tipping point in the management of the Gulf fishery, at which you have the power to decide which way the decision is made. Do we continue to accept a, quote, unquote, best available science, such as MRIP, when we

know that it's categorically false, or do we use some common sense and put our foot down and throw out this flawed data? It's clear, to anyone, that MRIP is broken.

The fact that members of the Office and Science and Technology can stand in front of the council yesterday and defend such a broken model goes to show how out of touch those who model our fishery are with the actual numbers that are out there. We have to move away from MRIP. We have to find a better solution. I'm here today to ask you two things, number one that you do not use MRIP data for management decisions until it's fixed, and number two that you hold the scientists who continue to put forth this flawed data accountable for the failure to provide accurate data.

I have been involved in listening to fisheries meetings since I was high school, and I'm thirty-four years old now, and one trend that has always carried through is that fishermen are always complaining that the science is wrong, and the scientists are always saying that it's the best available data. However, we have finally come to a point where the science is so egregiously wrong that the scientists can no longer defend it.

I'm just a simple fisherman, and I have no experience in coding or scientific models. However, anyone can see that this is categorically wrong. Now, I may come across as angry and hostile, but it's because the data that these scientists have put forth have had a large negative impact on myself, my friends, and the people in my community.

Before last year's commercial gag quota reduction, 65 percent of our commercial spearfishing revenue was based off of gag grouper. 65 percent. Imagine losing 65 percent of your income. We've had to scrounge around and change the way we dive and fish in order to replace this lost income with revenue from other species. It's been a struggle for my friends and myself to keep a profitable and viable commercial spearfishing business afloat.

My friends who are charter captains booked all of their gag season out with their best clients. Last year, when the season closed early, based on flawed data from the scientists, those clients no longer had a reason to pay for a charter, and they cancelled. Hundreds of charter captains along the west coast of Florida lost tens of thousands of dollars of revenue due to flawed science, and I'm asking the Gulf Council not to rest until these scientists are held accountable. Until we have good, solid science, no one's job should be safe.

Dr. Cody's presentation yesterday really struck a nerve with me,

because he asked everyone to be patient with the changes with MRIP, but I'm not sure he understands that people's livelihoods cannot wait. People's families cannot wait. I'm not sure if these scientists realize that they are literally taking food off the tables of hardworking fishermen of the Gulf coast. Our families, who rely on our income, do not have any time for patience.

 I can tell you that, if I had messed up this badly at my job, that I would no longer have a job. In any other career, this would be — There would be professional consequences for being so categorically wrong. Where are these professional consequences for the scientists in the Office of Science and Technology? When was the last time a high-level scientist in NOAA was formally reprimanded, or fired, for underperforming and putting out data that is seven-times higher than the, quote, unquote, more precise SRFS data?

Did anyone lose their jobs when MRIP-FES was determined to be overestimated by 30 percent? No, and we will continue to have flawed science, and egregious errors, until something is done to hold scientists accountable for the subpar product that they produce. Throughout MRIP-FES, hold scientists accountable. People's livelihoods, and their families, are counting on you. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. Any questions? No questions. All right. Next, we have Eric Schmidt.

MR. ERIC SCHMIDT: Good afternoon. Don't worry. I am not going to talk about African pompano. On July 24, I received this email from NOAA Fisheries. It is titled "Fishery Announces Recreational Fishing Data Collection Priorities for 2024". It's a four-page email. In the spirit of the National Paperwork Reduction Act, you could have sent one sentence, fix the damn problem.

I sent this email to Mr. Strelcheck, and to Ms. Simmons, and I believe to Mr. Anson and a few other members, after the Wave 5 data was released on November 11. Just let this sink in for just a minute. It was 1.475 million pounds of fish. If you extrapolate that to forty-one days, that is 70,465 pounds of fish per day. On a six-pound average, that's 11,744 fish per day.

This includes recreational landings. Recreational fishermen do not fish every single day, and I know for a fact, from friends of mine that are fulltime charter fishermen, there were four days in the month of July that they weren't able to fish, plus they're fishing for red snapper during that time of the year, and red grouper is kind of a bycatch, and now we have the situation with

gag grouper and the one intercept and the 106,000 pounds from shore.

 The numbers have always been the problem. I have been coming here a long time, and we dealt with MRFSS, and then MRIP, and now MRIP-FES, and now there's a new pilot program, and so we just keep kicking the can down the road here, and nothing ever really gets solved. We move from one problem to another problem to another problem, and the next problem you're going to have, if you look at the landings numbers, because nobody is really paying any attention to the deepwater snappers, and, if you look at the recreational landings numbers on those fish, from the years 2015 to 2021, they are astronomically low. You're going to have a serious problem with those fish.

We've got to do something here. This industry is hanging on by a thread. In southwest Florida, we had to deal with a hurricane, and I've moved, and I'm no longer in the fishery, and people are really, really struggling, and I don't think we've got another three or four years to rectify this situation, because this entire process works at such a snail's pace, and so I hope that something can be done soon, and I hope this pilot program is somehow going to be beneficial, because we can't continue at this rate. Have a good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Eric. Next, we have Andrew Smith online. Skip? Okay. Then we'll stay in the virtual world, and we'll go with William Callis. Moi Van. Let's go to the room then. Richard Warren.

MR. RICHARD WARREN: Good afternoon, council. My name is Rick Warren, and I've been fishing the Gulf of Mexico, from Sarasota to Fort Myers, for about the last twenty years. I've spent some time on a bandit boat, a grouper boat, commercial fishing, but, for the last thirteen years, I've been the owner-operator of a federally-permitted offshore fishing charter business.

I flew here today from southwest Florida to urge you to reconsider this MRIP-FES catch data collected regarding red grouper and gag grouper. I believe these numbers are unbelievably high, and absolutely inaccurate, and I would like to explain to you a few reasons why, in my opinion, that they are.

In September of the year 2022, we had a massive hurricane that affected Charlotte Harbor and Naples, one of the most damaging hurricanes in our history, and lives and families were ripped apart from the storm surge. Myself, like many others in my profession, were found jobless in the coming weeks and months, and we were

fortunate to find some -- I was fortunate to find some work running a boat that monitored storm debris removal in the waterways surrounding Fort Myers, from Bonita Springs to Pine Island.

During that time that I was there, I worked seven days a week, twelve hours a day, and I saw commercial boats, and I saw charter boats, and I saw recreational -- Places where recreational fishermen would fish from, like boat ramps and marinas, and these places were all closed. They weren't just closed to them, but they were closed to the public. You would see news crews there, but that was about it. We worked from those locations.

I believe there was no way that intercepts, and surveys, really could have been conducted in these areas like they had been done in years past, and I think that this skewed the data. Let's see. Where were the efforts -- Where did it come from from these surveys? What parts of Lee County and Charlotte County and Collier County -- Where did they come from?

Before the break, I met with a young man who showed me some of the information on where some of these intercepts were done, and he kind of gave me some numbers on the location and how many were done, and Lee County had something like forty-nine intercepts done over an eight-month period, whereas, in the St. Pete area, there was over 600, and I don't believe that that's normal. If you look at previous years, I don't believe that that would be something you would see as normal.

Last year was the first year in the last thirteen years that I really didn't operate, and I only operated about four months out of the year, and I normally run 160 trips out of the year, and I ran about twenty, and so that should show you, and tell you, that — There's many other people like me, that have very similar stories, and so that should you that the numbers should be a whole lot less than what they actually were.

 While I'm here, I also would like to take a second to let you know that I was in favor of the SEFHIER program and that we're really looking forward to it, and a lot of the captains around us are looking forward to giving you better data on our catch, so we stop this guess-and-check, so we can give you better data, so we can have better catch and better fishing days.

I will finish with I'm sure that I'm not telling you anything that you haven't heard from other people, and other people in this room, but --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Warren, could you wrap it up, please?

MR. WARREN: Yes, and I just wanted to let you know that I flew here for about eight hours, just to tell you guys how important it is to me and my family and other fishermen in my area, and I will leave it at that. Thank you, guys.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for being here. Next, we have Bill Dantuono. Bill, are you there?

MR. BERNADINE ROY: You will have to unmute your line, Bill.

MR. WILLIAM DANTUONO: There we go. Good afternoon. Thank you for having me and giving me the opportunity to talk. I'm a dual-permitted federal for-hire reef fish commercial -- I'm a MREP graduate and a recent Gulf states panelist.

My business relies on red grouper being available for harvest. In the last five years, I've seen my business, since being a new entrant, gutted due to inaccurate data. NOAA, and FWC, requires us, as commercial fishermen, to be accountable on our offloads, to the pound or number of fish caught on the recreational side. The consequences of that are criminal or civil fines, but NOAA can be off by a million pounds and it's okay. This double-standard has to end, and NOAA must be held accountable for their actions and inactions. The American people deserve better. Is this the best data we have, as the United States of America? Ask yourself that, because it's not.

On red grouper, NOAA claims we caught an absurd amount in twenty days, and we had a short season, with bad weather, not to mention southwest Florida, where I'm sitting right now, was under three feet of water, and we are still recovering from the hurricane, which, also, we were denied funds from the federal government, because -- We just didn't get any funding from that, on the commercial relief.

Half of our marinas, if they didn't close down altogether, are still closed, and there are multiple boat launches that aren't even open yet, and I can think of four that didn't reopen, or are still closed, just in Naples alone. Marco Boat Ramp won't open until 2025, and so where were these intercepts done? It sure wasn't in southwest Florida, and I know -- Actually, Rick Warren, who just spoke, his business just restarted within the last two months.

When I thought the red grouper numbers were bad, then the gag grouper numbers come out, for that short forty-nine-day season, and that season was even worse with storms. I mean, it started

with Hurricane Idalia, and so when were these 1.3 million pounds caught? They weren't.

NOAA can't have their cake and eat it too. They can't tell us that gag and red grouper stocks are down, and then they tell us an unfathomable amount of fish were caught in a short amount of time, and it's bad weather. These numbers are either deliberate or it's due to incompetence, and there's no other answer. Not a single person in that room believes in these numbers, and so where do we go from here?

We need to find a way to get away from MRIP, and we cannot move forward with these numbers until sound science is completed. We need NOAA to be held accountable. We've been waiting for years to fix this mess, and the time is now. As a federal charter operator, I would love to move away from any flawed recreational data and to use SEFHIER, and that needs to be more palatable for the next phase.

With the recent lawsuit, and, you know, NOAA was trying to get our financial information, and they're just overstepping their bounds. We need to start demanding accountability, and it's putting hardworking Americans out of work, and it also forces pressure on other species, which is what I call total mismanagement. It takes focus away from other important issues which we could be tackling, and my sentiments are representing thousands of other anglers who could not make it to this meeting.

 Lastly, I want to mention these weather forecasts are also wildly inaccurate. I specifically remember, during gag grouper season, a forecast saying the waves were fair, when it was not a fishable day. I'm not sure you have the right datapoints, but, if you're basing fishable days off of NOAA's weather forecasts, then that is something to look at. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Next, we have Ted Venker.

 MR. TED VENKER: Good afternoon. My name is Ted Venker, and I'm with the Coastal Conservation Association. At my very first time at a Gulf Council meeting, I naively signed-up to give public comment on something not at all controversial, like red snapper probably, and I went to introduce myself to Dr. Bob Shipp, who was the chairman of the council at that time, and I told him who I was, and what I was planning to say, and he looked me up and down, as Bob did, and said -- All he said was "gird your loins", and one of the very first and wise pieces of advice that Dr. Shipp gave me back then, and I think of it every time I come to this podium, and so he was a great man, and I'm going to miss him.

2 3

I had a feeling that we were all going to be saying roughly the same thing today, and so I tried to give a little thought to being creative, and I kept coming back to a movie that I watched on a flight recently, and it was a bad movie about the rise and fall of Blackberry, and what struck me, in that movie, was how difficult it must be to pour your time and resources and heart and soul into a product, or a system, and come to realize that it's on the wrong track, that it needs to be radically redesigned to survive.

It's a painful admission, and it's apparently so painful that it's difficult to recognize. Blackberry was huge. It was on the cutting edge, and it had a huge market share, and people called them crackberries, if you remember, because everybody was addicted to them, and they had to have one, and, just a few years later, it was on the dust heap, because iPhone showed up and blew them out of the water, and it was largely because Blackberry executives were a little too arrogant, and they were a little too attached to their technology to see that it was becoming obsolete until it was too late.

It's not a perfect analogy, but it seems that we may have reached that same place with MRIP, and it may have been the best of its kind at one time, at some point, but, for this time, for what we need it to do now, it isn't up to the task, and it's not up to the task when you keep trying to make new fixes, and you patch it with band-aids, and it's not working.

There are a lot of people angry about these grouper numbers, and being mad doesn't seem to get us anywhere. Honestly, I bet we're all tired of being mad about this, and you can see that even Andy is not happy where we are, and, to his credit, he's pointing out where the flaws are and how we can try to fix it this time.

Rich Cody, Clay Porch, John Walter, all the council staff, all the very smart people, all reduced to grappling with things that don't make sense because MRIP keeps kicking out things that don't make sense. You shouldn't have to do that. This has been a problem for a long time, too long, and we absolutely fully, 100 percent, agree with what Ed Walker said yesterday, that this isn't working. We need a new system, and the most promising thing out there is state-based system that can operate in a common currency across all states.

Probably most importantly, we have to stop trying to perfectly align state data with past MRIP data, because we don't know if the past data was ever right, and most likely it was not. We may be standing here trying to get a broken Blackberry to communicate

with an iPhone 12, and it's just not going to happen, and the Blackberry thing, I understand, is a really tortured analogy, and I appreciate you bearing with me, but the bottom line is our MRIP data is a mess, and a fix is easier said than done, and I don't think you can get from where we are now to where we need to be without admitting you're on the wrong track, and, if we can't adapt, or innovate, and go in a new direction, then this whole process is I think just going to keep crashing and crashing.

That was my comments on MRIP, and I just have one more comment, and that is that the management timeline tool, that was in the Outreach and Education Committee report earlier, that thing is really cool, and it's going to be super useful, and so thank you for putting that out there.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Ted.

MR. VENKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Next we have -- Online, we have Evan Rexrout. Sorry. It's been updated. Richard Ryan.

MR. RICHARD RYAN: Hi, council members. How are you doing? Can you hear me all right?

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

MR. RYAN: All right. So I'm not a technical guy, and I'm a fisherman. I own a boat called The Paladin, and it's been in Port Ritchie for years, and I don't have a year. I don't have two years. This closure last year cost me -- I lost \$21,000 of business, not to mention \$10,800 of refunds, and where these numbers are coming from, you already know, they make no sense, but, when you look at the economic impact that this is having, not only on me, and I don't have a year.

My insurance for my boat is \$13,000, and it's a forty-three-foot Jersey Dawn, and it's been in Port Ritchie for close to thirty years, and my insurance -- You know, that has to be paid. My hard costs, they have to be paid, and I simply can't afford to be in this business and be expected to pay bills when there is nothing that people want to go fish for on a charter boat that they can do for, you know, eighty or ninety bucks on a headboat, and so, I mean, if you're going to do something -- My thought would be, and I don't know if this is out of line or not, but my thought would be to maybe make a recommendation that at least the charter boats and the headboats get an exclusive gag season this year, but don't

take it all away. I'm telling you that we don't have a year. I certainly don't, and I'm done. Have a good day.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Chris Horton.

MR. CHRIS HORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. My name is Chris Horton, and I'm with the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, and like a lot of folks that you're hearing from today, and will continue to hear from, we're frustrated with this latest example of the inability of MRIP to meet the needs of federal fisheries management.

It's a good survey for what it was intended to do, but it was never intended to manage in-season, and it never will be, no matter how much money we throw at it. I had the privilege of testifying to Congress to that effect over ten years ago, and we're still here today.

Replacing MRIP with state data collection programs is probably the only viable option that we have. We're very encouraged that NOAA is working with the states and headed in that direction. However, we're just a little bit concerned with the lack of urgency that NOAA seems to have to get us to a point where we can reach a resolution and move forward.

Likewise, we're frustrated with the entire SEDAR 74 process, and this red snapper research track assessment came on the heels of the Great Red Snapper Count, which was the most comprehensive fishery-independent study that's ever been done, and it was the perfect opportunity to hit reset and develop a model that could actually predict what's going on on the water today, but, instead, we used -- Instead, we looked this \$12 million gift horse in the mouth, and it provided us with an absolute abundance study like we've never had before, and an opportunity to build that new model, and to show us what's actually out in the water, or estimate it, but, instead, SEDAR 74 seems to have tried to simply increase the complexity of the single thing that we've always done, which, by the way, underestimates red snapper abundance by, according to the Great Red Snapper Count, around 300 percent.

At the end of the day, we're just discarding the Great Red Snapper Count altogether. It just seems -- It's baffling, to me, how we could ignore the best dataset we've ever had, and, finally, I want to mention one other thing, and you'll probably hear it from some others, but there's a real issue, a real concern, with the sale rate, the decommissioning, of oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico.

The last time the council considered an essential fish habitat designation for oil and gas platforms in the Gulf, there was around 2,200 to 2,500 oil and gas platforms left out there. As of today, this morning, we have 1,101, and 266 of those already have a decommissioning application submitted. Of those, seventy-five are going to the Rigs to Reef program, roughly 28 percent, and so we're losing 72 percent, and so roughly -- We're losing three-quarters of every one that is being decommissioned.

There was a 2020 study by LGL Associates for BOEM that estimated as much as 45 percent of the amberjack biomass is located on the oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico. With the problems that we're having with managing greater amberjack, it seems like now is the right time to reevaluate if the council should pursue essential fish habitat for this species. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Chris. Next, we have Chris Smalley.

MR. CHRIS SMALLEY: Hi. Thanks for letting me speak today. My name is Chris Smalley, and I've been a Florida resident, and a recreational fisherman, here for the past twenty years, and I'm going to beat a dead horse and talk about the grouper assessment.

The season closed early, you know, in October, and, for most of us recreational guys, you know, that don't have huge boats, that's when all of my gag grouper fishing mainly occurs, because, if anyone knows, gag grouper come in closer from October through December, and so I don't see how like these numbers could come out and be that skewed, when anyone that knows anything about fishing knows, you know, when primetime is for gag grouper fishing.

When those assessment numbers were posted, at first, I thought it was a joke, because, I mean, you know, with the technology that we have available today, I can't understanding, or fathom, how, you know, we closed the season early, estimating that we would reach our quota, but then we crush it by that much, when, like other people have stated, you know, there wasn't even a lot of good fishing time during that period, and so something needs to be done.

I have never, ever got on one of these before, but now I'm at a point where, you know, I'm getting pretty pissed off that, you know, you can't even enjoy like one of the best things to do in this state, and so it needs to be fixed, and that's all I've got to say.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mike Colby.

MR. MIKE COLBY: Thank you, council. Mike Colby, and I'm a charter

owner-operator out of Clearwater, Florida, and I'm still President of the Clearwater Marine Association. The ad hoc AP for the SEFHIER program -- It's off on the right foot, and it got started really well, and I made a couple of observations about that.

The first one is, in the fifteen-some-odd years I've followed the council process, I have never seen an eleven-member panel pass thirteen motions unopposed. I found that peculiarly interesting. The second observation is the last motion on not using SEFHIER data for an argument for or against a quota fishery for federally-permitted charter boats -- That -- When I thought about that, whether a fisherman wants a quota fishery or not, they can come to this council, and the council can seat another AP, and you can have that discussion, but I thought that that motion probably should have been left out of that discussion, since they weren't tasked to look at that.

The middle ground that I am looking at, and thinking about one of the motions for -- I remember that everyone collectively agreed that they wanted this SEFHIER program to get up and running as fast as it could, and obviously we need that. We need that enhanced data collection. To me, the middle ground is where we want to end up, and I've looked at a product like NEMO, and there's Boat Command, and there is different already type-approved systems out there, cellular, that can be put on the vessel and can be geofenced.

Yesterday, I had a conversation with the Vice President of Sustainable Fisheries at Woods Hole, and he said that I can program NEMO right now to geofence anywhere you want, characterized by where the fisherman fishes, and I said, great, and, all right, so you have that, and the fisherman still has a mobile device, and they're using eTRIPS, or they're using VESL, and NEMO is great. It can be solar-powered, and you can plug it into 120 if you trailer your boat, but that, to me, is something you might sell as a buy-in from Texas to Florida.

 The biggest argument was we don't want twenty-four-seven tracking. Then fine. We can geofence those cellular platforms, stick them on the boat, take your cellphone, and you're off and running. To me, that is the perfect middle ground that you can probably get a buy-in from most fishermen, I think, throughout the Gulf. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Mike. Mike, we have a question from 46 Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, Mike, one of the other things, other than the VMS

tracking, was the conversation about the economic questions, and what are your thoughts on that?

MR. COLBY: Well, I was always in favor of producing some kind of information so that, you know -- Certainly for disaster relief and BP oil spills and things like that, and I know there's a lot of consternation about it. I don't have a problem with putting down how much I paid for fuel, or what I even charged for the trip, and I don't have a problem with that. Some folks may, but I think, in order for the council to wrap their arms around that, you're probably going to need a lot more public testimony on how other fishermen feel about that before a decision can be made.

I know the AP wasn't particularly in favor of that, but, personally, for me, and I've been fishing for forty-some-odd years, and I will probably stop fishing when the Coast Guard tells me to stop, but, right now, I don't have a problem with that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Next, we have Justin Visconti.

MR. JUSTIN VISCONTI: I'm a recreational fisherman down here in Naples, Florida, and I've been fishing for about seven years. I know that we get out probably every two weeks, and you guys are crushing us with these quota numbers that keep coming in. We don't really know how the numbers are calculated, and we don't understand, but we just know that our resource is getting taken away.

This is an equal resource for everybody, and, you know, we just want to make sure that there's accountability, and, when there's numbers that are as skewed as they are, we just want to make sure that you guys are looking into them, because this is everybody's resource. Not commercial, and not recreational, but it's everyone's, and so that's all I've got to say.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Richard Fischer.

MR. RICHARD FISCHER: All right. Good afternoon, council, and welcome back to the great City of New Orleans and the great State of Louisiana. I am Richard Fischer, and I represent the Louisiana federally-permitted charter-for-hire fleet. I was very proud to serve on the data collection electronic reporting AP, and I think it was a very productive meeting, and I was happy to participate in the process. Despite the fact that about 80 percent of our captains, in our polling, are against moving forward with electronic reporting, I still feel that it's very important to kind of read the room, and participate the process, and make the best of it, and I really appreciate the opportunity to be able to

do that.

I want to explain the rationale behind the permit motion, and I believe there was a question yesterday about that, and about that motion kind of purposely being vague, and so there have been situations in the past, which I've been through here at this podium before, about how we've got a captain who lost his vessel in a hurricane, and he didn't have a vessel to put his logbook on. Therefore, he wasn't able to renew his permit, and, yes, you've always had permits affiliated with the vessels, but, in the past, you could just put it on some vessel you've got in the side yard, and that will be your vessel until you get your actual vessel later on.

When you lose your vessel in a hurricane, you're not thinking about getting another center console immediately, but, with logbooks, you had to. That was one of the issues, and another issue was a captain lost his cellular signal in his boatshed over the winter, and he got a not-so-nice letter from NOAA Fisheries saying that we're not going to let you renew your permit until you fix this, and the wording wasn't great, and both of those situations were addressed, but the issue that we were looking at was to try to work well-intentioned issues with the logbook program and not have permits being on the table for being lost because of that, and, by keeping it vague, we weren't limiting what you guys, as a council, could talk about.

Also, I wanted to talk about the IFQ motion, and provide some rationale on that too, because that was also my motion in the AP, and so it was originally saying let's not use the data from this program toward IFQs, to work toward that program, and the first part of that got removed from the motion during the conversation, as we went along, and we can maybe address that at a future AP meeting, because, you know, some of you all have the opinion that it does not fit within the charge of the AP, and we can address that in the future, and we had our reasons for doing that, but we'll continue talking about it, and I want to thank the AP for making that vote as well, because I think it's very important to make the statement that this data is not going to be used for that, for all the reasons that I went through in the AP.

On economic data, our guys are very against using it as part of the electronic reporting program, and we think there are other ways to do it. Maybe an annual survey based on itemized expenditures, or you could let the Science Center draw a statistically-valid sample of captains.

48 Reimbursement, it's important that we get the reimbursement

program back up and running, and that it's fully funded, and I also want to quickly switch gears and change the subject on --

3
4 CHAIRMAN ANSON: You're out of time. Sorry.

MR. FISCHER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So two things, and so did I understand you to say that 80 percent of your fleet does not want data collection?

MR. FISCHER: That is the polling that we've gotten from the polling that we've put out, yes.

MS. BOGGS: So, if the Science Center did a statistical amount of drawing the economic data for people to report, I'm assuming they would not want to be part of those statistics?

MR. FISCHER: They might not want to, but, you know, we all do a lot of things in life that we don't want to do, but we've got to do, you know, and I think that, while they -- I think they would be much happier having a separate survey that they don't have to do on a daily basis, separate from the electronic reporting itself, but, when push comes to shove, yes, they will probably do it.

MS. BOGGS: Are you telling me that Louisiana wants to secede from the data collection system?

MR. FISCHER: I am not saying that, and I'm not not saying that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Richard, we have a couple more questions for you. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Richard, for your testimony, and so 80 percent means how many numbers? What is the number that is associated with that?

MR. FISCHER: So we're a pretty small sample, and we only had about ten captains respond, which is roughly 10 percent of our federal fleet out of Louisiana. So 10 percent of our federal fleet responded to the survey.

44 MR. GILL: And 80 percent of that said no, and so that's eight 45 people?

47 MR. FISCHER: Yes.

MR. GILL: All right. Thank you.

MR. FISCHER: Hey, I'm just providing you the facts.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Richard, thank you. We appreciate it.

MR. FISCHER: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next up, we have Ryan Balsinger. Ryan, are you 10 online?

12 MS. ROY: Mr. Balsinger, go ahead and unmute your line. Mr. 13 Balsinger, you will have to unmute your line to speak.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Next, we'll go to then William Callis. William, are you online?

MS. ROY: William, go ahead and unmute your line to speak.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We'll go then next to the audience. Scott Daggett.

MR. SCOTT DAGGETT: Good afternoon. My name is Scott Daggett, and I'm an owner-operator out of Madeira Beach. I've been fishing thirty-seven years, and I just wanted to talk about the IFQ system for a little bit, because, looking at you guys' numbers yesterday -- You know, when you guys opened it up to the public, you kind of ruined the whole system.

I mean, I'm looking at 662 accounts with shares, and then, down at the bottom there, it's shares and landings are 201, and so, in essence, one-third of the fishery is fishing, and two-thirds is leasing their shares out. Now, when I got sold this bill of goods, years ago, when it first started, it empowered the fishermen, and they weren't for dealers, and they weren't for Joe Blow sitting on the couch, and it was for the fishermen to have their own future in their hands.

Over the years, since it's gone public, it's gotten further and further away from the fishermen. You don't have to be a genius to figure out that it's a 10 percent return on your money, and you guys have pretty much turned it into an Amazon stock, and that's where we're at these days.

 As far as the restrictions that I had seen yesterday, you know, the account, I'm all for it. Every one of these boxes that you check, if you're a commercial fisherman, and you have a permit, and you have a boat, and you have a VMS, and you go fishing, and,

I mean, you should have to land at least, I would say, at least 51 percent of your shares, and you know what I'm saying? Instead of sitting at home and leasing them away, and I just -- I just feel like you should be all-in or all-out, and that's pretty much all I've got to say.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your testimony, and so my advice to you is we're just getting started in that whole discussion, and continue to participate and weigh-in, and then we can hear your suggestions, and they may or may not get incorporated, but at least you've been part of that process to get to the endpoint. Thank you.

MR. DAGGETT: All right.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we have C.J. Peppe.

MR. C.J. PEPPE: Hi, guys. I will keep it pretty short and simple, you know, and you guys have heard it plenty, and I disagree with both the gag and red grouper numbers that NOAA has put out, and so I won't spend too much time on that, and I just wanted to -- I have another -- I'm a recreational fisherman from the Tampa area, and I do want to just point out one thing.

 I'm only twenty-eight years old, and, in my short lifetime as a fisherman -- I mean, I've fished my entire life, since I was born here, all twenty-eight years, but, you know, I've seen it go from five per person at twenty-two inches, to twenty-four for half the year, and now we're here, and so, you know, I don't have much belief in, you know, really much of anything that the system has to provide for us going forward, that, you know, we see a light at the end of this tunnel here, and so I don't know what the solution is.

That's not my job, and I work a normal nine-to-five job, but I'm hoping that you guys can figure it out, and so I have belief in the council, and I don't have belief in NOAA, and I don't even really trust them for weather, let alone counting fish, and so, if you guys have any questions, and, you know, I'm a young recreational fisherman that has committed my whole life to fishing in these waters, and so I'm hoping to see it change. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for your comments. All right. Next, we have Dylan Hubbard.

MR. DYLAN HUBBARD: All right. Thank you for the opportunity to

speak. I have a lot to say today MRIP, and so you're going to have to be a little patient with me. For gag grouper, thirty-two intercepts is just simply unacceptable. We need a bigger sample size, especially when you look at the shore mode to illustrate varying landing numbers and an unacceptably high PSE.

These estimates for gag landings are simply impossible to be in the realm of realistic. The fact that we've been accepting MRIP landings consistently about three-times higher than state numbers, and now it's an issue at seven-times higher, and it seems a little crazy.

Another glaring reason that we need to take some steps forward on our approaches to recreational data collection is the headboat numbers, which are the only numbers in the landings that use a census-based data collection approach, while avoiding estimation and extrapolation, show only 1 percent of the landings, or about 8,664. This is a clear sign that we need to expedite moving forward, standing up a new electronic reporting system for the federal for-hire fleet in the Gulf. This will help us improve a portion of the recreational landings and exponentially provide yet another ground-truthing metric, like the state data has been, for MRIP.

The MRIP for the red grouper data was another failure of the data collection process currently. There is no possible way that 1.2 million pounds of red grouper we caught in just a few weeks, especially with the bad weather during the period and Waves 1 through 3 only averaged about 400,000 pounds apiece, and why would we be able to land 70 percent of the quota in less than three weeks, when it took us six months to land 60 percent of the quota? Keep in mind that 30 percent of our fleet is out of operation, due to Hurricane Ian.

Captain Rick Warren mentioned it before, and a lot of those guys down there, a huge portion of the red grouper fleet, didn't fish during 2023, and so it's unfathomable that we landed that amount of red grouper in that short amount of time.

While there are many things on the horizon that may help MRIP and this glaring data issue, and the agency seems to be amenable to working hard on this, we, as the stakeholders, demand more immediate and expedited action. We have been patient for way too long. We cannot continue to be asked to be patient. This is the way that many of us feed our families, and, for others, it's a lifestyle and a part of the way of life. We need to explore this multiyear ACL approach, and we need more communications between states and NOAA OST more frequently, and we need to pay closer

attention to data outliers and investigate them earlier in the process.

Gag grouper management measures, I support the committee's motion to stop work on the gag grouper management measures document. A 50 percent reduction for a 10 percent gain doesn't make sense.

For SEFHIER data, please move forward on standing up a new program as quickly as possible, based on the ad hoc ELB discussions and motions. We need a new program with buy-in, with as little information required as possible, while still being validated, able to pass peer review and plugged into assessments. We need to lower scientific and management uncertainty, while making the burden on the fleet as small as possible, and I'm out of time, but I will email you the rest of my comments.

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

MS. BOGGS: So not as the chair of the ad hoc -- Yes, you are the chair, or, no, you weren't there. Never mind.

MR. HUBBARD: I was not. The chair was Jim Green.

 ${f MS.}$ BOGGS: So, in your opinion about the economic questions with the --

MR. HUBBARD: My personal opinion on the economic questions is I support it, and I would like to see our fleet evaluation as important. Evaluating the impact, economic impact, of our fleet is important, for many different reasons, from disasters to Chapter 3 in amendments, and we have to have a number on our impact, economic impact, but my personal opinion in that -- The opinion of the fleet is there's not a lot of buy-in there for the economic questions, and so, for me, I think it needs to be a different survey.

I think doing something like the commercial fleet does already, where a portion of the industry is polled quarterly, and it's acceptable in the commercial fleet, and we're trying to get up a similar style of lowering uncertainty and lowering scientific and management uncertainty, and so, if we can follow their lead -- If it works in the commercial fleet, it should work for us, and I think that would have more buy-in from the industry, and so I'm supportive of whatever gets us through that goal of lowering scientific and management uncertainty, lowering buffers, while keeping the burden on the fleet as small as possible and increasing buy-in.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: So, following the cheat sheet that we received, could you speak to the Reef Fish AP and lane snapper?

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you, and I appreciate it. The Reef Fish AP is getting readvertised this year, and I would like to be reseated on that, when you guys vote in April. Also, the lane snapper, I support the approval of the increase that you guys voted for in committee, and I would ask for another look at another increase, and that is a very, very healthy fishery that is continuing its expansion, and we see larger lane snapper and more area every day, and it is a very healthy fishery, and so I would like to avoid more quota closures and issues in that fishery, and so let's explore increasing it again next year. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I'm glad to see you all bleeding the same way that Mississippi is bleeding, because, you know, we know, we bled that way with the snapper, and maybe you all can get some attention to this.

MR. HUBBARD: Well, I think the 355 online comments, and the virtual participants today, speak to that, and so I hear what you're saying.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you, Dylan. Next, we have Alex Spring.

 MS. ALEX SPRING: Good afternoon, council members. My name is Alexandra Spring, and I'm a recreational fisherman in the greater Tampa Bay area, and I've been fishing for the past twenty-five years. I'm here to pretty much echo what's already been said and what will continue to be said long after I'm done, and that is to complain about these red and gag grouper numbers that have recently been released, such as a single gag intercept on the Skyway, a single intercept, led to a shore model estimate of over 100,000 pounds, whereas, the year before, there was no intercepts, and so the catch was estimated to be zero.

These numbers simply don't make sense. They are astronomically high, and they indicate an even larger problem from within, and I'm hoping the council realizes this above catch estimate is gathered from flawed data, something has to be done, and it needs to be done quickly, and it's simply embarrassing. Thank you for your time, and good luck today.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for the words of encouragement. Next, we have Josh Murphy.

MR. JOSH MURPHY: Good morning. I'm Josh Murphy, and I run a longline boat out of Madeira Beach, Florida, and, basically, I just wanted to get up here and say that, the way that the IFQ system is set up, it's really hard for somebody, and this doesn't get talked about a lot, is somebody trying to get into the commercial industry, buy a boat, and start from the bottom and get somewhere.

It's hard to want to keep going at something when you know you're never going to be able to get at the top. When you're, you know, trying to get into the industry now, you can buy the boat, and you can buy the permits, but you're not going to be able to have the fish to catch, to be able to work, you know, the business, and I just wanted to say something needs to be done about that.

The black grouper, we're seeing more black grouper than we've seen in the last ten years this year, and, you know, try and get some of those fish back to us, and use real science, and I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Josh. Next, we have Taylor Coke. Taylor, are you there?

MR. TAYLOR COKE: Good afternoon. My name is Taylor Coke, and I'm a recreational fisherman, and I fish out of Biloxi, Mississippi. Today, I would like to address you with my concern for the inaccurate MRIP data being used to manage our fisheries. First, it was a calibration ratio that basically cut our snapper quota by 60 percent, and then it was the May amberjack season, and now the push to close gag grouper for 2024, and, at this point, I do not believe that NOAA's data is very credible, especially when it comes to their numbers on effort and catch estimates.

We have seen multiple occasions where these numbers have been overestimated, and nothing has changed, and, in Mississippi, MRIP has reported harvest levels that exceed the state's allocation during times that the season was not even open. In my opinion, nobody knows our fishery like we do. Tails 'n Scales is a data collection system that is 95 percent compliant, and why are we having to take our factual catch data and multiply it by a calibration ratio to align with NOAA's inflated MRIP data?

