1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	295 <sup>TH</sup> MEETING
4	THE COUNCIL SESSION
5 6	FULL COUNCIL SESSION
7	The Battle House Renaissance Mobile, Alabama
8 9	JUNE 7-8, 2023
10	
11 12	VOTING MEMBERS         Greg StunzTexas
13	Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)Alabama
14	Susan BoggsAlabama
15	Billy BroussardLouisiana
16	Dale DiazMississippi
17	Phil DyskowFlorida
18	Tom FrazerFlorida
19	Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas
20	Michael McDermottMississippi
21	Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks)Louisiana
22	Bob ShippAlabama
23	Joe SpragginsMississippi
24	Andy StrelcheckNMFS
25	C.J. SweetmanFlorida
26	Troy WilliamsonTexas
27	
28	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
29	Dave Donaldson
30 31	LTJG Shelby ThrelkeldUSCG
32	STAFF
33	Assane DiagneEconomist
34	Matt FreemanEconomist
35	John FroeschkeDeputy Director
36	Beth HagerAdministrative Officer
37	Lisa HollenseadFishery Biologist
38	Mary LevyNOAA General Counsel
39	Natasha Mendez-FerrerFishery Biologist
40	Emily MuehlsteinPublic Information Officer
41	Ryan RindoneLead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
42	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
43	Carrie Simmons Executive Director
44 45	Carly SomersetFisheries Outreach Specialist
45 46	OTHER PARTICIPANTS
40 47	Austin AbramsPanama City, FI
48	Greg Abrams
- 0	oregrame

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Nicole Beckham Charlie Bergmann Jane Black-Lee Randy Boggs James Bruce	
8	John Caraway	-
9		Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance
10		
11 12		AL
13	<b>-</b>	Leesville, LA
14		Madeira Beach, FL
15		FL
16		
17		
18	Richard Fischer	
19		Leesville, LA
20	Ken Haddad	ASA, FL
21		Pew Charitable Trusts
22		AL DCNR
23		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
24		NMFS
25		
26		Nokomis, FL
27		Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance
28 29		FL
30		FLNMFS
31	<u>-</u>	LA
32		
33	<b>=</b>	NOAA OLE
34	<u> </u>	
35		Panama City, FL
36		Panama City, FL
37		SEFSC
38	Sean Powers	AL
39	Charlie Renier	FL
40	Matthew Sexton	Naples, FL
41		Leeville, LA
42	<u>-</u>	Ocean Springs, MS
43		
44		AL
45	<b>-</b>	
46	Jim Zurbrick	Steinhatchee, FL
47 48		
48 49	_	
せり		2

	TABLE OF CONTENTS
Tabl∈	e of Motions
Call	to Order, Announcements, and Introductions
Adopt	tion of Agenda and Approval of Minutes
Droge	ontations.
rrese	Update on the Commission's Recently-Finished Red Drum
	Fishery Profile
	Presentation on EFP from Mote Marine Lab
	NOAA Fisheries Request for Comments on Advance Notice of
	Proposed Rulemaking for National Standard Guidelines 4,
	8, and 9
	Update from BOEM on Wind Energy Development in the GOM
C	unting Tarangias Hadata
Suppo	orting Agencies Update
	NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE)
	Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission
	U.S. Coast Guard
	South Atlantic Council Liaison
Award	l
Momer	nt of Silence in Memory of Bill Teehan
Counc	cil Member Recognitions
Commi	ttee Reports  Ecosystem Committee Report
	Ecosystem Committee Report
	Data Collection Committee Report
U.S.	Coast Guard Agency Update (continued)
Close	ed Session Report
D 1 7 '	
Publi	c Comment
Commi	ttee Reports (continued)
	ttee Reports (continued)
	Exempted Fishing Permit
Other	Business
OCHEL	Disbanding IFQ and Shrimp Focus Groups
	Istan Depending National Standards A. O. and O.

Letter Regarding National Standards 4, 8, and 9......112

1	Litigation Update114
2	
3	Committee Reports (continued)115
4	Law Enforcement Committee Report115
5	Sustainable Fisheries Committee Report
6	Reef Fish Committee Report140
7	
8	Adjournment
9	
10	
11	

<u>PAGE 46</u>: Motion to direct the Ecosystem Technical Committee to remove offshore wind energy and achieving optimum yield for the reef fish complex from the working list of FEIs. <u>The motion carried on page 46</u>.

<u>PAGE 47</u>: Motion to direct the ETC to develop the red tide FEI and come back with management options for gag, red grouper, and other affected species by June of 2024. The motion was withdrawn on page 49.

<u>PAGE 110</u>: Motion to recommend approval of the Mote Marine Laboratory's EFP. The motion carried on page 111.

<u>PAGE 111</u>: Motion to disband the Shrimp and IFQ Focus Groups. The motion carried on page 112.

PAGE 118: Motion that the council requests that the LETC, at its upcoming October meeting, research all IFQ Red Snapper advanced landing notifications from 2022, among all five Gulf States, and formulate a comparison report of the proportion of inspected to non-inspected red snapper IFQ landings subsequent proportion of amended landings reports for each category and the quantity of pounds amended by category. Further, provide a comparison of the number of non-inspected amended landing reports that adjusted poundage higher versus lower along with the frequency of occurrence and the magnitude of adjustments in pounds and whether any patterns exist. addition, the report should include incidents of mismatched reports and amended landing reports as to the relationship of the dealer and the fishermen being the same entity. should provide a report back to the council at its January 2024 meeting in the Law Enforcement Committee. The motion carried on page 120.

<u>PAGE 123</u>: Motion to direct staff to write a letter to NOAA Fisheries outlining the council's concerns as they relate to the proposed Rice's whale petition. The motion carried on page 124.

PAGE 146: Motion to use the following goals and objectives discussed during the Reef Fish Committee meeting to initiate a plan amendment: Goal 1: Improve opportunities for participants to enter the program. Objectives: to evaluate the merits of limiting share ownership and implement, if appropriate, alternative mechanisms for equitably redistributing shares and allocation to accounts harvesting IFQ species; limit share

ownership (maintaining and obtaining shares) to accounts that are harvesting IFQ species; identify barriers inhibiting limiting participation by surveying participants and those wanting to enter the fishery; create an allocation bank to reduce barriers to fishing privileges. Goal 2: Reduce IFQ discards. Objectives: improve collection of discard information from IFO vessels; create an allocation bank to further reduce bycatch and discards of IFQ species; evaluate additional or new flexibility measures to reduce discards. Goal 3: Maintain flexible fishing options and economic stability within the IFQ Programs. Goal 4: Increase IFQ market transparency (eliminates information asymmetries). Goal 5: Reduce costs per unit Staff develop an additional objective under Goal 1 to address the inheritability of shares and their ownership in perpetuity. A proposed objective is as follows: recover and redistribute IFQ shares and allocation held previously by a deceased shareholder to accounts of fishermen currently harvesting IFQ species. The motion carried on page 151.

<u>PAGE 151</u>: Motion to discontinue work on Reef Fish Amendments 36B and 36C. The motion carried on page 152.

PAGE 153: Motion to approve Framework Action-Recalibration of Red Snapper Recreational Catch Limits and Modification of Gray Snapper Catch Limits and forward it to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 154.

<u>PAGE 155</u>: Motion in Action 1 to move Alternatives 2 and 4 to Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 156.

<u>PAGE 157</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 3 the preferred. The motion carried on page 157.

PAGE 157: Motion in Action 1 to move Alternative 5 to Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 157.

PAGE 161: Motion in Action 2 to add an Alternative 5 to establish a commercial trip limit of eight fish. The motion carried on page 163.

 $\underline{\text{PAGE 164}}$ : Motion in Action 2 to move Alternative 2 to 46 Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 164.

PAGE 164: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 5 the
preferred. The motion failed on page 167.

<u>PAGE 167</u>: Motion to direct staff to modify the amendment for scamp and yellowmouth grouper OFLs, ABCs, and ACLs to include black grouper and yellowfin grouper SSC catch recommendations. In the amendment consideration should be given also to implications to the IFQ fishery involving the shallow water grouper complex. The motion carried on page 168.

  $\underline{\text{PAGE 169}}$ : Motion to consider removal of wenchman from the Reef Fish FMP and to set ACLs and AMs for the remaining species in the midwater snapper complex (blackfin snapper, queen snapper, and silk snapper). The motion carried on page 169.

<u>PAGE 170</u>: Motion to approve Draft Amendment 56: Modifications to the Gag Grouper Catch Limits, Sector Allocations, and Fishing Seasons and forward it to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 174.

- - -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at The Battle House Renaissance in Mobile, Alabama on Wednesday morning, June 7, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

prepped and ready, I need to read our normal opening statement

Greg Stunz, 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. Please be advised that alcoholic

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

It looks like we're a little ahead of

meeting of the Gulf Council. My name is

4 5

2

3

6 7

8 CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ: 9 schedule, which is good, and maybe to save a little time for tomorrow and expedite that up, and we're going to move a few 10 11 things up in the agenda, and we'll start Full Council, and I've 12 got a statement to read here first in just a second, but, before 13 I do that, we have some announcements and recognitions and other things, and I think we'll hold off on that until some more 14 15 people are here, and we'll do that when it's normally scheduled, 16 but we'll start off now with some presentations that we had scheduled on that Item IV in the agenda, and so Steve VanderKooy 17 is going to give the first one, but, while that's getting 18

into the record.

Welcome to the 295th

20 21 22

23

19

29 30 31

32

33

34

35 36 37

42

43 44 45

46

47 48

The council has seventeen voting members, eleven of whom are

appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and include individuals

benefit for the nation.

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

beverages are not permitted in the meeting room.

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

8

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 room. We accept only one registration per person. Public comment may end before the published agenda item 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, we will call attendance for the council members attending virtually first. After this is completed, members in the room should identify himself or herself, starting on my left. We will first go with those online, and so is Bob Shipp online?

DR. BOB SHIPP: Bob Shipp, Alabama.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Bob. Andy, are you still there? It doesn't sound like it. Is Bob Gill?

27 MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck, NOAA Fisheries Southeast 28 Regional Office.

30 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Andy, and we don't have Bob Gill on 31 the line, and so we'll go to in-person. Tom, if you would like 32 to start, please.

DR. TOM FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.

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

38 MR. PHIL DYSKOW: Phil Dyskow, Florida.

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

43 MR. DALE DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.

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

47 MR. MICHAEL MCDERMOTT: Michael McDermott, Mississippi.

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

3 MR. PETER HOOD: Peter Hood, Southeast Regional Office.

5 DR. CLAY PORCH: Clay Porch, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

7 MR. CHESTER BREWER: Chester Brewer, and I'm the liaison from the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

10 MR. KEVIN ANSON: Kevin Anson, Alabama.

12 MS. SUSAN BOGGS: Susan Boggs, Alabama.

14 MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE: Chris Schieble, Louisiana. 

16 MR. BILLY BROUSSARD: Billy Broussard, Louisiana.

18 MR. TROY WILLIAMSON: Troy Williamson, Texas.

20 MR. DAKUS GEESLIN: Dakus Geeslin, Texas. 

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Carrie Simmons, Gulf Council staff.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, everyone, and so we'll take care of a few items of business here, and the first will be the Approval of the Minutes from last time. If everyone has reviewed those minutes, is there any edits or any suggestions for changes for the minutes? Seeing none, I guess we need to have a motion for approval of those minutes.

DR. SWEETMAN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: It's so moved by C.J., and it's seconded by General Spraggins. Is there any opposition to that motion? Seeing none, we'll consider that the minutes are approved. The next step will be Adoption of the Agenda. Are there any items that need to be modified in the agenda, or any Other Business items? Carrie.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could we add, under Other Business, a short discussion of disbanding the IFQ Focus Group and the Shrimp Focus Group?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you. We've got that. Anything else for Other Business? Are there any other agenda items? Could we please get a motion to approve the agenda, please? It's moved by General Spraggins, and I need a second for that.

It's seconded by C.J. Sweetman. Okay. Any opposition to approval of the agenda? Seeing none, we'll consider the agenda approved. Thank you, everyone.

Moving on, then we'll start with the presentations and go in order there, and the first one up is an Update on the Commission's Recently-Finished Red Drum Fishery Profile, and so, if you all want to pull up that presentation on the screen, please, and Mr. VanderKooy is here and ready. As soon as they get that up, you're set. For those following, that will be Tab A, Number 7.

#### **PRESENTATIONS**

## UPDATE ON THE COMMISSION'S RECENTLY-FINISHED RED DRUM FISHERY PROFILE

 MR. STEVE VANDERKOOY: Thank you. I'm sure that most of you are very familiar with red drum at this point, and so I'm not going to go into too much detail, but I will provide a high-level overview of this management profile, which we completed and made available this past January at Gulf States.

First, for those who don't know me, I'm Steve VanderKooy, and I direct the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Program, which helps to coordinate management of our fisheries in state waters. To that end, we developed regional management plans to assist our partner agencies when dealing with shared nearshore species. Our FMPs were tailored to mimic the federal plans.

The commission has produced FMPs for a number of fisheries, with multiple revisions over time, and these include fisheries like blue crabs, oysters, Gulf menhaden, just to name a few. However, in recent years, the designation of a fishery management plan has become confused, especially with regard to their intent and authority. They are, in fact, not equivalent to a federal plan, and so we developed a new approach and began to produce species profiles instead of FMPs.

The new profiles are either biological profiles, for those which have limited management, such as Atlantic croaker and tripletail, and then also management profiles for those with well-established histories of state or federal oversight. We are currently working on a biological profile for mangrove snapper, but our most recent management profile is the red drum in the Gulf of Mexico.

The red drum taskforce had its introductory meeting in June of 2019, and it was just beginning to gain some momentum as COVID

hit. Needless to say, we did still manage to work on the document, albeit it slowly, until things returned to normal.

The profile provides a comprehensive review for the species and the associated fisheries, and we explored as much of the published literature that we could find and provided the detailed accounting of the critical components related to the population in the Gulf specifically. This includes their biology and physiology as well as their distribution.

The profile includes all the relevant research, past and present, and hopefully can be beneficial in future management and assessment of the stock. The profile gives a state-by-state history of the commercial and recreational activities leading to the management scheme that we have today.

With the elimination of the commercial fisheries on red drum, we also detail the source of fish that are imported into the U.S. from the rest of the world and characterize the history of domestic aquaculture, as well as stock enhancement, in our own waters.