I am hopeful, with the implementation of Mississippi Creel, that the additional data will reinforce the Tails 'n Scales data showing that we aren't overfishing like they say we are. No two states are the same. Therefore, they cannot be managed the same. In my opinion, the only way to fix this is to implement something like Amendment 50 for all reef fish, so that it can be managed at a state level.

I feel like the data collected on the state level is much more accurate than what NOAA is doing. If NOAA's input is necessary, have them make their recommendation on a state-to-state basis with data provided by the state. I truly do want what's best for this fishery in the Gulf. I want the fishery to be around for my kids, and grandkids, in the future. If the shortening and closed seasons were justified, I wouldn't have a problem with it, but, based off of what I have seen, NOAA has overestimated -- With NOAA's overestimated data on multiple occasions, I do not feel it's justified. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Taylor. Next, we have Charlie Renier.

MR. CHARLIE RENIER: My name is Charlie Renier, and I'm a multigenerational fisherman, and I grew up in the Keys. My daughter is now third-generation. I own two seafood companies, a dozen fishing boats, and lots of quota. My whole life, we've battled, and I have spent our life savings buying quota, buying boats, and buying permits to stay in this industry.

We feed millions of people around the country, time and time again. The sports fishermen, they have their fish, and the charter fishermen are losing a fortune, because they can't go out and catch these gags. 20 percent of our money that we make off of our boats was taken when you all hit us with the 80 percent reduction. If our gags are hurt, we want a reduction, but you all were telling us, at one time, that the gags were hurt, and then the greatest thing happened. One guy caught a fish off of the bridge, the Skyway Bridge, and, all of a sudden, all you all's numbers turned crazy, and you had 200 intercepts that turned your numbers upside down.

How can you tell us there is no gags out there, but 1.4 million pounds the sports caught in forty-five days? I wonder how you all can tell us that. If there is no gags, where did they come up with 1.4 million? That's more than the commercial boats caught in two years. That's impossible. You all know the numbers are wrong, and you all have got to fix this. Our lives depend on it.

There is hundreds of boats, and I have a hundred commercial boats that fish for me between Key West and Madeira Beach, all over the Gulf, and we're counting on you all. We need you all to look at this and say something is wrong, and we've got to get it fixed.

1 2

If you want people in Florida to continue eating Florida seafood, you all have got to step up and help us out. I mean, we're here. We're spending the money, and we're coming to the meetings, and we've got to fish. We've been fishing in twenty and thirty-knot winds, that we usually don't, because we're trying to survive.

Our snappers, we had two-dollars a pound, and so we're out catching snappers, and our gags are gone. We can't even catch them, and we've got to throw them back. Our red grouper is what we survive on now, and I'm scared to death that you all are going to take something. If you do, we're done. If you all want seafood to remain in Florida, and this country, think about it, and we feed millions of people, millions, and not 30,000 sport boats, or not 40,000, but millions of people eat our seafood, and, if you all want that to continue, you've got to help us out. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Renier. I was just curious, as a guy that owns a bunch of quota, and a bunch of, I'm assuming, dealer licenses and all that, first off, what do you think about the suggestion of requiring a permit and participating in the fishery and all these things we're talking about?

MR. RENIER: I absolutely love it.

MR. WALKER: You do?

MR. RENIER: I mean, yesterday, I heard about the dealers, and every fish dealer that I know of has quota and permits, whether it's a fish dealing permit, boats, and we all have millions of dollars tied in it. Every fish buyer I know has millions of dollars tied up in this whole thing.

You know, just to say that somebody is a fish dealer -- If a fish dealer owns quota, and is getting the fish for his place, what's the difference of him having three or four boats? As long as he is in the fishery, he's in the fishery.

MR. WALKER: Okay. Along that same line, you recognize the loophole that the dealer license might leave open to people just grabbing one of those to get around the regs, and what do you think about that?

 MR. RENIER: Absolutely, and, like I said, there's a difference between somebody going to buy a dealer's license and being able to own quota. You all know what a real fish house is, and you all

know who has got a dealer's license. That is very easy to look

 I mean, a fish house is usually somebody on the water, somebody that's got a company, and they've got trucks, and they've got employees, and it's very easy for you all the see who is what. If you're vested in this industry, and I don't care if you own a boat or you own a fish house or you own fifty seafood restaurants or two seafood restaurants, but, if you're vested in this fishery, you need the seafood, and we need the seafood, and we need to catch it, and we need to feed people. We don't need somebody that is going take their 401K and cash it out, and they're making 6 percent, and put it into quota and make 10 percent. That's what we don't need.

 We need people that are willing to come to this room and fight for what they've got, and everybody I know that's in this industry is willing to do that, and the only chance we've got is you guys. If you all won't stick up for us, we're done, absolutely done. Thank you.

MR. WALKER: That's great. Thanks for your input.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we have Steve Papen, followed by Randy Lauser.

MR. STEVE PAPEN: Hi, everybody. Well, thank you for giving us this opportunity to speak on our issues today. I know that MRIP data has been beaten to death, and we'll continue to do so, but I'm going to add to it and pile on, and so my name is Captain Steve Papen. I'm owner and operator of Fintastic Fishing Charters here in Madeira Beach, Florida, which is the grouper capitol of the world.

 I have got almost thirty years in this fishery, and so I kind of feel like I have a PhD in everything that's going on here. The MRIP numbers are -- I know they're a real hard topic of everything we're looking at today, and I totally understand that counting fish that we cannot see is a very difficult task. That being said, looking at the new data, the one glaring outlier that I noticed, that concerns me the most, is the gag landings, per sector.

The headboats, which is the only real data that comes in, and I think they've been recording since the 1980s, they have the smallest number of anybody. Every other estimate that we have is all estimated, which is kind of a big red flag to me, because everything that we look at -- We want real data, and so we have it from one of them, and that is the smallest -- They account for the

smallest amount of gags than anybody else, and so that was kind of a big red flag for me.

 I've seen the management of this fish go from five per person, open year-round at twenty inches, to what we see now, which is -- You know, now we're looking at nothing, and nothing has worked, and so it's time to rethink how we manage these species.

I would also like to touch on the red grouper, the idea that we caught 1.1 million pounds in six months, and then caught 1.4 million in twenty days, which basically equates to around 13,500 fish per day, or 6,750 limits per day, with at least five of those twenty days being unfishable, looking back at my calendar, and it's completely unrealistic.

 We need better data, because a lot of livelihoods and families depend on this data being accurate. We want what's best for our fishery, and we always have, and we always will, but these numbers are simply unrealistic. We really, really need you guys to, you know, step up and fight for this. I know a lot of the people on the council kind of feel the way we do, especially after seeing a lot of these numbers, and, you know, it's pretty scary. You know, the future kind of scares me.

I just got a second boat here, and I got, you know, charter permits and commercial permits, and, I mean, I'm fully involved in this fishery, and I'm totally open to help in any way possible with giving you boots-on-the-ground data that we can give you on a daily basis.

The SEFHIER program, I'm on that panel, and I'm really just trying to help out as much as I can, but we need you guys, and so please help us out. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Next, we have Randy Lauser. I'm sorry. Steve, are you still on?

MR. PAPEN: Yes, I'm still here.

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

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Steve, for your public testimony. I am curious, and you made a comment that it's time to rethink how we manage these species, and are you making that statement in light of needing better data, or are you talking about more of the management and regulations, and, if so, what ideas do you have?

 MR. PAPEN: Well, I mean, better data is always one thing. I mean, I've been doing this for, you know, a really long time, and so, to me, I understand that, since the IFQ came out in 2010, you know, there's been more demand, more people, more technology and everything, but, pre-2010, and I'm sure that everybody remembers, we had a complete closure of all grouper during the spawning months, which was February and March. It started off February 15 to March 15, and then it went all of February and all of March, and then the IFQ system came out, and then those fish were being caught again during their spawn.

I've done a lot of research with FWRI in the last six or seven years, and I have learned a lot about the gags in general, and how many eggs that each individual female carries, and, to me, harvesting those fish, when they're full of 50,000 or 60,000 eggs apiece, is just kind of crazy. I feel like, you know, a spawning closure is not a bad idea, and I've been yelling about it for a long time now, and, you know, I've talked to Sue, and a few other people, about it, from FWRI, and, you know, there's, you know, pros and cons to it, I guess, but I feel like harvesting these fish while they're spawning is a bad idea, whether it's red or gag grouper.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thanks again, Steve.

MR. PAPEN: No problem. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we have Randy Lauser, and then there was a glitch in the system, and next up, after Randy, will be Bob Zales. He's not on the list, but there was a glitch in the system, and so, Randy, go ahead, sir.

MR. RANDY LAUSER: Good afternoon. I'm Randy Lauser, Southern Offshore Fishing Association. On the IFQ program there, I've been here for the whole system. It was working fine, and everything was going great, and we could fish year-round with what we had, and then, once it went public, we just threw a monkey-wrench in the whole thing. It ruined everything, and it got out of the fishermen's hands. It should have stayed in the fishermen's hands, where it belonged to be, and that's where it was supposed to be, you know, and now, after, you know, getting some of our quota taken away from us, it's hard to find. If you don't know somebody, you're not getting the quota.

Then, on the gag groupers, fishing is off the chain. I've been fishing -- I've been longlining the Gulf for thirty-nine years, and I've seen fishing slow, good, and slow, and, my last three years of fishing, it's just off the chain. I mean, we're throwing

back -- I'm having a record number sets that, in thirty-nine years -- In the last year, record number sets of gag groupers, and it's just -- I'm throwing them all back, and it's making me sick to my stomach.

I move ten miles away, to try to get away from them, and there they are again. They're everywhere, and it's just -- I've never seen gag grouper fishing so good, and, with today's economics, it's costing us double to fish, for everything, fuel, groceries, everything, and we're losing \$10,000 to \$15,000 per trip, because we don't have the gag groupers to catch, and so thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, and sorry for mispronouncing your name. Mr. Zales.

MR. BOB ZALES, II: Bob Zales, II, Executive Director of Southeastern Fisheries Association. Thank you, Kevin. For a minute, I was thinking that MRIP was taking over your system up here, and it was a glitch, but I'm not going to continue to beat you all up on all this stuff.

I mean, this is not new. I've been involved in these fisheries since the late 1980s, and MRIP, MRFSS, FES, has been a consistent problem the whole time. The only new thing here is the massive number of people that are talking about it here and online and emails you've got, which that's kind of encouraging, and so maybe something can finally get done here, because clearly there's a massive problem that everybody sees.

Working with SFA, shrimp is a big part of our organization, and so we would hope that you all support that shrimp initiative that John Walter and Mike Rubino are talking about, and try to expedite that, because the shrimp industry, kind of like this industry, is in serious trouble. Imports, which I'm just now learning about the connection between international trade and commerce, but clearly the imports are a driving force, and something has got to be done, or this industry won't be here. Somebody said, the other day, talking about the cultural part of shrimpers, and it's big, and so we need to keep that.

 Clay mentioned about working waterfronts, and we clearly need working waterfronts throughout the region, and throughout the area, because, without working waterfronts, you've got no place to unload, and you've got no place to get ice, bait, tackle, or anything, and so, you know, hopefully you all would support that.

When it comes to the data, you've got the emails, and it's relative

to the MRIP thing, and, when we're talking about rec discards, and rec discard mortality, they're directly related to the efforts that are out there that you're putting on the rec side. The higher that is, the more discard mortality you -- We know, through FES, that 40 percent of that effort was too high, which means that, whatever discard mortality was there, it's higher than what it should be, and so we've got to get a handle and get this data as correct as possible, and so I will stop there. Any questions, I'll be glad to try and answer them.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Zales. I don't see anybody. We appreciate it.

MR. ZALES: Okay. Thank you again.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we have Stephanie Lockhart, followed by Clay Shidler.

MS. STEPHANIE LOCKHART: Good afternoon, council. My name is Stephanie Lockhart, and I live in Las Vegas, Nevada. I'm a recreational fisherwoman, and I am landlocked, and so I do travel to fish on charter boats and partyboats, primarily out of the Madeira Beach area in the Gulf, but I actually learned how to fish in New Orleans, and so Gulf waters, and the fisheries, are near and dear to my heart.

I did recently review, and, as many others, I have a huge concern with the gag grouper MRIP Wave 5 data, and, as others have mentioned, I do think that the recreational numbers are way too high, and it's actually leaning toward mathematically unrealistic. It's impossible that recreational fishermen, and women, landed the numbers that are being stated, and, when you look at the headboat numbers, it only correlates to 1 percent of the landings.

You know, these are the folks that we've passionately heard from, and they fish for a living, and they put us on those fish for a living, and they're the only real data that we have, and we only are attributing 1 percent to them? I really feel strongly that you all need to look at other approaches to helping recreational anglers, such as myself, to have better access to the gag grouper fishery, and I also feel that we need a new stock assessment before decisions are made for potentially years to come, regarding seasons, openings, and closings.

I have also sent my viewpoints to your email address, and Pat Neukam, Dylan Hubbard, and many others have given much better suggestions than I could, and so I won't try to even delve into that, in the interest of time, but I really do appreciate you

giving myself, and my peers, the opportunity to speak to you today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for taking the time to speak to us today, Ms. Lockhart. We appreciate it. Clay Shidler, followed by Brian Lewis. Clay, welcome.

MR. CLAY SHIDLER: Good afternoon, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the Gulf Council. My name is Clay Shidler, and I fish out of Crystal River, Florida. I own thirteen federally-permitted charterboats, and I am thirty years old, and I've been doing this since I was eighteen years old, and I started in the commercial fishing industry, and, actually, Mr. Bob Gill -- I own Shrimp Landing now, and I commercial fished when he owned it, and I was a young man when he saw me there.

I'm here to speak, of course, about the MRIP data, and I believe that everybody in this room understands how skewed it is. As a gag grouper fishermen, in what is arguably the heart of gag grouper country, and I've been doing it my entire life, from fishing with my father to fishing professionally for the last twelve years and watching my guys learn how to do it, and come up with innovative ways to do it, and become better at it. That being said, of course, there's no possible way that we caught the fish that the MRIP-FES data shows that we caught.

I'm also on the ad hoc AP council for the rebuilding of the SEFHIER program, and I think that's going to be a huge implementation, a huge step for the charter fishery to get back on the right track, whether you're talking about red grouper or gag grouper, and pick your species, but that's going to be a massive piece of the puzzle, because, in my opinion, in the past year, as we've seen maybe the economy slow down a little bit, we're going back to a time where we're seeing more charter boats on the water than we're seeing recreational boats on the water, where, through COVID, I would say that that's not something that we saw.

That being said, standing up the SEFHIER program again is an incredibly important puzzle piece, and especially for all of us that do this on a daily basis and do it for a living.

I would like to urge the council to adopt the SRFS data, in lieu of the MRIP-FES data, and I've been a part of every survey that I've ever been asked to do, from eleven years ago and working with Daryl and Deb at UF, doing grouper tagging, all the way until now, and working with Hayden Melendez and working with MRIP daily at our marina, and allowing MRIP to be at our marina on a daily basis, and asking my guys to participate, even if they didn't necessarily believe that the MRIP data was going to help us.

1 2

We asked the guys that fish out of our marina to participate, because it's the right thing to do, but what has gone on has not helped any sort of public trust in the system, and we all understand that, but I appreciate you guys doing what you can to get us pointed back in the right direction, and I appreciate you guys looking at how to stand the SEFHIER program back up, and I'm very honored to be a part of that, and thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Clay, we have a question from Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Clay, and thank you for serving on the ad hoc advisory panel. Aside from what the advisory panel sent to the council, what is your opinion on the economic questions? Would you be willing to answer those, or no?

MR. SHIDLER: I was absolutely willing to answer them in the first round of the SEFHIER reporting program, and to say this, and I was a part of the commercial fishery in the IFQ era, and there was never a question in my mind of should I do this or shouldn't I do this, and this is what you do, and I will be honest with you, and maybe that's just the way my mind worked on the subject, but there was no idea of I don't want twenty-four-hour reporting, and did I necessarily enjoy it, and do I think the fleet wants it?

No, we don't, but I think that using the commercial program for the economic data of a random selection, and whether it's quarterly or you're drawn to do your economic data for certain months, I think that's a very easy way to do it, and I think that, as a fleet, you can't expect 1,300 permit holders to come together and all put the stamp of approval on the exact same thing, but we can come up with something that is simple, that's easy for guys like myself, that are thirty years old, as well as guys that are seventy-five years old, to use a program and make it to where, first and foremost, the data works for the purpose that it's made to work for.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Clay. I had a -- You made an interesting point there about volunteering to help with sampling, and perhaps having your data that you helped gather improperly extrapolated, and what do your guys think about, going forward, voluntarily giving up data, and access, to their catch, based on the current scenario?

 MR. SHIDLER: I will be honest with you that I am the owner of Shrimp Landing Marina, and we have nineteen charter boats out of Shrimp Landing Marina, and, out of nineteen charter boats, sixteen have federal permits on them, and I cannot force anybody to do anything, but you can ask Hayden, and you can ask Deb, and I did really pressure guys to allow them to sample gonads this year, and that was something very specific that they needed to come to us for, because we have shallow-water grouper, and they needed shallow-water grouper gonad samples.

I pressured the guys, and everybody participated, whether they really wanted to or not, but we believed in what was going on, and, that being said, there is an MRIP survey that is scheduled to take place at our marina this Saturday, and I am aware of it, and I know that most of the guys will have absolutely zero interest in participating, and I cannot ask these guys to do it, and that is just the absolute truth of it.

Granted, I still believe that we're on the right track, and we're doing the right thing, and we're standing here in front of you guys today, and I can't imagine anybody in this room that thinks that that data is actually accurate, and I believe that we needed to get to this point to prove that it was inaccurate, so that we can make things go in the right direction.

If it was off by 20 percent every year, there's no way to prove that it was ever wrong, but we needed this, and so I am happy that we're here. It is frustrating, but it is the job of this council, and it's the job of the stakeholders standing behind me, to stand here and find a way moving forward for a fishery that I plan to spend the next forty years in.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I don't normally do this, because it's not a question, and it's going to be a comment that, based on what we are looking at with the MRIP data, the challenge is not with the dockside intercept collection, right, because that gives us the catch rate information, and it's with the effort survey that gets mailed, right, and then, for charter, you guys get, obviously, the 10 percent weekly phone call sampling, and so I just wanted to acknowledge that, and I know that people are angry about MRIP, and they don't want to contribute data, but, on the intercept side, what our data shows with MRIP is very consistent with what the State Reef Fish Survey shows, with what they're collecting.

 MR. SHIDLER: I know I'm out of time, but I will say that Pat Busby calls all of us, correct, and we all field phone calls from her, and I will tell you that there is a lot of guys -- I only deal with people from Hernando Beach to Cedar Key, about forty-one permit holders, and I deal with them, to try to keep everybody pointed in the right direction, and that's why I applied for the AP, and that's why I'm standing here in front of you today.

I'm not saying that I'm officially anybody's voice, but I am my own, and I understand what the guys in my area want, and most of these guys are not fielding Pat's phone calls, because they have just lost the trust, and whether it is rightfully so, or their frustration is placed in the right avenues, that's -- I thank you guys for your time, and I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Clay, we've got a couple more questions for you. Hold on. Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: It's a quick one, and you know you don't have to answer it if you don't want to, but I'm curious, and how do you know when an MRIP assignment is going to be at your marina before it happens?

MR. SHIDLER: One more time?

MR. SCHIEBLE: How do you know that an MRIP assignment is going to be at your marina before it takes place? You mentioned, a minute ago, that you know you have an MRIP assignment coming up at the marina this weekend, or something like that, and how do you know that? How did you figure that out, that you have the assignment before it takes place, or did I misunderstand you?

MR. SHIDLER: I own a private marina, and, therefore, we don't have to allow people there, and I will say that for one thing, and I am very friendly with all of the biologists, and not just at the MRIP collectors that come to the dock, but up above, because, in the past, I've had a lot of communications with all of these people, to make sure we do the right thing, and I just said, look, everybody at my marina has asked me to tell MRIP to not show up, just so you know, and I made a phone call, as the owner of the marina, and I said, look, these people do not want MRIP to show up, and they said, well, what is your thoughts on it, as the owner?

I said that I'm not kicking anybody out, but, if you have anything coming in the near future, table it, if possible, and let me get back from this meeting and talk to these guys, and that's honestly the truth, and that's what I did, is I made a phone call, and that is how I know -- They said there was one coming soon, and I pretty

much deduced it down to that is, and, that being said, we don't have to have them there, but I have every confidence that everybody in this room wants to use this data appropriately, and wants to use it the right way.

There was two MRIP surveys taken at my marina during gag season, and both of those surveys showed a perfect score. When I say a perfect score, we had perfect weather, and we had eighteen boats charter fish, and every single customer that stepped foot on Shrimp Landing property went home with a limit of gags.

Now, that was not always the norm, but those were the two days, just so you know. Does it have the ability to skew data? Possibly, and I'm not here to decide how the data got misconstrued, but I can tell you what I saw. When every single person that shows up goes fishing and catches a limit of gag grouper, and everybody reports their data accurately, and we did have an issue, and I can't speak for many marinas, but there's not a lot in our area that have sixteen federally-permitted vessels, and there's not a lot of places in the world where you can walk up to a marina with that many people going fishing and everybody walks back home with a limit of gags, and that's all that I will say.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I appreciate the answer. Thank you.

MR. SHIDLER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Overton.

DR. OVERTON: Clay, a quick question. You know the charter boat captains in your marina better than we do, and what would it take from us to have them be more willing to participate in our data, you know, capture events? What would it take?

MR. SHIDLER: I will be honest with you and tell you that the people that do the very -- That do the data collection at our marina are some of the best biologists that I've ever seen, in dealing with people, dealing with the customers, dealing with us. They treat us respectfully, and they're very kind, and they're a lot of fun to be around, and they joke with us and everything else. They do a great job, but, as you have heard everybody stand behind me and say, this is all an MRIP problem, it's all an MRIP problem, and they wear the MRIP badge.

They don't even know the difference when there's MRIP surveys and there's the bio surveys, which were two different surveys, but they were the same people, and they show up, and they have the iPad from MRIP and bio, and they're over cutting otoliths out, and

the guys didn't even know the difference, and that's fine. I'm not asking them to know the difference, but they have to understand that there's a lot of moving pieces and parts, and there's only so many boots on the ground, and it's a very challenging thing for the guys to separate is it the girl that's walking down to the dock to take your survey -- Is it her fault, because she put it in the iPad wrong, or is it somebody in Maryland's fault that misconstrued the data, and trying to get charter fishermen to draw that line, and understand that I need to put the data in this end and expect you guys to create the steps in the middle to get the right answer here, is the challenge.

I will just say it like that, and that's I guess the best way that I can put it, but you have great people on the ground collecting data, and you have people like me that are working very hard to help promote the fact that we need to give the data to the people, and I do apply pressure on my guys, because I know it's the only way for you to do your job.

DR. OVERTON: Thank you. Fair enough.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We're going to have two more folks ask questions, and then we're going to have to proceed. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Based on what you just said about was it the person at the dock's fault, because they put in the tablet wrong, or was it something that happened in Maryland, if you -- If we had the SEFHIER program back, where you were the responsible one, or your captains were the responsible one, would they have a little more trust in what was being reported?

MR. SHIDLER: Yes, I think they would. I will also say that, as a part of having the SEFHIER program back, I would like to see sector separation go through. It will make the numbers a little less muddy, I think, in guys' opinions, and, whether that's true or not, it's an important thing for the gag grouper fishery, but, yes, if we had the SEFHIER program, it would definitely help.

Nobody liked it, the SEFHIER program, because it was change, and very few people vote to have more regulation, but you also have to understand -- They need to understand that this fishery needs it, and you've heard multiple people come up here and say that, and you didn't hear much of that before the first rollout.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Just real quick, and I appreciate everything that you've been saying here, Clay, and, obviously, your perspective on

this entire situation here, and so my question for you is the folks that people in your marina don't want to work with -- Are these FWC employees, or are these federal employees, along those lines?

MR. SHIDLER: These are surveyors. These are people collecting data, and, when you sour a charter captain to the concept of data collection, it doesn't matter what badge they wear, or what acronym is on their shirt, and you're going to get very little good information, or very little good-hearted information, because we did deal with, during SEFHIER, with the federal side coming down and asking us questions about our trip, and, because we're federally-permitted, we had to answer those questions. The girl was very clear that you have to answer our questions, just so you know.

Nobody wanted to deal with her, really, because it felt like you were being forced, but I can tell you that the person that does 99 percent of our MRIP -- There's actually three people, and 99 percent of our MRIP, whether we see them at the boat ramp when we pull our boat out or they're at our marina, and I won't give you their names, but they're easy to find, and they do all of our MRIP surveys, and they do a phenomenal job. They're young people, and they're there to do a job, and they're underpaid for the job, and they're working hard to try to get the job done correctly, and that is, in my opinion, the best way to put it.

DR. SWEETMAN: Yes, and I understand that completely, and the only reason why I'm saying that is because I did hear you say, you know, advocating for State Reef Fish Survey over MRIP in some of these circumstances, and this data goes directly to the State Reef Fish Survey as well, and so I just kind of wanted to throw that out there.

MR. SHIDLER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Clay, for answering all those questions. We appreciate it.

MR. SHIDLER: Thank you, guys, and I'm easy to find, if anybody has any other questions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Next, we'll have Brian Lewis, followed by Brandon Branch.

MR. BRIAN LEWIS: Good afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the council. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Brian Lewis, owner of the Commercial Fishing Vessel Trip Limit out of Clearwater Beach. I commercially fish and

recreationally fish. I have a few things to touch base on.

Number one, regarding the IFQ program, I was paying attention to this whole council meeting virtually, and I'm hoping that there will be some flexibility for the circumstances of leasing of our quota, because I want to talk about something.

While I was remodeling my boat, I was leasing out our quota, and we used -- You know, we followed the whole business plan of this thing, okay, and we were able to have the flexibility to lease it or trade it or whatever, okay, and now we're talking about coming in and trying to change it, okay, and so my concerns are -- I want to make sure the council keeps this in consideration when they start wanting to try to make changes, that, you know, there is people like me out there that were in these circumstances, whether it be sick or remodeling a boat or engine failure or whatever, right, because we're able to use this quota to lease out and pay for an engine or whatever, right?

I used some of the quota to buy more quota, to crawl my way back into this industry, because, when I first started fishing, I didn't get any gifted shares, okay, and I've been fishing for twenty years, okay, and the permit that I bought had no catch history, and so I had to start from scratch, okay, and so I'm a little bit worried about hearing some of these changes that want to try to be done, and, you know, so please keep that in mind. I do support that all quota holders must have a reef fish permit, okay, just so you know.

All right. Secondly, I want to talk about something, because we're seeing all these glaring issues with data collection, right, and so, yesterday, in the Q&A session, I asked about what about harvest tags, and have we considered that for the private recreational fishery, okay, and, you know, I heard a comment, and I didn't get to say anything more about it, but, that being said, I challenge this council, I challenge National Marine Fisheries, and I challenge FWC to engage the fishermen.

The fishermen are the best scientific information, and use it, okay, and create maybe a focus group, a workshop, or maybe consider this harvest tag as a solution to maybe this whole data collection, okay, and this can solve -- You know, a lot of fishermen don't like seasons, okay, and so this -- The harvest tag could actually enable them to go fishing when they want, and you can keep track of discards, and it could reduce discard mortality, which affects all the sectors, okay, and so I challenge this council, because we need your help, okay, and you heard -- I echo what Charlie Renier said, and I echo what Randy Lauser said, and I echo what Scott

Daggett and all these other recreational fishermen out there too, all right, and they are accountable on the management system they have right now, and they need a better system, okay? That's all I've got to say, and I'm open to any questions you may have for me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Lewis. I don't see any questions. Thank you. Next, we have Brandon Branch, followed by Captain Brian Hansen.

MR. BRANDON BRANCH: Good afternoon, guys. My name is Captain Brandon Branch, and I'm owner and operator of Crystal River Fishing Company. I fish out of the same marina or the marina that Clay owns, Shrimp Landing in Crystal River.

I am one of those guys that was there putting the data right in front of everyone to the surveyors, and we are seeing -- My clients were cooperative, and we were all there to help, and to see these astronomical numbers coming out, seven-times over, and 106,000 pounds caught from shore, and it is not possible.

The last eighteen days of red grouper fishing, catching 72 percent over what we caught the first six months, it's not possible, and that is making each and every one of -- Myself, all the captains at the marina, all of my clients, not wanting to answer these questions. We have to get the SEFHIER program back up and running immediately. We have no other option, and that is going to give us the exact data that we need to move forward with this.

I am for anything to make it move forward as fast as possible and give exact data on what we are catching out there. It's not just a guess, and we're out there every single day, 300 days a year, bad weather or good weather, and we are out there fishing. We can give you the numbers that you guys need to be able to make collective data and get the right numbers. We really need to see this MRIP data get thrown away and reconsidered this year. Myself, and a lot of other guys, are kind of depending on this to be able to go out and make a living, but we are going to try to work with you guys and be fishermen.

Myself, everyone behind me, everyone that has submitted, is ready to help, ready to take action to get the correct numbers in front of you guys, and that's all I really have to say today, and I do want to say that, and I am with you guys on keeping the gags and not cutting the bag limit to one, and keeping them at two, and I think that's great, instead of a 10 percent cut, but, if you all have any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Branch. We do have one from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I will ask you, as I've been asking everyone else, as far as the revamped SEFHIER 2.0, or however you want to refer to it, but would you be willing to answer economic questions, if not on a daily basis, on a random basis, but would you be willing to do it in some form or capacity?

MR. BRANCH: Absolutely, and I would do whatever it takes to get that to move forward as possible, just to get the real numbers in front of you guys, instead of just a complete guess, in my opinion. I will do whatever it takes, give you whatever you need, to get the numbers of fish that we're catching on a daily basis in front of you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you.

MR. BRANCH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have Captain Brian Hansen, and then next will be Tim Dillingham. Captain Hansen.

MR. BRIAN HANSEN: Good afternoon, council. My name is Brian Hansen, and I'm a third-generation Florida native. I've been fishing the Gulf of Mexico fulltime for the last twelve years. I have two federal charter boats, and I stone crab and commercial fish, all that stuff. Obviously, everybody has touched on the MRIP, you know, discrepancies. When you have a state estimate, you know, at only a couple hundred thousand pounds for gags, and then the federal estimate comes in at, you know, over a million pounds, it's just -- It can't happen.

 Then 106,000 pounds of shore-caught gag grouper, and that is literally impossible. There's no way that can even happen. Hooking gags from shore -- You know, probably only 1 percent of the fishermen can even hook a gag from shore, let alone land them, and, you know, you have your headboats catching 8,500 pounds, which, you know, you're saying the headboats only caught 8,500, but shore fishermen caught twelve-times as many grouper from shore, and it just -- It can't happen.

Then, you know, to touch base on the red grouper, obviously, in the first seven months of the year, you know, we caught X amount, and then, in three weeks in July, somehow, you know, we caught — I forget the number, but 60 to 70 percent, you know, of the quota, and it's just not possible.

 Like I said, I've been fishing out here, doing charters, for twelve years, and this is by far the slowest year of charters that me, and many other captains, have ever seen, and, you know, it's probably slightly because of the economy, but I think it's more because of the fish closures, you know, and all we have to fish for are, you know, grunts, porgies, hogfish, lane snapper, mangrove snapper, but a lot of these people are not going to spend the money to go catch a bunch of reef fish, you know, and they want to catch grouper, and we just -- We can't go catch the grouper.

I am going to touch base on the SEFHIER program. You know, the old SEFHIER, it wanted to know how many you caught of a certain species, how many you released, but there was no differentiation between -- You know, you could have caught eight keepers, and, you know, we said we released forty fish, but those fish could have been eight inches, or they could have been twenty pounds, you know, and there's no way to know, and so I think, for the next SEFHIER program -- The commercial guys are -- You know, we have to -- We have to tell how much poundage we're bringing in, and so, you know, we're pretty good at estimating our poundages.

Instead of asking how many head of fish we caught, you know, estimate -- Make us estimate the poundage, because we can guess it pretty close. That's all I've got to say, other than, you know, if you want to go harvest a deer, you've got to use a tag. If you want to go harvest fish -- You know, there has to be some kind of accountability for the recreational sector, and so that's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. We have Tim Dillingham, followed by Derek Engle.

MR. TIM DILLINGHAM: Hello, Gulf Council. Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is Tim Dillingham, and I've been commercial fishing for about twelve years now, and I also am a dealer as well, who manages three, and about to be four, other boats.

 A lot of things, and I'm not going to repeat everything that everybody has said, and I think we understand a lot of what's going on, and so I'll start out with triggerfish. Nice job. Triggerfish, there was a lot of population of that, and it's been a big help for our company, and so I think that's a win. I think this council could probably use a win right now. Also, lane snapper, I agree completely with, and that is also a win.

I want to welcome Ed Walker. To be honest with you, it's nice to see a fisherman, not only on the charter side, but on the

commercial side, representing this council, and I think it's important not only to have a bunch of intellectual people on the council, but people that are on the water, people that see it every day.

You know, you're sitting here depending on this MRIP data, which we all know is nonsense, and we should all be embarrassed to be sitting up here talking about it right now, and so, to be honest with you, it just needs to be thrown out. There's lots of options we can come up with.

You know, in the commercial sector, we're fully accountable, and the big word is "accountability". Commercially, we're accountable for every single pound we catch, and it looks like the charter sector, with SEFHIER, is going to be going that way, which is, I think, going to be a great thing, and I think it will be a great thing for them, because they don't want to take the chances of letting this MRIP data control our fisheries, and the same thing with the recreational guys stepping in, and have you ever seen this much involvement by the rec sector at any of your meetings? These are all good things.

We're at war right now, all of us together, commercial, rec, and charter, and it's against the data. The data is wrong, and so accountability. When it comes to the charter fishermen, they're going to start accounting for that through SEFHIER. Commercially, we're fully accountable, and I think there could be something as easy on the rec sector as, hey, look at this, and we've all got a cellphone, right? Creating an app is super easy, and so your statistical data, because it's not science, and it's a statistical formula that is a wrong formula, and it is wrong. You can literally create an app, where every recreational fisherman, and I'm a recreational fisherman as well sometimes, could just log into the app and say, on this day, I was fishing, and, on this day, I estimated how much fish I caught.

This will give you a lot better numbers than what we've got going on right now, and it's just one idea. The tag system is another idea, but it sounds like that tag system might be economically difficult, and so that's the first thing.

I want to, real quick, touch on the windfarms, and I know we didn't really talk about them too much, and, obviously, I think it's out of the control of this council, but having windfarms out there, in an already fragile ecosystem, where we know they create pollution, plus with all the problems we've had with the whales, and now we have to slow down, and we're just on a slippery slope, guys, and we've got to do something.

1 2

 I know it's not your place to do it, but you know the people that can step up, and so we've got to step up for that, too. Gag grouper, to get back on that, it's nonsense. I am having my best gag years in the last three years as well, and the facts are that, you guys truly believe in this MRIP data, then gag isn't overfished, and, actually, they're overpopulated at this point, based on the data that we're seeing, right, and I think everybody can agree on that, and so why are we cutting the season down, and why are we actually dropping the commercial by 80 percent, which is now taking another 20 percent? These are completely out of whack.

The last thing that I want to touch base on is with the IFQ shares. I am an IFQ shareholder, and I buy in small increments, as I go, and I'm pretty new to the industry, and I've only been in ten years, and I didn't know a single person. I figured out how to do all of this by reading. I didn't know a single person in the charter community or the commercial community.

I slowly started to grow it up, and I am a shareholder, and I'm not confident. I keep buying more shares, thinking I'm going to lose my money.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Dillingham, you have to wrap it up. Your time is up.

MR. DILLINGHAM: Okay. All right. Well, the last thing is I do absolutely and fully believe that we all -- If you're going to have shares, you should definitely have a permit, and you should be landing fish. If you're not a commercial fisherman, or a dealer landing fish for commercial fishermen, you've got no business in this industry, and so thank you very much for your time.

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

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Tim. As a dealer and a shareholder, what are your thoughts -- How could the council avoid leaving a loophole open with the dealer permits to be a shareholder and consolidate the share --

MR. DILLINGHAM: That's the outside-of-the-box thinking that we're talking about here, is you don't want to take somebody that's only been a dealer for twenty years, who has been supporting say ten boats, and, you know, these fishermen -- The quota has gotten so expensive, because of all these problems, and most fishermen can't afford to get the quota, and so some of these dealers -- Like, for the boats that I manage, I get the quota for them as well, and so,

not only am I getting it for the boat that I'm running, but I'm getting it for three other boats, and it's extremely expensive, and so we do have to consider some of the dealers that have been in this business for twenty years.

Maybe there is some sort of a moratorium, or a grandfather clause, that says, okay, if you've been in this industry for at least ten years, or five years landing fish, every single year, and you're putting the trip tickets in, and you're helping the fishermen, and you're involved in the fishery, and I think that would maybe be the only option, but it's something that I need to give some thought to as well, because I didn't think outside the box either when I came here.

 I came here saying, hey, if you don't have a permit, and you're not the fisherman landing the fish, you don't belong in this, and there are some outside-the-box things that we've got to start thinking about, and so it's kind of a -- I would definitely be open to have more discussions, and I will give it some thought, and I can email that to you, Ed.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Anyone else? Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: Tim, thank you for your testimony, and I wanted to follow-up on your comment about the windfarms and your concerns related to that, because we haven't heard that many concerns about some of those impacts, and so if you could elaborate a bit on some of what you feel your concerns are about them.

 MR. DILLINGHAM: Well, number one, they leak oil. Number two, there is a lifespan problem with them as well, and what do you do? It's the same thing with decommissioning the oil rigs, right, and there is so much stuff out there, and what are you going to do when these turbines stop working, you know, and we're already having problems with red tide and the runoff here, and pollution is a super huge problem.

To be honest with you, the pollution in the Gulf is taking way more fish than our entire commercial sector, and that's the reality. When a red tide event happens, which, obviously, is not directly related to wind turbines, but they have made many public posts about how the wind turbines affect seabirds, affect the whales, and you can see. You can see the plumes of oils dripping off of these turbines and things, and it's just -- Why put them in the water? Why put them in something that has no filtration? Why can't we put them next to the coast, or in areas where it's still windy, but it has soil to filter through? When you have something like this, it goes directly in the water, and it's in the water,

and it's not going anywhere.

I know this isn't anything for the council to fix, but we have to collaborate together, all agencies, all people, and this isn't right. I mean, there's tons of places that they could put these turbines, and putting them in our water is not the right answer, and we sure as hell don't want them in southwest Florida, and I'm speaking for everybody I know there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have Rob Murphy, followed by Dale Woodruff.

MR. ROB MURPHY: My name is Rob Murphy, and I'm a passionate lifetime fisherman in the State of Florida with nothing left to lose. I put my life savings into a commercial boat in the Gulf, and the gag reduction put me out of business commercially last year. Now I just want a recreational season to fish with my son.

Trust the science. How many times have we heard that lately, but the credibility of the scientific community is at an all-time low. Public trust is at an all-time low. NOAA is now telling us to trust the science that 106,000 pounds of gag grouper was caught from shore last season, based on a single intercept from the Skyway Pier.

The study claims that, in nineteen days in October, 750,000 pounds of gag grouper were landed, and that's more than the entire commercial fleet catches in a good year. These are the most egregious examples, but the entire MRIP study is fatally flawed and based on wild extrapolations from extremely limited datasets. Does it not bother you that there is a million-pound discrepancy between the state study and the federal study?

 You know this study is flawed, and I ask the Gulf Council to stand with the public in calling out junk data. It undermines all of the good work that you do. NOAA should be ashamed of themselves for being so careless with people's livelihoods. This is reckless incompetence, and we're at a tipping point. People are angry, we're tired of having our rights stripped away by corrupt, lazy, unaccountable, and unelected bureaucrats.

Fishing is a proud tradition in Florida, and we will continue to fish sustainably. If they move forward with a complete gag grouper closure, based on this junk science, it will turn honest men into criminals. You will face unprecedented public rebuke, and you will leave people no other option than mass civil disobedience. People will ignore oppressive, nonsense closures and responsibly self-regulate our fishery.

I have spoken at many fisheries management meetings over the years, and I have never used this type of tone before, but we've tried for years to work constructively with regulators, and nothing has changed with regard to recreational data integrity. If you accept this study, you are either incompetent or complicit. You, the Gulf Council, should have immediately demanded the elimination of the jobs of anybody who tried to pass off this study. You should have thrown out this garbage data.

Demand better. Do better. The responsibility is now on you to rebuild public trust. If this closure is forced on us, based on flawed and impossible estimates, the public has a responsibility to stop at nothing short of an absolute purge of all involved parties and to demand they be replaced with individuals who prioritize sanity, accountability, and reason. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. We have Dale Woodruff, followed by Jesse Zuban.

MR. DALE WOODRUFF: Good afternoon. I'm Captain Dale Woodruff, and I'm President of the Alabama Charter Fishing Association, and I'm also a permit holder of two charter boats. I've been doing it a little bit, before my hair turned gray, but it sounds like we need a reporting program, like the SEFHIER. We kind of had that, but 80 percent of the charter-for-hire fleet out of Louisiana didn't want it, or was that eight?

I represent over sixty-eight charter-for-hire permit holders in the State of Alabama under our association, and I would ask the council to follow the recommendations of the advisory panel for the for-hire reporting program, so we could get back to reporting as soon as possible.

We support final action being taken on modifications to catch limits for the lane snapper, and then no reduction in the bag limit for gag, and keep it where it is, if we're not going to gain anything really, and I would urge the council to take unprecedented action to correct the methods used in MRIP-FES.

The thing about being a charter-for-hire permit holder is it's a privilege, and it's not a right, and the same thing with having a driver's license, and it's a privilege, and it's not a right, okay, and there's things that you have to do if it's a privilege. You have to follow the laws, and then there's laws that are added onto everything, and, you know, I can't drive sixty-five in a thirty-five, or I get a citation, and the idea of, well, I shouldn't have to do this, or I shouldn't have to do that, as a federal permit

holder, and I get it. I mean, I understand that people don't want to do anything, or they want to do the least possible, but you should be a good steward of your resource, and being a federally-permitted charter-for-hire captain -- You know, to report, it should be required.

It should be required to get the people in the back room the economic and the data for the reporting, and people say that they shouldn't do economic, or they shouldn't do twenty-four-seven or whatever, and I get it, but this is a privilege. I'm sorry, but it's not a right.

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

 MS. BOGGS: Thank you for being here, Dale. Of the sixty-eight charter boats in your association -- Well, let me rephrase the question. Is your association onboard with the reporting requirements of the economic data that was required in SEFHIER, and would they be onboard with it for the new data collection system?

MR. WOODRUFF: Well, at one time, yes, we were all for it, and everybody was for it, because it's what we wanted, and they're still for reporting the economic data, but maybe -- You know, I'm coming to grips on maybe doing an annual survey, or something like that, and, if I step aside as an individual, I don't mind reporting my data, okay, and I speak for every person in the association.

 I know there are a few that wouldn't care to report the economic data, but I know a lot of them will, because there are benefits to reporting your economic data, such as natural disasters and anything else that may come along that happens on this Gulf coast that we've been through, between the oil spill and the major hurricanes and fish kills, you know, and COVID, and so, to me, every business should report anyway, because, if there is a disaster, there is help to get them back out of being crippled by a disaster, and, if they don't have any economic reporting, then they're stuck. They're down where they're left to burn and die.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Woodruff. If people could take their conversations outside, and we're getting a lot of background noise from folks in the audience while people are providing their testimony. Next, we have Jesse Zuban, followed by Laura Chicola.

MR. JESSE ZUBAN: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Jesse, and I'm the Vice President of Dolphin Deep-Sea Fishing in Tarpon Springs, just north of Tampa Bay. I'm calling in with my concerns

about the MRIP, and I don't believe that the science is accurate, especially being the owner of two headboats and seeing what our numbers are from the federal headboat survey, as compared to shore landings and other landings, and it's just -- I can't put a word on it, and I guess angry, or upset, would be a good adjective.

Also, by shutting down the grouper, it's going to put pressure on other fisheries, as it already has, and everybody has seen, and I don't think that's a good thing either, for midwater snapper and different things that weren't historically harvested at the volume they are, and, with the numbers that are being reported, it should show that conservation has worked, in my opinion, if those numbers are actually going to be taken.

I mean, geez, we were fishing in September and October, and then, of course, the season was cut short. I mean, even Ed Walker had talked to me, at one point, and when the numbers first came out, and he goes, man, are you guys just crushing the gags all of a sudden or something, when these numbers were coming out, and I'm like, no, and some of the offshore trips and stuff were doing all right, but, between weather and it being such a hot time of year in this area, certainly not.

Also, the red grouper is out of sight, and even the numbers from the beginning of the year -- Most of the northern Gulf, the forhire and charter fleet, doesn't fish for the majority of the winter months, early spring and winter, and they're closed past the twenty-fathom curve, as it is anyhow, and so half the EEZ is shut down anyway, and so how those numbers add up is kind of beyond me.

As far as egg-bearing fish during the spawn, I don't see how it really matters one way or another, and I feel like what's good for the goose should be good for the gander, and, if the commercial side is allowed to harvest their fish during the spawn, I don't understand why the recreational sector and the for-hire sector is not. You know, you can catch that fish a week before it bears eggs, or while it bears eggs, and the result is the same.

One other point too is, with the gag grouper fishery in our area being closed, it will negatively financially -- It will negatively impact our companies financially, and my employees, not to mention the supporting industries around them, and, also, a word, and there's been a lot of talk on the dock, with some other charter boat operators and stuff, and headboat operators that weren't present at this meeting, regarding pushing for an IFQ for the forhire sector.

I don't believe that's a viable thing. Just because you have an

IFQ, it does not guarantee that your section of fish is carved out, and look what just happened in the commercial side, with over an 80 percent reduction in their fish, and one last point, before I wrap up, is, as far as the reporting is concerned for charter boats, I do believe that it doesn't need to be a detailed SEFHIER issue and all this.

Just continue on what the headboats are doing, like with the federal headboat survey. It's very simple, and you get an accurate report every day of what we catch, and there's no VMS, and it's kind of the best of both worlds, and so thank you for your time, and, if anyone has a question, I'm happy to answer.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you. I'm not seeing any hands up. Thank you. Next, we have Laura Chicola, followed by Will Schmidt.

MS. LAURA CHICOLA: Good afternoon, council. My name is Laura Chicola, commercial sector, boat and permit owner, and no shares. I am here before you because, overall, I still believe in what you are doing. The presentation yesterday on participation and permit requirements was really shocking and damning, when 30 percent of the IFQ participants catch all the quota.

This demonstrates exploitation of our men and women on the deck, fishers that risk their lives to harvest this resource, and what a mess the Gulf Council predecessors have made of this program. It's time to see a turn in the tide in respect to access for active fishermen, and the time is now to make it right for the few active fishermen that are left, instead of the corporators and investors. Thank you, and I'm sorry about the big words, and I'm having trouble with them. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right. Next, we have Robert Grable, and I'm sorry that I called Will, but he's not available. Robert Grable, are you there? He's not there either. Captain John Fidi. He's not there either. All right. We'll go back to in-person. Scott Hickman.

MR. SCOTT HICKMAN: I wasn't quite prepared, but here we go. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for hearing me today. This is Captain Scott Hickman from Galveston, Texas. I have a few things to say. Hopefully I can get it done in three minutes.

The unused IFQ shares and the unclaimed accounts I believe should be put into a program for military veterans that want to get into the fishery. People that have given so much to our country, I think we can do that for those folks, and it would be a good program.

1 2 3

Please forge ahead with the fishery ecosystem plan. It shows lots of promise to solve issues, and, also, let's get a good study fleet to collect environmental data, and fishery data, that would help the fishery ecosystem plan.

 Please implement the South Atlantic wahoo dolphin plan to include the Gulf. I know that Andy received some information, and the Flower Garden Banks Banks Sanctuary Advisory Council passed a motion to have a bag limit for wahoo for the big aggregation inside the sanctuary, and so you could work that plan in from the South Atlantic and cover that.

The rec fishing initiative should be given a priority by the council, and there is too many problems not to expedite this plan. The Charter Fishermen's Association supports the Graves reefing bill that's working itself through Congress right now, and we would like it to include wind structures as well, and the CFA, Charter Fishermen's Association, supports the offshore wind industry in the western Gulf of Mexico. These structures are vital and essential fish habitat, just like the oil and gas structures have been in the past.

The Charter Fishermen's Association and the Shareholders Alliance held an offshore wind summit this last year in Galveston, and it was really great, and we will be holding two more this year, in Texas and Louisiana. Please use the charter-for-industry industry data AP's recommendations as a blueprint for SEFHIER 2.0, and let's use the new Starlink cellular phone technology in SEFHIER, and also for private red reporting, through Starlink's worldwide cell network that's coming online this upcoming year.

You think MRIP is questionable? My state counts empty boat slips, and empty trailers at boat ramps, to get fishery effort data, and I think we can do better, on both systems, with new technologies, as I've listed above, and not mailouts. People quit using the U.S. mail years ago and are mainly paperless now, just like when we quit using landlines and went to cellphones.

I think my wife told me the other day that all of our bills are paid directly, and we do everything via email, and so she only checks the mailbox like once every week or two weeks, and so, if you're sending out mailouts, a lot of people aren't even checking their mail anymore, and it's all electronic, and so we can do better. Let's use technology, and let's get good data, because obviously it ain't working. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Scott. Next, we have Stephen Stang, followed by Kelia Paul.

MR. STEPHEN STANG: I'm Stephen Stang, and I'm a private recreational angler in the Big Bend, and I just wanted to say, you know, that I really appreciate all this good conversation that we're having, and I think it's, hopefully, the beginnings of some really meaningful change in the right direction with how we estimate our effort for gags, and I'm hoping that it goes in a similar direction that the red snapper has gone, and it kind of goes more to the state level. Most of our landings are brought in within Florida waters anyway, and so I think that would make the most sense.

We have a lot of good research being done by our state agency, at the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, and they're learning a lot about gag movement and spawning and stuff like that, and so I would like to see it go more towards the state level, especially looking at the discrepancy between MRIP's effort and the state's effort.

The other thing that I would like to bring up is I know the fishery is currently considered overfished, and I don't know how many more years the recreational sector is going to have a shortened season, but I just wanted to speak on behalf of that season length and when it started.

The Big Bend historically had an early spring season in the four-county region of Franklin, Wakulla, Taylor, and Jefferson Counties in state waters, and I'm sure there were a lot of public meetings had to get that put into place, and my understanding is it was based a lot on the fact that it gave anglers with smaller boats the ability to target gags when they're closer to shore, and I really would like to see that come back and not fall by the wayside, when discussions to maybe lengthen the season comes back on the table.

I also kind of question the September season, and I know, at least in the Big Bend, the fishing gets really good in October through December, and November and December are great months to fish. We're catching them in shallow water, with very minimal predation, like you see out in deep water in September, and no barotrauma, and so I would imagine that post-release mortality is very low in the shallow waters in the months of November and December, and so I would just like to get on the record that you know, the thought of going back to that early season opening in those four counties, and it meant a lot to those economies, but also considering a fall season, a late fall and winter season, when people know the gag

fishing is incredible, and it's what brings people to these areas.

You're seeing more and more people talk about catching shallow-water gags, and it makes our grouper fishery really unique, and so the September season really doesn't allow recreational anglers to capitalize on that, that epic fishing in November and December, and so that's all I wanted to say, and I'm glad we're having all these conversations, and I'm hoping that this is really the beginning of some positive change.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for your comments, Stephen. Next, we have Kelia Paul, followed by Rondal Springston.

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

For the for-hire data collection program, we do want to see this set up as soon as possible, to properly reflect what the for-hire sector is harvesting. We want to see the inputs streamlined and usability improved, auto-populate date and time on the hail-out, area fished, and carry the overlapping information from the hail-out to the landing notification, so that it doesn't have to be entered twice.

We do have a question around the target species field, and will this be used to calculate effort? If so, we would prefer a high or low category field, rather than a specific species, because we target multiple species on every trip we run, and we do not want to have inflated effort data. We also want to be sure that the ones that are dually-permitted, and already have VMS systems, are allowed to continue use of our tablets for reporting. We do not want different platforms and apps to manage, if possible, and it also allows our captains to submit a notification on the ride in and not have to wait for cell service.

 Validation is paramount in the success of the system, and we do not believe that a manual button is sufficient. We would like to see the geofencing option with a demarcation line that is set with the input of the local fleet. We are not in favor of daily economic data reporting, as we're trying to streamline and simplify, but we would not oppose the yearly sampling of a percentage of the fleet, like the commercial does.

For Amendment 59, we support requiring a permit to hold IFQ shares. We do believe that, as was said yesterday, there could be some

unintended consequences, like to the dealers. With this amendment, the council should explore all of those properly.

PCBA does have one more issue. We would like to see a change in the charter-for-hire red snapper season. We do not have a lot of tourism after mid-August, and we would like to see those days reallocated to May. We already have amberjack and gag in the fall, and we would like to have something to catch in May besides triggerfish and vermilion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Let's go to Lawrence Marino, followed by Ryan Bradley.

MR. LAWRENCE MARINO: Good afternoon. My name is Larry Marino, and I'm here on behalf of Louisiana Attorney General Liz Murrill. Regarding MRIP, it was, obviously, disappointing yesterday to hear about the latest problems, with the huge and unexplained variances for red grouper and gag. It does sound like small sample size, with some outlier results, may be at least a part of this particular problem. Outlier results need to be eliminated, or at least taken into account as such, but, even if that's all the data there is, it's a problem to use it to calculate a number for the harvest when the data is so unreliable.

This reminds us, once again, that MRIP wasn't designed for inseason management. This was said repeatedly, but we're still using it for in-season management, and we need to start moving away from it once and for all, and the thing to move to is the state surveys. It's encouraging that NMFS seems to want to work with the states in this regard. Particularly with the recent jolt of IRA money, now is the time to make that move.

Regarding the IFQ programs, the presentation regarding Amendment 59 was a good start, adding the actions for permits and active participation, but we already know that just requiring a permit won't do enough. This is why the objective that was addressed here was originally stated as limiting share ownership to accounts that are harvesting IFQ species. None of the options presented for determining active participation involves income requirements from fishing. Particularly given how many fishermen have raised this over the years, it seems that it should be an option that is at least considered here.

An option was presented to require harvesting a minimum number of pounds, and that seems to be a little bit not quite the right focus. Instead of a binary trigger of hitting a certain number of pounds, or not, the focus should be on how many shares the shareholder actually fished, and one way to do this is capping

ownership with the greatest number of shares fished by that shareholder over say the last two or three years.

Allowing a rolling time period to allow for health and vessel problems is appropriate, and perhaps also a hardship process to address more extreme situations, but the frame of reference should be whether the shareholder fished the shares, rather than simply whether the shareholder fished at all, or fished over some particular threshold, which can be very different, depending on the size of the operation you're talking about.

One thing that was missing from the amendment is one of the other objectives that this council stated, evaluating the merits of limiting share ownership, including alternative mechanisms for equitably redistributing shares. Several meetings ago, we heard an extensive presentation regarding adaptive management and cyclical and periodic redistribution of shares. Amendment 59 is the appropriate time to address that, as you're already dealing with whether and how shares must be divested.

The focus of adaptive management is equitably distributing the shares and the fish among fishermen and not just on limiting share ownership to actual fishermen. Both are important objectives, and both should be considered together in Amendment 59.

Finally, as you consider Amendment 60 at the next meeting, regarding the redistribution of shares, please consider not redistributing the shares, but consider instead holding the shares in a quota bank and distributing the allocation each year to target whatever needs the council or the quota bank leadership identifies. This avoids recreating the problem that got us here in the first place, functionally granting ownership of the shares to private individuals, along with the public's fish that those shares represent. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Marino. Ryan Bradley, followed by Jamie Gaspard.

MR. RYAN BRADLEY: Hello. Ryan Bradley here. I'm from Long Beach, Mississippi, and I'm a commercial reef fish permit fisherman, and I also operate a Gulf and South Atlantic seafood dealership. In fact, I'm the only federally-permitted seafood dealer in the State of Mississippi, currently. I have to be, because there is no one else that can offload my fish.

Most of the comments I'm going to have today is in regard to Amendment 59, and I oppose 59, related to the commercial sector's IFQ program, and it sounds like the council is in agreement about

requiring a reef fish permit to access shareholder accounts, and we've been talking about this for a while now, but we wanted to reiterate a few different considerations that are extremely important to consider as the council moves forward.

First, it's very important to include some kind of qualifier attached to the permit. In the council's presentation, they talked a lot about active participation and tying that participation to the shareholder account. Those considerations are good, but I think those would be -- They should probably be reserved for talks on cyclical redistribution, you know, and that's fine to come up in Amendment 60. I think 59 should focus on just getting the permit requirement in place, and that would be a good start.

You know, what we want to do with that permit income qualifier is similar to what was in place with the reef fish permit before we transitioned to an IFQ program, and so this is not a new idea, and this was in place before we went to IFQ, and, also, NOAA currently requires an income qualifier requirement for the spiny lobster fishery, and, if you are able to pull up their permit renewal application on page 6, you can see more information about how they request that information for the spiny lobster, and I think we could do the same thing for the reef fish fishery here, and that would be beneficial to us.

This is so important, because, if we just go with a permit requirement for these shareholder accounts, the price of the permits are going to go through the roof, and we're going to further compound barriers to entry for these young fishermen, and so we don't want to do that.

Secondly, in the document the council presented, we really need to consider language that says a reef fish permit is required to, quote, obtain quota shares or allocation, and not maintain, and the difference in "maintain" is that would require all shareholders to have a permit to keep the quota, and it would force a divestment at a drop-dead date.

 By using the word "obtain", we would simply require the shareholders to have a permit to obtain shares going forward, or facilitate new transfers into their account, and they would not be penalized for their current holdings, and they wouldn't be forced to divest, and so that's a big thing to consider there.

There is also some other big reasons why we wouldn't want to use the word "maintain", which would force divestment, and that could create a whole bunch of unintended consequences that would be counter to what we're trying to do here, and so, by using the word "obtain" over "maintain", that will also help us avoid the whole discussion about grandfathering people in, providing exemptions for certain operators, and, you know, to talk about an exemption for a dealer, and I'm a dealer, and I don't think a dealer needs an exemption for anything, especially if we change the program to make it where participants only need to have a permit to obtain the shares.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ryan, can you wrap it up? You've met your time limit. Can you go ahead and wrap it up?

MR. BRADLEY: Okay. That's it, and, in closing, just let's look at those things and try to make a good move there on requiring these permits in this IFQ program, and I think there's some caveats there that we need to pay close attention to. Thank you for your time, and we appreciate your service to the USA.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. We have a question for you, Ryan, from General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Ryan, we've talked some about this, and I think, also, you know, if we look at Action 2 of the active participation in there, it talks about a minimum poundage, is what they're looking at, but, from talking, I think you're thinking we ought to put something in there like a percentage of income, and is that correct?

MR. BRADLEY: That's correct, General. What I would recommend is a percentage of income from any commercial fishing activity from our region in the Gulf, and that could be a state fishery or a federal fishery, and our goal is not to exclude all commercial fishing, and we want to be able to be inclusive to as many legitimate commercial fishermen as we can, to give them access to this fishery, but it is a very limited-access fishery, and so we need to be limiting that access to bonified commercial fishermen.

I thank you for asking that question, because I brought up Mississippi, and Mississippi has a similar income qualifier that we use for our speckled trout, and maybe you could talk more about that to the council, and tell them how that works for our state, and maybe the good or the bad or your perspective on that, and I think we could do something very similar with our Gulf reef fish permit here, and that would protect the people we're trying to protect. Thank you, sir, for the question.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Yes, that's correct, and what we do is we have like a qualifier, where you have to have a certain percentage of whatever your income has to come from that, to be able to qualify

for a speckled trout permit, and that's something you might want to entertain when we look at that. You know, instead of just poundage, maybe we could put a percentage, like you did for spiny lobster or something.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thanks again, Ryan. All right. Next, we have Jamie Gaspard, followed by Jesse Hunt.

MR. JAMIE GASPARD: How are you doing? I'm Captain Jamie Gaspard from Pure Adrenalin Fishing Charters. I'm a commercial fisherman and a charter fisherman, more charter than commercial. I don't have shares, and so I've got to lease my quota.

I came here today to talk about the SEFHIER program, first off. I'm for it, and I've also talked to a couple of my friends that is for it too. With the past year, with the economy down, we were kind of competing against non-permitted boats, and this would be another leg to help us start eliminating some of that, like it was. I support the Starlink cellular, because it really wouldn't cost any more, and we could eliminate some equipment by using that.

Another thing too that I would like to add is I would like to see the Gulf split into two zones. That way, I'm not getting punished for other people.

My shrimper friends, try and help them guys out any way you all can, because they're getting beat up pretty bad, our local people, and one thing I will say is people way up north make decisions for people that live on the coast, and sometimes that ain't the right decision, and so I'm just leaving you all with that. That's about all I've got, guys, and maybe we can look into maybe adding something to the shark population that is out of control, maybe some kind of --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Jamie. What is your opinion on the economical part of the SEFHIER program?

MR. GASPARD: Keeping a part of what?

MR. DUGAS: The new SEFHIER program.

MR. GASPARD: I really don't have a problem with it. I mean, I guess I can go either way on it, really, and I guess it's what it's used for. You know, as long as it's used for the good of it, I guess we can work with it, and I signed up -- Especially for SEFHIER, I signed up for the pilot program when they started this,

and it wasn't a real big deal to us. It really wasn't, and we like giving the data, and we want to give accurate data, and it's going to transpire to more days on the water. That's how I see it, and a couple of my friends see it. You know, other people have got different opinions of it, but we're good with it. We really are.

One thing that I would like to say though is like we were allowed a power-down exemption, and we had like a couple of instances where we would power-down, and it's seventy-two-hour power-down. Well, they don't want you to power-up, and so, like if a friend's boat breaks down, or you're going to take his trip, and you're in power-down, well, they don't want you to power-up, and so I would like to see that worked on some kind of way, and maybe going to a twelve-hour power-down or something, you know, and that's about it.

MR. DUGAS: One more. When you talk about splitting the Gulf east and west, are you pertaining to the charter fleet?

MR. GASPARD: Well, I think it would be everybody. The charter fleet would be fine too, but I would really like to see it split, because I don't want to be punished for what other people do. I mean, if we have a big biomass of fish here, and other people are catching theirs, we get punished for them, and I would like to see it split, and a lot of other people would like to see it split, for that reason.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Jesse Hunt, followed by Johnny Williams.

MR. JESSE HUNT: Good afternoon. My name is Jesse Hunt, and I'm a passionate recreational angler from west-central Florida. I'm here today to address the inaccuracies in the MRIP-FES data for the 2023 gag grouper. We all understand the critical importance of accurate data in managing our fisheries. Decisions based on flawed data not only misrepresent the reality, but it can lead to consequences that can affect every stakeholder involved.

Let me draw your attention to the specific issues with the data. This year, we faced substantial challenges with severe weather conditions, significantly reducing the number of fishable days, yet the MRIP-FES reports a total of 1.6 million pounds of gag grouper landed in 2023, a figure that seems implausible under these circumstances. The core of this discrepancy lies in the data sample size, and the total count of intercepts was only thirty-two. How can such a limited sample size yield reliable data for an entire fishery?

To put this into perspective, the Gulf Council is responsible for preparing fishery management plans for an exclusive economic zone encompassing 182,752 square nautical miles, as per fisherycouncil.org. With only thirty-two intercepts, this equates to one intercept per 5,711 square nautical miles. Such a sparse distribution of data points is hardly robust, or meaningful, for such a vast area.

Moreover, the extrapolation of shore landings is deeply concerning. Based on just one shore intercept, the MRIP-FES estimated over 106,000 pounds of gag grouper caught. This is in stark contrast to the 2022 data, where no shore intercepts resulted in zero pounds reported. The inconsistency is glaring.

It's common knowledge among us that gag grouper thrive in deeper waters, particularly during the months when the fishing season is open. The idea that shore anglers could out-fish headboats, let alone by a factor of ten, defies logic and our understanding of the species. If these flawed numbers are accepted as fact, the consequences are dire. We risk the closure of the gag grouper fishery for years. This would not only affect recreational fishermen, but also charter captains, headboat operators, and the tourism industry that depends on this fishery.

We're looking at a chain reaction of economic and environmental repercussions. I urge the council to reconsider the data collection and management methodologies. Our fishery, and all those who depend on it, deserve accurate, reliable data. It's essential for the sustainable management of our resources and the livelihood of our community.

In conclusion, the future of our gag grouper fishery hinges on the decisions made by this esteemed body. Let those decisions be informed by data that is accurate and as robust as possible. Thank you for your attention and for the opportunity to speak today. I am hopeful that, together, we can work towards a more sustainable and prosperous future for our fishery.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Jesse. Next, we have Johnny Williams, followed by Anthony Angello. Anthony Anderson, are you on the phone? All right. Kindra Arneson, and then, after Kindra, we'll have Jessica Essig.

MS. KINDRA ARNESON: Good afternoon, council members and guests. Welcome back to Louisiana. The presentation yesterday answered a question that I've had for some time. It should rock the public to its core to know that small family fishers are forced to lease

70 percent of the Gulf red snapper quota from folks whose feet never touch the deck of a boat to harvest these fish.

The boots-on-deck fishers in our coastal communities have been exploited to the breaking point because of this program. Seeing the current action being taken by this council is encouraging, and it gives a renewed hope for the boots-on-deck fishermen, fishers that have been negatively impacted by this IFQ program. Today, I ask -- I have one ask, catch share reform sooner rather than later. Please do not kick the can any further down the road. Please move forward with overhauling the IFQ program, and our hope is that you, the current Gulf Council, works hard, and swiftly, to put the fish back in the hands of fishermen, and their crew, and finally put a cease to the exploitation of fishers and our coastal communities.

On the phone, Mr. Bradley talked about requirements to be in this program, and I understand that we're moving forward with a permit requirement. I would be in agreement with an active income requirement, for the participant to have an active VMS, and active participation in harvesting fish.

My question for you is how many times can you cut up a resource? How many times should someone be permitted to make money off of the catch that is harvested by our fishermen? You know, when I go catch shrimp, I don't pay the dock to go catch that. I go harvest my shrimp, and I bring it back in, and I unload it to my dealer, and then it's up to them to market the shrimp to their buyer, to make their profit margin on it, but, in this program, we have dealers, and, look, the dealers didn't do this themselves, and this was done for them by this program, but we have dealers that are making money on two sides of this, and so where is the equity in that?

You know, where is it where my husband goes out, and can lose an arm, or I could lose a leg, or our life, on the boat for someone that is sitting on land that gets to double-dip into this resource?

On the windmills, I heard someone early say put them in the western Gulf, and let's split the Gulf in half. Well, why should I have windmills in my backyard, and they shouldn't have them in theirs? You know, we can't keep trading one off for the other, and I don't think that the windmills should be in the ocean, period. We're already seeing these large investors back out on the east coast. What's going to happen in the Gulf coast, and not if, but when we have a massive hurricane and it mows them down? Who is going to be there to clean up that mess? They're not oil and gas.

You know, for Katrina, we have massive infrastructure come down in the Gulf of Mexico, and a lot of it still lays on the bottom. You've got trawlers out here trying to trawl off the coast of Louisiana, and they're going to run into the lines, and the oystermen don't want the lines across their oyster beds, and nobody wants this stuff in the Gulf of Mexico, but it's full steam forward to continue development. We've got to start drawing the line somewhere to protect the resource and coastal communities that depend upon them. Thank you, all, and I will take any questions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Kindra. I don't see any questions. Thank you. Next, we have Kyle Varn, followed by Sonja Fordham. Kyle, are you there?

MR. KYLE VARN: All right, and so I am out of west-central Florida, the Tampa Bay area, and there's a lot of stuff that people have said today that I would just be beating a dead horse, and I don't want to necessarily reiterate some of that stuff, but the inaccuracies from this MRIP number that came from some group out of Maryland -- The fact that it's such a small sample size of only, what, thirty-two, and one shore fisherman, fifteen private boaters, and sixteen charter captains, or charter angling, and somehow private boat anglers did 1.4 million pounds, which is roughly a number that equates to how many actual saltwater fishing anglers that are licensed in the State of Florida, which I find just kind of wild out there,

As for the FES, I actually received -- I actually received that survey in the mail, and one of the things that I noticed about the survey is that it didn't ask if I had released these fish, and I thought that was a really important thing to ask during it, and I think any steps that we go forward with trying to make sure that we're getting accurate numbers, and accurate representation, is did this person -- Yes, did they catch it? Did they catch said fish? Yes.

Did they release it, because, for me, I didn't -- I wasn't on a boat, and I was in a kayak, or I was on my SUP, or I was from land, and, on some of these days, yes, did I catch a gag? Yes, but it was seven inches, and I didn't keep it. I caught a bunch of them, and it's great. It shows me that we have an estuary and a good establishment of this fish is thriving, and still growing, and it's still there, but to kind of put forward -- You know, I kind of feel like somehow someone up there in this Maryland area, that was looking at these numbers, was not taking that consideration into effect.

Going forward, we need to make sure that, whatever we do, whether

it's online, over the phone, an app, or even someone doing a survey, which that's very rare to even see, to me, and even to most captains, and we need to make sure that we are being honest and forward on the fact of what's actually being taken in and not -- Also what is also being released, and that is all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Kyle. All right. I called on Johnny Williams earlier, and he had just stepped back in the door, and I didn't give him enough time to come to the podium, but he is here now, and so Johnny Williams, followed by Sonja Fordham.

MR. JOHNNY WILLIAMS: Thank you. Johnny Williams, with Williams Partyboats, Incorporated, third-generation partyboat operator out of Galveston. This is going to sound like déjà vu all over again, but anyway, and king mackerel —— I tried to warn you all, about five years ago, that king mackerel were in bad shape. This year, I've got the data from last year, and we only caught like a little over one-third of the allowable total catch.

You know, the fishermen have come up here and told you all that king mackerel are in bad shape, and the data shows that king mackerel are in bad shape, and you're still not doing anything about it, and why are we not? Why are we sitting on our hands? Andy, I mean, it's like one-third of the quota is being caught, the total quota is being caught, but we're still not doing anything about it. You know, we need to do something about this fishery.

The red snapper, we had everyone pretty much from the charter boat and partyboat and commercial industry saying don't raise the quota, and the quota was increased anyway. You know, we need to have a balance between the scientific data and what the fishermen are saying, but, in the case of king mackerel, the data shows that the fish are in bad shape. The fishermen say that the fish are in bad shape, and nothing is being done. We need to do something.

We need to -- This council needs to be proactive, and not reactive or inactive, and we need to see what's coming down the line and do something about it. As I mentioned before at the council meetings, you know, we're coming up with this new technology, and they have the bottom relief shading, and spots that were not known to folks are going to be common now, and these red snapper are going to be more vulnerable, and we need to do something about that.

My suggestion of one thing we can do is push forward with Amendment 42. Amendment 42 accomplishes pretty much all of the National Standards that are required, especially 10, safety-at-sea, and Number 9, the bycatch, and, to a lesser degree, communities, cost

and benefits, efficiency, allocation, optimum yield.

I mean, I always contend that I can run my business better than the federal government can, and so let's put 42 back on the table again.