 One of the more useful portions of the profile is the research needs, which we produce after the extensive literature review. The list provides direction for potential research for students, as well as the resource agencies. In addition, the commission is able to provide numerous unpublished, or otherwise gray literature, that wouldn't be available in most peer-reviewed journals. The red drum profile we finished, the reference section includes just a little over 600 individual references.

The profile, and all the commission publications, can be found on our website, and they are organized by program and category, such as annual reports, past minutes, or enforcement, and you can find most of the literature that we have used in the past, in our FMPs and profiles as well, and it includes the holdings for the Gunter Library at GCRL. You can access any of that. If you go to our main page, under About, you can find publications, and the page you see there is the general list. On the upperright, there's a bibliography search, and, in that, you can find all of those additional publications that we have internally used, as well as, like I said, GCRL, and we're happy to assist in locating publications, when we can. That's it. Thank you, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Steve. Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for the presentation, Steve. On Slide 6,

when you look at the recreational harvest, for 2015 through 2019, Louisiana shows no catch?

MR. VANDERKOOY: These are the landings that are derived from the NOAA MRIP program, and that's because Louisiana is part of LA Creel, and you also don't have Texas landings, because they have their own survey, and so that's -- There is other ways that we represent that in the document, and this was just an initial approach, using NOAA numbers.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Are there other questions for Steve? Phil.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Perhaps Carrie can better explain this, but what is the overlapping authority, if any, between the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and the Gulf Fishery Management Council, and where is the overlapping authorities?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: We're kind of looking at you, Mara and Steve, or Dave.

MR. DONALDSON: I will take a stab at that. Essentially, there isn't any. I mean, we sit on this body as a non-voting member, and the commission has no regulatory authority. We defer to the states, each of the individual Gulf states, to have that management authority, and we just provide a forum to look at things on a regional basis, and so there really isn't any overlapping authority.

 MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could I ask a follow-up question? I am just trying to educate myself here, and what then was the purpose of this analysis of red drum? I am just trying to learn something here.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, as Steve pointed out, with the IJF program, we look at species on a regional basis, and it just provides guidance to the states, and that's why we've moved away from FMPs, because there was some misunderstanding that we had these FMPs, and it was like, well, how come you're not implementing these recommendations, and the short answer was, well, they're recommendations, and they're not — Unlike the Gulf Council, we don't have the authority to implement it, and it's trying to look at a species on a regional basis, instead of state-by-state, but so that's why, and, each year, our state-federal group gets together and develops a list, or has a list, of species for future development. As Steve mentioned, we're doing mangrove snapper right now.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Carrie.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think these are really nice bodies of work, and we're kind of doing something similar with our fisheries science page, and, for some of the species that are not federally-managed, it's nice to have that body of work, and we could have the Education and Outreach Committee maybe look at how we could link our website to your profiles for some additional information, and so we could have staff work on that, and tell the council where we land.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I think that's a great suggestion, Carrie, so we can point people to that document, and is there any other questions? Steve, having worked on my dissertation on red drum, many years ago, I read this document, and you all did a great job putting this together, and it's nice to see all the recent information summarized in one place, and so I'm confident that this will get a lot of traction, and so thanks for putting that together. If there is no other questions -- Dale.

 MR. DIAZ: I was just, real quickly, going to comment on Mr. Dyskow's question. One thing that I think goes beyond, I think, authorities is, the way things are set up now, in my view, is a really good partnership between the council and federal management and state management, because, without Gulf States coordinating all the data collection, that the states are collecting, it would be really hard to deal with the volume of data that we have, and so I really like the way it's set up now, and I think it's a good forum for the states to work together, and learn from each other also, and so, anyway, under Dave's leadership, I will say that the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission has been a wonderful partner for us, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Dale. All right. Steve, thank you. It looks like we'll move on to the next agenda item, and so, Peter Hood -- If you're ready, Peter, do you want to tell us about this exempted fishing permit for Mote Marine Lab, if you're prepared, and that's Tab A-8, if we want to pull that up.

### PRESENTATION ON EFP FROM MOTE MARINE LAB

MR. HOOD: Okay. We received an application for an exempted fishing permit from Mr. Max Lee and Ms. Carole Neidig from Mote Marine Lab. They are looking at an optimized retention management system for red grouper, and the funding they're

operating under is from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, or NFWF, and what their research has found is that, you know, from six years of monitoring data, they basically found that, in waters less than thirty-five fathoms, they get more undersized fish than in deeper waters, and so outside of thirty-five fathoms, but, you know, as we would expect, the deeper you go, the more likely the discarded fish are going to die.

The goal of this project is to try to improve catch utilization and eliminate red grouper discards in high-mortality spatial areas, by allowing for research-scale retention of undersized red grouper, with minimal impacts to the stock and improved sustainability for the fishery as a whole.

What the EFP proposes to do is allow the possession, sale, and purchase of a limited number of undersized red grouper, and so they're looking for no more than 3,000 pounds, which translates to a little over a thousand fish. These fish would be harvested seaward of a line approximating the thirty-five-fathom contour on three federally-permitted commercial vessels with eastern Gulf reef fish bottom longline endorsements, and what they would be using is the thirty-five fathom summer bottom longline closure that's on the books, and so that's how they would know whether they were inside or outside of thirty-five fathoms.

The EFP would exempt harvest activities from federal regulations specific to the commercial red grouper size limit, which is a minimum size limit of eighteen inches total length, and so, in other words, they're requesting to land fish that are less than eighteen inches. The vessels would be equipped with electronic monitoring systems, which use multiple cameras and sensors to record fishing activity, catch, and discards. All trips made by the three vessels would include 100 percent video review, using established and approved protocols to verify fishing and project activity.

The operators of the vessel would be able to land the undersized red grouper, and landings would be, you know, limited to that cumulative cap of 3,000 pounds that I mentioned. Undersized red grouper harvested through the study would be fitted with unique tags supplied to each vessel for the project, and the tag would facilitate dockside sorting, where the tagged, undersized red grouper would be weighed separately, to ensure that the poundage from these fish is counted towards that 3,000-pound limit.

The undersized red grouper would be weighed and processed through the IFQ system and assigned their own separate category

in a weigh-out ticket, and, that way, they could know of any pricing differences from the rest of the IFQ catch from a particular trip, and then I would also mention that the researchers are working with FWC, so that, should their port samplers meet -- Any of the trips that would be covered under the EFP, they would be able to obtain biological samples, like ageing structures, from those fish, and that's something that FWC staff has indicated that they would really like to get.

Then I would also mention that they plan on directly contacting both state and federal law enforcement, so they're aware of any trips, and they have already opened up lines of communication with those folks. We did send the EFP application out for review to the Center and state agencies and the Coast Guard, and the Center, found that the request contained all necessary information and constitute activities appropriate for further consideration.

If approved, the EFP would be effective from January 1, 2024 through December 31 of 2024 or until the project vessels have retained that combined 2,000-pound limit, and then I would just say that both Mr. Lee and Ms. Neidig are in the audience, and so, if there are any questions specific to the EFP, they would be happy to answer those, and that's what I have, and so what we're looking for from you is basically -- I guess it would be an endorsement of us approving this EFP. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Well, thank you for that summary, Peter, and yes, and, for those of you that don't know, we recommend approval to the agency, who gives the final approval for this, and so I think the best thing to do for right now, Peter, is ask questions of you, or the EFP applicants, if there is any, and then, tomorrow, I think we probably should hear if there's any public comment on this application, before we make any type of recommendation or approval, and I have a slot in the agenda for tomorrow to do that, after we have a little more, but now would be a good time to ask any questions of Peter, or others, if there are any, regarding this permit.