A lot of people are going to argue that, we've had problems with catch share programs in the commercial industry, and one thing we need to take into consideration is, when the allocations originally came in the commercial industry, when the eastern Gulf of Mexico was not harvesting a lot of red snapper in the years that were suggested, and a lot of people that are catching red snapper now were not included, but we've had fish in the eastern Gulf for quite a while, and so I think that -- I don't think that would be a problem, and please be proactive. Let's not be inactive, and let's not be reactive, and let's be proactive. Let's try to do something for the fish and the fishermen. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Williams. We have one hand, at least. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: A comment and a question, and so the comment is, if people say we don't listen to your public testimony, we do, and, at the last council meeting, we passed a motion to begin an action looking at adjusting king mackerel catch limits, and so --

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Andy, and I appreciate that. It's long overdue.

MR. STRELCHECK: It's not on this agenda, but it is in the queue. My question, and you didn't talk about SEFHIER, right, and what are your thoughts in terms of the AP's recommendations?

MR. WILLIAMS: About what, sir?

MR. STRELCHECK: The for-hire logbook program, and I know you're part of the headboat survey.

MR. WILLIAMS: You know, the better data we have, the better grip we have on what's actually being caught out there in the industry, and I support anything. I was really disappointed when I heard that you all lost in court and we're able to pursue catch reports from the charter boats, and, I mean, I'm all onboard. The more data that we have, you know, the better we're able to make decisions and recommendations.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. Have a great day.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have Sonja Fordham, followed by Zach Zistre. No Sonja? All right. Zach Zistre, are you on the phone, online?

MR. ZACH ZISTRE: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Yes, we can.

 MR. ZISTRE: All right. Give me one second to pull this up. I'm Zach Zistre out of Crystal River, Florida. I'm an IFQ commercial spear fisherman, and I fish from Naples to Steinhatchee. We have zero bycatch or discards. I also provided a 2022 FWC gag study with the most gonads of all participants. We produced male gags in areas that don't exist, according to your data.

All these fish that are supposedly overfished, we see them underwater, I mean, every time we go out, and we can't get away from gags, red grouper, and amberjack to find other fish to shoot. Gags and amberjack are 75 percent of our annual income, typically, and imagine taking a 75 percent loss and living off of 25 percent, because of somebody's supposed data that is -- It's wrong. It's completely wrong.

I am just hoping that you guys can do immediate action on mandatory reporting for all sectors with an app on your phone. We do it already. The charter guys do it, and we started to do it some, and it got taken away, and that's the only way that you get actual data of what's coming out of the ocean. This needs to be mandatory, and there needs to be a heavy fine if you get caught not doing it, two or three times, and, the third time, take your license for a year. This is very important.

This MRIP data, you guys -- Everybody in this room listening and everywhere knows it's wrong, and are you guys -- Here's my question. Are you guys throwing this out, and I want an answer to this today, right now.

On the permit requirement, I own a very small portion of quota that I've bought, and I came into this about ten years ago now, and it's tough. You've got to fight and claw for quota, for any quota to make a living. You need to have a permit, and you need to have a boat, and you need to be fishing. I'm also a dealer too now, because that's the only way that sometimes I can sell my fish and make enough money to survive. Finally, we're tired of being told to be patient and waiting for our livelihood to continue to completely be extinguished. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Zach. Troy Frady, followed by --

MR. ZISTRE: No answer to that. It makes me so mad.

MR. TROY FRADY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm Troy Frady, a charter boat captain from Orange Beach, Alabama. I did actually go and attend the ad hoc SEFHIER program meeting here a couple of weeks ago, on my own dime, and I wanted to sit in there, because we've been doing this for thirteen years, and I just wanted to see what some fresh, new ideas that some new faces would come up with, and then the surprising thing is they came up with about the same thing we've come up with over the past thirteen years.

I personally support the implementation of a new SEFHIER program as soon as possible. I would like to see you all secure funding for the validation of the program. We need to have funding set up for the development of things like the geofencing that we were talking about, and that technology, to make sure that tool can be used for validation.

I do feel for those who depend on the gag and red grouper. It's kind of like the déjà vu that Johnny Williams was talking about, about the -- You know, that was our red snapper, and now it's happening to you all, and it is time to make some serious changes and try to get some real in-season quota monitoring. You know, but, since the MRIP is the best available science, I do understand that we must use it. However, I do believe that we can do a better job.

I do believe that we should continue providing our economic data in the fishing industry, and not many people know about this, but each industry in the United States comes up under what's called an NAICS code, which stands for North American Industry Classification System. Right now, charter fishing comes under 487110, which is scenic and sightseeing transportation, land.

Well, that's about a \$4 billion economic driver for our nation, and so, if we had our charter-for-hire industry, our own NAICS code, it would help the federal government kind of hone-in on who we are, and, if we do have a natural disaster, or something like that, we could get funding, or help, loans, or whatever it would take to help our industry. Other than that, you all keep up the good work, and I think now we've got a lot of people so upset, all the way to the tip of Florida, that maybe we may get some folks in here to change the direction of getting better data collection. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Frady. All right. Next, we

have William Callis, followed by Eric Brazer.

DR. WILLIAM CALLIS: Hello, council and fisher friends out there. I am a recreational fisherman, and I grew up in the St. Marks area in southwest Georgia, and I've been spearfishing my whole life. I'm currently an Army physician, and I'm in Augusta, Georgia, and I try to get down there anytime I can. Last year, I got to go fishing one time, you know, during the scalloping season out of Steinhatchee with my boys. We were able to get a weather window and go to the Florida Middle Grounds, but gag season was not in, but we caught -- We lost count of how many we caught and released that night, and so the fishery is absolutely strong, from my one anecdotal experience.

I think -- You know, everybody has made these great comments about the MRIP data, and I think that's a no-brainer, that your data collection is broken, and I would definitely be for a better data collection system for recreational anglers. You know, we all have smartphones, and I definitely would be in favor us having an online reporting of, hey, here's what I caught, as soon as you come in.

You know, Georgia, for deer hunting, and a lot of you Florida fishermen are hunters in Georgia, and we have that 1-800-hey-you-got-one, and it works very well, and you get real-time data collection. That's all I have to say, and I sent my other comments by email.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. We have Eric Brazer, followed by Ryan Balsinger.

MR. ERIC BRAZER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Eric Brazer, Deputy Director, Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance. I've got to start with IFQs, right, but I do want to start by thanking staff for a really great presentation at this meeting, and at the previous meeting as well, and so now you have goals, you have some objectives, you have two actions that are moving forward.

I don't think you have agreement on a unified vision for what you're trying to achieve, but I'm not going to harp on that. I would just ask that, from time to time, as you go through this process, kind of hit pause, take a breath, and make sure that what you're doing is actually following what you intended to do.

So you've only just started talking about this, and you're already seeing that this could have some impacts on dealers, and this is going to be part of the process, and this is a good thing. Walking through all the different permutations, and there is so many

different permutations and business plans in the commercial reef fish fishery, and walking through them and figuring out how different combinations of what you're looking at are going to impact the different business plans, and how do you envision dealers operating under this new system? How do you envision allocation banks operating under this new system? How do you envision multi-fishery businesses and dual-permitted businesses operating under these new regulations?

It's easy, and it's relatively easy, to look at this for the one boat, one permit, one account owner-operator model, but the fishery is much more diverse than that, and so, the more you can get input from the industry, the better, and we agree this is the right way to go, this is the right way to do this, and we continue to support this process, and we're really looking forward to seeing the next iteration of the document.

FES, we need to do better. The council made the right decision that you shouldn't use FES to reallocate this fishery, and now we're asking the council, and the agency, to do the right thing and take some real, tangible steps towards a mandatory, comprehensive recreational catch and effort reporting system.

It's going to be hard, and it's going to take some time, but, unless we get there, all we're going to keep doing is arguing over extrapolations, right, and we're tired of the extrapolations, and we need to do better, and we think you can. Speaking of doing better, we support SEFHIER, the people I know, and let's get it done.

Then my second-to-last comment is the National Seafood Strategy Implementation Plan, and we agree with General Spraggins and the rest of the council members' comments in response to the plan, and we ask that the council do whatever it can to support this effort. The only thing we would add to the agency's presentation is that the Young Fishermen's Development Act should be considered as a strategy, or a vehicle, to help support this work, and I want to end on a sincere note, and I want to thank you, Mr. Chair, for the kind words about Dr. Shipp and Charlie Bergmann.

 These guys were larger than life, and many of you knew them better, and longer, than I did, but, despite all the fighting, and the chaos, and the stress, it's always good to kind of take a step back and remember the people that helped build the system. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Eric. I don't see any hands up. Thank you. We're going to go to Garner Wetzel, followed by Randy.

MR. GARNER WETZEL: Good afternoon, council. Thank you very much, council. I'm glad to see overestimation of effort receiving some earnest attention at this meeting. As a recreational angler in Gulfport, Mississippi, I am no stranger to the impossible effort estimation produced by MRIP, and here are some examples.

In 2016, MRIP Wave 1, the Mississippi red snapper season is closed, but MRIP reports that Mississippi landed over 150,000 pounds of snapper. In 2017, MRIP Wave 1, Mississippi red snapper season is closed, and MRIP reports that Mississippi landed over 400,000 pounds of snapper. In the 2019 Mississippi snapper season, Tails 'n Scales reports that Mississippians harvested 150,000 pounds. An independent effort survey conducted in Mississippi reports 176,000 pounds. The MRIP estimate of harvest exceeds one-million pounds.

Amberjack landings in Mississippi, in the years 2015, 2017, 2018, and 2019, do not exceed 50,000 pounds for the entire year. In 2016 and 2020, MRIP reports Mississippians harvested over 250,000 pounds in one wave each year.

MRIP, in these circumstances, has grossly overestimated directed effort. When this data is inputted into stock assessments and other models, discards are also overestimated. MRIP, in turn -- MRIP catch estimates, in Mississippi, are, in many circumstances, wildly inflated and highly volatile. The data forces kneejerk management decisions that do not benefit stocks or stakeholders.

It is my hope that, with more states bolstering their data collection systems this year, NOAA will replace MRIP estimations with data streams from the states that have proven to be more in sync with reality. As always, I appreciate the time to speak to the management council. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Garner. Next, we have Randy Sobieraj, followed by Michael Jennings, Mike Jennings.

MR. RANDY SOBIERAJ: Good afternoon. My name is Randy Sobieraj, owner and operator of a commercial fishing boat, and it seems like you guys got a lot of backlash today, with all the recent comments and data, and I applaud you for dealing with all the negative feedback, but I've come to a lot of these meetings, and I am one of the very few young fishermen in the commercial industry, and, with Amendment 59, and I know it said stuff with new participants, and, you know, I do want to encourage --

For new entrants, first-generation fishermen, it's very hard to

get into the fishery without a lot of backing, because it's not a cheap endeavor to go down the path, you know, with quota prices, and share prices, and whatnot, and just even building a boat is very expensive. I know, with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, it does have a clause in it with set-asides for new entrants, and I urge to push for that, and I appreciate the time for listening today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Mike Jennings, followed by Sean Heverin.

9 10 11

12

13

14

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

> MR. MIKE JENNINGS: Chair and council members, I appreciate you all letting me testify today. I'm Mike Jennings, and I'm the owner and operator of two federally-permitted charter boats and one commercial reef fish and king mackerel boat out of Freeport, Texas. I'm also the Vice Chair of the Data Collection AP.

15 16 17

18

19

20

I will touch on a couple of things real quick, without beating you all up over the same information on the gag grouper. You can take Captain Dylan Hubbard's testimony and just make it mine as well. I read through it, and listened to what portions of it he was able to give you all here.

21 22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

On lane snapper, I support the final action being taken on the catch limit modifications, and last, but not least, the Data Collection For-Hire AP that I was on, and I heard Captain Mike Colby make a comment today that it was unanimous, and I think where some of that came from was there was a lot of heated discussion in that room about some of those motions that we passed, especially the last one, and I was very vocal in my opposition to that, but, in the manner of bringing this council the largest suite of options to work with to replace that gold standard that we lost in that lawsuit, we were able to kind of come to these unanimous agreements and get this thing up here, and then hope this council takes all of it into consideration and makes the best decisions to get us a viable data collection system back up and running, and hopefully we can stand that thing up as quickly as possible.

36 37 38

39 40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

I mean, we're missing one big piece here, and that's the ability to understand that those boats actually are going fishing and returning and not just sitting at the dock making reports, and we know how important that is to that data collection system, and I think a lot of us forget that we learned that years and years ago, when the Alaska program went so awry, but, with that said, I encourage the council to move forward with that data collection program, and let's get this thing stood up as quickly as we can and start reporting again, because there was -- I think we lost this data collection system to a very few, a minority, and not a majority that was in agreement with the overall premise.

3 of 4 jus 5 you

Each person may have a little bit of heartburn with bits and pieces of it, but we understand the need for it, and we're asking you just to move forward with that, and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Captain Jennings, we have a question from Ms. Boggs.

MR. JENNINGS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BOGGS: I actually have two questions. One, you mentioned your commercial boat king mackerel fishes, and we just had Johnny Williams that stood up here and addressed the king mackerel, which no one else has, and can you tell me, very quickly, what you see in the king mackerel fishery, and then I do have a question about the charter-for-hire data collection.

MR. JENNINGS: It's non-existent. I mean, every one of us pulled outriggers and planers off our boats and ignored them. We would catch a few between spots, but the numbers are so poor that it wasn't even worth targeting, and they were a total incidental catch from moving from one spot to the next, and it's collapsed, as far as I'm concerned, even with the -- On the charter boat side of things, in the western Gulf, I know -- Every region is different, and we know that every time we have these discussions, that, to me in Texas, triggerfish are irrelevant, and I could care less if I ever catch another one. They're not anything that we've ever built a business on targeting. I can't sell a trip on one fish, and, in a lot of the Gulf, the king mackerel are irrelevant, and we bank on those, especially after red snapper is closed.

A lot of our trips are run out and get king mackerels, and catch a limit on them, and, on a normal day, an average day, you could do it in an hour-and-a-half, you know, and slower on some and faster on others, and we come back in, and we would focus on our nearshore fishery, our redfish that are starting to show up and things along those lines, and we're working on both sides of that fence to sell a trip later in the year, and, without those king mackerel, it's made it tough.

There's been some pockets here and there, and you will catch some of the guys that -- No offense here, but you'll catch a few of the guys that fish very little, and they stumbled across a couple of solid limits this summer, which we all did, and they're, well, they're fine, and, no, you fished five days, and you just caught the right days, but, no, they're in bad shape.

MS. BOGGS: Then, with regard to the data collection, in your opinion, and not the AP's opinion, how do you feel about the economic questions?

MR. JENNINGS: I'm perfectly fine with it, and, again, our recommendations, from the AP side, just speaking for myself and my opinion of it, is we came to a -- We worked a lot on compromise, that put suites of options in front of this council that were near-and-dear to only one or two people, and that was all the way around the board, even myself, and there was a couple of things that were near-and-dear to my heart, that I wanted from this council, that the majority of the room had spoke a little opposition to, and so I think that's where that came from. Me personally, I'm perfectly fine with it. I see the purpose and the need. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. We have -- I called out Sean Heverin, followed by Kay Smith.

MR. SEAN HEVERIN: Hi. How are you doing today? I'm Sean Heverin, commercial fisherman, boat owner, dealer, based out of Madeira Beach. I buy and sell fish from boats from all over the Gulf, Louisiana, Pensacola, Fort Myers, Naples.

I really wanted to touch on the MRIP-FES surveys, which I definitely disagree with the data, along with I don't know how many exactly people have talked about that today, but I am in agreement with the majority of the people here that the data should be thrown out. I really find it unfortunate that we've used this data in the past to make different management decisions, specifically reallocation that they have taken the fish away from the commercial sector to reallocate to different sectors, using this data, and now, you know, you're using this best available science to shut down the recreational and charter seasons there for red grouper and gag, and it's unfortunate for the charter fishermen, and the recreational fishermen, here in the Gulf that they have -- Whether it's business that they are planning on to get for charter season or recreational to go out and try to harvest some red grouper and gag, for a hobby or fun, and I just find that unfortunate for them, that they're using this best available science, which is not correct.

I know I've spoken about this, the many different times I've been up here, that, you know, I think better accountability of the recreational sector, or the charter sector, whether it's electronic reporting, giving fish tags to recreational users to harvest fish throughout the year, and you could even like an app on your phone, as recreational angler, just to hail-out and hail-in, and then just, you know, report what you caught that day, and,

you know, it could be -- Like I have an app on my phone to pay for parking for the day, and it could be like have an app on your phone and hail-out that you're doing a recreational fishing day, and that would give us better data to make management decisions from, and it could be something as simple as, you know, logging-in.

If you reported that you caught four snapper that day, and two red grouper, and whatever on recreational trip, and you hail it in, you know, there could also be some enforcement measures built into that too, to help manage the fishery better and make it easier for law enforcement to enforce some of those rules and so forth.

Really, it's not going to affect us on the commercial side as much, the dealer side, but I just -- I find it wrong that the recreational and charter side is being forced to use this data, potentially, to shut down their seasons, and maybe in the future -- Maybe reallocate from the commercial sector to give more to the recreational side, which I don't think is a fair way to do that for our side, on the commercial sector, for being accountable and VMS and IFQ and the number of factors and hoops and whatever things we have to jump through to manage our businesses.

It's already hard enough, with business models that are working on leased fish, and, you know, your profit margins are shrunk down, and you have to overcome the lease prices by, you know, catching more volume. Longlining, you're doing longer trips, you know, and so we have a lot of challenges on our side to try to turn a profit, and so that's really all that I wanted to say today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Kay Smith, followed by Jim Green. Kay, are you on the line?

MS. ROY: Kay, you will have to unmute your line.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Then, Jim Green, you're up.

MR. JIM GREEN: Hello. Captain Jim Green, President of the Destin Charter Boat Association and President of the Charter Fishermen's Association. Concerning MRIP and the preliminary estimates on the gag and the red grouper fishery, the DCBA and CFA supports today's testimony by Captain Dylan Hubbard.

We have a tremendous problem, and we urge the council to take unprecedented corrective action. From the 100,000 pounds of shore data, and its 98 percent chance of being wrong, to the headboat survey, the only census-based data source, contributing 1 percent of the landings, it should properly display that corrections need to be made. This is not just for business and access, but also

for the proper biological management of the fishery in the future.

When it comes to lane snapper, we support the final action framework. When it comes to for-hire data collection, first, I want to say that Lisa and Carrie and all the staff at the council and agency did a great job preparing and executing the AP meeting. During the committee report, I was more worried about the motions, and making sure that they were properly understood, and I failed to give those praises, and they were very deserving. They did a really wonderful job.

I've heard mixed reviews, in passing, about what "all unanimously approved motions" means, or could be interpreted as, and I will say that I was surprised that it is the way that it fleshed out as well. You know, it was a surprise, but I believe it's a testament to you as a council, building an advisory panel with so much diversity, as well as our industry's willingness to take our experiences, and the direction of the ruling, and produce recommendations that are built upon just that.

The two major contentions in SEFHIER was the economic reporting and the twenty-four-seven tracking, and the ruling gave us a path, by removing those in a certain manner, which allowed for a far less-contentious approach to redeveloping this program. Our organizations have always strived to evaluate fairly everyone's ideas and input, no matter what their intentions are, whether expressed or not, and give them the opportunity.

Everyone in the meeting got to speak as many times as they wanted, as long as they wanted, about what they wanted to talk about, and, while there is always opposing views, and everyone has their perceptions, the committee report simply shows where all of the diverse participants agreed that they would like to see this fleshed out as options as the document evolves.

I want to speak for myself for just a minute, because I guess I injected, not intending to, controversy with this depredation data field, and I will say that I figured there would be some concern, but not to the extent that played out, and certainly not the extent that we have now. I laid in bed that night, before the AP met, the AP meeting, and I was going through my head and checking the boxes, and I realized that depredation data would address something that every sector complains about, and has for a long time, and continues to say it's getting worse, and so why would we not, and how can we expect to find a solution if we have absolutely zero scientific-collected data on it?

I think, with how complex our management system is, and how arduous

it can be, getting the ball rolling on certain things is better sooner than later. It's clear there is some reservations, for a good portion, about what it means, but we should definitely see what comes out of it being explored. With that, we request that you take all the recommendations from the AP and direct staff to move forward with the next steps, and I appreciate the time to speak today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Captain Green. Captain Green, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So, Captain Green, thank you for leading that AP, but, as the President of DCBA and CFA, what do those two organizations — How do they look at the economic questions that are being debated in this?

MR. GREEN: I think with CFA -- DCBA and CFA are pretty much lock-step a lot of the time, because both organizations want to flesh out what's best for whatever it is, no matter what you feel about something, and we want to flesh it out, and we were onboard with it. I think, like anything, there was people that had reservation, but still did it, and there was people that were just totally against it.

We continue to want to see the economics explored, on different ways of collecting it, because it is -- You know, over time, and I'm not going to get into that, but there's been amendments passed where there was a hurdle, defining the economic value of our industry, and I think it's very important that we collect those.

I've heard quarterly, like the commercial fleet does, random selection, and I've heard annual, to tie it to the permit renewal, and I think that that's kind of -- As we develop it, we kind of figure out where people want to tune-in on that, but, as far as collecting it, it's vitally important, not just for restoration and all that stuff, but also to properly manage these fisheries by the National Standards. We have to consider the economic impacts on coastal communities, and I think it's important to have that number. Sorry that I was a little long-winded. Thank you, all, very much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Last on the list is Jason Delacruz.

MR. JASON DELACRUZ: So it's been a long afternoon, and everybody is standing up. I don't really have much to say today. I am looking forward to the IFQ conversation, and let's start working down our own adventure novel here, because that's what this thing is. We're going to pick some buttons, and it's going to light

stuff up, and we're going to pick some more buttons and have a lot of conversations.

Any of you guys that don't understand this system, and want to talk about it, please reach out to me as a resource, and I hope you trust me at this point, to believe that I will give you honest answers, and I will explain it to you in a way that you can kind of understand from our perspective, from other perspectives, of how this system really works. That's really it. Let's call it a day. It's been a long day. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Jason. That concludes public testimony. I certainly appreciate everyone's comments and participation, whether they were here in-person or online, and we will start again tomorrow morning at 8:30 in the morning. See you then. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on January 31, 2024.)

February 1, 2024

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

_ _ _

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Hyatt Centric French Quarter in New Orleans, Louisiana on Thursday morning, February 1, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, everybody. If council members can make their way to their seats, we're going to get started here momentarily. All right. Good morning, everyone. We will reconvene Full Council.

I would like to make, at this time, just one change to the remainder of the agenda, if you will allow, and that is to move up the discussion on the recommendation on the exempted fishing permit application and have that now. A request was made to do that, and so, if I don't see any major dissention, we'll go ahead and do that and then proceed with the Admin and Budget Committee. Mr. Gill.

RECOMMENDATION ON EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT APPLICATION

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and, to that end, I would like

to make a motion that the council recommends approval of the LGL EFP.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Is there a second? Is that a second, Ed? All right. It's seconded by Mr. Walker. Do we have discussion? Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I didn't think that there was a motion needed, and I thought that it was Andy's discretion and that it was done.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: That is true, and we do not make that decision, but the reason it's brought before us to provide our reaction and advice to him in making that decision.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Then, just to kind of close the loop, what's been done in the past, my understanding is that there's a letter that is formally written to the agency from the council, and so I guess we'll just assume that it's included in the motion, or if we need to add it, but that's all. Again, just as far as the communication in closing that loop. Any other discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion?

DR. SWEETMAN: I am going to abstain.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We've got one abstention. All right, and so the motion carries with one abstention. That will take us to the Administrative/Budget Report. I'm sorry. For clerical -- The motion carried with one abstention and one absent. General Spraggins, are you ready for Admin?

COMMITTEE REPORTS ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am. The Administrative/Budget Committee report from January 29, 2024, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab G, Number 1, and the minutes, Tab G, Number 2, of the October 2023 committee meeting were approved as written.

 Discussion of Proposed Standing and Special Scientific & Statistical Committee Reorganization for June 2024 Appointments, Tab G, Number 4, staff provided an overview of the proposed reorganization of the Standing and Special Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC).

A committee member asked if there was any concern with the ability to find enough qualified applicants for each category if the makeup of the SSC changes. Staff stated this was possible, but seemed less likely after our most recent effort to fill the vacant economist position on the SSC, as technical staff reached out to a number of colleagues, and that resulted in a high number of qualified applicants for that position.

Another member expressed concern about the change in the proportion of biologists compared to the social scientists and economists. Staff clarified that the proposed changes are intended to integrate the existing Reef Fish, Ecosystem, and Socioeconomic Committees into the main body of the SSC, which will replace these three special SSCs. The overall goal is to improve the multidisciplinary expertise available in the primary committee.

The proposed verbiage in Section 2.5 was edited to change the phrase "at least" to "up to" in reference to the number of proposed economists and anthropologists/social scientists. The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council accept the proposed changes to the SOPPs in section 2.5 related to the SSC. The motion carried with no opposition, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Okay. Discussion continued on the remainder of the suggested SOPPs changes. A member asked if the mention of the SSC using the best scientific information available, the BSIA, created an additional layer of decision-making for the SSC that is the purview of NOAA Fisheries. Staff explained that this verbiage is intended to bring the SOPPs to be more in line with the current language in the regional BSIA framework that was recently drafted by the Regional Office. The ultimate decision of what comprises BSIA rests with NOAA Fisheries.

A committee member asked what would happen if the SSC disagreed with the agency's BSIA statement. NOAA Southeast Regional Office staff responded that this process is defined in the regional BSIA framework. The draft of this document will be provided to the council as background material prior to the Full Council convening on Thursday. Staff also suggested that a link to the final document eventually be included in the SOPPs for reference.

In Section 2.5.1, under Review of FMPs, Amendments, and Framework Procedure Actions, a member suggested the removal of the verbiage "as requested", over a concern that this might limit the feedback

of the SSC. Staff clarified that this proposed edit was to inform SSC members and stakeholders that the council may be working on items that the SSC may not be asked to weigh-in upon.

In section 2.5.2, a member questioned retaining the phrase "without cause" in reference to the council's right to remove members of the committee at any time. The member was concerned that retaining this phrase would have a negative effect on recruiting academics to the SSC. This concern was echoed by the Science Center representative. Staff agreed to consult with NOAA General Counsel on the origin of this clause in the SOPPs and provide additional information during Full Council.

A member questioned the inclusion of the parentheses in Section 2.5.3 and also if the SSC needed to meet concurrently with the council. NOAA General Counsel clarified that this verbiage is in Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Thus the inclusion of this language in the SOPPs was recommended.

In section 2.7.3, at the request of a member, the phrase "with economic, social, or biological/ecological expertise" was moved within the sentence. The revised statement is "Membership includes three staff from NMFS, one of which is from the Atlantic HMS Division, five members (with economic, social, or biological/ecological expertise) from the SSC, and up to four other stakeholder representatives." The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council accept the proposed changes to the SOPPs. The motion carried with one opposition, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so the next-to-last paragraph reflects there without cause discussion, and we were going to bring it back, and, before we vote on this motion, I think we ought to get that feedback, as part of this discussion, so we can incorporate it into our thinking in how we vote on that motion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Hager.

MS. BETH HAGER: Okay, and so I went back and did some research. When the SOPPs were being revised with the template from FALD, back in 2014 and 2015, or, well, we actually revised it the year before that, but we got the information and feedback from them, and we didn't have any language in there about how the SSCs were appointed or removed or anything, and so, in June of 2015, that language was proposed into the SOPPs and approved by the council.

It was a in section that FALD said was up to us, and each council could write their own, and so, other than perhaps, you know, the council's input on whether or not it's appropriate, and whether the council feels like taking it in or leaving it out, and that's -- You all put it in in June of 2015.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Given that, and I'm not sure how we proceed here, since we have a committee motion on the table, but I would like to make a motion that considers removing that, and, now, whether the council agrees or not, we'll find that, but we need to do that before we vote on the committee motion, and so I'm not sure how we proceed, but that's my intent.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Perhaps a substitute motion that would kind of go along those lines.

MS. HAGER: Okay, and so we're going to keep that the council accepts the proposed language to the SOPPs, with the removal of those two words. We're going to do a substitute motion to accept the proposed changes to the SOPPs, with the removal of the language "without cause".

MR. GILL: In Section 2.5.2.

MS. HAGER: Yes, in Section 2.5.2, and so that's doing both things at the same time, basically.

30 MR. GILL: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have a motion. Is there a second to the motion?

MS. HAGER: Yes, but put the 2.5.2 after with the "removal of the" language, because proposing -- You're accepting the proposed changes to the SOPPs and with the removal of the language in 2.5.2.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, Mr. Gill. We want to make sure -- 40 It's been changed, and so do you agree with it?

42 MR. GILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay, and we have a second by Mr. Walker. All right, and so we have a second. Any discussion on the motion? 46 General Spraggins.

48 GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I would like Ms. Levy to address this again,

because I think, when we did this in the meeting earlier, we talked about it, and I think that it was understanding that -- I would like her discussion on it, if I could, for legal.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Levy.

 MS. LEVY: Sorry. I was trying to find the whole thing in context, and I haven't gotten there yet. I believe it still says that they can be removed, right, and I just -- It's a double sentence, and you're just removing the last two words. To me, it still means they can be removed at the council's discretion, and, like I said yesterday, you do your appointments, and any removals, in closed session, and so there's not going to be an articulated reason for people to review anyway, and so I'm not really sure that it makes a difference.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Also, I don't -- I've only been on the council for about six years or so, but I'm not sure that they have ever been done just for the fun of it, that someone has been relieved just because the chairman, or somebody else, didn't want them there, and so, I mean, personally, I don't see where it makes that much difference, and I understand Mr. Gill's thoughts, you know, and I understand the thoughts of "without cause", but, you know, I'm kind of in between on it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other discussion on the motion? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, but, I mean, if it's not stated, what says we can't dismiss them without cause?

UNIDENTIFIED: (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. BOGGS: Yes, and, I mean -- Well, I know, and I have to process sometimes.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Hager.

MS. HAGER: I just asked staff to bring this up on the screen, so that you all could all see it in context, and so, Bernie, can you zoom-in on that section? It's the second paragraph down, and it's the last sentence in that second-to-last sentence in that paragraph, where it says consideration for appointment may include the appropriate interest, experience, and past performance, blah, blah, as well as other factors, such as the record. SSC members serve at the pleasure of the council and may be removed at any time without cause. What it will retain is "SSC members serve

at the pleasure of the council and may be removed at any time."

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

1 2

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and, as we discussed in committee, effectively, this sentence could have a period after "council", and everything after that is redundant, and so, in essence, it's piling on, and I would prefer it to end at "council", but I'm fine, but "without cause" just turns the knife a little bit, and I don't think we need to go there.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other discussion on the motion? General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Also, it doesn't say we will remove them with cause, does it?

18 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

20 MR. GILL: They serve at the pleasure, and we can do it with or 21 without.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Seeing no other hands, we'll go ahead and vote on the motion. All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand.

27 MS. HAGER: Do you want to use the clickers?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: That's right. We'll use the clickers. We are voting on the substitute motion.

of the language	"without cause"	in section 2.5	.2.	
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins			Abstain
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (15)	No (0)	Abstain (1)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So we have fifteen yes's, no no's, and one abstention, and there is one absent. All right. General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: All right. The committee reviewed the two currently appointed ad hoc committees. The Ad Hoc Charter Forhire Data Collection AP was recently appointed and has just started work, and so no update was necessary. The proposed change to the charge of the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP will be addressed by the Reef Fish Committee under Other Business. The Reef Fish and Shrimp APs are due for reappointment this year. With no objection from the committee or council, staff will proceed with advertising these panels for reappointment.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins -- Yes, Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: While we're talking about advisory panels, I wanted to bring something up for discussion, and so I had somebody text me about this particular -- About the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ panel, and, anyway, just looking at it, and I didn't think about this before I got that text, and they didn't text me about this, but so we're readvertising our panels every three years, our standing panels, but our ad hocs -- We just appoint them, and they go on, but, generally, an ad hoc is set up for a specific purpose, and we don't use them for a long period of time, but this Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish thing has been in existence 2018, and so our regular panels -- We would have done turned those over twice, and so I guess the reason I bring this up

is, you know, the world changes a lot in six years, and I don't even know who is on the panel, and I'm not going by that, but we've had three meetings.

The council doesn't know who has been present and who has been absent for those meetings, if we've got good participation, and some people might not be in the fishery, and some people might not be alive, and so I'm just wondering if we need a -- If we should let this panel just go on and on without readvertising it and then redoing the panel. I'm just bringing it up for discussion, because, when I look at it, and I think about the way we treat the other panels, I thought it was worth bringing up to the council and seeing if anybody had strong feelings about it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I wonder, Dr. Simmons, and I'm putting you a little bit on the spot, but if you have any information about maybe the last time they met, and to that issue of reviewing those applications and that process, and do you have any information about that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so the last time they met was in June of 2021, and I believe there was one gentlemen that was deceased that we took off this panel, but I don't recall participation. I mean, I think we had most people attend, but we'll have to pull all that information together, and I don't have it right now. We can pull up the list of folks that are on that panel, and it's on our website. If you want to pull that up, we can.

MR. DIAZ: I'm not personally worried about pulling up to look at who is on the panel, but I just wanted to bring up to the council that I know we've got a panel that we haven't reviewed for quite some time, and the ad hoc -- I don't think we ever intended for ad hocs to stay around for six years. I mean, generally, I think we give them a charge, and they work on that charge, and then the ad hocs are generally dissolved, but this one has been around a long time, and there is going to be IFQ work to be done, and so I just wanted to bring it up, that, you know, it's -- This ad hoc is being treated a little different than our standing panels.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I'm in a little unfamiliar territory, but, to something that Dale said, these ad hocs are put together for a specific reason, and we're getting ready to change the charge for the ad hocs, and so, if it's different, then why would we not look at repopulating, if you're changing the charge for the ad hoc, because these people were put there for a specific reason, and, by

changing the charge, maybe you need -- Because we're talking about new entrants and various things like that, and we may need to look at repopulating, and I'm not trying to create more work, Carrie, but it does seem like a valid statement, concern.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I think, obviously, we want all of our advisory panels to be fresh, fresh in the sense at least that, you know, are the folks still in the fishery for which they originally were nominated and voted in, and so we probably need to look at what their charge was for the current ad hoc panel, and it may align with what the next charge is, and we can just roll on into, but I think we ought to at least review, to, you know, see what participation is and those types of things, because you're right that they are going to be asked, I think, to do some work here, and we ought to maybe get ahead in that game, and try to get that —— If we need to, you know, kind of cancel that one and reestablish another one, and so is that something maybe we can bring up at the next meeting, potentially, Dr. Simmons, maybe some of that information?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so you're referring to attendance and deliberations from the last meeting and the proposed revised charge that we're going to go through during the Reef Fish Committee?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: What the charge was for the current established ad hoc.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, and I think we have that to discuss at the Reef Fish Committee. We have the current charge and our proposed new charge, and, primarily, it was just text from old amendments that we are no longer working on, but we could discuss that more.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay. Great. All right. Dr. Frazer.

 DR. FRAZER: I mean, again, I agree, I think, with everything that's being said, and so, in the Reef Fish Committee, we have a motion on the table, and we'll revisit that motion, I think, and, after we vote that up or down, we can have the discussion about what we want to see in the April meeting.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins, do you want to continue?

 GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Okay. Thank you. Review and Discuss Proposed 2024 Activities, Tab G, Number 6(a) and Budget, Tab G, Number 6(b), staff provided a draft list of activities proposed for 2024. A committee member asked if staff considered reducing the number of

SSC meetings to three when planning the activities. Staff replied that the current reduction from five SSC meetings to four seemed to be the most likely course to balance the expected workload with the SSC resources and the anticipation of the reorganization of the SSC composition.

The member then asked if SEDAR 97 proposed for red snapper is likely to proceed as planned. Staff reminded the committee that these activities and budget are not confirmed at this time. A member inquired if there were any indications of when the funding level would be confirmed or received for 2024. Staff stated that this will need to be before the end of March and that each council is facing challenges due to the federal system updates. Further information should be available in April and will be shared with the council as it becomes known. Any questions? Okay.

All right, We reviewed Update to 2020-2024 Administrative Award Anticipated Carryover, Tab G, Number 7, and staff provided an informational update on the current position of the council funding. As more details of funding, and potential funding from the Inflation Reduction Act award, become known, staff will continue to update the council. No questions? All right.

Review and Approve Proposal for Phase II Inflation Reduction Act Funding for the Regional Fishery Management Councils, Tab G, Number 8, staff presented the proposed activities, project plan, and budget for Phase II of the Inflation Reduction Act funding for the regional fishery management councils in Tab G, Number 8.

A member expressed that they felt the proposal matched well with the needs and were impressed with the proposal. Mr. Strelcheck stressed the fact that this phase of the project will be evaluated against the other regional fishery management council proposals and awarded on a competitive basis. He emphasized the need for the project to highlight direct connections between actions and tangible outcomes based on the funding priorities.

A member asked if the approval of this funding would affect the administrative award and if the council would be charging for overhead. Staff confirmed that, if the proposal is approved, activities cannot be charged to both awards simultaneously and might need to be moved from the existing award.

 Staff informed the committee that the council does not have an approved federally-negotiated overhead rate. Thus, all staff time is directly charged to each funding source to support the actual activity. The proposal must be submitted by January 31, 2024, and so any feedback from the council should be provided for

incorporation into this proposal as quickly as possible.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council approve the proposed activities for Phase II of the Inflation Reduction Act. The motion carried without any opposition. Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. There's a committee motion. We've already met the -- Ms. Hager.

MS. HAGER: (Ms. Hager's comment is not audible on the recording.)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: They received a one-day extension, and so we do need to go through this formally through the Full Council vote then, and so we have a committee motion that the council approve the proposed activities for Phase II of the Inflation Reduction Act. Is there any discussion? All right. Then we'll go ahead and dispense with the motion with your clicker, and so if you could do that, please.

Inflation Reduc	tion Act.			
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck			Abstain
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (15)	No (0)	Abstain (1

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have fifteen yes, zero no, one abstention, and one being absent. General Spraggins.

 GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to also thank Dr. Simmons and her staff for the hard work they did on this. I will tell you what, and they scrambled hard to try to get everything done, and they worked very extensively on it, and so I would just like to thank them for that.

2 3 4

All right. Review and Finalize the Steering Committee Makeup for the Recreational Initiative, staff presented a summary of the anticipated makeup, scope of work, schedule of meetings, timeline for the steering committee component of the council's recreational initiative.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

5

The committee discussed the proposed makeup of the steering committee and expressed a desire to ensure proper representation from both private and for-hire components of the sector. committee member asked whether the addition of another council member would propose budgetary issues, and staff clarified that the proposed budget could be modified to include an additional member. However, staff did caution that an additional member may increase logistical challenges associated with the scheduling.

15 16 17

18

19

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the council approve the number of recreational council members be increased from two to three (two private recreational and one for-hire). The motion carried with no opposition, Mr. Chairman.

20 21 22

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a committee motion on the board. Any discussion? Mr. Diaz.

23 24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. DIAZ: I sent Bernie a substitute motion, and I'm going to put my substitute motion out there. Bernie, can you put that on the board, please? All I'm trying to do with the substitute motion is soften it up a little bit and make sure that it's understood that the Chair has discretion in appointing the members of the My motion would be that the council recreational committee. approve the number of recreational council members to be increased, and then I'm adding "at the Chair's discretion", from two to three (two private and one for-hire). If I get a second --

33 34 35

MR. GILL: Second for discussion.

36 37

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a motion and a second. Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Gill.

38 39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46 47

48

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I agree with the intent here, as I expressed in committee, but, as we've gone alone, it looks, to me, like we're already there, right, and you're going to announce, according to this, the choice of who these steering committee members are, immediately thereafter this, and so, in that sense, Dale, I see this motion as redundant, and we're already doing that, but I agree with the intent. I don't think we should necessarily -- Whatever the decision that has been made is made, I don't think we need to go to three if the council is willing to

have a charter and a private rec as the two that are already there.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Maybe we don't need it, and so what I was thinking is the first one was kind of descriptive, and it said that it was going from two to three, and I think what I intended to do is that, if it worked out, where that could be that, but, if it had to stay at two, it was up to the Chair's discretion, and so that's kind of why I softened it up a little bit, to where it didn't have to be three, and it could be two, and so that was what I was thinking, whether I was correct or not. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Williamson, followed by Ms. Boggs.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I made the motion, but I yield to the Chair's discretion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I think -- Getting to I believe what Bob said, it was -- Because the way this reads, the "Chair's discretion, from two private and one for-hire", but it doesn't say that one must be private and one must be for-hire, if you only go with two, because that's kind of what we were talking about. We felt like there should at least be one charter-for-hire, and the intent of the motion prior was to leave your two recs, but just add one charter-for-hire, and this, to me, gives the Chair the discretion of two private and one for-hire, or one for one, and it doesn't state that you will have one private and at least -- At least one private and at least one recreational, and so that would be my only comment.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other comments or discussion on the motion? All right. Seeing none, the substitute motion is that the council approve the number of recreational council members to be increased, at the Chair's discretion, from two to three (two private and one for-hire). Again, clickers for this.

	Council approve increased, at the			
(2- private 1 fo		e chairs discret	3011, 110111 2	
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson			Abstain
Susan	Boggs		No	
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Strelcheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (14)	No (1)	Abstain (1

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have fourteen yes, one no, one abstention, and one absent. General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir. To finish my report, the committee took volunteers for the steering committee, and council membership will be announced by the council chair prior to conclusion of this committee report.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Very good, and so, based on the motion, the selection -- I am going to select two individuals, more for just keeping it a relatively small group, as we discussed during committee, and there are benefits to doing that, and so I'm going to choose Mr. Michael McDermott and Mr. Ed Walker. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, for the remaining members for this steering committee, I just will be asking Mr. Donaldson, here in the coming month, who he might be appointing, because remember we need a Gulf State Marine Fisheries Commission staff member involved in this exercise, and then, also, to Mr. Strelcheck, because we need at least two fisheries staff from our office to help us with this in the next month, as we start getting consultant applicants in and trying to decide who we're going to select for this effort. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks for that, Carrie, and so I did reach out to Russ Dunn, and he expressed interest in being on the steering committee, and I would just ask that you reach out to him directly to confirm that. For myself, I would like to be involved in the steering committee. The question I would have for the council is if it would be okay to also have me designate someone in the event I can't attend, so that would probably be Jack McGovern, as my designee, if it's okay with the council. I do a tremendous amount of travel, and so I just can't make every meeting.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any opposition to what Andy is trying to offer? I saw a lot of thumbs-up, and so I think that will be fine. Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: For the commission, it would be myself, and, along the lines of Andy, I would like to have Gregg Bray as my designee, if I can. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Sounds good. All right, and so that will take us to our next committee report, and that will be Law Enforcement, Tab L. Mr. Diaz.

LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

 MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Law Enforcement Technical Committee Report from January 29, 2024, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab L, Number 1, and approved the minutes of the June 2023 meeting, Tab L, Number 2, as written.

 Summary of Law Enforcement Technical Committee (LETC) Discussion on Red Snapper Individual Fishing Quota Advanced Landings Notifications, staff summarized the LETC discussion on red snapper individual fishing quota advanced landings notifications held during the October 2023 LETC meeting.

 Staff presented the council motion requesting the LETC evaluate 2022 red snapper IFQ advanced landing notifications, the proportion of inspected to non-inspected red snapper IFQ landings, the subsequent proportion of amended landings reports, and the magnitude of adjustments, in pounds.

LETC members indicated landings notifications do not appear to constitute a major issue and noted that data needed to fulfill the council's request would be challenging to compile and would require resources and manpower that are not currently available.

47 LETC members noted that shareholders tend to underestimate 48 landings, because it is administratively simpler to amend

underestimated landings reports than to have already deducted IFQ annual allocation returned to one's account.

 An LETC member asked whether the presence of an officer during offload constituted a determining factor in the poundage adjustment. The LETC replied that the same reporting pattern was noted, regardless of officer presence. The LETC unanimously approved the following resolution.

The LETC considered the council's request and is unable to comply for various reasons, including a lack of standardization in reporting amongst the five Gulf States and the National Marine Fisheries Service and the lack of manpower to perform the manual analysis the request would entail. Further, the LETC believes the information requested is unlikely to provide any useful information to law enforcement or the council, and the information necessary for investigations is already being provided on a caseby-case basis, when requested.

A committee member noted the importance of transparency in IFQ programs and stated that, if the data requested by the council are not available, changes may be necessary. Mr. Strelcheck replied the data exists, just not in a way that is easy to compile. He further noted that, although there are appropriate checks and balances in the IFQ system, NOAA will continue to look for improvements.

Major Dean Aucoin, from Louisiana, noted that data they collect or request from NOAA are specific to particular cases and ongoing investigations.

A committee member stated that the IFQ the system should encourage accurate landings reports. The committee noted that, because a dealer has up to fifteen days to amend a dealer report, enforcement should place particular attention on instances in which the dealer and the fisherman are the same entity. A committee member noted it makes sense to underestimate landings, because an overestimate could result in a transaction being flagged for insufficient allocation.

Summary of Law Enforcement Technical Committee Discussions: Additional Topics, staff summarized the LETC discussions on the sale of recreationally-caught fish and indicated that LETC members noted that Gulf states have appropriate regulations to address the issue. Staff noted that the LETC expressed satisfaction with the current nomination process for Officer or Team of the Year. A committee member inquired about the timeline for reviewing nominations. Staff replied that the council will review LETC

nominations during the April 2024 council meeting. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Diaz. Any other comments or business that people want to bring up for Law Enforcement? Seeing none, that will take us into our next committee report, and that would be Data Collection and Ms. Boggs.

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The committee adopted the agenda, Tab F, Number 1, and approved the minutes, Tab F, Number 2, of the October 2023 meeting as amended.

Discussion on For-Hire Data Collection, Tab F, Numbers 4(a) and 4(b), the committee reviewed the meeting summary of the Ad Hoc Charter-For-hire Data Collection Advisory Panel (AP). Captain Jim Green, the AP chair, presented the AP's motions and provided the AP's rationale for its recommendations.

A committee member asked if the AP had any preferences on approaches for trip validation. Captain Green stated that the AP did not. However, the AP was opposed to a vessel monitoring system (VMS) recording twenty-four hours. He continued that the group offered possible alternatives to VMS for the purpose of trip validation, some of which had been explored when the Southeast For-hire Integrated Electronic Reporting (SEFHIER) program was operational, but the group did not want to be too prescriptive on alternatives at this point.

The committee discussed the AP's motion regarding optional reporting of depredation events as part of the new program. A committee member stated that the AP discussion was more conflicted on depredation reporting than reflected on the voting results for the motion. While some members of the AP are not opposed to providing a voluntary report of depredation information, they contested making those data fields a standard reporting requirement.

Several AP members contended that no one from the office of Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) has specifically asked for this type of information, nor has HMS communicated explicitly how those data may be used. Additionally, they argued adding data fields would be counter to objectives to streamline the new program.

A committee member asked about the AP's discussions of the economic survey questions. Captain Green stated that the AP had a better

understanding of how the economic information is used when assessing management alternatives, but that there was still some consternation among the industry about reporting economic data. Recently, specific consideration for the for-hire industry has been included in federal law to assess disaster relief determinations, and the committee stated for-hire economic data in the Gulf could be used for those future assessments.

Dr. Jessica Stephen, Southeast Regional Office staff, presented information collected from one year (2022) of the SEFHIER program. The committee asked why it appeared fishermen were landing species outside of the fishing season. Dr. Stephen responded that it was difficult to assign a specific reason for that observation. She stated those catches could have been incorrectly reported as retained, rather than discarded by the vessel operator, or it is possible that more outreach on management measures is needed to help educate program participants and bring them into compliance.

She continued that investigations were underway to send an error message to program users to alert them if they marked a species as retained outside of the fishing season. Several committee members said that linking permit renewal to program compliance was an effective measure and that mechanisms are in place to help get reporting issues resolved and permits renewed.

 The committee then reviewed each AP motion one-by-one, referencing each motion by numbered order in which they appeared in the AP summary report. The committee categorized the AP motions into those that could be addressed in an initial draft document, those that would require more exploration before possibly being incorporated in a document, and those that do not pertain to document development at this time.

When discussing AP recommendations that could be incorporated directly into an initial draft, several committee members provided comment. One committee member stated that a lot of time and resources had been dedicated to setting up the VMS portion of the SEFHIER program. He requested open-mindedness to the use of VMS when exploring approaches for effort validation.

NOAA General Counsel cautioned that, if prescriptive data fields for the program were included in the document, progress to modify survey questions could be hampered in the future.

The committee discussed the desire, within the document, to define a trip to avoid multiple hail-outs for non-fishing operations, which was realized during the SEFHIER program, and advised an approach to review a range of reasonable alternatives to define

when a hail-out would be required. A committee member reminded the group that any consideration for assessing when a trip occurred would require an associated validation measure.

3 4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

2627

28

29

30

2

The committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to include Motions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11 from the January 2024 Ad Hoc Charterfor-Hire Data Collection Advisory Panel into the charter-for-hire electronic data collection document. Motion 1 to adopt the following objectives for a new charter-for-hire data collection program: increasing the timeliness of catch estimates for inseason monitoring; increasing the temporal (and/or spatial) precision of catch estimates for monitoring; reducing biases associated with collection of catch and effort; and increasing stakeholder trust and buy-in associated with data collection. Motion 2 to recommend the council not require twenty-four-hour tracking. Motion 3 to recommend to the council that trip declarations include the following components: vessel registration number, captain's name, departure date and time, estimated return date and time, location, trip type. Motion 4 to recommend to the council that Trip Declarations are only required for for-hire fishing trips before departure. Motion 6 to recommend to the council that a trip report include the following components: vessel registration number, captain's name, departure date and time, actual return date and time, location, trip type, angler count, passenger count, crew count, average depth fished, general area fished in GPS format, individual species data kept and discarded, fishing occurred yes or no, primary gear used, primary target species. Motion 11 to recommend the council maintain the component of the SEFHIER program that allowed safe dockage before submitting report and off-loading fish. That motion carried with no opposition. Mr. Chair.

313233

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Gill.

343536

37

38

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could we ask staff, before we consider voting on this motion, to tab the kept and discarded in to further clarify that they're part of the individual species data, and that's the intent of both the AP and the motion?

39 40 41

42

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Does staff understand the request? I am seeing a somewhat positive look that they think they can. How does that look, Mr. Gill? Is that what you're thinking, at the top of --

43 44

MR. GILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That works fine. Thank you.

45 46

47 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So the Number 4, to recommend to the council that trip declarations are only required for for-hire fishing trips before departure, and I didn't go back and look, but it seems like the last document that we passed, before the SEFHIER program was struck down, is we already had those discussions about what constitutes a trip, and it seems, to me, that, as I recall, it was more like you were receiving payment as a trip, and not necessarily fishing, because I think the data, and correct me if I'm wrong, Andy, but even for those non-fishing trips is important to understand, because that also builds in -- It comes into question with your economic data, because, if you're still producing income -- I mean, that's just my opinion on that, and the council may not see that, but I don't know if we need to maybe break that one out for more discussion, but I would like to maybe revisit that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, Mara can weigh-in, and I view this as we are adding these to the document, but you still have to have a range of alternatives, and so there will be additional alternatives that will be in addition to these, and what you're saying, Susan, will be exactly what I think we would have to include for consideration.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for that, and I just wanted to make sure that we didn't lose sight of that, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other discussion on the motion? All right. We'll go then to our clickers and vote.

2024 Ad Hoc Ch	arter-for-Hire D	ata Collection A	Advisory Pa	nel into the
charter-for-hire	electronic			
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (0

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right and so we have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstentions, and one absent. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: The committee then discussed AP recommendations that would require more exploration by staff. Both the optional depredation reporting and economic questions were the topic of focus. The committee generally agreed that more information regarding what data would be collected, and how that information would be used, needs to be communicated by NMFS to the council before considering those elements in a draft amendment.

For the economic survey, council staff provided some context on the use of those data and noted that the for-hire industry sells trips. When evaluating potential effects of management measures on the for-hire industry, changes in economic value are needed. The determination of economic value, which is the amount of money a for-hire operator earns in excess of the cost of providing a trip, requires for-hire business costs and revenues.

Staff noted that the last comprehensive economic analysis of the for-hire industry was published in 2012, and that is footnoted. The values in that report, adjusted for inflation, are still being used in current economic analyses. Several committee members expressed an interest in collecting economic data in a new for-hire data collection program, with guidance from fishery economists. However, at the time of committee discussion, no

guidance was provided regarding the collection of economic data for the for-hire fishery. Mr. Chair, can we pause right there and maybe have a discussion about that?

1 2

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Sure. Any discussion? Do you want to go ahead?

MS. BOGGS: I would like to request, the next time we have a Data Collection Committee meeting, that either Assane give a more indepth presentation, or maybe from someone from the agency who can provide more detail of how this is important, how it would play out in a survey census-type situation, so that the charter-for-hire industry gets a more better understanding, and maybe this council will as well.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Perhaps maybe -- I don't know, and it might be a good time to go ahead and then, you know, maybe also summarize where that information goes, as far as in our documents, decision—making maybe within the agency and such, you know, with previous examples or something, and that might be helpful as well to add in that presentation, and so I don't know if we necessarily need to make a motion for that, Carrie, to include that, in an as-soon—as-possible type of thing.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't think so, and we're making a note of it here, and we'll try to bring it back, when we can, to the next Data Collection Committee.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I had a similar thought to Susan, and the only difference is bringing it back to the council for a presentation at a future meeting. I talked to Dr. Mike Travis on my team, and Assane, and I think they could both, obviously, present on this, and give us some good information. Dr. Travis is heavily involved in the disaster determination process, and so he could speak directly to that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Maybe I wasn't clear, but, when I said "Data Collection Committee", I meant the council Data Collection Committee, and not necessarily the AP, if I wasn't clear on that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Walker.

48 MR. WALKER: I think continued discussion on that is worthwhile.

I kind of feel like the charter guys might be amenable to a very limited -- If we could identify really the most important points, that are the least intrusive, and are limited in number, because, if you get economists to put in on this, you know, they want the most -- More data is better to an economist, and more data is not better to a charter fisherman who is trying to go out and do his job.

9 I kind of feel like all economic data is not necessarily off the 10 11 12 13 14

table for the charter guys that I've talked to. Most of them don't want to tell you what they get in their paycheck. intrusive, and I feel that way too, and I just -- When someone asks me how much I made in a day, I just don't really feel right giving that, and that's probably the main sticking point, and so I think we can have a discussion with the economists. If there was two or three key factors that would help them get what they need, I think it would be possible that we could get the charter community to come to an agreement, a compromise, on that, and that's just my personal thoughts.

19 20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28 29

15

16

17

18

2

4 5

6

7

8

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I will just quickly add to that, and, Assane, I quess when you're developing that, relative to the type, or amount, of data, that could be asked, you know, think of it, I guess, in terms of, you know, the Cadillac versus the Escort. If you only asked two or three questions, and got that, you know, piece of information, you would be able to produce whatever analysis, which would then be helpful in management that way, but, if you asked for the Cadillac option, or suite of questions, you might be able to do something else, and so maybe that might be something helpful as well. I have Mr. Strelcheck, followed by Ms. Boggs.

30 31 32

33 34

35

MR. STRELCHECK: That's exactly what I'm thinking, is kind of the benefits and tradeoffs of not only the data variables that we collected, but the different survey approaches, right, and so trip level versus some sort of survey at the end of the year, versus periodic surveying throughout the year.

36 37 38

39

40

41

42

I'm also trying to think ahead, in terms of the administrative burden to do this, right, and so the simplest, most straightforward way is to somehow integrate it into the logbook program, but, you know, if industry is willing to provide some economic data periodically, could we randomly survey them through the logbook program, as an example.

43 44 45

46

47

48

I will note that I did find a little bit of an irony in the public testimony yesterday, that people aren't willing to provide economic data, but they're willing to provide their income for qualification, and so there seems to be some willingness to provide economic information, but I don't see income qualifiers as really a viable avenue for us either.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so one of the things that I would like to look at is look at that portion of the old SEFHIER program, because I can't even remember exactly what it is, because, personally, we report to the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey, and it's two questions, and so, unless it was more than I don't recall in SEFHIER, and I know we've seen those presentations, but I didn't recall how many questions it was, and so that might be good for the council to revisit, to see what was inclusive in the SEFHIER in its finality, and then we can kind of go through and digest that and see how it matches up with this.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other discussion on this particular topic? Seeing none, Ms. Boggs, if you can continue with your committee report.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The other AP recommendations were considered by the committee. The recommendation for one-stop reporting was interpreted by the committee as a goal, rather than an immediate program need, and encouraged continued work towards that effort.

 The lists of potential validation measures put forth by the AP would be used as guidance for the interdisciplinary planning team (IPT) while they consider development of the document. Regarding linking permit renewal with program compliance, the committee referred to their earlier discussion, where existing methods allow for program participants and the Permits Office to resolve issues as they arise. The recommendation for outreach planning, such as using port ambassadors, can be developed separately, but simultaneously, with the amendment.

For the AP's motion to avoid any consideration for any individual fishing quota, the committee noted that no such program existed, was not a charge of the AP, and would not be included in any data collection for-hire document. The committee also acknowledged the AP's request to move progress as quickly as practical in getting a new for-hire data collection system implemented.

I will say there, Mr. Chair, that I would hope that this council keeps this on their radar, moving forward, and that we don't lose interest in it.

Update on the implementation timeline status of the commercial

electronic logbook, council staff provided a verbal update on the implementation timeline for a joint amendment with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to transition the coastal commercial logbook program to electronic reporting.

The document has been finalized by the IPT and is currently being reviewed by the South Atlantic Council chair. Formal transmission of the document to NOAA is expected before the South Atlantic Council's March 2024 meeting. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Any other issues to be dealt with in Data Collection? All right. That then puts us at a break in the schedule, but not in the time, and so I'm thinking we'll go ahead and try to utilize the time, and we can probably get the Shrimp report done close to kind of where we had a break, or maybe a little bit after, but, Mr. Schieble, are you ready for that?

SHRIMP COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. SCHIEBLE: Yes, Mr. Chair. I think we can get through this pretty quickly. There's only one motion in it, and so please bear with me. I think I have the French Quarter funk from this meeting here.

The committee adopted the agenda, Tab D, Number 1, and approved the minutes, Tab D, Number 2, of the October 2023 meeting as written.

We got an update on the Early Adopter Program for shrimp cVMS. Dr. Lowther, from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, presented an update on the Early Adopter Program for a cellular vessel monitoring system on the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) federal shrimp fleet.

 A council member inquired as to the location of the five vessels that signed up in the last half of January 2024 to participate in the program. Dr. Putman, from LGL Ecological Associates, responded that the vessels are located in Florida. Another committee member asked which devices had been selected by the sixteen vessels that had signed up to participate in the program. Dr. Lowther responded that he did not have that information at this time.

A committee member stated that, on the timeline, device installation would end in July 2024 and asked if there was a deadline to participate in the program. Dr. Lowther explained that all funds have to be spent by August 2026, and so, in order to provide two years of service, that devices would have to be

installed no later than July 2024. However, if someone wanted to participate after July 2024, the device could potentially still be provided, but without two years of cellular data transmission costs being paid for through the program. Dr. Putman stated that the July 2024 date was more flexible than originally planned.

The committee member then asked how many units might be provided based on the knowledge of costs so far. Dr. Lowther responded that fifty to seventy-five devices might be provided. Dr. Putman stated that the retail prices were provided to shrimpers, so that they would understand future costs if a cVMS device needed to be replaced.

 Dr. Simmons inquired where the data collected by the cVMS devices would be transmitted. Dr. Lowther responded that the data would be transmitted to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Dr. Simmons asked if side-by-side testing would be done with cVMS devices and current cellular electronic logbook (cELB) devices. Dr. Lowther responded that there was limited capacity to reprogram cELB devices that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center has in supply.

Dr. Simmons asked if it was possible to at least check if the currently installed cELB devices were operating properly, so they could be used in side-by-side testing, particularly with any new vendors that may want to participate in the program and were not included in the pilot test. Dr. Walter responded that they could check with LGL Ecological Associates to see if that was possible, but that program funds would not go to reprogramming the old cELB devices to run side-by-side testing.

The committee then reviewed the Shrimp Futures Project: Workshops to Address Current Challenges and Future Scenario Planning. Dr. Walter, from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, presented information on the Southeast Fisheries Science Center's Shrimp Futures Project.

 A committee member stated this information had been scheduled to be presented to the Louisiana Shrimp Taskforce on January 17, 2024, but the meeting was cancelled. The committee member noted that the Louisiana Shrimp Taskforce meeting has been rescheduled for March 6, 2024, and encouraged the presentation be given at that meeting.

Another committee member inquired what council support could entail. Dr. Walter stated that the council letter sent to Dr. Rubino on the National Seafood Strategy was already a show of council support and added that lending council staff time to these

workshops would be helpful. Dr. Simmons responded that additional details on the workshops would be useful for knowing the extent of council staff time that may be requested.

Several committee members stated that they wanted to applaud the efforts laid out in Dr. Walter's presentation. Dr. Simmons added that local leadership and Sea Grant agent assistance would be needed to encourage workshop attendance by the shrimp industry. Dr. Simmons also encouraged more information be provided to the council on how funding from the Inflation Reduction Act may assist with this project. A committee member commented that an update at the April 2024 council meeting would be informative.

I have a committee motion here. The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend the council support the Shrimp Futures Project. That motion carried unanimously. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? I guess, to make it formal, or continue on, if we can go ahead and vote with our clickers, to keep it consistent.

First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (0

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstention, and one absent. Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: We had one Other Business item. A committee member inquired if council staff are on-track to bring the draft shrimp document to the April 2024 council meeting. Dr. Freeman responded

in the affirmative. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report of the Shrimp Committee.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, sir. Let's go ahead and try to do one more. Dr. Frazer has a phone call that he needs to tend to, and he can still make the Reef Fish report at 11:00, as it is currently scheduled, and so I'm going to try to accommodate his request to be here to provide the report to the council, and try to work and change that up, and so if we can go then to Dr. Sweetman for Sustainable Fisheries as the next committee up. Dr. Sweetman.

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES COMMITTEE REPORT

 DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay. The Sustainable Fisheries Committee report, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab E, Number 1, and approved the meeting minutes, Tab E, Number 2, of the August 2023 meeting as written.

Allocations and Allocation Review Policy, Tab E, Number 4, staff presented expected start dates for initial allocation reviews set by the council and discussed completed and implemented reallocation amendments that included allocation reviews. Examples include Reef Fish Amendments 53, 54, and 56, which reviewed and revised allocations between the recreational and commercial sectors for red grouper, greater amberjack, and gag grouper, respectively.

For each of these species, the next allocation review was scheduled based on the date upon which the final rule implementing the amendment became effective and the predetermined time interval between reviews. For example, because Reef Fish Amendment 54 became effective July 17, 2023, and a six-year interval between reviews was set by the council, the next review of the greater amberjack recreational and commercial allocation will begin no later than July, 17, 2029.

 Staff discussed ongoing amendments with allocation reviews and noted that state directors plan to meet to discuss the apportionment of the private angling component of the recreational red snapper annual catch limit (ACL) between Gulf states.

Staff discussed an October 2023 council motion which stated that the council will delay commercial and recreational allocation changes for fishery resources subject to the Marine Recreational Information Program's Fishing Effort Survey (MRIP-FES) until the 2024 pilot study has been completed and deemed consistent with the best scientific information available by the council's Scientific and Statistical Committee.

Staff then presented a revised allocation review schedule consistent with the council motion and completed and ongoing allocation amendments. The committee discussed the proposed revisions to the schedule for allocations that are not between the recreational and commercial sectors. Staff indicated that potential adjustments to recreational data are expected to affect several allocations. Staff also noted that the revised schedule assumes that the 2024 MRIP pilot study and subsequent SSC evaluation are expected to be concluded by January 2026.

Committee members inquired about the planned completion date for the pilot study. Dr. Richard Cody indicated that study results and updated recreational data should be available in 2025 and available for use in management in 2026, respectively. The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend the council approve the updated allocation review schedule. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, again, if you would use your clickers.

Fl				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin			Abstain
Bob	GIII	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (15)	No (0)	Abstain (1)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have fifteen yes, zero no, one abstention, and one absent. Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The committee directed staff

to send a letter to NOAA Fisheries detailing revisions to the allocation review schedule.

Summary of SSC Discussion on Incorporating Social Science Theory and Methods in Ecosystem Assessments Recommendations, Tab E, Number 5, staff summarized the SSC's discussion on incorporating social science theory and methods in ecosystem assessments. The SSC received this information, presented by Dr. David Griffith, (Standing SSC) at its September 2023 meeting.

 The SSC discussion included illustrative examples related to social data and methods, including conventional methods such as interviews, focus groups and surveys, and other approaches, such as cultural consensus analysis and the conversion of qualitative data into quantitative data to create dependence and vulnerability indices.

Of note, Dr. Griffith said that timely and systematic data collection programs and syntheses of data collected would be very informative, such as interviews with fishermen and their inputs relative to fishing effort and areas fished, and constraints relative to their ability to fish could be utilized to inform stock assessments. SSC members noted that social science data and analyses could be more prominently included in the council process, but social information is not routinely collected in some regions, and that research funding is usually reactive to present needs. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Dr. Sweetman. Any other discussion topics for Sustainable Fisheries, before we move on? Okay. So we are ahead of schedule, and we've already dispensed with the exempted fishing permit item earlier, when we first started this morning, and we're going to go ahead -- We'll have a little bit longer break, and we're going to come back at 10:30, but, when we come back at 10:30, we'll be doing Education and Outreach at that time. Mr. Strelcheck.

 MR. STRELCHECK: I don't know about other people's flights, but the earliest that I could get on to get home tonight was eight o'clock. If we could move faster, I might be able to get on an earlier flight, and I don't know if people want to try to keep moving and having a shorter break.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We can do that. I'm just trying to look to see -- I think the person -- The only person -- Well, everybody that will be presenting, I think, is here, and so we just might move into the liaison reports. Again, I'm trying to accommodate Dr. Frazer's schedule here, and he'll be back at eleven o'clock, and

so as long as we understand that there will be some flexibility, and we might receive some liaison reports, but, yes, if you want to -- Let's do take some time now though, and let's come back at 10:15 then, and that will give time -- Hopefully enough time for people to check out and do what they need to do. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Folks in the audience, wrap up conversations, or take them outside, please. We're going to reconvene. All right. Just to bring everybody back up to speed, we have completed -- We have completed, so far this morning, Admin/Budget Committee report, Law Enforcement, Data Collection, Shrimp, and Sustainable Fisheries, and we've also completed the exempted fishing permit, and so that will take us then -- Again, trying to keep Reef Fish scheduled at 11:00 a.m., and that will take us to Education and Outreach with Mr. Dugas.

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Outreach and Education Committee report, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab O, Number 1, and approved the minutes, Tab O, Number 2, from the February 2023 meeting as written.

2023 Communications Improvement Plan Progress and 2023 Analytics, Tab O, Number 4, staff provided an overview of communications analytics, along with a progress report on the 2023 Communications Improvement Plan. Staff noted some issues with Google Analytics and cumulative analytics tracking for blog articles. Staff highlighted the incredible return on investment it gets from creating short videos for social media and called out the positive reception it's received for the blog digests.

A committee member complimented the Fish Rules commercial app and noted that the quota monitoring feature on the app is well maintained and incredibly useful.

 2024 Communications Improvement Plan, Tab O, Number 5, staff presented the 2024 Communications Improvement Plan, which was developed in response to communications analytics and using suggestions from the Outreach and Education Technical Committee.

 Staff highlighted its intent to update management area maps, publish eight blog articles, improve the aesthetic of the website, publish a paper on the council's Fisherman Feedback tool, begin sending press releases promoting comment opportunities for framework actions, and redesign the *Navigating the Council Process*

publication.

2023 In-Person Event Outreach Progress and 2024 Plan, Tab O, Number 6, staff presented a summary of the 2023 in-person outreach and an outline of the proposed 2024 in-person outreach plan. Staff highlighted the goal of attending at least one event in each state and the desire to find events that allow council staff to interact with a variety of stakeholder groups. Staff will also attempt to have a booth at ICAST, if time and logistics permit.

 Staff provided a list of potential events in each state, with the targeted event highlighted. It was suggested that staff replace the Blessing of the Fleet in Mississippi with the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources Discovery Day, because the Mississippi shrimp fleet is diminishing.

Committee members were supportive of continuing to collect and assess engagement metrics, and several committee members commented on the benefits of collaboration with other agencies and offered assistance with choosing appropriate events. It was also suggested, while in-person outreach is valuable, it can be cost-prohibitive and may be worth trying other outreach efforts, such as radio shows or Facebook Live.

Communications Guidelines Book Review, Tab O, Number 7, staff reviewed the final draft of the council Communications Guidelines Book. The committee

had previously reviewed and approved communication guidelines for media, press releases, public comment, and social media. This was the first opportunity for the committee to review guidelines on the use of council products, fishing regulations, communications analytics, Fisherman Feedback, and in-person outreach events.

One committee member sought clarification on the process for giving quotes to the media. Staff explained that, when answering as an individual, council members may freely represent their own interest on council-related topics, but should make it clear that they are not presenting the council as a whole. However, individual council members should not act as a spokesperson to represent the council without coordination with the Public Information Officer and council leadership.

Fishery Ecosystem Plan Outreach, Tab O, Number 8, staff presented a draft fishery ecosystem plan and Red Tide Fishery Ecosystem Issue Communications Plan outline. The first part of the plan addresses the need to broadly communicate the fishery ecosystem plan by redesigning and maintaining the council's Fishery Ecosystem Management webpage.

Next, the plan outlines a process for engaging the public in gathering and ranking fishery ecosystem issue ideas by developing an online tool that allows the public to suggest potential fishery ecosystem issues and asking submitters to rank potential fishery ecosystem issues on a regular basis before the council reviews and selects future issues.

 Staff then explained that there were general communications strategies that would be appropriately applied across all fishery ecosystem issues, which include creating dedicated webpages for each fishery ecosystem issue, curating a list of involved stakeholders appropriate for each individual issue, and measuring stakeholder sentiment on each issue through feedback received using an online tool.

Staff highlighted the specific outreach plan for addressing the pilot fishery ecosystem issue of red tide. Staff suggested hosting a red tide symposium that brings together a range of affected stakeholders, extrajurisdictional agencies, media, and other groups to collaboratively address the issues holistically. Staff also suggested producing a federal fisheries red tide report that summarizes social, economic, and biological impacts that red tide has on federal fisheries and share that report with existing agencies and organizations addressing red tide.

The committee clarified that, although the council may not be able to directly manage red tide events, the council can take action indirectly by reacting in useful ways to red tide events, including using management buffers and shifting effort in response to fish kills.

The committee also cautioned that the symposium could easily become a huge undertaking and suggested that staff carefully define goals and manage expectations and attendance. Staff reminded the committee that a summit is proposed in the council's phase II of the funding request for the Inflation Reduction Act. It was also noted that the federal fisheries red tide report would be a very useful product that could be used to justify continued work on red tide mitigation.

Coastal Migratory Pelagics Stakeholder Engagement, Tab O, Number 9, staff presented a draft Coastal Migratory Pelagic Communications Plan that aims to gather stakeholder input on king and Spanish mackerel to compliment the South Atlantic Council's port engagement effort and inform future Gulf Council actions.