Well, I'm not seeing any, and so thank you, Peter, and then we'll just make a final recommendation, and you all think about that between now and tomorrow. Andy, go ahead, please.

MR. STRELCHECK: Greg, not a question, just a comment. I mean, I really like this exempted fishing permit, and I would ask for the council's support. I think it really mirrors nicely the conversation we had yesterday about the IFQ program goals and objectives and reducing bycatch, and it's an opportunity to do

some innovative work to evaluate new ways of managing the fishery, and so I just wanted to comment on that and connect it to, obviously, our discussion yesterday.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thank you, Andy. I am not seeing any more questions or comments around the table here in-person, and so, with that, we'll go ahead and move on to the next agenda item, and we might skip a presentation. Is Ms. Macpherson here?

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Yes.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: She is? Okay. Well, sorry, I didn't see you earlier, and so you're up next, and so that's going to be Tab A, Number 9(a), and (b) as well, and she's going to give us a presentation regarding NOAA's Fisheries Request for Comments and Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for National Standard Guidelines 4, 8, and 9. Thank you, Marian, and it looks like your presentation is ready to go, and so, whenever you're ready, go ahead.

# NOAA FISHERIES REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON ADVANCE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING FOR NATIONAL STANDARD GUIDELINES 4, 8, AND 9

MS. MARIAN MACPHERSON: Thank you. Hi, and I'm Marian Macpherson from National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Sustainable Fisheries, and I'm here today to talk to you about our advance notice of proposed rulemaking for the Magnuson Act's National Standards 4, 8, and 9.

Our objective here is to inform you about an advance notice that we published on May 15 to inform you that we're considering updating our guidance that we have to interpret the Magnuson Act and these three National Standards, 4, 8, and 9. Our goal here is to solicit input on whether we need to update these guidelines, and, specifically, we do have some specific issues that we would like input on addressing.

 Just to provide a little bit of background, a refresher probably for most of you, the three National Standards that we're looking at in the Magnuson Act are National Standard 4, which deals with allocations, and it provides that management measures shall not discriminate between the residents of different states, and, if it's necessary to allocate, then the allocation must be fair and equitable, reasonably promoted to promote conservation, and also not create excessive shares for any individual or entity.

National Standard 8 focuses on fishing communities and requires that we take into account the importance of fishery resources to

fishing communities, and in order to provide for sustained participation of these communities and, to the extent practicable, minimize adverse economic impacts on them.

Then National Standard 9 focuses on bycatch, and the requirement there is to minimize, to the extent practical, first of all, the bycatch itself, and then, to the extent that bycatch cannot be avoided, minimize the mortality, and so that's what we have in the Magnuson Act, and then NMFS has provided additional interpretations in our guidance on how to apply and comply with these National Standards, and so, periodically, we update this guidance, as is appropriate, to reflect changes in the statute or evolving fisheries management needs.

 The last updates that we've done for these three particular standards, National Standard 4 was twenty-five years ago, in 1998, and National Standards 8 and 9 were fifteen years ago, in 2008.

Our current focus right now is on two challenges that we're facing, climate and the environmental equity and justice goals, and so, first, in terms of climate, we've got changing ocean conditions that are affecting location and productivity of fish stocks, and, also, it's changing how interactions with bycatch and protected species are occurring, and these changes can have impacts on fisheries on and the fishing communities. It can cause social and economic and other types of impacts, and so we understand the importance of updating management to address current and anticipated needs and conditions, and this includes addressing dynamic stock conditions and changing conditions.

 In terms of equity and environmental justice, this is a big priority for our administration, and NMFS is committed to advancing equity and environmental justice, including equal treatment, opportunities, environmental benefits for all people and fishing communities, while building on continuing efforts and partnerships with underserved and underrepresented fishing communities, and so I'll have more details about the interaction between these challenges and our National Standard Guidelines on the next few slides.

Starting off with the climate issues, starting with the National Standard 4 Guidelines, since environmental changes are affecting our stock distributions and abundances and have the potential to change the applicability of how we're using historical information and how relevant current regulations are, these are things that you're going to want to look at, in terms of

climate, and so, in terms of allocations that have already been established by councils, most of them are highly complex and supported by extensive analyses, and many of these have relied heavily, or at least included consideration, on documented catch over specific time periods, and so this is very important to help participants maintain access to the resources they've been dependent on.

However, it's also important to consider needs of other users, such as new fishermen who would like to enter the fishery, fishermen who have been displaced from other fisheries, and/or existing fishermen who are catching these species in historic fishing grounds, and so NMFS is considering whether updates to our guidance would help encourage allocation decisions that balance the needs of these different user groups for updating and creating allocations, including for stocks that are shifting or have shifted.

We are considering how to -- What approaches there are for better balancing access for historic users, marginalized individuals who may have been excluded inequitably, and new users in allocation decisions. We're also considering whether revisions are needed to reinforce NMFS' 2016 Allocation Policy requirement that councils conduct periodic reviews of allocations, and so we're also looking at whether to provide additional guidance on the types of documentation to consider, for example spatial allocations between sectors or gears, different mixtures of historic use, and dynamic allocation schemes.

Now to focus on communities and bycatch, in terms of the climate challenge, in light of how environmental changes are affecting stock distributions and abundances and creating challenges for communities that have been dependent on these resources, NMFS is requesting comments on options for updating our guidance to better account for these changes and improve the ability of communities to adapt.

We're also requesting comments on options for updating the National Standard 9 guidance to account for bycatch that results from changes in interactions between fisheries and/or protected resources, due to environmental change.

Now, shifting over to our equity and environmental justice topic, National Standard 4 and allocations, we're requesting input on whether the National Standard 4 Guidelines need to be updated to provide guidance on approaches for considering underserved communities, previously-excluded entrants, and new

entrants in our allocation decisions, and, also, we're seeking input on the types of documentation and analysis that should be considered, to be sure that our allocation decisions are fair and equitable, and so we know that these decisions are difficult, and controversial, given the history, traditions, financial expenditures that current participants have already put out, and we're just requesting input on how we would need to make future adjustments or to existing allocations, or both.

Talking about National Standard 8, communities, in terms of equity and environmental justice, we are committed to serving stakeholders equitably, by engaging underserved communities in science, conservation, and management of the nation's fisheries, and we're looking at how the National Standard 8 Guidelines have been interpreted, particularly in terms of the term "fishing community" and how our guidance may further interpret that beyond what is in the statute.

The Magnuson Act itself has a definition of "fishing community", which is a community that is substantially dependent on or substantially engaged in fishing, and this includes vessel owners, operators, crew, and fish processors that are based in such community. In our interpretation, in the guidelines, we have interpreted that we should have a place-based requirement. A community must be a specific location, and our guidance has focused on the dependency aspect more so than on engagement.

 Now we're looking at whether our interpretations need to be updated, whether we should remove that place-based community members that the community members must reside in a specific location, and this could allow for a fishing community that's based on its characteristics, rather than its location. For example, the community might be the community of charter fishermen targeting Atlantic cod.