The plan is a three-pronged approach that leverages an online tool,

virtual workshops, and advisory panel feedback to develop a broad understanding of the coastal migratory pelagic fisheries, their status, and their value to the fishing community.

The committee advised the staff to include cobia in this effort and asked how biases based on different levels of fishing experience or geographic location would be addressed. Staff suggested that gathering broad feedback should allow for themes to emerge and for biases to be recognized, if sufficient numbers of representative stakeholders are engaged.

Management Timeline Tool Review, Tab O, Number 10, staff presented the committee with a draft of its new interactive, web-based Management Timeline Tool, which uses gag grouper and greater amberjack as pilot species, allows users to view all management changes over time and sort them by action type. Numerous members of the committee remarked on the utility of the tool, and the committee suggested that staff add management histories for red grouper, gray triggerfish, and red snapper next.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Hold on, J.D. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I have a question for Emily, and I hope I'm not putting you on the spot, or maybe it's Dr. Hollensead, but when might the tool be available for gag grouper and amberjack for the public, or this council, to be able to view and utilize?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Did you like what you saw yesterday?

30 MS. BOGGS: Absolutely.

32 MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Then we'll publish it next week.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you.

36 MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Sure. As soon as possible. Let me revise that. 37 We will make sure that we give it one last spit-shine, and we will 38 get it up as soon as we can.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: I had made that suggestion yesterday, about, when you click on amendment, if it would highlight it throughout, and, if that's not something functional, or available now, it's impossible, I'm good with that, and it was just a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We'll need a pilot study to figure that out. All right, Mr. Dugas. If you want to continue with the report.

MR. DUGAS: Return 'Em Right Best Practices Manual Update, Tab O, Number 11, staff presented the council with the newly-published Return 'Em Right Best Release Practices Manual for Reef Fish and Related Species. The manual is organized around the major decision points that anglers are likely to encounter during a fishing trip and aims to present anglers with the information necessary to make decisions, based on their individual situations, to improve survival of fish that are caught and released.

The committee asked if hard copies are available for distribution and if it was appropriate for businesses and other entities to share this resource. Staff indicated that hard copies could be requested from Return 'Em Right staff and that the resource could and should be shared as widely as possible.

 Other Items from the December 2023 Outreach and Education Technical Committee Meeting, Tab O, Number 12, the chair of the Outreach and Education Technical Committee, Captain Dylan Hubbard, presented the remaining items from the December 2023 Outreach and Education Technical Committee meeting.

He reviewed the technical committee's discussion on illegal sale of recreationally-caught fish and concern expressed that it's not clear that bartering fish in exchange for a free meal at a restaurant is illegal. Captain Hubbard also emphasized the desire for the Outreach and Education Technical Committee to play a major role in the roll-out and communications of the newly-formed forhire data collection program as it's implemented. Good communications strategies may play a pivotal role in the acceptance and success of the program. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Mr. Dugas. Any other items that need to be discussed under Education and Outreach? Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Not really a question or anything, or a motion, but just some comment in regard to the Return 'Em Right plan, and so can someone refresh my memory as to what the expiration date, or the terminal date, of the DESCEND Act is? I think it's next year, and is that right? Two years? It's two years from now, and so we still have that program for two more years?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I think it was two years from when it was implemented, which was 2022, if I wasn't mistaken, and so I would think it would expire at the end of this year.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: That's what I was under the impression of as well, but I could be wrong, and so my comment to that is maybe, at some future council meeting this year, we could sort of get a brief technical update from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on how that data from that program, the Return 'Em Right, is benefiting discard data, and then we can look at the potential of getting buy-in, or better buy-in, from the stakeholders that are using it to hopefully get it renewed, to get the DESCEND Act potentially renewed for another time period, or a new act, or whatever it would take to get something on the books that keeps, or continues, the use of these devices for reducing discards that are dead.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay. I have a couple of people here. Ms. Muehlstein.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: I just wanted to clarify that the DESCEND Act expires January 13, 2026, and so we do have two years from now, and I did want to sort of respond and say, you know, either we could work with -- You know, I don't know if we are actually allowed to work on getting the DESCEND Act renewed, or whatever, but we certainly have the authority to consider something at the council table, if that's not a consideration.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble, to that?

MR. SCHIEBLE: To that point, I guess what I'm getting at is we hear from angler that, well, what's the use of getting this stuff, if we don't see a return, and the value of it is that we are reducing dead discards, which leaves more fish in the water, more availability for them to go fish and opportunity to catch, right, but we have to make that connection, to show the anglers that this is what this is for, so that we keep going forward with that, and, you know, right now, we're sort of like in the early stages, right?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I had Ms. Boggs and then Dr. Simmons. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I believe we need to get the results of the studies that were funded from this effort, and I think we'll get those towards the end of the year, or early next year.

MR. DONALDSON: Correct. The plan for the Return 'Em Right research that the commission has been involved is we're going to have a general session at our October meeting presenting those results, and, maybe at the November meeting, we can present some of those findings.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so then would the next step be to also provide some of that information to our SSC and then try to get that into the Science Center's workflow?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Yes, and I've actually had that conversation with some of the folks at Return 'Em Right, because, right now, I don't know that there's a clear plan to kind of quantify how usage may have increased, to make that connection that Mr. Schieble is referring to, and so, yes, we know anglers are learning about the approaches, and we don't know exactly how much more they're actually employing them, and so it's really hard to quantify what that is, and so I'm hoping that we can get that kind of information from Return 'Em Right.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: To that point, I mean, ultimately, that's the goal of the program, and to be able to quantify the usage. We did a preliminary study to show what the usage is, and the ultimate goal, at the end, is to hopefully show that there's more usage and that we're reducing the amount of discards, dead discards.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I want to get back to Ms. Boggs. Go ahead.

 MS. BOGGS: Well, I have other questions, but, to Mr. Donaldson's discussion about the use, I don't know, and I hope you use the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey data, because it does now require us -- If we show that we released a fish, it asks did you descend or vent, and you do have to answer that question, but I do have other questions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I have a couple of other hands that came up, and so I'll try to keep on this topic for right now. Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess this question is more directed to Andy or Clay, or maybe even Mara, but what's preventing, or what hurdles would need to be, you know, high-jumped to get a requirement to use these devices, not only rigged and ready, but actually to require anglers to use them when they observe signs of barotrauma, much like Florida and Texas have done within their state waters?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

2 MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I think -- I mean, adequate enforcement, 3 enough people to actually know that that's happening on the water, 4 right, and so that's the challenge, and, you know, we can put a regulation in place, but people are going to make decisions with 5 6 regard to their fishing practices when they're out on the water, 7 and it's not as easy as just saying you have to do it and then them actually implementing it, and so I think this has been a 8 combination of a lot of efforts, right, and we're doing best 9 fishing practices, and we're requiring these devices, and it's 10 11 good for fisheries, you know, and it's good for the fish 12 populations, and, ultimately, that will result in some benefit.

13 14

15

16 17

18

The harder part, and I appreciate Chris's comment, is then how do you quantify that, and then I will add, in an environment where there's a shifting baseline, more people fishing, more boats, faster boats, better technology, right, you can't always see it as a net gain, where you're going to get more season, or more days, because there's more effort.

19 20 21

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Geeslin.

22 23

2425

26

MR. GEESLIN: Andy, I understand that, and, to your point about enforcement, I mean, the same thing could be said of any regulation that we have in place, and I guess I'm wondering would this take an act of Congress, or would this come through -- It could come through the service?

272829

MR. STRELCHECK: Through the council.

30 31

MR. GEESLIN: Okay. That's where I was going.

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 44

45

46 47

48

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Just to, I guess, go back, to circle back a little bit to the data, speaking just for Alabama, through our Snapper Check survey, the dockside survey, we implemented some questions, at least last year, and it may have been the year before, in our dockside survey, asking folks on descending device use, and we actually added a question regarding the number of discarded fish on that survey, because it's primarily targeted to harvested fish, and so we have some additional data, and we've been providing that to the Return 'Em Right folks, and so I suspect there will be more than just these initial, you know, surveys that Return 'Em Right specifically did, as far as trying to determine usage and then trying to quantify how that would then be, you know, beneficial, or at least identify those fish that are being potentially saved from barotrauma issues. Ms. Boggs, did you -- Did you still have questions? I think we can move on to your questions now, and so go ahead.

MS. BOGGS: I have lots to say. Back to Mr. Schieble, and so, I mean, in this informational brochure from the Gulf Council, a venting tool, or a descending device, is required to be rigged and ready for use when fishing for reef fish, and so I think we've already covered that, and do you need the DESCEND Act to do that? Not necessarily, and I think it can be done at a council level, but I think, at the time that the DESCEND Act was going through Congress and voted on, I don't think we had done anything yet.

 I know the South Atlantic had, because I was at that meeting when they passed it, and so that's to that point, and so I don't know that we would need to do anymore, unless, as Dakus says, he wants this council to come back and add "must be used", but then I come back to Dakus about must be used, and I agree with Andy, and why are we going to implement something that cannot be enforced?

The only way I see that being done, and the room is probably going to explode, is every vessel must have a camera onboard, because that would be the only way that I think that you can enforce something like that, and so why should this council take the time to do a framework amendment for something that we know we can't enforce, and I would certainly like to get law enforcement's take on this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I can't find it right now, and I will go back and look at some of the history, but Mara and I were talking, and we are actively implementing descending device requirements in the Caribbean right now, through an amendment that would align with what's already in place in the South Atlantic, and so certainly, if those councils proceeded, our goal would be, obviously, to have consistent regulations throughout the entire Southeast.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Andy, on those particular regulations in the Caribbean and the South Atlantic, there is -- The tone, and the message, of that is that -- It's kind of similar to what I think the Return 'Em Right program is trying to do, is just to, you know, A, get the word out, so to speak, and educate folks that there is a benefit to doing things on fish that have barotrauma stress, but, on those fishery regulations in the Caribbean and South Atlantic, it does kind of give an opportunity for folks to make that determination, because, with a descending device, you don't have the same impact as you would a venting tool, but, you know, keeping the fish on the deck, while you try to get your descending device -- You know, there's some other things, and so is it worded such that it still allows some folks to use the discretion for

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I think it's very much in alignment with what has been done with the DESCEND Act as well, right, and so it's -- What we've learned with barotrauma, right, is it's not the same for every fish, and it's based on circumstances and depth and temperature of water, and so giving fishermen the tools, and the information, in terms of best fishing practices to make those decisions, to me, it gives that flexibility on the water, right, and the downside is, right, if you don't require it, and mandate it, and they just choose not to do it, then you're not getting a benefit out of it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I just thought I would point out that, if you have questions, Nick Haddad, the head of the Return 'Em Right program, is on, and I've been communicating with him here, but, if anyone has questions for Return 'Em Right, he can answer you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other comments, or questions, on this particular matter? Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair, and so, obviously, the reality is the only thing you can really enforce is them having the equipment on the boat. Anything else, unless you had, you know, cameras on everybody, there is no way to actually enforce it, and they're actually making good decisions, and using it when appropriate, and so, regardless of what happens, you know, there will be some discard mortality.

 I think one of the important parts of our red snapper IRA program that's going through Gulf States is funding a workshop to look at the best ways that we can get estimates of discards, and, obviously, it's highly uncertain now, and it's predominantly self-reported, except a little bit for some of the for-hire industry, where we have observers, and so trying to find ways that we can get better estimates of discards is really important, because, even if you think we have clear evidence that we've reduced discards, you still need to know what that is and how much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just one more point, and so I pulled up the regulations, and we specifically point out gear required by the DESCEND Act of 2020, and then we talk about the requirements are effective until January 14, 2026. I think this could be certainly a simple, expedited framework that the council could work on, and

we would essentially strike some of that language of the DESCEND Act and not put an end date in terms of when it's required.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I guess I didn't understand what Andy said, because our framework, or whatever document we put in, it didn't have an end date, and so, to me, it would perpetual until this council changes that, and did I misunderstand something?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Levy.

 MS. LEVY: We didn't have a framework that added a descending device requirement. The DESCEND Act did it, and then we -- The agency did regulations to implement the DESCEND Act, but this council didn't go ahead with a regulatory action for that.

MS. BOGGS: Okay. I was just curious, and I will also point out that the South Atlantic is only for snapper grouper, you know, and it's specific to what it is, where we have it here for reef fish.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I guess what I'm hearing is that, if there is a desire, amongst the council, to do something, to have something in place, that goes beyond the date that's mentioned in the DESCEND Act, then we need to go forward with a framework action that then outlines what it is that we intend to do. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I would like to wait and see what the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission comes back with first.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I am not seeing any other hands. Ms. Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry, and I was just pointing out the term "reef fish" and "snapper grouper", in our case, is interchangeable, and it applies to all the species, the triggerfish, the porgies, everything, and not just snapper and grouper.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. I am not seeing any other hands, and so we'll go ahead and continue on the agenda, again trying to keep that eleven o'clock start for Reef Fish at that time, and that leads us into our next agenda item, and that would be the Louisiana Law Enforcement Efforts Presentation, Tab R, Number 1, and Major Aucoin. Welcome.

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATE LOUISIANA LAW ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

MAJOR DEAN AUCOIN: Thanks for having us today. It's been a

pleasure having you all down here, and I've had some great conversation over the last few days. I'm going to be pretty brief and just give a guick rundown.

First off, I would like to say that it's been going pretty well in Louisiana. We have some -- We're doing a good job working with our NOAA partners. I would like to applaud NOAA. They do a great job of stealing our state assets and bringing them over to their side of the field, and Tom Forehand is here, and is our local NOAA OLE guy, and he works for the department. We trained him to be the best, and that's why they took him.

We can go to the next slide and just talk, real quick, about our statistics for the JEA program. The 2022-2023 total patrol hours was 9,022. Of those, 7,500 were commercial and 1,400 were recreational.

That commercial number is high because of the IFQ landings. Louisiana has put a lot of focus into our IFQ landings, and we try to attend all of them, and I'm not saying that we do, and we have some things that come up, boat accidents and things like that, where we cannot attend them all, but I can promise you that, if we're not at one, then Tom is at one, and so we are hitting them all. That's why you see a lot of the commercial hours are not vessel hours, and they are dockside hours, which is going to be at our IFQ landing sites.

Out of those hours, we had 2,100 contacts, 696 were commercial and 1,400 recreational contacts. The majority of those contacts are going to be reef fish contacts or HMS contacts.

 Investigative report writing, court, or any administrative hours, we've had 165. The majority of these hours are going to be dedicated to myself and my assistant, who works on the documentation that we provide to NOAA, for our TED inspection forms, as well as our administrative duties for the federal JEA agreement program.

The next two slides I'm not going to go over in detail, and it's just our compliance rating. As you can see, we do not have a big issue with compliance. When it comes to our federal fisheries patrols, we have a very high compliance rate, especially when it comes to our reef fish. This year, we put a heavy emphasis on the recreational snapper, and we really didn't make any major cases, over the limit or things like that, and so I'm just saying it's not due to us not working it.

Again, just to wrap it up, LDWF has focused heavily on IFQ landings

over the last two years. We're trying to just wrap our head around the landings, and, as you all are aware of some of the things that have come up with some cases that we've made, and we have a heavy focus on the IFQ right now, and so any questions?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any questions? I am not seeing any, and so, Major Aucoin, we appreciate you being here.

MAJOR AUCOIN: Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for all of your efforts and all of the efforts of your team.

MAJOR AUCOIN: Absolutely. It's a team effort. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Next, we'll go then to the South Atlantic Council liaison report and Ms. Marhefka.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL LIAISON

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you, and, once again, I would like to thank you all for having me here. Everyone is always so nice when I come to this meeting, and I really appreciate it, and so thank you.

We met in December, between Thanksgiving and Christmas, in North Carolina. Before that, in the fall, three of our APs had met, Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and King Mackerel, and one of the sort of emerging themes that came out of those advisory panel meetings was the call for limited entry into the for-hire sector.

That was -- A lot of it was based on sort of people understanding that SEFHIER reporting was not working, and it wasn't -- People weren't being held accountable, and so, coming out of our Snapper Grouper meeting, we instructed staff to begin an amendment on a for-hire limited-entry program for those three fisheries.

 We're also working on -- We're still continuing to work on our private recreational reporting amendment. We're chugging along, and we stood up an ad hoc AP of recreational industry recreational members, so that we can move along with that, and it looks like we'll be having public hearings later in 2024. As you can imagine, that is an interesting thing to discuss, and a very heavy lift, as far as determining how this permit is going to work, but everyone is really excited that we're working on it.

Yellowtail snapper, which we've been working on with you all, has been put aside for the moment, while we wait for the assessment to be updated with the reef fish -- With the Florida numbers.

2 3 4

We're also working on a scamp and yellowmouth grouper amendment, and we're attempting to separate those out of the complex, and sort of reorganize it, in response to a stock assessment that we got, and then the red snapper -- I'm going to read this verbatim, as much as I hate doing it, because I don't want to editorialize on this at all.

After the review, and much discussion, the council rescinded its approval to submit Snapper Grouper Reg Amendment 35 for formal review. The amendment was developed to address overfishing for red snapper, reduce the number of fish that are caught and released, and reduce the mortality of released fish. The council will continue to work on the amendment and further explore actions to reduce release mortality, while maintaining access to the overall snapper grouper fishery.

We acknowledge that, while the red snapper stock is deemed to be overfished and undergoing overfishing, taking additional time to work on the regulatory amendment poses little risk to the stock, as it's rebuilding faster than expected and exhibiting strong recruitment, increasing abundance, and expanding age structure. We'll continue working on a holistic approach for managing the snapper grouper, or, as you said, the reef fish fishery, via a management strategy evaluation and expanding outreach for best fishing practices, and so we spent a lot of time talking about that.

We're working on a gag and black grouper -- It's been brought up here before, and there's misidentification issues with gag and black in Florida, and so we're just doing a little tweak to those species, and then we're working on on-demand black sea bass pots being allowed in the sea bass fishery, to reduce interactions with right whales and possibly open up some areas that have been previously closed because of right whales.

Of course, we've talked, this week, about what's happening in mackerel, and you know that we're going to be doing the port meetings, and, of course, your amazing staff, and our amazing staff, is working well together to make sure that the word gets out and we get really great feedback about these fisheries, and, of course, as always, we just have the most amazing citizen science staff, who are developing apps and working closing with ACCSP to use an app that other people can -- To create an app that's sort of plug-and-play, that other people can then create an app, and hopefully we can create some great data. Finally, we worked on our allocation review guidelines, and, with that, I will take any

questions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Any questions? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Not a question, and great report, Kerry. One thing I just wanted to let people know that's happening at the South Atlantic is we went out with a grant opportunity, in the fall, to do innovative management for the reef fish fishery, or the snapper grouper fishery, to help reduce discards.

The panel has offered their recommendations, and we're kind of nearing the final decisions of making decisions on those grants. It's kind of like what happened years ago in the Gulf of Mexico, with exempted fishing permits for regional management, and we're pursuing some EFPs as well to test some new strategies for helping the snapper grouper fishery, and so I look forward to reporting on that more as those grants are awarded.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. All right, and so let's move then into our next liaison report, and that would be the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, Assistant Special Agent Bradford.

MR. TERRELL BRADFORD: Good morning, everybody. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, council staff, for having me. We're going to go through some Quarter 1 reports and updates here for the National Marine Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement. I'm the Assistant Special Agent in Charge out of League City, Texas, and my area that I encompass is the Panhandle of Florida all the way to the Texas/Mexico border.

As you can see here, we had 123 opened incidents this quarter. Of the 123, sixty-one of those, or, actually, a little less than that, and 50 percent of those resulted in no violations or compliance assistance. Fifteen cases were referred to our General Counsel or the U.S. Department of Justice, and I know everybody is looking at that one right there, the unpermitted charters, and they're finally coming through the system, and they're at the General Counsel level now. Observer harassment was some of the cases that came in, and sanctuary casework as well.

There were thirty-six summary settlements, and those ranged between \$100 and \$2,000, between retention during the closure and sanctuary violations.

Some of our enforcement highlights were, this quarter, we had -- In the top-left corner there, we have some triggerfish there that resulted off of an IFQ offload, where the fisherman exceeded -- The IFQ offload exceeded the limit of triggerfish. They exceeded

the limit of the triggerfish commercial fish limit for that day.

Out of Freeport, Texas there, you've got a snapper case that was in the EEZ. A recreational angler in possession of twenty-three red snapper over the limit, and, of course, we've got some outreach going on everywhere in the areas, and we're continuing to educate our partners.

Here is our partners here, and we work really well with LDWF and Major Aucoin, and we do a lot of work with these folks, and we watch Louisiana Wildlife, and we tend to take some folks off that show and bring them over to NOAA, and we are working with each other hand-in-hand, our state JEA partners, as well as the United States Coast Guard Region 8, and it's a uniform effort, and, recently, we're working with Customs and Border Protection as well, with the seafood import monitoring program, and so it's a united effort. As you can see, there were twenty-six enforcement referrals this quarter, for Quarter 1, nineteen from FWC, two from Texas Parks and Wildlife, and one from the United States Coast Guard.

Here is some of our enforcement partnerships. I know Ms. Boggs, at the last council meeting, was talking about the Gulf illegal charter taskforce out of Mobile, and one of our officers received the joint taskforce officer of the year, out of Mobile, and they're very effective out there, and they're really combating the illegal charter fleet that is operating out of those areas, from the Panhandle all the way to Louisiana. They're very effective, and they're doing a very good job. A lot of education and outreach going on that, and we appreciate the Coast Guard for that.

We've got the Environmental Crimes Taskforce out of Puerto Rico there at the bottom, and they're working well with us, and Texas Parks and Wildlife here, and that was an IUU operation. We have been doing multiple operations down in the Texas/Mexico border to combat the illegal seafood fraud and seafood import monitoring program, and getting statistics through that.

Some of our targeted operations, in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, we had Operator Spa Watcher. This was heavy enforcement on the charter requirements. We had multiple violations that resulted from this. You know, we had retention during the closure, some undersized fish in the closed areas and sanctuary SPAs.

I think there's two IUU operations there, Los Coyotes and El Tejano. During the El Tejano operation, which was in Brownsville, Texas, there were multiple lanchas interdicted by Station South Padre Island of the United States Coast Guard, Texas Parks and Wildlife, and NOAA. This operation, they serve as deterrents for the lanchas, and you can see there were six lanchas interdicted during that operation that resulted in 3,000 pounds of red snapper that was seized. That's a lot of red snapper.

For shrimp folks, we have a shrimp seizure right there that came through the passenger lane to the port of entry at Laredo, Texas, and that's how far, you know, our folks are out there educating, not only our state and local partners, but our federal partners, the Customs and Border Patrol, the Agriculture folks, and we're really educating on the seafood import monitoring program, but where that doesn't focus is on the passenger lanes of traffic, where we get -- You know, this could be a commercial load of seafood coming in somewhere for sale, and that was a really good job on the enforcement officer down in Harlingen.

The current spotlight for OLE is in charter enforcement and the IUU and seafood import monitoring program, and we're educating our partners. Our JEAs are now assisting on seafood import monitoring program inspections, and we're educating everybody on a united front on all this seafood product.

Here's our contact number, if you have any tips from the general public, and this is a good number to call, and we're take that number twenty-four-seven. It's monitored. Any questions for me?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Yes, we have a question from Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: Thank you very much for the presentation, and I'm glad that Glen got the award, because he does a great job over there. We've had this discussion before, and I think there's a little more confusion, at least in my mind, and maybe you can help clarify that.

If a charter vessel does not have a federal permit on January 1, and fishes for red snapper, and then he puts the permit, federal permit, back on his vessel by June 1, and fishes for red snapper in federal waters -- I mean, is that -- I know you can't have the permit and remove it and then fish, and so he couldn't have it June, July, August, take it off the boat, and fish September, October, and November, but can he fish the frontend of it, if he has a state permit and not a federal permit?

MR. BRADFORD: There's a question, Ms. Boggs, and can we unmute our General Counsel, and I'm going to let him answer that question, Duane Smith. He will give you the proper answer on that. I can

give you one, but I want to satisfy that question 100 percent. Duane, are you on?

MR. DUANE SMITH: I am. Can people hear me?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Well, it's funny that Terrell punted to me, and I was going to punt to Mara, who is sitting in the room. My recollection, and we ran this to ground not that long ago, and my recollection is that, if someone does not have a federal permit, and they put one on during the course of the year, obviously, any requirements that apply to federal permits don't kick in until they actually have a permit, and so I think you've correctly identified potentially what may be characterized as a loophole there, Ms. Boggs, but I am going to defer to Mara on what the regulation is, just to make sure that my recollection of our discussion is correct. Mara.

MS. LEVY: Who can I pass to? No, I think that's right, and so the requirement that the catch limit, the for-hire catch limit, and regulations apply to you if it's on your vessel at any time during the fishing year, and so, if you don't have a permit on your vessel when the fishing year starts, those regulations don't apply. Once you then transfer, or have it on your vessel, you are considered for-hire, for purposes of red snapper, for the whole year, even if you take it off again, right, and so the link is to the permit being on your vessel during that fishing year.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions? I just have a question as it relates to the second slide, but the first slide with information, and do you all -- When you have these special operations, do you keep track of kind of your -- I hate to say it, but your success rate, as far as, you know, incidents that you create, develop, based on maybe some more targeted enforcement activities? Do you keep track and say, okay, under our normal law enforcement activities, this is what we would get, but, when we do these specialized operations, we get twice the amount, or something like that, and do you all keep track of that?

MR. BRADFORD: Yes, we do. We keep data on our patrol operations, our boardings, our inspections, and we try to also talk to the charter captains, the local -- You know, our council members and everybody, and get information from the public on our problem areas, and that is where we start to form these patrol operations that target problem areas that might have a problem with illegal charters, say, and we very -- We keep track of everything, and we really go back and document it well, but we really need that --

You know, that communication with the public and our charter fleets, you know, letting us know where the problem areas are, and then we'll focus our operations on that area.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: That's great to hear, and I just was wondering, you know, as far as, you know, looking back, if you will, after a certain enforcement activity had ended, to maybe go back and retrospectively look at that and see, you know, if it resulted in a higher success or, you know, resulted in solving the problem, I guess, going back to talk to those individuals and see if there is a reduced amount of that activity, because that might, you know, lead you to maybe change up how you do it in the future or some other -- You know, some other possibility, and that's all, and I was just trying to see if --

MR. BRADFORD: Yes, sir. After every operation, we do an afteraction report, and we communicate with each other to try to figure out we could do things better, and we also communicate with folks in the local area and enforcement, you know, our state and local partners, who might have a problem there, and to talk to the general public, to see if there was a change in the bad activities and if it was effective.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Very good. Ms. Boggs.

 MS. BOGGS: I'm sorry, but I would like to ask one follow-up question to my previous question, and so, Mara, I'm going to maybe come back and -- It may come back to you. If a vessel permit has expired, but yet it still has that one-year renewable period, are they subject to the federal for-hire stipulation?

MS. LEVY: No, because it's not a valid permit, right, and so they're not able to fish as a for-hire vessel.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Anyone else with any questions? I am not seeing anything, and so Assistant Special Agent in Charge, and I didn't include that the first time, Bradford, I appreciate it. Thank you, again, for your efforts as well.

MR. BRADFORD: Absolutely, and a shoutout to the applications folks out there, because we use the Fish Rules app to teach during our academies, and we teach -- You can get on there and talk about state or federal waters, and, you know, there's multiple things on the Fish Rules app that talk about the DESCEND Act, venting tools, and it's very, very helpful for the field, and so I'm sure that Major Aucoin can tell you that it's very effective for all of our wardens and folks that are deputized by NOAA, and we really appreciate that. We also educate the public with the Fish Rules

app, and we tell them to download it, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Okay, and so I think we are ready to go then, and we'll pick back up and get to the Reef Fish Committee. Dr. Frazer.

REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

 DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, thank you, and the committee, for accommodating my request to modify the agenda here. All right, and so we'll get going with the Reef Fish Committee report.

The Committee adopted the agenda, Tab B, Number 1, after moving the Review of 2023 Gulf Red Grouper and Gag Grouper Recreational Landings and Quota Closure under Gag Management Measures and adding a discussion item under Other Business related to the SEDAR schedule. The minutes, Tab B, Number 2, from the October 2023 meeting were approved as written.

Draft Options: Modification of Mid-Water Snapper Complex Composition and Catch Limits, Tab B, Number 4, council staff presented options for the potential removal of wenchman from the Reef Fish FMP and subsequent modification of the overfishing limit (OFL) and acceptable biological catch (ABC) for the remaining species in the midwater snapper complex: blackfin snapper, silk snapper, and queen snapper.

Staff clarified that any changes to the catch limits would be made in Marine Recreational Information Program's Fishing Effort Survey (MRIP-FES) data units, as opposed to the historic Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), the current data unit. The SSC made OFL and ABC recommendations in MRIP-FES units.

Wenchman is often caught incidentally in the commercial butterfish/scad trawl fishery. Council staff highlighted the list of factors outlined in the National Standards Guidelines that should be considered when determining whether a species needs conservation and management.

 The committee noted that, although wenchman is a rare-event species, there are other rare-event species that are still federally managed. Council staff noted also that little life history information exists for wenchman and annual landings data are erratic and uncertain. Accordingly, there is little chance of a stock assessment being completed for this species in the future.

Staff discussed the SSC meeting deliberations, and the

confidentiality issues surrounding landings data for wenchman in any given year must be averaged over a period of three to five years.

Committee members remarked that it may be beneficial to consider removing wenchman from the complex, but retaining wenchman in the Reef Fish FMP as an ecosystem component. This would allow continued monitoring of the species, but would not require ACLs to be established.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to add an Alternative 3 to remove wenchman from the mid-water snapper complex but remain in the Reef Fish FMP. That motion carried with one abstention. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Not seeing any, we'll go ahead and use the clickers.

the mid-water Snapper complex but remain in the Reef Fish FMP				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. It appears that we have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstentions, one absent.

DR. FRAZER: Regarding Action 2, a committee member suggested adding an alternative for a multiyear ACL. Council staff asked the committee what other information it needs to determine if wenchman needs conservation and management. While the amendment can be updated to reflect the council's motion, it is unlikely

that any more data will be available to examine. Consideration of the National Standards Guidelines criteria for determining ecosystem component classification will also require discussion.

A committee member asked for staff to consider if there is room on the April 2024 council meeting agenda to discuss these criteria and, if not, to then bring an updated amendment to the June 2024 council meeting, to allow more time for discussion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ryan.

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to remind the council, as it pertains to the midwater snapper action, that, as it relates to the current action, or Alternative 2, in Action 1, that you guys do have that checklist of recommended considerations that we'll ultimately have to move through, and so, whether you decide to do that here, or you decide to do that the next time that this document is brought up, those would all be key things for you guys to be thinking about as part of building the record for that part of the discussion.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thanks, Ryan, for that. All right. Review of 2023 Gulf Red Grouper and Gag Grouper Recreational Landings and Quota Closure, Tab B, Number 8, SERO staff reviewed the 2023 Gulf red grouper preliminary recreational landings, in particular those landings from Wave 4 (July and August). The MRIP-FES preliminary landings estimate for this wave in 2023 was considerably larger than the previous three waves of January through February, March through April, and May through June, combined.

The proportional standard errors, or PSE, for the Wave 4 fleet-specific estimates (private vessels 48 percent and for-hire 37 percent) are above 30 percent, but below 50 percent, indicating a need to exercise caution when using these estimates for management purposes.

 SERO stated that trends and outliers are evaluated and addressed as necessary before finalizing season duration projections. A committee member said that the 2023 red snapper season in Florida opened in June, and a large spike in effort was not observed in Wave 3 for red grouper.

Another committee member asked if the effort distribution in prior years was comparable to 2023 and what proportion of the dead discards came from the open versus closed season. Dr. Richard Cody, from the NOAA Office of Science and Technology, replied that the NOAA Office of Science and Technology noticed a similar pattern

from prior fishing years, but could not comment on the proportion of dead discards by season at this time. SERO staff clarified that the positive intercepts for red grouper occurred almost entirely during the open fishing season.

SERO and NOAA Office of Science and Technology are continuing to investigate these landings estimates, which are expected to be finalized in the spring of 2024. The landings will reflect any modifications based on those investigations. The accountability measure (AM) for red grouper does not presently have a payback provision, but does require management in the following fishing season to be set based on the annual catch target (ACT) in the event of an overage of the ACL in the previous year. SERO clarified that no decision about the 2024 season projection has yet been made.

Of note, SEDAR 88, which will assess Gulf red grouper, will consider the State of Florida's State Reef Fish Survey, or SRFS, for private recreational vessel landings. Shore mode landings are not included in the red grouper stock assessment, due to a lack of data for that mode.

A committee member advocated for and noted past instances where conversations with state fisheries staff have helped to resolve outliers or explain oddities in the landings data. SERO agreed, stating that SERO could do more to flag outliers and identify other abnormalities in landings data.

Another committee member asked what NOAA Office of Science and Technology was doing to resolve puzzling trends in the data. Dr. Cody replied that getting the data sooner may help and that NOAA Office of Science and Technology is looking into working with the Gulf states to seek efficiencies in data provision. Dr. Cody added that the 2023 estimates would be finalized by NOAA Office of Science and Technology in April and that he does not expect them to change much.

A committee member did not think NOAA Office of Science and Technology working more closely with the states was enough and thought that MRIP was broken. The committee member noted that the SRFS estimate, which has a lower PSE, was over one-million pounds less than the MRIP estimate and thought that the MRIP estimate was uninformative.

Another committee member thought the overestimation issues were not related to the 2023 pilot study, which characterized telescoping bias and a possible overestimation of private and shore landings. The committee member thought the errors within MRIP

were more symptomatic of an error inherent to its effort extrapolation methods and would not be resolved with alternative question ordering in the Fishing Effort Survey (FES).

Dr. Cody replied that NOAA Office of Science and Technology's continued work was necessary to improve MRIP-FES and said that all surveys could be improved in some way. A committee member said that stakeholders' livelihoods were at stake, based on these MRIP-FES estimates, and the continued issues with this survey were very concerning. Dr. Sweetman.

 DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I figured this was a good time to bring up a motion along these lines here, and so, Bernie, if you could bring up the one that I sent you. Okay. Thank you. The motion that I'm proposing here is to write a letter to NOAA's Office of Science and Technology escalating the review and evaluation of recreational effort extrapolation methodologies between MRIP-FES and state effort programs. These findings should be presented to the Gulf SSC and council. I can discuss more if we get a second.

MR. DIAZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I heard a second by Mr. Diaz, and so any further discussion, Dr. Sweetman?

DR. SWEETMAN: No, and, I mean, I think it was pretty well covered within the committee report here. However, the extrapolation methods -- These seem to be at the heart of some of these issues that we're dealing with here, and we've heard it consistently from various states, whether it's greater amberjack in Mississippi, whether it's now Gulf gag and red grouper here, during this situation, and so I feel like this is an important issue that we need to effectively navigate here, as we're trying to deal with some of these data discrepancies between the various surveys.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Diaz.

 MR. DIAZ: A couple of things. Can I make one friendly suggestion? At the end, where it's -- At the last word, "council", that we put "ASAP"? I hate to put a date certain, you know, because I can't control Science and Technology's schedule, but we've been talking with folks from Science and Technology for a long time about working with folks, on ways to smooth out outliers, and that falls right in with this, and I support the motion.

While I have the mic, I want to say that I applaud the people at public testimony yesterday. I cannot remember a time, since I've

been on the council -- Very few times when we had that much recreational participation, and so maybe one or two other issues might have brought it up, but this is definitely one of the best participation that we've had, and we're hearing, loud and clear, that they don't trust MRIP, because they see some of the crazy numbers that gets determined by MRIP.