The other aspect of this is balancing the concepts of dependence and engagement, and so, as stocks are shifting, or decreasing, communities are going to need to adapt, and so this could imply a need to move away from focusing on historic dependence and looking at a community's level of engagement and the ability to target things that are coming into place, and so shifting from dependence to engagement is under consideration, and we're interested in thoughts on how this could build up communities' economic resilience and help preserve communities as fishing communities into the future.

We're also interested in ideas for appropriate measures for improving climate, addressing social and climate vulnerability

in communities, and so we're considering removing -- Sorry. Backing up to the previous slide, I just wanted to mention that this is something that we're considering removing, and there's a statement in the National Standard 10 Guidelines that says that National Standard 8, on its own, does not provide a basis for allocating to a specific community, and we're thinking that this text may be unnecessary and confusing, given that National Standard 8 doesn't provide or prevent that, and there could be rationale under other provisions of the Magnuson Act, and we think it's possibly blurry, having it in this location of our guidance.

In terms of a complex between fisheries and gears, we're aware that, you know, there can be geographic overlaps in areas where species are caught. Relevant to the National Standard 9 guidance, a situation where there's bycatch in one fishery that has negative impacts on another fishery, usually due to a mortality limit on a shared stock, and so this issue can be even more complicated when one of these fisheries is important for an underserved community, and so we're welcoming input on how the National Standard 9 Guidelines could be modified to minimize bycatch in a manner that's equitable across all the fisheries and gear types and also on ways of how we could better balance the needs of bycatch and target fisheries that is equitable across fisheries and gear types, especially when more and more of the fisheries are important for underserved communities.

There are other fisheries and management issues relevant to National Standards 4, 8, and 9 that are not necessarily covered under these two topics of climate and EEJ, and one of them is considering a practicability standard that could be included in National Standard 9, and so we would be considering, you know, whether we could add provisions to address bycatch on an ecosystem level, as opposed to single species, how we would go about developing, or implementing, alternative performance-based standards to help us avoid bycatch, and/or increasing the provisions to document bycatch avoidance.

 Another issue that we're aware of, and are taking input on, is the concept of reducing waste, and so we're aware about some regulations that help us avoid bycatch that result in regulatory discards, which is a waste of fish, and we're trying to think of, you know, ways that we could improve that situation, and so we're looking for input on how we could create incentives to reduce the waste, including innovations to decrease bycatch, decrease bycatch mortality, or incentives that could increase use, while still avoiding the catch of an overfished or low-productivity stock.

This is just our schedule of where we've been and where we're going, and we're here today talking to you about what is in our advance notice of proposed rulemaking, and the purpose of that document is to help us decide whether to undertake these revisions that I've told you about, and so, to the extent that you have ideas that you can contribute, we'll be considering those and making any decision about whether to move forward, and then, if we do move forward, what will go into it.

The public comment period on this is open until September 12, and, if a determination is to move forward with a proposed rule, we would start working on that in the fall, and that is it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Marian, and I will open it up for questions here in just a second, but, from a council perspective, in terms of what we need to do here, and so maybe to help guide your questions, first, I thought perhaps Tom or I could deal with this, writing a letter on our behalf, but, after your presentation, Marian, I think those three National Standards do have a lot of implications of what we're talking about around this table, particularly the recreational motion that Andy put forward a few meetings ago, and, of course, we've been talking a lot of bycatch, and well, really, a lot of things, and so I think maybe it would be good if we all thought about that.

We can get our thoughts together and put this back on the agenda for the August meeting, and maybe have a draft letter at that point, and then we would still have time to meet your September deadline of putting that through, and so, for you all, that's kind of, I think, maybe the general plan, but, with that, Marian, I will open it up to see if there's any questions from the council members. Tom.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks, Marian, for being here. On Slide 3, that slide deals specifically with kind of an overview of the three standards under consideration, and the question I have is with regard to National Standard 4 and the allocations, and one of the key points there is that allocation should not result in excessive shares, and so I'm just curious, from the agency's perspective, how do they define "excessive"?

MS. MACPHERSON: That is an excellent question, and I believe there is a description of that in the existing National Standard guidance, the National Standard 4 guidance, but I don't have it in the top of my head right now, but I can definitely follow-up with you on that.

DR. FRAZER: That would be great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Carrie.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mariana, for the presentation, again, in more detail than we got during the CCC meeting, and so I appreciate that. Just a question about the process, if you could remind us of that, and so, if the agency decides to move forward with considering these changes, there will also be another opportunity to delve in again and comment on those specific changes to each of those standards, and is that correct?

 MS. MACPHERSON: Yes, and thank you for bringing that up, and so, if the decision is to move forward, then the next step would be to develop a proposed rule, and that would go out for public comment, and people would be able to see specifically what we were thinking, in terms of making changes, and there would be a comment period on that as well.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you. I appreciate that, and so I had a question about engagement with the communities. I think you did provide some background, as to why that was being considered, but could you just remind me again how that came about and why engagement is important and how that term was derived, and maybe defined? Thanks.

MS. MACPHERSON: The statute -- In terms of fishing communities, the statute has the language that a fishing community is a fishing community that has historic dependence or is substantially engaged, and our guidance has really focused on historic dependence, but, as we're seeing species shift, and stocks changing, in terms of climate, it seems possible that communities may need to shift, not to the stocks that they've been historically just dependent on, but that they want to engage on, and so whether our guidance needs to focus a little bit more, to provide for that sort of change.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for your presentation. I live in Florida, and we have seen a tremendous influx of population, and we've seen significant transformation of what, in the past, might have been defined as traditional fishing communities.

With the influx of population, they are still fishing

communities, but they have certainly transformed beyond your definition, and many of these communities are focused on recreational fishing, and they have marinas, and they have fishing tackle boxes, or fishing tackle stores, and they have guides and charter boats, and it's a complete transformation from a traditional definition of a fishing community, but yet they are still fishing communities. It might be —— It might be wise to consider this transformation, so that, as these fishing communities evolve, they don't fall outside of your definition.

MS. MACPHERSON: Thank you, and that's certainly the type of thing we would like to hear about.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. Just since I have the advantage of having a computer and can look up the National Standard 4 Guidelines, I thought it would just share the part that talks about avoidance of excessive shares, and it's short. It basically says an allocation scheme must be designed to deter any person, or other entity, from acquiring excessive share of fishing privileges and to avoid creating conditions fostering inordinate control by buyers or sellers that would not otherwise exist, and so it's really focused on excessive control, right, and you want to make sure that your allocation is not giving any particular entity, or person, excessive control of the resource.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks, Mara, for looking that up.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. I am not seeing any other hands up around the table. All right. Well, thank you, Marian, and, for all of us, if you all could think about that, because, obviously, there are a lot of things here related to the discussions that we've been having around this table this week, and so that will help construct the letter for next time, so that it allows to get it submitted by September.

MS. MACPHERSON: Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. With that, then we'll move into the next presentation, which is a BOEM update on some latest developments of wind energy in the Gulf, and so, Mr. Filostrat, they're pulling that up, and, whenever you're ready, go ahead.

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

MR. JOHN FILOSTRAT: Thank you, council, for inviting BOEM here

today. I'm John Filostrat, and I've been with BOEM since 2011, and I work in the Office of Communications, and I'm here today to give you an update on the latest in renewable energy in the Gulf of Mexico, and we have two updates.

You have probably seen these slides before, and the Gulf of Mexico is poised to transition to a renewable energy future, and the Gulf of Mexico is right on target. We've been in this process now for about three to four years, and there is some significant advantages for renewable energy development in the Gulf of Mexico, the proximity to oil and gas supply chain being a big one, and leveraging existing infrastructure in the Gulf of Mexico.

We put out the proposed sale notice in February, and, currently, we're going through the comments. The comment period closed on April 25, and we received about 330 comments to the proposed sale notice, and we're combing through those right now, and we hope to put out a final sale notice this summer. The other update is that we published a final environmental assessment on May 30, and so just last week, and that's the next step in the process to hold an auction in the Gulf of Mexico, and that's still TBD, but the final sale notice would give us an idea of when that auction would be, approximately thirty days, thirty to forty-five days, after the FSN, final sale notice, is published.

We're in the second stage of renewable energy in the Gulf of Mexico, and the next slide kind of gives you a little bit more detail on that, and the planning and analysis and leasing, Stage 1 and 2, is what we're in right now, and, after the auction is held, we'll move into the third and fourth stages, the site assessment stage and then the steel in the water, basically, and that's where our sister agency, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, will come in, with the safety and enforcement aspect, similar to what they do for oil and gas.

You have probably seen this on our website, and this is the proposed lease sale areas, and there are three, two off the coast of Galveston, Texas and one off the coast of Lake Charles, Louisiana. It's approximately 300,000 acres, which is significantly smaller than the call area, which was about thirty-million acres, stretching from Alabama to Texas.

The reason why we picked these three proposed areas is the proximity to shore, and it's in shallow water, and so you're looking at fixed bottom structures, and it's a really low shrimping area, fishing area, and so we wanted to make sure that we were taking that into account, and reduced conflicts with

other users, like the military, and the NREL study that we published in 2020 kind of gives you an overview of what type of power we're looking at, potential power, and over one-million homes with just these three areas.

The bottom line is that the Gulf of Mexico -- We like to call it a super energy basin, and we have multiple uses in the Gulf, and this slide is a little busy, but it kind of basically points out all the active oil and gas leases, about 2,000, and we just received the authority to regular carbon sequestration, and so we're looking at areas in the Gulf of Mexico for that use as well, and we're working on a proposed rule that we hope to get out later this year for public comment on carbon sequestration, and, of course, the wind energy areas as well, and there are significant sand resources, and so those are the four areas that we manage.

The next slide kind of goes into a little bit more detail on that, and, you know, taking into account the importance of interacting with the other users and the resources, including fisheries, as a huge ocean user, and so we're thankful for this opportunity to speak to this group, and we will continue to engage our audiences as we move through the process, and so that's a short update, and the next slide kind of gives you my contact information. I'm also on boem.gov, and, if you go under contacts, you can get my email and phone number, and then also my colleagues in the other regions as well, and so, with that, I will pause here and see if there are any questions, and I will try to answer them.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. Are there questions for John? Billy.

MR. BROUSSARD: Are there federal regulations on the depth of the transmission lines?

MR. FILOSTRAT: So transmission is an important part of this, and we're not there yet, and we're still in the early stages of that. We work with other federal partners, and our state partners, on that aspect, and that would come in in the fourth stage, and the construction and operation plan would lay out the transition issues.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

46 MS. BOGGS: I am just curious, and you've got the acreage laid 47 out here, and there is an approximation of how many windmills 48 can fit per acre? 1 2

MR. FILOSTRAT: That's going to, again, come in the later stages of the process. The construction and operation plan would weigh that out. I mean, we would do more environmental analysis on that, and we would publish an EIS, and that would sort of get to the nitty-gritty of how many we're talking about, but we're still not there yet, and so I guess the short answer to your question is we don't know at this point, but we hope to, after the auction, go into the third and fourth stages, and that would lay out -- The companies that would win those bids would lay out their construction and operation plan.

MS. BOGGS: So I'm just curious, and like off of Rhode Island, and I don't know how big those areas are, if it's 100,000 acres or fifty acres, and about how many windmills are in those regions.

MR. FILOSTRAT: So, currently, we have no windmills in federal waters, on the outer continental shelf, and so we have several regions in the Northeast that are further along in that process, and I'm not up to speed on the Northeast, although I will tell you that I'm going, next week, to New Jersey, and we're holding public meetings there on the Atlantic Shore South, and that construction and operation plan is underway, and we have a draft environmental assessment, but, as far as the Gulf of Mexico, we're nowhere near that stage yet, but we do have other areas that we looked at in the call area, and so there's about, you know, twelve other proposed, you know, lease areas that we could go to in the future, but we're not there quite yet.

### CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kevin.

 MR. ANSON: Thank you for the presentation, but, just to follow-up on Ms. Boggs' question, as part of the process, the plan that will be submitted by the company, as far as the specific location of each of those individual structures that will have the windmill, they're going to kind of -- They're going to do basically a bottom profile of the entire area, and then, if there are certain areas that are sensitive, like hardbottom and such, that they will take steps to avoid those, is what I'm assuming, and is that correct?

MR. FILOSTRAT: That is correct. Yes, sir, and similar to the process with oil and gas, and so the companies will conduct their own geographical and geophysical surveys, to avoid, or mitigate, sensitive areas and hardbottom and species, and that would also be identified in our environmental assessment impact statement study, in the third phase of the process.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you for the presentation, and I want to first start off just by commending BOEM for working with NOAA, including NOAA Fisheries, on that marine spatial planning, since it really helped us to deconflict at the frontend, by identifying areas that would be most suitable for offshore wind and have the least impact on all the other industries, and so, so far, we've been very happy with the collaboration and the choices that have been made.

I do want to ask you a question about the bidding credits and how that works. As I understand it, they're in the works for fishery compensation and workforce development, but they also affect our survey enterprise, our resource survey enterprise, and I wonder what's in the works there, as far as survey mitigation, since we won't be able to survey in some of those areas.

MR. FILOSTRAT: So you're right that we do have several bidding credits, and you identified two of them. I'm not sure on that survey area, but, if you shoot me an email, I will find the answer for you and see if there's anything that's going to be identified. The final sale notice will lay out all of the bidding credits and the other issues, but, as far as that, I will have to get back to you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks again for the presentation, and I was wondering, Bernie, if we could go to Slide 7. On that slide, and, I mean, I recognize that carbon sequestration falls under your kind of authority and responsibility, and there is -- I couldn't follow, on this figure, with the blue shading, if you had actually indicated on this map where those activities might take place, and if you could elaborate a little bit on what a carbon sequestration activity actually is.

MR. FILOSTRAT: So, right now, we're developing a draft rule that should come out this year, hopefully, and that would lay out the exact, you know, activity that we're proposing, and these areas that we're looking at here in the blue are just potential areas, right, that we can store carbon underneath the seafloor, but by no means are these areas where we're going to actually do it, right, and so we're just looking at these areas right now, and we're still early in the process.

 The draft rule would lay out, you know, just how to go about doing it, and then we would open it up for public comment, and so we're not really there yet, to where -- To the question that you're having, but we'll get there, after the draft rule and the public comment. We'll have sixty days for public comment. During that time, we'll no doubt have public meetings, either virtual or in-person or both, to make sure that we're, you know, engaging the public and our various partners and stakeholders, and so it's really premature.