This work here, in my mind, is very important, and not just because of gag and red grouper, and I brought up, a few meetings ago, and somebody from Mississippi brought up the amberjack stuff in Mississippi. I mean, we've got a couple of times where we're showing amberjack, for one wave, for two-hundred-and-fifty-thousand-plus pounds, and, in most years, we land less than 30,000 pounds, and so, if we don't have a way to deal with these things, and we have to shove out fish that don't exist, and maybe have paybacks, and close seasons early, and a whole lot more unpleasant things, we just ought to be able to deal with them, and we can't now. Anyway, I applaud the public, and I hope they know that at least this council member hears them loud and clear.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I very much appreciate the motion, and I do support it, but I want you to also understand that I hope that we look at all outliers, and not just one or two, because I know it's been brought up, time after time, about Mississippi and our outliers and red snapper and where it's at, and I realize the outliers that you're looking at now, but I want to make sure that, if we're going to go forward with this, we look at all of them, and not just one.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Yes, General. This would be -- That is my thought here, too.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I had two folks, and I had Mr. Strelcheck and Ms. Boggs.

MR. STRELCHECK: So I guess I'm just seeking clarification from C.J., because I'm hearing a couple of different things, and so, to me, this issue of outliers may be related, but your motion reads more of kind of the comparative methodologies and why are there such stark differences. I mean, the outliers, and some of the statistical decisions we make with regard to then monitoring catch limits, is more in the purview of this council, working with our scientists, and so I just wanted to clarify.

DR. SWEETMAN: To that point, I agree with you, and I think that 2 inherent in there, and I understand sample size constraints and 3 relative to outliers, but inherent in that is the extrapolation procedures that are used in there, and so I would think that it would be all accommodating for basically everything on the table there, Andy.

6 7 8

4

5

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

9 10

MS. BOGGS: My comment is not actually to this motion, and so I will be happy to save it.

11 12 13

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Walker.

14 15

16

17

MR. WALKER: I certainly support the motion, but, to me, this is just a minor look here at a far bigger problem than, you know, what this might fix, but I support it, but I have bigger issues with MRIP, myself.

18 19 20

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

MR. STRELCHECK: So, C.J., I know we've been working very well with Bev Sauls and Luiz Barbieri, and would it be worth narrowing the scope of this initially, to use like the recent examples with grouper, to investigate those effort estimates in greater detail? I mean, I understand the broader need to look at this across all our state programs, but I'm trying to think of what might be able to be provided sooner rather than later.

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

DR. SWEETMAN: I understand where you're coming from there, Andy, and I just want to say, and maybe, for the sake of timing, I can understand how gag and red would be one of the first things that we could look at there, but I would not want this to be restricted to just that, because there's other issues with the other states that we talked about there too, and so I want to be encompassing, but, if it's just a procedural way for what we talk about first, sure, but I want to make sure that everything is included.

37 38 39

40

41

42

43 44

45

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I would agree with Dr. Sweetman's comment, you know, because -- You know, the two species we've been talking about most this week are pretty much Florida-centric species, and the calculation of the estimates for particular waves, and how the methodology, and the process, got to that might be different for other states with other species that have been discussed here at Reef Fish, and briefly here during Full Council, and so I would -- I appreciate you staying with that.

46 47 48

DR. SWEETMAN: Also, I'm good with the friendly amendment from

Dale.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Just a question. Adding "as soon as possible", and would it be more feasible to add a sunset, like at the next council meeting, or the June meeting?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Sweetman.

 DR. SWEETMAN: While I would like it to be before then, I'm not sure that's entirely feasible, considering we're going to need to interact with various state agencies and different staffs of both Science and Technology, FWC, and I don't necessarily want to be too prescriptive, as far as a date goes there, J.D., and that's my thought.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will point out that the GulfFIN Regional -- The new GulfFIN Regional Implementation Plan was announced today, and one of the priorities in that plan is to streamline, or to develop, an inclusive and transparent process for reviewing recreational catch and effort data, and specifically how to handle outliers, and so that's something that is on the table. I know it's not specific to this, but it's something that is on everybody's radar, and we're working to improve that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I haven't seen that timeline yet, Dave. Does it give an indication as to when it might occur, those meetings, or when a product would be developed?

 ${\tt MR.~DONALDSON:}$ Yes, and it was actually the meeting that is scheduled for May 14 and 16, here in New Orleans, that Dr. Cody referred to.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Just to add to that, you know, you remember we've had this conversation about the red snapper IRA funds, and so, in tandem with the effort that Dave Donaldson just mentioned, we'll be funding a workshop that's going to look at alternative methods of estimating effort, and you might hear about that a little bit later, but that should happen -- Dave, I'm not sure exactly when that's scheduled, for February, or is that the one that's a little bit later, but it's happening pretty soon.

48 The point being that I don't think we're going to get a full

resolution on this, because, at the end of the day, they're all surveys, and so we don't have a gold standard to say which one is right, et cetera, and this would be a way that at least parts of the domain get something that we hope is a gold standard, and we don't know exactly what we'll do, and it could be counting boats going through passes, or, in some cases, it could be satellite technology, and it could be a lot of different ways to do that, where we could actually count the vessels that are fishing and then compare it with the effort estimates that we get from various surveys. I think that's going to be a really important development for everybody to watch for.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I certainly don't want to communicate that the next iteration, or new methodology that's proposed, is going to be the silver bullet, you know, that makes everyone happy, so to speak, but at least it has to kind of produce a number that, you know, as far as what we have discussed previously, not only at council, but during some of the meetings that I've been involved with when we're talking about recreational data, it has to address the issues of accuracy and precision.

Right now, we are -- We don't have a very accurate survey for the recreational data that we're using in our management, nor is it very precise, and so those are the challenges that we need to be looking at as we look at reviewing the current FES survey, as well as when we start thinking about a new replacement survey, or surveys, to do that.

You know, there's two issues that I see here, that a lot of public comment were made yesterday relating to the FES survey, and that is the accuracy side of the house, and then, you know, the timing of how folks who are directly impacted -- How the council will be able to mitigate that within Magnuson-Stevens, but how quickly we can provide some sort of relief to them, and certainly getting better data will address that, but that won't address the timeliness of it, and so, anyway, I'm going a little bit off-tangent. Is there any other discussion on the motion? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: A friendly suggestion. The letter is directed at NOAA, and we're certainly happy to collaborate, and coordinate, but, because the states are going to be involved, and they provide the effort estimates, I would also recommend that we send the letter to the states.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Sweetman.

DR. SWEETMAN: Yes, I think that's fine. Obviously, it's going to

require coordination between the various states and S&T, and so, Andy, were you talking about removing the Science and Technology part of it or just adding in to write a letter to NOAA's Office of Science and Technology and the state agencies?

MR. STRELCHECK: (Mr. Strelcheck's comment is not audible on the recording.)

DR. SWEETMAN: Okay, and so, Bernie, I think we're keeping in the NOAA's Office of Science and Technology, and we're just adding "and state agencies". I'm okay with that, if the seconder is as well.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. I think that captures it. Dr. Sweetman, and Mr. Diaz, the motion -- You're good with that? All right. I got two thumbs-up. Okay. Any further discussion on the motion? All right. Clickers out, please.

the States escal	ating the review	and evaluatio	n of the rec	reational
effort extrapola	tion methodolo	gies		
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (0

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstentions, and one absent. The motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: All right. SERO staff reviewed the 2023 Gulf gag grouper recreational landings from Wave 5 (September and October). This MRIP-FES landings estimate was considerably larger than anticipated. SERO and NOAA Office of Science and Technology are continuing to investigate the 2023 landings estimate, which is

expected to be finalized in the spring of 2024, including any modifications.

2 3 4

 Like red grouper, the PSE for the fleet-specific estimates for Wave 5 (private vessels at 42 percent and for-hire 33 percent) are above 30 percent, but below 50 percent, indicating a need to exercise caution when using these estimates for management purposes.

The shore mode landings are not recommended for use, per NOAA OST. The shore PSE is 99 percent. The MRIP-FES estimate is seven-times higher than the comparable estimate from SRFS for private vessels in 2023. SERO noted that there are three private vessel dockside intercepts which are highly influential to the landings estimate that are being investigated.

SERO added that final rulemaking for Amendment 56 to the Reef Fish FMP is underway, which would transition catch limits to SRFS data units and institute a payback, unless the best scientific information available suggests otherwise. SERO will evaluate the final estimates, ultimately converted to SRFS data units, to determine the subsequent recreational fishing season duration for 2024. Lastly, SERO said that an overage would have occurred regardless of the data unit used to monitor landings.

A committee member thought that more needed to be done to consider the state survey data. NOAA OST previously acknowledged that SRFS was more precise than MRIP-FES. Another committee member thought the issues with MRIP were justification for a for-hire sector-specific data collection program.

A committee member said much weight is placed on dockside intercepts and provided an example of how unusual intercept data can affect the end estimate. The committee member agreed that more collaboration with the states was critical.

 Council staff asked for clarification about why an estimate for shore was published, if there was only one intercept, and asked Dr. Cody to clarify NOAA Office of Science and Technology's practices for minimum sample sizes. Dr. Cody acknowledged that NOAA Office of Science and Technology does not have control over minimum sample sizes and added that data are published, even if not supported by NOAA OST due to high PSEs, for transparency.

A committee member said that, of the nineteen days for which the gag recreational season was open in October 2023, several were unfishable, due to inclement weather. Despite this, the landings estimated by MRIP-FES in October 2023 exceeded the annual

commercial gag landings for the last five years. Andy.

3 Mi 4 k: 5 p: 6 th 7 al 8 SI 9 we 10 in 11 ha 12 20

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Tom. I just wanted to speak again to kind of next steps, and we talked about, with red grouper projections, bringing back something for the April meeting, and so that will be what we're going to strive for, in terms of talking about that, and then, with gag grouper, because we are shifting to SRFS, through implementation of Amendment 56, I had mentioned, and we're still exploring, being able to factor in the SRFS landings into the projections, determine how much influence that overage has, and what adjustment would be needed for the catch limit in 2024 to account for that overage, which is different than just simply taking the landings, subtracting them from the catch limit, and saying there's potentially a zero catch limit.

We're in the, I will say, early stages of exploring that, and that would have to be determined to be best scientific information available, consistent with our accountability measures, but we can also, hopefully, bring that information back to you by the April council meeting, and that's a little less urgent, because, obviously, the season wouldn't open until September 1, but we definitely want to work through that as well, and we'll coordinate with the State of Florida on that, since gag is obviously a major fishery off of Florida.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks, Andy. Ryan, did you have a question? All right, and so we'll move on.

Draft Options: Gag Grouper Management Measures, which is Tab B, Number 5, council staff reviewed a revised presentation of the effects of modifying the recreational daily bag limit for gag from two fish per person to one fish per person. Effects were described as the difference in the projected recreational fishing season duration between these two scenarios and were considerate of the council's stated goals for gag management during the rebuilding plan.

A committee member did not think a 10 percent gain in fishing days was worth halving the recreational bag limit. Another committee member wanted to prioritize preserving the fishing season and questioned what other options might be available to further constrain harvest.

A committee member thought that fishermen's behavior may likely change, with effort compression, if the fishing season is shortened. However, the committee member acknowledged the shortcomings in the precision and reliability of the data to analyze that effort compression.

22 23

A committee member thought it should be a priority to avoid increasing discards for gag, as the council prioritized at its August 2023 meeting. The committee recommends, and I so move, to stop work on Draft Options: Gag Grouper Management Measures. That motion carried twelve to two with three abstentions. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we'll go ahead and move to a vote.

Measures				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson			Abstain
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Strelcheck		No	
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman			Abstain
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (13)	No (1)	Abstain (2

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have thirteen yes, one no, two abstentions, and one absent. The motion carries.

DR. FRAZER: A committee member asked when the council might see a document considering spatial area closures for gag. Council staff replied that considerable research would be needed prior to presenting options to the council for modifications to spatial area closures. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairs. I don't know if this is the appropriate time to bring this up, but, while we're talking about options, and just thinking outside of the box, and we've got so many species that are in trouble, and I will put it that way, and I understand the data is in question, and we've got gag grouper, red grouper, amberjack, king mackerel, cobia, and, I mean, the list goes on.

I was wondering if we could explore, and I don't know how this would happen, and probably the Science Center, but if we had an incidental catch for some of these species. Instead of having seasons, if you're out red snapper fishing, and you catch a gag grouper, keep the darned thing, because what's killing us, it seems like, in all of this, is our discards, whether they survive, whether they're dead, and discards always seems to be an issue.

Andy had challenged us, I think a year ago, to start thinking outside the box, and, I mean, I see, you know, spatial area closures and all of that, but you know, that's -- If you're looking at the charter-for-hire industry, if you have a six-pack boat, you can have two incidental -- I'm just throwing numbers out, and I'm not saying -- But I think we need to start looking at some of these issues and see if that helps some of our problem, and it's just a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other comments? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I agree with you, Susan, in terms of, you know, concepts, ideas, you're throwing out, and I think this is really going back to the intent of the recreational initiative, and standing up this workgroup, and them thinking through some innovative new strategies, and so, unfortunately, it just can't come fast enough, the way I'm looking at it, but I agree with you that we need to continue down that path.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Final Action: Draft Abbreviated Framework Action: Modifications to Catch Limits for Gulf of Mexico Lane Snapper, Tab B, Number 6, staff reviewed the summary of public comment, draft codified text, and draft abbreviated framework action document. A committee member noted that the SSC did not express concern over the increase to the OFL and the ABC in Option 2. The committee recommends, and I so move, to make Option 2 the preferred. That motion carried without opposition and with one abstention.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have a committee motion. Any discussion on the motion? All right. If you can get your clickers again, please.

B.6.1 To make Option 2 the preferred				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (0)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstentions, and one absent.

DR. FRAZER: The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend the council approve the Abbreviated Framework Action: Modifications to Catch Limits for Gulf of Mexico Lane Snapper and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. That motion carried without opposition.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a committee motion. Any discussion on the motion? Okay. Let's go ahead and vote.

Framework Acti	ion: Modificatio	ns to Catch Lin	nits for Gulf	of Mexico
Lane Snapper				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstention, and one absent. The motion carries. Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Permit Requirements for Participation in Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ), Tab B, Number 7, Ms. Alisha Gray, from SERO, said two IFQ-focused amendments are currently in development in response to previous council motions. Reef Fish Amendment 59, the main focus of her presentation, will update the goals and objectives of the red snapper and grouper-tilefish IFQ programs and address requirements for obtaining an IFQ account and holding and obtaining IFQ shares and annual allocation. The second amendment (Reef Fish Amendment 60) will be discussed during the April 2024 council meeting.

Ms. Gray reviewed a draft purpose and need statement for Amendment 59. The committee recommended staff delete references to IFQ program reviews from the statement, because the reviews are now several years old.

Action 1 considers alternative requirements to obtain and maintain a shareholder account. Ms. Gray reviewed IFQ participation trends and noted that the most restrictive alternative would require a commercial reef fish permit to obtain and maintain an account. The committee discussed the addition of an alternative to Action 1.

 The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to add an Alternative 4. Alternative 4 is require a commercial reef fish permit to maintain an account. That motion carried eleven to three with three abstentions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay. Again, it's a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we'll go ahead and vote.

permit to maintain an account				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson			Abstain
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Strelcheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (15)	No (0)	Abstain (1)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have fifteen yes, zero no, one abstention, and one absent. The motion carries.

DR. FRAZER: Action 2 defines and evaluates active participation within the IFQ programs, which could be based on landings, VMS activity, and trip declarations and landings notifications. Committee members discussed activity metrics presented and indicated that IFQ species landings, rather than overall reef fish landings, should be used to assess activity, because the interest is in evaluating activity levels of IFQ participants.

The committee suggested staff exercise caution in using VMS pinging activity after the demarcation line as a metric, because it may unduly penalize those who fish closer to shore. The committee recommended the removal of trip declarations from the amendment, because they do not necessarily capture activity.

Actions 3 and 4 address requirements to hold and maintain IFQ shares and annual allocation, respectively. Alternatives in

Action 3 range from status quo to requiring a permit and showing fishing activity to obtain and maintain IFQ shares. Action 4 considers a similar range of requirements to obtain and maintain IFQ annual allocation.

Ms. Gray noted that share requirements and allocation requirements do not have to be the same, and that a reef fish permit can be valid, expired but renewable, or terminated. Ms. Gray discussed divestment protocols and procedures, including divestment measures at implementation and post-implementation and time periods to consider to account for adjustments to the permit and activity requirements.

Ms. Gray provided a timeline for the development of Reef Fish Amendments 59 and 60, indicating that Amendment 60 will be discussed in April 2024, while Amendment 59 will come back before the council in June 2024.

The committee inquired about the potential impacts of permit requirements on dealers. Committee members noted that the updated goals and objectives of the IFQ programs intend to give control of the shares and allocation to those who actively fish. Staff noted that dealer permits are open-access permits. The committee recognized that the purpose and need statement should be amended, if flexibility for dealers is included.

The committee asked whether exemptions to permit and activity requirements could be considered. Staff replied that, rather than exemptions, the alternatives presented afford the council the flexibility to select a suite of alternatives consistent with its vision for the IFQ programs. Committee members recommended staff fully consider the role of dealers in the IFQ programs while developing the amendment.

The committee inquired about the potential impacts of permit status on divestment measures. Staff indicated that additional options based on permit status will be developed.

Committee members discussed the federal finance program and thought further discussion to ascertain whether there are opportunities to support fishermen is warranted. Staff noted that, while some consolidation would be expected under permit and activity requirements on related accounts, a better understanding will be gained as the amendment progresses.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I know the answer, but I'm going to ask it, so that

people who don't may understand, and will we see this again at our April meeting for discussion, because I know we'll see Amendment 60 as well.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, at the end of the meeting, staff has put together a little PowerPoint slide for us to think about what we're planning to bring back for regulatory actions to the April council meeting, if we could just hold that until then.

MS. BOGGS: Yes, ma'am, and I realize that, but, for those that didn't, I wanted them to know that there would be further discussion, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Okay. Under Other Business, Gulf of Mexico SEDAR Schedule, a committee member sought clarification about the SEDAR schedule, based on the results of the SEDAR 74 research track for Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Staff noted a SEDAR Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for March 2024 in Charleston, South Carolina, and that the SEDAR Committee will be convened in April 2024.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center added that the type and timing of the next red snapper stock assessment needed to be negotiated between the council and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center at the SEDAR Steering Committee meeting. Council staff replied that it is the current intent to request a benchmark assessment, which will produce actionable management advice upon passing an independent peer review. Council staff also clarified that the Gulf SEDAR schedule would be updated for the April 2024 council meeting.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I would like to have just a brief discussion of this. I wasn't aware that the SEDAR Steering Committee was going to meet before our next meeting in April, and so, in light of that, and in consultation with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, I've put together a motion that I sent to staff earlier, and they should have it. It's fairly robust.

I can read it, while they're pulling it up, just to clarify it here, and so the motion is to request that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center work with the Gulf Council staff to outline a proposed action plan for revising aspects of the SEDAR process and

planning to be presented at the spring SEDAR Steering Committee meeting, to include consideration of state surveys becoming fully-integrated replacements for FES, consideration of conducting assessments of some stocks outside of SEDAR, and the potential for utilization of interim assessments for some species towards implementation of more responsive approaches.

I think this is -- Obviously, I'm open to some feedback on this, and it's fairly lengthy, but I couldn't figure out a more consolidated way of combining these, because I don't think we could look at them separately, and I think we need some sort of direction for the Steering Committee meeting to possibly evaluate some of these things, and then we could get a report from them back at our April meeting and the SEDAR Committee.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We can have lots of discussion, but we'll get a second for that. Mr. Broussard seconds. Any discussion, further discussion, on the motion? Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am looking there towards the end, Chris, about the potential for utilization of interim assessments, and mostly because -- Like the interim analysis, or interim assessment, and we've kind of used that interchangeably in the past, actually refers to a specific approach that's used, and there might be other approaches that we could use for different species, depending on the data available, and it might be something that uses say a couple of indices or -- You know, or what have you, and so not like a strict interim analysis, but also not a fully blown, you know, age-structured stock assessment either, and so I'm just putting that out there for you to think about a little bit, you know, maybe changing what we're calling -- What's said there from "interim assessments" to "appropriate analyses", or something like that, or "data-appropriate analyses", but just to give us a little more flexibility.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: To that point, I'm open to suggestions, and I was trying to think of the correct phrasing for simplified assessments, or expedited assessments, and I know that interim assessments generally are, and so that's why I stuck it in there, but, if you've got better verbiage, I'm open to suggestion.

MR. RINDONE: I think it would be my recommendation to say "data-appropriate analyses", and so I'm kind of looking at Dr. Porch, to see if that makes him itchy.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Porch.

2 Di 3 i: 4 a; 5 b; 6 t; 7 b; 8 a;

 DR. PORCH: I get the intent here, and interim assessments, or interim analyses, as we typically use them, mean a very simple approach, usually linked to an index of abundance, you know, the best information that we have, and so you might want to preserve that sentiment, and it's not just doing simplified assessments in between assessments, and we may want to include some interim approaches, and so I wouldn't object to putting the potential for utilizing simpler assessment methods and interim analyses or something, and I don't know how specific we have to get here, because the motion is just asking us to request -- It's requesting the Southeast Center work with Gulf Council staff to outline a proposed action plan, and so I don't know if we have to sort through all the specific details.

I will say that I support the sentiment, because SEDAR itself was never intended to be used for every single stock assessment, and it's intentionally a very slow and transparent process, and, consequently, it involves many, many partners, and so, consequently, when you run assessments through it, it's a very slow process, and that doesn't always suit our needs, and sometimes having just a consistent process, that you can implement quickly, may be the better route, and so I like the sentiment of the motion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a question regarding the item, where it says "consideration of state surveys becoming fully-integrated replacements for Fishing Effort Survey", and so, right now, kind of the way we're handling it is, as we get a new assessment, and we go through terms of reference with our SSC, and we talk about, you know, if the data is available, and it's gone through a certification process, if it's needed, and how it could be integrated into the stock assessment, and so I believe, in February, when we're talking about the review for red snapper, we're going to start thinking about how we're going to do this for red snapper in the benchmark assessment.

I think it's okay to leave in here, but it is kind of a beast in itself, and I don't know that the Steering Committee is really the right folks to be working through that, and so maybe we could think about it with different staff, and a different process for each species, and I'm just not sure it's -- Maybe it should be a separate effort, is what I'm trying to ask, and I don't know, and maybe Andy and Clay have a better idea about that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: I guess I was hinging on the word "consideration", you know, but actually coming up with a way to do it is a whole different beast, and, in the case of the upcoming red snapper assessment, we already have had experts say, at this point, it's not practical, and maybe impossible, because you have all these different currencies, and we've got to deal with all the different calibrations, and some of them don't get discards, and so you rely on FES anyway for the discards, and so I don't know that that would happen for the red snapper assessment, and remember that consistency is key, but coming up with a plan, consistent with the Gulf States' plan that Dave Donaldson just mentioned, I think is really important.

I also have a little bit of a concern if we set up several different groups working on the same kind of thing, and so I would recommend that, if we move forward with consideration of state surveys becoming fully-integrated replacements for FES -- That's part of the broader vision for the Gulf States transition plan, and I think that's the appropriate place where that could be considered.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: To that point, my thought process here, and maybe — You know, we're going to have a pilot study taking place here, with Alabama and Mississippi, using the similar effort survey to Louisiana, and so, at the endpoint of that, we'll have three states under the same effort survey system, and so maybe, in that portion of the motion, we say "consideration of state effort surveys becoming fully-integrated replacements for FES", to specify just the effort component of the state surveys, and not the dockside part, and would that fix part of the problem here?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Again, I guess it just depends on what you mean by "consideration". You know, take it in the broader sense, and, yes, we should totally consider that, and that, again, would be part of this broader Gulf program that we're talking about, and I don't -- Obviously, that hasn't even happened yet, and so it's not going to happen tomorrow, but it just depends on where you see that plugging in. I think there's a broad effort to reimagine the whole recreational fishing data collection program, and, to me, this is part of that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Right, and so that's why, at the beginning, it's to outline a proposed action plan for revising aspects of the SEDAR

process, and so those are -- This should really be more like bullet points below that, I guess, in a way, but I didn't know how to phrase it in the motion, but the overall action here is to get that plan from you all, with the council staff, to the Steering Committee for -- Was it the February or March meeting? All right, and then report could come back to us in April for a SEDAR Committee. Then those would be the bullet points for consideration.

They could -- You know, they could come back with a report that says, okay, here is our thought process on integrating state effort surveys as replacements, and then that would just be an agenda item for us to look at at that point, but we're going to need to start somewhere to fix this process, and so that's my consideration.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of thoughts, and I really appreciate and can value the spirit of this motion, Chris. It's well thought out. While we're in kind of the context of reenvisioning, and reconsideration, I wonder, just given the stock, or the status of this stock assessment, which I will categorize as the wheels have fallen off, is this a place where we could, you know, direct, or reconsider, incorporating the Great Red Snapper Count?

You know, we've heard a lot, at the SEDAR level, about why we can't use this, and we can't incorporate it into the model, and maybe a little different spin on that, and how we can incorporate it into the stock assessment, would a more appropriate approach at this given time, just given where we are with this stock assessment, and so I would love to see an incorporation of the Great Red Snapper Count into this motion, and into the stock assessment process, and really embracing that how do we incorporate that, rather than, you know, we can't, we can't, we can't.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

 MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My reaction to the motion, Chris, is I appreciate you bringing it forward, but exactly the same as Ryan's, and so I would like to propose a friendly change to incorporate that, and, instead of "utilization of interim assessments", "utilization of other methods, such as interim assessments".

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I've got a thumbs-up from Mr. --

 MR. SCHIEBLE: I'm good with that, if Mr. Broussard is good with it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Broussard, are you -- Both have thumbs-up, and so, Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so it gets back to Mr. Geeslin's question, and so, for the red snapper count, I believe the SSC is going to talk about this, what the reviewer said, and what our next steps are going to be, as far as how — What we need to do to try to consider it in the next assessment, benchmark assessment, process, and so I think maybe that would be a separate motion, since it's so specific for red snapper, if you want to make that clear for us for the SSC meeting, is what I'm thinking right now.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other discussion? General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: I definitely support the motion, and, obviously, you know, when Amendment 50 was written, you know, the state data was what we was looking at, and what is the state data, and we've had now a good five years of state data, and so I agree with what you're saying. You know, state data needs to be looked at, and we need to look at that, as compared to FES, because the state data is more accurate, for the state, than anything out there, and I think that ought to be looked at very hard and make sure that they don't just -- You know, it's hard to make a change, but I think it's time.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I will support the motion, only because it says "consideration of", because what concerns me about the state surveys is they're not consistent, and you will be using some for some SEDAR assessments, and some for not, because, as you just mentioned, Chris, Alabama and Mississippi, even though they're going to be piloting, they don't currently collect all the data that Louisiana does, all the data that Florida or Texas does, and that's what concerns me, but, the fact that the word "consideration" is there, I will support the motion.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: To that point, thank you, Ms. Susan, and I appreciate that, and, yes, it's -- So I guess the thought process, in my head, is a timeline, because the pilot study for the FES evaluation will be finished about the same time the pilot study for the state effort surveys in Mississippi and Alabama will be

finished, and so those two will make it to the finish line at the same time, and then we'll have a good idea of where we are with those.

You will have three states running the same effort survey in the Gulf, out of five, and SRFS is fairly similar to the way it works, as we've seen by the implementation of it into the gag assessment already, and so I think that we can get to that timeline, and then make critical decisions once those two things are done, but to get this process started on the frontend, and we know how long it takes to do things here, right, and that's my thought, is to match those up at the end.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have a motion on the board. There was a change made, and so I will read the entire motion, quickly. To request that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center work with the Gulf Council staff to outline a proposed action plan for revising aspects of the SEDAR process and planning to be presented at the spring SEDAR Steering Committee meeting, to include consideration of state surveys becoming fully-integrated replacements for FES (Fishing Effort Survey), consideration of conducting assessments of some stocks outside of SEDAR, and the potential for utilization of other methods, such as interim assessments, for some species towards implementation of more responsive approaches. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I suggest that we put a common after "interim assessments", so that it's not misread? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Okay, and so we'll go ahead and vote on this then.

proposed action plan for revising aspects of the SEDAR process and						
planning to be presented						
First Name	Last Name					
Kevin	Anson	Yes				
Susan	Boggs	Yes				
Billy	Broussard	Yes				
Dale	Diaz	Yes				
JD	Dugas	Yes				
Anthony	Overton					
Tom	Frazer	Yes				
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes				
Bob	Gill	Yes				
Michael	McDermott	Yes				
Chris	Schieble	Yes				
Joe	Spraggins	Yes				
Andy	Streicheck	Yes				
Kesley	Banks	Yes				
CJ	Sweetman	Yes				
Troy	Williamson	Yes				
Ed	Walker	Yes				
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain		

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have sixteen in favor of the motion, zero no, zero abstentions, and one absent. Hold on a second. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: While we're on SEDAR, why is gray triggerfish taking so long? Can someone please tell me?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Porch or Ryan? Dr. Porch? No? Ryan.

MR. RINDONE: Well, upon deep and further reflection, Carrie decided it was not in fact her favorite fish anymore. I mean, we have a very dynamic schedule that we've been contending with, and, with the time loads from some of these efforts, like SEDAR 74, and our representatives on the SEDAR Steering Committee have kept it on there, and I think the version that you guys had sent around to you was a June version, which I am trying to very quickly pull up, but we do have it as a -- It originally was on the schedule as an operational assessment, but some preliminary conversations that we've had with the Science Center, and given the pivot with some of the approaches, we've talked about doing that more as like a benchmark assessment, one due to what happened with the last assessment, and two due to the amount of time it's been since we've done anything meaningful with it.

It would just give a better opportunity for data evaluation, and, because of what happened with SEDAR 62, it really would be appropriate to have, you know, a benchmark-style approach applied here, and that would allow us to have a good framework upon which

to move forward with, you know, perhaps a simpler updating approach in the future.

Right now, the stock is still using CHTS data units, and so that would have to be turned over, and then an evaluation of, you know, like the GFISHER video survey would be something else that would be key to that, and the last assessments used more of a piecemeal approach to the video data, and the GFISHER is a considerable advancement from that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: I would just add that there's been considerable work on ageing these animals, and it turns out that we needed to revise that approach, and, also, you know, we're revisiting our bycatch estimates, because bycatch estimates were -- Shrimp bycatch were driving a lot of it, and we wanted to understand those better, and so we've been totally reevaluating our entire observer program and how we're collecting samples and how we're extrapolating up and all of that, and so all of that is part of the delay, but just in an effort to make sure we give the best data possible.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so it is still my favorite fish, but don't forget the council is funding exactly what Dr. Porch was telling you about with the spines and the otolith issue with ageing, and so we are expecting to get results of that here soon, so it can be integrated into the stock assessment, in Dr. Patterson's lab.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I only ask because I was at the 2019 SEDAR meeting when the wheels fell off of this, and that's going to be five years this May, and it just -- Now we're another -- 2025, I believe, the end of 2025, is when I see it back on the schedule, and so I'm just curious, and it better be good, and that's all I can say.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: Well, while we're on SEDAR, I have some of the same questions, or concerns, maybe, for Ryan, and is there any movement on amberjack?

MR. RINDONE: So we currently have amberjack also listed as a benchmark on the June version of the schedule, and beginning in

2026, using data through 2024, and amberjack is in a similar situation as gray triggerfish, with respect to improvements in looking at ages and then the ability to also consider the GFISHER data, as opposed to the piecemeal version of the video data that we've used in the past, and it may come to pass that using the video data is something that we can use as part of a simpler approach to being able to assess amberjack more frequently in the future, and so we've had some positive conversations with the Science Center about using that approach. Right now though, starting in 2026 for amberjack.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: So is it appropriate to make a request, or maybe it needs a motion, but can we make a request to have, I guess, Sean Powers, or whomever, come give an update on the Great Amberjack Count at the next council meeting? Is that something we can do, or do you need a motion for that?

MR. RINDONE: We had an update from Dr. Powers at an SSC meeting, a few meetings back, and I can try and find exactly -- I don't remember, off the top of my head, which one it was, but it is included the SSC summaries, but I can send that around to you guys, but, if you want him to come and give an update, either to the SSC and/or the council, we can certainly ask him to do that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ryan, isn't that supposed to wrap -- Isn't he supposed to provide the final report like at the end of the summer or something?

MR. RINDONE: Something like that. It's close to getting the bowtie on it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I was just going to say that April will be in Orange Beach, or Gulf Shores, and it won't be a long travel for him.

39 MR. RINDONE: Surprise, Dr. Powers.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Any other points regarding SEDAR, 42 before we wrap up the Reef Fish report? I don't see any. Dr. 43 Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Update the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ Advisory Panel (AP) Charge, council staff reviewed the current charge for the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP and an alternative charge that

better aligns with the current expectations of the AP.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to accept the proposed changes to the charge for the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP. The revised charge is to evaluate and make recommendations relative to requirements for participation in the red snapper and grouper-tilefish individual fishing quota (IFQ) programs considered in Reef Fish Amendment 59 and to modifications to IFQ shares and annual allocation distribution approaches proposed in Reef Fish Amendment 60. That motion carried without opposition and with two abstentions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have a committee motion. Any discussion? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So I don't know what order we need to do this in, and I suppose we can vote on this motion, but I'm going to go ahead and let you know that I'm going to recommend that we repopulate, because, if this passes, we're totally changing the charge.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Sounds like a plan, yes, and so, relative to the motion on the board, regarding the charge, is there any discussion on the motion? All right. We will need to do this by clicker.

Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ AP				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (0)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstentions, one absent. The motion carries.

DR. FRAZER: Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you for that. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I didn't know if I needed to do it now or then or -- I'm really not prepared, but I would like to make a motion that we advertise to repopulate the Ad Hoc Red Snapper/Grouper-Tilefish IFQ Advisory Panel.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so we'll have staff get that motion on the board. All right, Ms. Boggs. Is that your motion?

MS. BOGGS: That's the intent. I'm not exactly sure if that's how it should be worded, or if we just need to say to advertise. It's good. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and do we have a second? It's seconded by Mr. Diaz. Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: So we had a short discussion about this in Admin/Budget, and our staff did get me some information on absences, and so they met three times. The first two meetings, there was really good attendance. The third meeting, about a third of the committee, or exactly a third of the committee, was absent, but, between the —This is at the last meeting, which was a virtual meeting, and the fact that it's been so long since we're reviewed this panel, and that's my reasons for supporting the motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Walker.

 MR. WALKER: I agree with Dale. It's been a long time, and there's nothing wrong with it, and, if you really want the same people, you can put them back on, and so a fresh look is a good thing, in my view.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Those same people will have to reapply though, and so yes. All right. No further discussion? Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So my question is, and I guess this will follow the same timeline as all the others that we'll be advertising for and populating, looking at it in April, and then voting on, or confirming, in June?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I will look at staff. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: That's what I anticipate.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Great. All right, and so we'll go ahead and use our clickers one more time.

Grouper Tilefish IFQ AP				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Strelcheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (16)	No (0)	Abstain (0)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have sixteen yes, zero no, zero abstentions, and one absent. The motion carries. Any other discussions, or topics, for Reef Fish? I am not seeing any, and we are well ahead of schedule, but we may need a bathroom break, and so let's take a short bathroom break, for let's say ten minutes, and we will be back here at 12:30 to wrap up the meeting.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, folks. Council members, if you can make your way back to the table. Okay. We're going to reconvene. Before we move on to the next agenda item, which will be the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission liaison report, I had another comment from Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I didn't know exactly where to bring up this motion, whether it was more appropriate in the SEDAR or at the conclusion of the Reef Fish Committee, and so I will bring it up now, and, Bernie, if you will please bring up the motion that I crafted, and I will read it into the record.