We just lay this out to demonstrate that, in addition to oil and gas, and, in addition to significant sand resources, and renewable energy, that this is coming, right, and so we have to, you know, take that into effect, but the blue potential areas for carbon sequestrations are just that, and those are certain areas that might be suitable for this activity, but it's just, at this point, way in the early stages.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands up, and so, John, thank you for that presentation, and I just want to echo too what Clay, Dr. Porch, was mentioning about just, you know, your frequent meetings here with our council and updating of what's going on, and that's been very good, very positive. That way, everybody has an opportunity to chime-in and understand what's going on and that sort of thing, and so thank you for doing that.

MR. FILOSTRAT: I appreciate the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Seeing no questions, first, I wanted to recognize a former council member in the room, and that's Captain Walker in the back, and so he's maybe on his phone and can't hear us, but David Walker, and somebody can nudge him, and I've seen him move in and out, and, while I caught you, David, we just wanted to say thank you, and it's good to see you again, and welcome back. We miss you around the table up here, David, and so, anyway, it's good to see you.

What I think we'll do, moving on, and, obviously, we're ahead of schedule, and that will save us a little bit of time. We have some of the supporting agency and liaison reports that I believe we can get through, and Tom just took a break a few minutes ago, and so maybe we'll do this for about a half-hour and then take a short break, and we'll see how many of these we can get through, and so that's moving towards the end of the agenda, and we'll just go through in order. The first one up is Major Downey was

going to give us a presentation on the Alabama law enforcement updates. If you're here, that's Tab R, Number 1. All right. Major Downey, it looks like it's there, whenever you're ready.

# SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATE ALABAMA LAW ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

MAJOR JASON DOWNEY: Good morning. I'm Major Downey with Alabama Marine Resources, and so I will be giving you a brief overview of the joint enforcement agreement we have for the year 2022-2023.

Our JEA runs from August 24 through August 23 of each year, and, this year, we received \$523,990. \$135,000 of that was spent on direct purchases, and so we purchased three law enforcement vehicles with emergency lighting, eleven thermal printers for officers to use in the field, and two outboard motors for one of our offshore vessels.

Here is a list of our JEA priorities, with the amount of funding, as well as the total patrol hours, for each priority. Our priorities are turtle excluder devices, recreational reef fish, individual fishing quota, marine mammals and dolphins, coastal migratory and highly migratory species, and SEFHIER, and so we worked a small percent of the SEFHIER patrol hours before the court ruling that ended that program, and that portion of our JEA was about \$109,000. All of these patrol hours are split between offshore, nearshore, and dockside patrols.

 We still have a couple of months left on this year's JEA, but here are a few statistics, as of May 31, and so we've worked 704 boat patrol hours, 1,116 shore patrol hours, and there have been 438 commercial anglers inspected, 2,967 recreational anglers inspected, and 129 charter or headboat inspections. Officers wrote 105 citations and/or warnings for various violations during that time.

 This year, there's been an emphasis on combating illegal charters. Alabama has participated in the Gulf Coast Illegal Charter Taskforce, which consists of officers from the U.S. Coast Guard, NOAA, and agencies in Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas. That's a picture from the last meeting we had.

On May 3, the taskforce had a media event, hosted by the U.S. Coast Guard at Station Destin. Several media outlets from Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi were presented, and the estimated local viewership was over 370,000 viewers, and so it

was pretty successful.

1 2 3

Alabama submitted a couple of illegal charter cases to NOAA, and we're currently conducting investigations in the other potential illegal charter violations. The picture in this slide was one of the easier cases to make, where the captain decided to advertise fishing trips and boat cruises on these fancy cardboard signs, and so just things like that are easy to make, and some of the harder ones are the ones that you've got to catch actually in the act, underway. That concludes my presentation. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Major. I will open it up for questions. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: On the illegal charter, just so I understand, are some of these state guideboats that are fishing in federal waters, just out of curiosity?

MAJOR DOWNEY: Yes, and so the illegal charters could be many different things. It's basically anything for-hire, and it could be dive boats, state dive boats, or state charter boats going into federal waters that are unpermitted, and so, yes, it could be, potentially.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

MS. BOGGS: So I would just like to make a comment. The taskforce -- I just have to share this, and the taskforce is there, and I was at the marina one day, and I heard a car door slam, and it was four U.S. Coast Guard armed, with flak jackets, and I was like, holy cow, and they did shut down a vessel at our marina who is a sightseeing boat, that he didn't have the proper documentation, and they tied him to the dock, and they're serious about this, and I was at the marina the other day when DCNR came up and had two of the Coast Guard folks on the boat, and they were out patrolling, and so they are in Alabama in force, I promise you that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Susan. Any other questions? All right. Seeing none, thank you, Major Downey.

MAJOR DOWNEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: It looks like Chester might have just stepped out, and so we'll skip over that one, and then we have NOAA OLE, with Officer O'Malley. Are you ready?

#### NOAA OLE

2 3

MR. JOHN O'MALLEY: Good morning. I am Assistant Special Agent in Charge John O'Malley, out of the League City, Texas office, and this is our FY23 Quarter 2 briefing. During this period, we had 193 Gulf open incidents, and that was out of a total of 325 for the SED. Twelve of those cases were referred to General Counsel or DOJ, and we had seventy-four summary settlements that were issued, ranging from \$100 to \$3,000, and that includes the Gulf of Mexico and the Florida Keys area of responsibility.

Some of the violations were retention during a closed session, undersized, typically red snapper, not having the descender device onboard, IFQ violations, and fishing in closed areas within the sanctuary. 48 percent of those incidents were no violations, or compliance assistance, and that might seem a little high, but we also document patrols and boardings, and so those are basically information only.

Some of our enforcement highlights are we had IUU efforts, trade monitoring, ports of entry on the Texas-Mexico border, and we had two significant Lacey Act cases that were completed this quarter, and there's a link on the slide, and you can read some of the stories, but it was against two seafood dealers in south Florida, dealing with some spiny lobster, Aifa and Elite. They were both sentenced this quarter.

What they entailed was Elite was importing Caribbean lobster from Belize and Nicaragua, importing it into the U.S. and relabeling it as a U.S. product and then exporting it to China. Aifa was doing a very similar thing, and they were getting lobsters from Haiti and importing them into south Florida and mixing them in with produced lobster out of Florida, most of it out of the Gulf, and then that was being reexported to China. Obviously, having that U.S. designator makes it a more valuable product.

 The end was result was Elite pled guilty, and they were fined \$250,000, five years of probation, and they were ordered to be on a compliance plan for five years. We also found that they had also been exporting shark fins labeled as frozen fish, and so that was uncovered also.

Aifa also pled guilty. The company was fined \$250,000, five years of probation, and they were also put on a compliance plan. The owner of the company was fined \$100,000 and given five years of probation. On a side note, we had a previous case on Aifa, back around 2014 or 2015, for a Lacey Act violation too, in

which they were purchasing Florida-produced lobster without any permits, not issuing trip tickets, and so this was the second case we've had against that company.

Moving on to trade monitoring, our enforcement officers, working with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, have been doing SIMP inspections down at the Texas border, anywhere from Laredo down to Brownsville. While they're down there, they do other things, too. They try to do patrols, and they did do some of those. They worked with Parks and Wildlife and the Coast Guard.