Okay. The motion reads as such: To direct the SSC to include

consideration of the Great Red Snapper Count in the terms of reference for the planned benchmark assessment of Gulf red snapper. Consideration should be sensitive to the concerns expressed by the peer review team during the SEDAR 74 review workshop.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have a motion on the board. Is there a second for the motion? It's seconded by Dr. Banks. Any further discussion on the motion? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I would like to hear a little bit from staff, and I thought the indication was that the SSC is going to discuss this at the next meeting, and whether this is different than what is already planned.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So they're going to talk about the SEDAR 74 review, which will include comments from the reviewers about, you know, this is what you did, this is what we liked and didn't like, and then the Science Center is going to have, you know, basically what we intend to do next, or like what we would envision doing next, like to the extent to which they have an agreed-upon approach to whatever problem needed solving.

With respect to the Great Red Snapper Count, there were several things that the reviewers had talked about, and so those will be discussed at the SSC meeting. I think the SSC would have talked about this anyway, and one of the issues outstanding though, both directly from members of like the co-PIs from the team and from conversations between them and the Science Center, is that a lot of these co-PIs have moved on to other projects, and constantly coming back to this project is not something they necessarily have budgeted time or resources for, and so one of my concerns would be trying to -- That there are some things that would require the people that initially handled the data to be involved, and I don't know the degree to which we can coax, or coerce, that, and we certainly can't require it, because we don't manage those people.

A couple of the co-PIs, like Dr. Sean Powers and Dr. Will Patterson, are active participants in our SSC process, and they have not held back as far as like continuing to provide information about what they've been responsible for, and so, as far as the rest of it is concerned, we would just have to try to work with those other co-PIs to gauge the degree to which they could be involved and help out with some of the outstanding concerns from our review workshop.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other discussion on the motion? We'll go

assessment of 0	Sulf red snapper	·		
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Diaz	Yes		
JD	Dugas	Yes		
Anthony	Overton			
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Bob	Gill		No	
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schieble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Andy	Strelcheck	Yes		
Kesley	Banks	Yes		
CJ	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Ed	Walker	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (15)	No (1)	Abstain (0)

B.9.2 To direct the SSC to include consideration of the Great Red Snapper Count in the terms of reference for the planned benchmark

CHAIRMAN ANSON: We have fifteen yes, one no, seven abstentions, and one absent. That will take us then to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission liaison report and Mr. Donaldson.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Historically, I have a given a verbal report about the activities of the commission, but I'm not sure how effective that's been, because there's been several things that I've reported that people haven't heard, and so I have threatened to do an interpretive dance, but I don't want to -- No one really wants to see that, and so I'm going to try a PowerPoint

instead.

We've got several activities going on, and one is the IRA funding activities through the commission. The overarching goal on that is to kind of revitalize the state-federal cooperative programs, and then the specific goals are to improve quality and timeliness of recreational fishery-dependent data, for assisting management of red snapper, and also other species, and there is five activities under that, like improving the state and commission data management systems, improving better quality control,

establishing the commission as the central warehouse for the region's fishery-dependent data, and then evaluating ways to validate recreational fishing effort and improve recreational discards.

For this year, we're focusing on the data management system improvements, and we're developing recreational fisheries standards, through a workshop that we're currently setting up, and then we're also evaluating the data management systems, both at the commission and the states, and we're going to focus on improving the data management system at the commission, and then the other two are two workshops that we've alluded to throughout our discussions this week, but first is the effort validation planning workshop and then the recreational discards workshop.

Where we are with those workshops is we've created a steering committee to develop the terms of reference, and Gregg Bray, Ken Brennan, Richard Cody, Bev Sauls, Trevor Moncrief, and Nicole Smith are on that, and we've also reached out to the council, to see if Lisa, or someone on the staff, would like to participate, but these workshops are going to look at effort validation, as well as discards, and help answer questions related to those and ID additional research and work that needs to get done. We're shooting for later -- Probably late spring or early summer to convene those workshops.

For the out years, we're going to be focusing on improving the data management systems for the states, and we will -- We will be contracting with IT specialists and programmers, and then also make money available to the states for hardware, network communication improvement, things along those lines, and be working with each of the individual states. The total award to the commission is \$6.6 million.

Another activity that we're involved in, and Mr. Schieble mentioned it earlier today, is we are conducting a recreational fishing effort pilot. It's a one-year pilot, and we're testing the LA Creel effort survey in Mississippi and Alabama. It's weekly telephone calls to anglers, licensed anglers, and we began this in January, earlier this -- Well, actually last month now, on January 9, and it presents a unique opportunity to examine the difference between the state and federal recreational surveys, and the Gulf states, NOAA, and the commission staff will be working cooperatively on the analysis, and hopefully that analysis will be given later this summer, or early fall, and so hopefully, by maybe the November meeting, I'll be able to provide some updates on that.

Also, the recreational survey programs meeting, and Richard Cody

mentioned this during his discussion, and it's scheduled for May 14 and 16 here in New Orleans, and it's going to include both state and federal recreational data program managers, and we're looking to restore the process of reviewing recreational survey programs and estimates, and then the main focus for this first meeting is to establish a new process for developing, or reviewing, these estimates, and we'll be developing this process for future years, and we plan on meeting in-person annually.

The last thing. that that I don't have a slide for, but I did mention, was that the Gulf Regional Implementation Plan was announced. It was released today, and I believe that everybody - Most people have received the email from Evan Howell, up in S&T, and there's a variety of different things in there, but there's six priorities that we're going to be focusing on.

It's improving the timeliness of recreational catch and effort estimates, improving recreational fisheries discard data, sustaining biological sampling, biological data collection, and to evaluate the age and sex of managed stocks, streamlining and improving the for-hire data collection methods, and, as I mentioned earlier today, developing an inclusive and transparent process for reviewing recreational catch and effort and how to handle outliers.

Then looking at additional methods for evaluating spatial data, which are essential in determining the impacts of wind and fish farms and things along those lines, and I just want to thank our state partners, NOAA Fisheries, and the commission staff, for putting this together. It's been a great collaborative effort, and we appreciate everyone's time and effort along those lines. I will answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any questions for Dave? Mr. Schieble.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you for that report, Dave. You may not have an answer to this question, but I don't know, and have you received any opinion on the BioFIN funding stuff? I know that the budget from last year -- Contracts had to be completed or whatever, in order to determine if there was funding for this year for that part of it.

MR. DONALDSON: We've got some -- We have some realized savings, because of COVID, and there are some unspent funds, and we're still working with S&T staff to see if we can utilize that, and so the short answer is no, we don't have any clarity on that yet, but we're hoping that there will news shortly.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Dave. The presentation was good, and I still think you need to up your game and do an interpretive dance next time.

MR. DONALDSON: As I said, no one wants to see that.

 MR. STRELCHECK: No, but, in all seriousness, I appreciate you providing the updates, especially on the IRA, and I know I've talked to Carrie, and a few folks, about people wanting to understand that better, what progress is being made, and so I think we'll work with you to provide those regular updates to the council going forward, and I appreciate you going into detail here today.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Anyone else? I will just add, Dave, that we appreciate you and your staff, and the hard work, that particularly Gregg did, with trying to get the contracts set up and the communications established between the contractor that Louisiana has used, to allow the States of Mississippi and Alabama to, you know, have a streamlined process, a quick process, for us to utilize the contractor that's been doing the survey, to make it a much more seamless process, as we try to get going as quickly as possible, and all that occurred within six or eight weeks, again at the end of the year, and so we just really appreciate their hard work and diligence, and so thank you.

MR. DONALDSON: We appreciate that, and, also, we appreciate Chris and his folks and their willingness to share and get things moving sooner than later, and so it was a truly cooperative endeavor.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I just want to say welcome to the skunkworks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: That will take us to our next liaison report, and that will be from the U.S. Coast Guard, and we have Lieutenant Fuhs, and so, again, welcome to the meeting, and hopefully you've had a chance to learn one or two things this week, but, please, take it away.

U.S. COAST GUARD

LT. CARL FUHS: Thank you for having me, and thank you for the warm welcome to the council. I just have a short presentation with some of the items that we covered. For our area of responsibility, the 8th District covers the majority of the Gulf. However, there are, on the western side of Florida -- That area is covered by District 7, and so one of my counterparts, a close

friend that's in Miami, kind of covers that, and so, if there's anything that is specifically on the west coast of Florida, that will fall under District 7's AOR.

Our Exclusive Economic Zone enforcement, this is what we call the lancha mission, and this is primarily down within Sector Corpus Christi, along the border of Mexico, and this is our main international fisheries mission, where we're looking to protect the U.S. EEZ and deter illicit fishing within our EEZ.

You listed some of the historical interdictions and then the amount of red snapper that we've found onboard these lanchas over the last few years, and there has been a slight trend downwards in the number of interdictions. However, that doesn't necessarily mean that there were fewer lanchas incurring in our EEZ. A lot of the lower amount of interdictions is more closely related to the lack of manpower within the Coast Guard, and, as everybody is aware, just the military, and the Coast Guard in general, we've had to take some decisive action with how we're sourcing and manning stations, and so we're losing several assets within the Gulf of Mexico, as a result of a recent force alignment.

 However, our main station, Station South Padre Island, is conducting interdictions, and then our fast-response cutters, which is pictured in the lower-right hand corner, also conducts this mission. Historically, we see an increase in lanchas incurring within the EEZ during the next upcoming few months, as we lead into Lent, as there is a higher demand for fish within Mexico, and so we're doing our best, and we should have consistent coverage along the boundary line, to prevent those incursions.

Additionally, with the red snapper, the pounds that we find onboard the lanchas -- It's not a super accurate indication of how much fish they are taking, because there's a number of different circumstances that can occur. You know, ideally, we interdict the lancha when they're heading north, before they get to set their nets, or their lines. However, a lot of the times, we'll interdict them after they've already set their lines, before they get fish onboard, or we catch them in the Gulf setting lines, and they run from that, and so, by the time we interdict them, they may not have fish onboard, but then the worst-case scenario is they already have the line already out there, and we weren't able to recover it.

Our cutters routinely recover several miles of longline, illicit longline, on each patrol. We had a cutter return last week, and they recovered about eight nautical miles, over a week-and-a-half period, of longline.

Then, lastly, Mexico is also looking to increase their cooperation with us, as a result of the negative certification, and so we've seen an increased amount of outreach from them, and we're looking to conduct targeted enforcement operations with them to maximize their utility along the boundary line.

 On the domestic side, these are our number of boardings from the last fiscal year and this fiscal year. Right now, we're sitting right around 200 so far, since October, with five significant violations. The majority of our violations come from TEDs and BRDs, and we've seen an increase in some of the TED violations recently.

In our look ahead, we're looking to just increase maritime domain awareness, and, as we've seen a reduction in our force within the Gulf area, we're looking to maximize our effect, by conducting some targeted enforcement operations, leveraging our partnership with NOAA and our state agencies to get maximum effect for the time we're out there.

Lastly, for marine protected resources, and this slide is actually out-of-date, and we had a -- During the cold weather, the last week or so, Station South Padre Island helped recover about 100 sea turtles, with some of their state partners, and get them to re-warming centers, and so we're already exceeding the amount of marine protected resources encounters that we had last year within the Gulf, and these typically are usually turtles, and stuff like that, that we find entangled, that we will help free, and then we'll turn them over to local resources, and that's all I have, pending any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you. Any questions? I am not seeing anything. Thanks again, Lieutenant Fuhs, for being here. We appreciate it.

LT. FUHS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay, and so we'll move now into Tab R, Number 6, Discussion of Council Planning and Primary Activities. Dr. Simmons.

DISCUSSION OF COUNCIL PLANNING AND PRIMARY ACTIVITIES

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've had several comments, from different council members, you know, regarding trying to get a better understanding of what to expect for the next meeting, and so what we tried to do is take our action

schedule and kind of bring up some of the documents to the forefront, the regulatory actions that we're really planning on bringing back to you in April.

This does not include everything that we're doing on the to-do list, all the other working groups and everything else that we're involved in, but just to try to give the council a snapshot of what to expect, again, for the next meeting, and so, just to go through this, you can see the green dots are the final action items, and so you just took final action on your framework for lane snapper catch levels.

The arrows, red arrows, indicate ongoing actions, and they don't really say on here, necessarily, what we're bringing back, and you have to go to the action schedule, but I will try to run through that here, as best as we can try to anticipate what we need to bring back to you in April, and so, for the for-hire data collection, I think there will be a series of presentations, one that would start to incorporate what you directed us to do for the next steps of the SEFHIER program, as well as trying to get into some of those economic information -- How the economic information is used in management, and have a separate presentation for that.

We're planning to bring a final action document for Spanish mackerel catch levels, and so you have now decided not to take action on the gag management measures, and so you will not see that in April, and I think, Ms. Boggs, you were asking about the IFQ amendment, and so we're planning to bring a new document, or, well, a draft, I believe, Assane, a document or a presentation, for Reef Fish 60, the IFQ distribution, but we will not bring back the permit requirements until June to the council, so we have some time to work on that.

 We have a lot to do on the shallow-water grouper amendment, and we're hoping we can make some progress on that and bring something to you on that in April. For midwater snapper, we talked about this in committee, and we want to skip the council meeting and then bring back the document in June, but, based on the discussion during the committee, our understanding is that we will be -- At least in April, we're going to start talking about those criteria, as far as if they're in need of management or not, and so I think we can squeeze that in.

Then we confirmed that we're going to bring back the framework action for shrimp vessel position data, and so, Mr. Chair, that's what we've got together to start this discussion, and so we're looking for feedback, if there's some different direction that you want us to go, or if this was helpful, and you want to see it

again, or what you would like us to do.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: This is very helpful, and I did ask my question to Assane, but, you know, and as you can see by the schedule, and I think it's good, every other meeting, we'll see either 59 or 60, so we're not so overwhelmed with the documents, and we're not so overwhelmed with what we're trying to do, and so I think that's very good, to space it out that way. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

 MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I agree. I think this is helpful. It integrates us with the future planning better. Even though it was in the action schedule, many of us don't pay a whole lot of attention that document, but I wanted to bring up another item, which is really not related to this directly, but it caught my attention, and so I would like to bring it to the attention of the council.

A couple of weeks ago, the Pacific Council convened a council-of-the-whole for two days. That struck me, and I said, what's that about, and it turns out that they were not discussing, and I don't know all the intricate details, but they were not discussing regulatory items, but council processes, how they were doing, what they should do in the future, et cetera, solely attention on council actions, and I was skeptical, and I thought, well, I don't know if we need that or not, but I was talking, after it, to a long-time council member, and I said, you know, how did it go, and what do you think, and he said it was great, that it was really helpful, and we got a lot done, and I'm glad we did it.

Well, I was surprised by that, and I didn't expect that reaction, and so I just bring it to you all's attention, and mention it, and I don't know if staff knows about it already, and I'm not suggesting that we need it, but it's a different way of doing business that we've never done, as far as I know, that might be worth a look, to see whether there is value to be gained for us.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Maybe perhaps, Dr. Simmons, if you aren't familiar with what they were doing, or what they got accomplished, if you can maybe check-in on that and see. You know, Dr. Simmons, and the staff, have -- You know, they're very much open to council member input, and there are the special meetings that are held, lunchtime meetings that are held, with each of the state representatives and the host state, to ask about, you know, how things are working, or not working, and so there's opportunities,

but that's not to say that, once you get everybody together, you might see things collectively a little different than you do more individually, but anyway, those are my comments.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, I can certainly look into that and get some more information to share with you and J.D.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Great. Thank you. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Bob, I'm not sure if I was fully following you, but I guess -- You've been to, as a liaison, to the South Atlantic Council, and the South Atlantic Council does business a little bit differently than the Gulf Council, and convenes council sessions sometimes before the -- At the start of the meeting as well as the end of the meeting, and even maybe in the middle of the meeting, and so is that similar to what the West Coast was doing?

MR. GILL: No, it was not, and so they convened a special meeting, outside the council meeting, for two days, and they all went up to Portland, and they just discussed council processes, et cetera, and so it's a different approach that they took.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right, and so is there anyone else that wants to discuss what Dr. Simmons presented and is on the slide, or the screen, right now? Any other comments related to that? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I will just say thank you, because I've been in Carrie's ear quite a bit about this, and I've provided the examples of what the South Atlantic Council does, and I think this is a great start.

You know, one of the concerns that we're always thinking about, after a council meeting, is motions that are passed, and work that needs to be completed, and how do we space that out with the existing staff and resources, and so, to me, this sets expectations, and it gives the council an opportunity to make modifications, if you think things are not moving fast enough, or might benefit from slowing them down, but, at the end of the day, it will also help us, in terms of planning, and in terms of our staffing and being able to complete actions in a timely manner for the council.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I will just add to that, and I don't want to add more work to staff, but they are -- They are very good at what they do, and they've had some recent experience, but I'm wondering if this could be taken just a step further, where you can incorporate the action guide with this, and it may be not the same

graph, but maybe a similar graph, to kind of put on the action guide, and the action guide is in a spreadsheet style, and maybe having a timeline format might -- With everything on it, with, you know, color-coding, or a letter associated with the activities, the actions, that we've got, and then the council can make a best guess as to when --

Or at least there is some indication, on the spreadsheet, as to when it might be started, when it might be completed or whatever, but have that, and then, in that same kind of web, the management timeline tool that we use, or observe, with, you know, all the amendments that are associated with a species, and what about having something set up like this, where it's got, you know, the timeline of the specific action, or document, or something like that, and so I just throw that out there, kind of on the fly. I haven't discussed it with staff, but I'm just throwing that out there for a possibility to look into, if it's not too difficult. Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I was thinking along similar lines, and, instead of using little red arrows, could we have -- So, for shrimp vessel position data, you would have discuss draft, like it says here in the action guide right now, and just put a little box next to the arrow that says "discuss draft" over April, you know, and then the boxes would replace the arrows, and they would tell you what we're doing in April. I don't know.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: That sounds good. I mean, really, I think it's just whatever technology is available, and staff time, but they are very creative, and so whatever you all can do to make it very clear and provide as much information that's easily, you know, synthesized as possible, and that will be great. All right, and so that takes us to Other Business, and we have on here the litigation update. Ms. Levy.

OTHER BUSINESS LITIGATION UPDATE

MS. LEVY: Thank you. I originally thought this was going to really be boring, and I would just be like I have no update, but that was not the case. Yesterday, late afternoon or early evening, the Mississippi District Court issued its decision in the Amendment 54 litigation, and that is the one that involves the Appointments Clause issue, and so really about the constitutional makeup of the council, whether council members are officers of the United States, and, if they are, whether they're appointed consistent with the Appointments Clause.

The takeaway is, and so it's a long decision, and it's like fifty-five pages, and there's a lot to digest, but the takeaway is that the court upheld the rule, but made some kind of unfavorable decisions, depending on who you are, about the council structure, and I'm going to summarize it like super succinctly, and I'm happy to take questions afterwards, but I will say, right now, I probably will not have any answers to broader implications and everything else, because, again, this decision just came down last night, and no one has had a chance to talk about it, or even necessarily fully digest all of the court's analysis.

Also, I will preface it with the plaintiffs in the -- There were two cases, and they were consolidated, and so the plaintiffs in one of the cases already filed a notice of appeal, and so it's going to the $5^{\rm th}$ Circuit Court of Appeals, and so whatever I'm going to say is not necessarily the end.

The court essentially held that council members are officers, under the Appointments Clause, and, if you're an officer, then you need to be appointed in a particular way, and, in this decision, the court said that council members are inferior officers, and that means that you can be means that you can be appointed by basically the Secretary of the department, right, and so department heads have the ability to appoint inferior officers.

The court said that six of the council members are not appointed consistent with that power in the Constitution, and so, the RA and the state reps on the council, because they are just on there by virtue of their positions, were not properly appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. The other members that are submitted by the governor, and actually appointed by the Secretary, the court said that their appointments were fine.

 There's another little piece of the analysis which, if you're going to be an appointed officer, okay, but you also have to be able to be removed, right, and so there's a removal type of consideration, and the court found that all of the officers except the RA are unconstitutionally insulated from removal, and so, for example, the state reps can't be removed by the Secretary at all, and they're on there because of their position.

The remaining council members can only be removed, under the statute, under very limited circumstances, like misconduct, things like that, and the court said that that limited the Secretary's ability to remove and that that was unconstitutional, but, in the end, the court upholds the rule, essentially finding that there was a majority -- So eleven properly-appointed officers, and that constitutes an appropriate quorum, right, for council meetings,

and a majority of that quorum voted for Amendment 54, and so the court said that that council action was appropriate, despite the fact that there are six members that are not constitutionally appointed.

With respect the removal provisions, the court essentially said there's a three-step test in the 5th Circuit about whether there's a remedy for this violation of being not being able to be removed, and that the plaintiffs hadn't met any of those requirements, and, ultimately, the Secretary, through Janet Coit, approved the amendment, and there was basically no indication that the Secretary wanted to remove anybody, and so that the plaintiffs could not get a remedy for that violation.

Again, the rule is fine for now, but a lot of stuff about appointments, and this is the first case that has actually addressed the merits of the Appointments Clause issue with respect to the council. There have been other cases, but they have been dismissed for other reasons, particularly standing, that plaintiffs don't actually have standing to bring the claim, and, in this case, the court said the plaintiffs did have standing. It's a -- I'm not sure that I want to get into all of that.

I did send the decision to Carrie, and she can distribute it to you all, and you can read what the court said about standing and things like that. If you have particular questions, I am happy to try to answer them, but, again, in terms of broader implications, and all of that stuff, I am not going to have answers to that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: General Spraggins.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Just a question, and you may or may not know the answer to it, but do other councils have the same makeup?

MS. LEVY: Well, I mean, they're made up in the same way, but they all have a different number of members, right, and so a different number of appointed members, a different number of state reps, and I will say that there are cases — The same arguments are being made in other cases around the country, and I believe there is a case in the $1^{\rm st}$ Circuit, and I believe there's a case in the $2^{\rm nd}$ Circuit, and those are still in the district courts, and so this argument is being made in various places, and so it just this happens to be the first decision like this on the merits here.

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: The second part is do I not have to come in April?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Any other questions? Mara, was that

all you had for your report?

1 2 3

MS. LEVY: Yes. Regarding the Amendment 53 red grouper litigation, it's still with the District Court of Appeals in D.C., and I haven't seen a decision on that one yet.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you. Well, that will take us then -- We had two other items that were added at the beginning of Full Council, and one of those two is the red grouper interim analysis. Dr. Simmons.

DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL REQUIREMENT FOR RED GROUPER INTERIM ANALYSIS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to remind everybody, the council had a standing request, a motion, that they would request, from the Science Center, to receive an interim analysis information every year on red grouper, and so we have done that for the SSC meeting in February, but that information will not have catch advice for red grouper with it, because we have an ongoing assessment for red grouper, and that is expected to be completed in August, I believe, and would go to our SSC and council after that, and so I don't expect that we'll spend a whole lot of time on it at the SSC meeting, but it is a health check. We will see what that index is doing, and then we'll get that operational assessment here later in the year.

In 2025, we're going to indicate to the Science Center that we think we're going to be working on the results of that operational assessment, and we would not need another interim analysis, and, if that changes, we could always make that change, based on what occurs, but I just wanted to bring that full circle. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any questions? I am not seeing any, and that takes us to the third, and final, item I have for Other Business, and that's the discussion on the 2024 red snapper for-hire season change. I think I wrote that correctly, and, Ms. Boggs, you brought it up.

DISCUSSION OF 2024 RED SNAPPER FOR-HIRE SEASON

MS. BOGGS: Yes, sir, I did, and thank you. I believe it was 2008 when Amendment 27 was passed, that set the red snapper season for charter-for-hire to start on June the $1^{\rm st}$, and, since that time, we've seen lengthening seasons, and, in October of last year, Andy posed, to Captain Walker and I, about, if there were fish remaining, would we want a fall season, and I know some comment at the podium has been they would like to move it back to the spring,

March or May, and, well, we can't do that, because of Amendment 27, and so I thought, well, at least maybe we can look at, for 2024, trying to see if there was some flexibility that we could have with the seasons, if maybe we could request that we have an end date sooner that would allow for another season maybe, and I put out there the Friday before Thanksgiving, but some way to kind of spread out the season, because a lot of the fishermen that I've spoken with, and I've talked to fishermen from Texas, and I've talked to Ed, and I've talked all the way down to Tampa Bay and St. Pete, and they were all willing —

They were all telling me that -- Except Louisiana, I think, was a little on the fence about we don't need red snapper in August, because school goes back, but, when you come into November, and you have people traveling for the holidays, it would be nice to have something to catch.

I have always said what's wrong with leaving a few fish in the water, but I think, if you kind of spread it out, and you open it more towards the November timeframe, and it would give National Marine Fisheries time to get the fourth wave, or the fifth wave, whatever wave that is, the July and August wave in, so they could look at the numbers.

The point to all this too is having kind of a time-certain date that would give NMFS kind of a deadline, and then give the charter-for-hire industry time to advertise, if they are going to have a fall season, and so I did send a motion to staff, but that's the intent of what I'm trying to do here.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Just to make sure that's your motion, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Yes, and it's a little redundant with the for-hire, but I wanted it to be very -- To be understood that this is strictly for the for-hire industry.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. There's a motion on the board. Is there a second to the motion? I am not seeing a second. Mr. Strelcheck seconds. Okay. Any discussion? Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: I think I agree with the spirit of the motion to maybe examine an additional season, and I'm not comfortable, as an individual, selecting the week that industry would like, you know, or whatever additional time, at this time. I think we have to go out and essentially survey the guys, because there are regional differences, and there are seasonal differences.

You know, from my area, pretty much everything is closed in

November, and I would think that my guys would say, yes, if we could -- If there was a good fish that we could target in our charter season, when all our groupers are closed, and amberjack is closed and everything else, they would probably be in favor of it, but I'm, again, reluctant. I think we can reach out and get a more broad opinion before just picking a date. I'm not opposed, but I think we should include more input.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I've got a couple of people that have raised their hands. I've got Mr. Strelcheck and Dr. Banks, but, before -- Just maybe a little administrative thing here, and should you include that this is just for red snapper, to make it clear in the motion? I know the bullet, the section, says the red snapper charter-for-hire season, but this is just for red snapper, and so maybe it ought to be clear in the motion.

MS. BOGGS: Certainly, and to request the Regional Administrator reopen the red snapper for-hire fishery the Friday before Thanksgiving, if it is determined that the red snapper for-hire ACT has not been met. I will say this, and, I mean, we don't have to put a time certain, as far as like the Friday before Thanksgiving, but the intention there was to try to -- The conversation is, and I think, even if October, we were talking about, well, when are we going to find out, and are we going to have enough time to advertise, and that was kind of -- Well, not kind of, but that was the intent of being specific about when to reopen.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Susan talked to me about this, and, you know, for those that may not be aware, there is, obviously, the start date, which is fixed in the regulations at June 1, and the way that the language is written is that NOAA Fisheries will project the length of the season, and determine when it's met, based on the catch target.

The intent here, obviously, is, if there is fish still left on the table, that you're giving direction as to when that general reopening would occur. The key here, and what I was conveying to Susan, is that we will -- We typically get the landings data for the full summer months season in mid-October, or a little bit later than that, and so this gives enough time for the Fisheries Service to review and process that data, determine if the catch target is met, and, if it hasn't been met, then work on getting an announcement out that's going to give at least several weeks, if not longer, for the industry to react to it.

 It also is at least putting a date certain for people to kind of be thinking about, in terms of when it might open, right, but with no quarantee.

The problem that -- I will speak briefly to the broader problem, and I think where the council should really consider going, is whether we want to reconsider the season structure and have that June 1 opening, or start moving that back into May at some point, or even providing like a final cutoff date, as to we want to close on August 15 and then reopen in the fall, if quota is available, and so I think there's a lot of options here, and I don't think we're prepared to talk about it today, but I think it's worth considering.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Banks, then followed by Captain Walker.

DR. BANKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think I agree with the sentiment behind Susan's motion, but I would like to hear, like Ed, from the charter fishery. I've already gotten messages saying that definitely not Thanksgiving, and so, at least from some of the guys in Texas, and so I would like to maybe hear a little more from the charter fishery before we just pick a hard date. In Texas, that's deer and duck season, and a lot of our guys have shifted into hunting, and so --

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: Well, I think it helps a lot, Mr. Strelcheck, that, you know, this is kind of like the earliest, or right up there with as early as it could be done, and I hadn't thought about it that way, and, historically, the week of Thanksgiving is a very busy charter week, where I live anyway, and so earlier would probably be better, once the number is available, for guys to start planning their season, but still we would need some regional input, because what we're saying here is it's either going to be November or December, and those are kind of your two options, right, and so that narrows it down a little bit.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So a couple of things. First, to Kesley's point, I'm very aware of that. I mean, my husband is a deer hunter, and I get it, but, for those that -- But we also -- This is our sole income, and to have the opportunity to -- A multitude of things.

 One, if you leave fish in the water, there was a comment made at another meeting, and I can't remember when, of, well, then give them to another sector, and so, if we're limited to these short

seasons, and we have fish left in the water, to me, it behooves that industry to prove that they can catch those fish, and that's one of my concerns, because, every year -- Well, not every year, but at least the last two years, I believe, we have been under our ACT, and it's not that we, we being the charter-for-hire captains -- They are very capable of catching those fish, given the opportunity to catch those fish, and so that was one of my concerns.

Again, this is a time of year when it's probably not going to have near as much pressure, and it does take some of the pressure off of the fish, because I know, in our port, June and July -- Those fish are hiding. They don't want to be caught, commercially or recreationally or otherwise, and I would not be opposed to, you know, take out the Friday before Thanksgiving, but, again, to Andy's point, that just kind of gives people an idea of having time to -- To be aware of when to maybe be looking for this opening.

If you push it back to April, you can get public comment, and that's fine, and I just was trying to do something that might be in place for the 2024 season, if possible. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: To that point, Dr. Banks?

DR. BANKS: Yes, thank you. Again, I agree with the sentiment. I am just saying, and I want to clarify, and, when I say it's deer and duck season, our charter guys are running guided duck hunts, and now they're doing guided deer hunts, and I am speaking about the charter fleet and not personal hunting excursions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. I have several folks. I have Mr. Dugas, Mr. Gill, Captain Walker, and Mr. Schieble.

MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Susan, I think I see the intent here, and I'm not ready to take a vote on certain days of Thanksgiving at this moment, and I would prefer us to bring this back in April, give us some time to think about it, to talk to the industry, get their public comment, and then we can maybe make a better-informed decision, but I'm okay to do something.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with J.D., and the second half is that Andy mentioned there's really a broader question here, and so maybe this ought to be two steps, one to address this question and the other later on, longer-term, to develop whether we want to change the frontend of the season, but J.D. is spot-on.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Captain Walker.

MR. WALKER: If I could ask Andy a question. The potential dates this might even possible would be November and December, or is there maybe a little bit more than that?

MR. STRELCHECK: I would say mid-November is probably the earliest, because you're going to want to give people some time to plan for it, right, and, when I say time, a couple of weeks notice. It's obviously under my authority that I can reopen at any point in time, right, if the catch target is not met, and, typically, there's landings that trickle in still, you know, after the seasons have closed, and so we've done a pretty good job of harvesting the catch target in the recent years, at projecting the season, but, yes, I would say mid-November is probably the absolutely earliest, and then all the way into December.

MR. WALKER: So we're talking about a six-week window here, and I don't know how long duck and deer season is in each state, and then I know we have Christmas at the end there, and so it's a smaller window than we might have thought, and so my thought would probably be the earlier in that part the better, but, again, more input is probably required, but it's not as open of a door as you think, and it's a narrow window to select what works best.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I can see the intent of the motion, and we can work on this, and maybe adjust it a little bit, and I might be in support of it overall, but I agree that I don't like picking a specific time upfront. We hear a lot of feedback, from our charter fleet, about they don't like how our state charters are able to get an earlier season at the beginning of the spring, before the federal for-hire fleet gets out there on June 1, and so I might be suggestive of we look at the frontend of the season as well, because they don't like them targeting the snapper before they get a shot at it.

 I'm also having a sense of déjà vu here, because I feel like we're talking about Amendment 50 discussions all over again, when we had the federal for-hire fleet included in some of the Amendment 50 individual state plans, when we went down the road of deciding state management, and this was part of the very reason we had them included in there in the first part, so that the individual states could decide when they wanted to have the federal for-hire season. I'm not trying to resurrect old dirt here, but I'm just saying that it seems like the same discussion.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, to be clear, this is specific to 2024, because the council would have to take action to change the season structure, and this allows -- It provides direction to me that I can consider, in terms of reopening. If there is fish on the table, when we get those landings in mid-October, it will be up to me to decide then when do we reopen, and, if your guidance says, well, we would prefer mid-November, versus before Thanksgiving, versus after Thanksgiving, that's an informative -- You know, it's information for me to make a decision.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I guess, to that point, Andy, administratively - I mean, let's assume a motion with this intent, or this particular motion, is passed here, and you come back with a formalized document, a presentation, for April, and assume it gets passed then, and, I mean, you're still looking at a six-month window in order to be able to put that through for 2024, or --

MR. STRELCHECK: Nothing would have to be done for this year's season, if this passed, because it's just a request, and so we would do our projections, open on June 1, and close when we think the catch target is going to be met, and then we'll assess if it wasn't met, and there is poundage, and then reopen based on whatever fish are left on the table, and we could start it at any time in that kind of mid-November or later window.

If we start it earlier, and have a lot of fish on the table, that potentially maximizes the season length. If you start it later, you might not catch all the quota, because you've just started it too late in the year to finish the quota.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Schieble.

MR. SCHIEBLE: This is just a question, and so we had this scenario two years ago, right, where we had the season closed, and there was a little bit left over, and we reopened, and when was that? Can you remind me? It was October, wasn't it, that we reopened? Right?

MR. STRELCHECK: Sure.

44 MR. SCHIEBLE: So isn't there the potential for that to happen 45 again?

47 MR. STRELCHECK: I work with three councils. You think I remember 48 all of that?

MR. SCHIEBLE: You remember an awful lot, and so I guess my point is we have an amberjack season coming up in September and October, and I would think, if we could have this in October, it would make more sense.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I think I recall there was some extenuating circumstance with that fall reopening, like a hurricane or something like that, that caused, you know, a disruption in landings, and so it was under that scenario, and so any other questions, comments, discussion about the motion on the board? Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Since I think this was a great discussion, and I seconded it for discussion, I think, if Susan is willing, I would recommend that we just pull this down and, you know, come back to this discussion in April.

MS. BOGGS: In Andy's words, sure.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Great. I don't have any other business listed. Dr. Sweetman.

DISCUSSION ON FLORIDA KEYS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

DR. SWEETMAN: Just really quick, Mr. Chair, and so I just wanted to highlight that we heard, during public comment, a request for a brief discussion about the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, and, since I'm involved in that, I figured that I might, just really at a high level, give something here.

I don't really want to get too into the weeds, but there's been a little bit of an issue recently that relates to authorities to implement fisheries regulations within the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, in both state and federal waters. The protocol, and the procedures, for which those fisheries regulations are implemented within the sanctuary -- They are outlined within the protocol for cooperative fisheries management.

The Gulf Council, South Atlantic Council, FWC, and the sanctuary -- We've been kind of actively working to try and update these agreements, since they are presently outdated, and you may recall previous discussion that we've had at the council level, and from the public, about the importance of the definition of "traditional fishing" that's housed within that cooperative fisheries management protocol, and so I just kind of wanted to highlight that.

 All of this is extremely important. We've been kind of actively working on the protocol for cooperative fisheries management, but we feel like we need to get some of these issues resolved, as it relates to authorities, before we move a little bit more forward on that and finalize the protocol, and, just from discussions with Carrie and other council staff, I do know that -- I do believe that this item will come before the council again, at least one more time, and so that's all I wanted to say, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you for the update. Anyone else? Is that it? All right. Well, we'll go ahead and finish Full Council. Thank you, everyone. Save travels, and we'll see you next time. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on February 1, 2024.)