 During this period, they were involved with pulling 200 feet of gillnet too, and that's what the picture shows, is gillnet that's been taken out of the Gulf, because we have the river entering into the Gulf, and so we have an international border on the river and offshore.

Also, while they were down there, the U.S. Coast Guard interdicted a lancha in state waters, and those are just typically referred to the state, since they actually charge those criminally under state law. Also, another enforcement officer visited fifteen ports of entry along the Texas-Mexico border, basically educating CBP on SIMP and letting them know the laws that we enforce, such as Magnuson, MMPA, ESA, and Lacey Act, and we're really trying hard to get the education, with CBP, because we work together, and they are able to keep an eye out and notify us when they see stuff we should be aware of.

Our enforcement partnerships, we can't go it alone, and we've worked with our JEA agreements with Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida, and we also work closely with the U.S. Coast Guard and CBP, and, during this period, we received forty-four overall enforcement referrals, and that's across the entire SED. Within this Gulf, this period, we received some from FWC, Texas Parks and Wildlife, and the U.S. Coast Guard. FWC was mostly sanctuary, TED, BRDs, and Magnuson Act referrals. Texas was retention during closure cases, which are red snapper cases, and the Coast Guard referred us TED and BRD cases.

Some of the current spotlights are we participated in a Gulf Coast Illegal Charter Taskforce, which was put on by the Coast Guard in Destin, Florida. It was also attended by Alabama and FWC, Alabama Department of Marine Resources and FWC, and the Coast Guard was highlighting illegal charter activity.

 We work with them, because the Coast Guard typically looks for the unlicensed mariners, which we don't enforce, and we look at the permit violations, and so, working together, we cover a more broad range, and, if you look at the right, and it's hard to read it, but there is an observer safety notice that was put out nationwide, and it basically details prevention, response, and reporting guidance regarding sexual assault and sexual harassment, known as SASH, towards observers and to prevent mistreatment, and so that's put out to all -- It's available, and it's put out to all the permit holders and folks that could be selected for observer coverage.

Down at the bottom, we had Operation TED Talk, which it included the NOAA gear team going down to the Florida Keys Sanctuary, and they gave training to our folks and FWC, refresher training on TEDs. After that, we did patrols and boardings, focusing on TEDs. There was a lot of education, a lot of compliance assistance, and they did find some violations, and those will be documented for prosecution.

For some targeted operations, we had Operation Ready Reserve done with FWC aboard their patrol boat The Trident, and it was a sanctuary-focused patrol, and we had very rough weather, and so it kind of limited them. They were patrolling the North and South Tortugas Ecological Reserve and the national park, and they were able to do three commercial boardings and assisted CBP with a migrant landing that was in the Marquesas.

Also, we had Operation Pescado, which was joint with Texas Parks and Wildlife and the U.S. Coast. Again, it's IUU/SIMP focused, and they inspected over 50,000 pounds of seafood, and they conducted some lancha deterrence patrols.

Again, just letting everyone know that we have the NOAA Law Enforcement hotline for tips. We rely on the public, and the public's information, and that's the number, is (800)853-1964. That concludes my report. Are there any questions?

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** All right. Are there questions for Officer O'Malley? Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you for the presentation. You mentioned that one of the companies had their second -- I think it was their second case against them, and is there a -- Is there like a the more cases they have, the higher the penalties, or three strikes they're out, and they lose their permits, or is there anything like that in the system?

MR. O'MALLEY: On federal, there is sentencing guidelines they use, and that's kind of a point schedule, depending on previous violations, previous convictions, and so, yes, it can take that

into account, and it also depends on the similarity of the violations, if they're the same or different.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Any others?

MR. O'MALLEY: Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, seeing none, thank you. Thank you for the good work. All right. Our next report is, Mr. Donaldson, if you're ready to give an update from the Gulf States.

### GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our ongoing activities are continuing, with SEAMAP, GulfFIN, IJF, Sportfish, our Aquatic Nuisance Species and Return 'Em Right programs, and you recall that we provided, or Greg Bray provided, an update, and those programs continue.

The exception is our aquaculture program, and we have been providing funding for regional pilots for aquaculture, to help promote and implement aquaculture in the Gulf of Mexico. Unfortunately, funding for this year was not provided from the Office of Aquaculture, and they utilized those funds to open another aquaculture area of opportunity in Alaska, and so we will not be doing the pilots this year, but we will continue with the oyster -- We still have funding for the oyster consortium and the IMTA project.

 The other issue that I wanted to talk about is our October commission meeting, and it's scheduled for October 16 through 19 of this year, and it's going to be in Louisiana. We're still working the specific location, and we'll have our regular meetings of our various committees and subcommittees, but we'll also be doing -- We'll be presenting two Lyles-Simpson Award Winners to Tom McIlwain and Joey Shepard, and then our general session is going to be focusing on looking at past regional pilot aquaculture projects that we funded and having them present the results, and so that's just a quick overview of what's going on with the commission, and I will answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Dave. Any questions for Dave? All right. Seeing none, then we'll move to our U.S. Coast Guard report, and, Chester, we'll follow-up with you after that, for the South Atlantic report. You all might remember Lieutenant Commander Motoi, and we do have a new person now, and it's Lieutenant Shelby Threlkeld, and so, if we want to pull up that

tab, R-5, and I think that Shelby is online.

Shelby, welcome, and we have your presentation up here, and we can forward the slides for you, and welcome, and I understand that you will be at our meeting in-person next time, and we'll look forward to seeing you there, and so we see your presentation, and we can hear you fine now, and so go ahead when you're ready.

### U.S. COAST GUARD

LTJG SHELBY THRELKELD: Awesome. Well, good morning, everyone, and thank you so much for having me, and, just as the Chair said, I will be the new point-of-contact for District 8. For today, I'm just going to be going over District 8's area of responsibility, and I will also be discussing our Quarter 2 domestic fisheries statistics, other law enforcement for FY23 through Quarter 2, the lanchas, and then our recent operations.

As you can see, our District 8 is the largest district in the Coast Guard, and it encompasses six states, spanning from the Canadian border to the Mexican border, and nearly the entire Gulf of Mexico. With that being said, we are very busy, and we handle many missions, ranking from search and rescue --

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ladies, if you want to communicate with her, maybe we can pick that back up in just a second, and so we'll put that one on hold just for a second. Chester, would you be ready, in a minute, to give us an update on the South Atlantic Council? That would be Tab R-2.

MR. BREWER: Do you want that now, or do you want to wait?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Let's go ahead with that now, Chester, if you're ready.

### SOUTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL LIAISON

MR. BREWER: All right. Good morning, everybody. My name is Chester Brewer, and I've got one more meeting as a council member on the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and so I will be off of that pretty soon.

Really, there are two, I guess, main areas that would bear some interest for the Gulf Council, and one has to do with discards, and I am really pleased to see the work, and the consideration, that is being given to that issue by this council. Our huge problem is, of course, red snapper, and has been every time I've

given this report, and I'm sure others have spoken to you as well, and it just came out, I think, last week, that the season, from the Keys up to North Carolina, this year will be two days, two. That's it, and the primary reason that the season is going to be so short is discards.

The biomass of the red snapper in the jurisdictional area of the South Atlantic Council is higher than it has ever been, and yet they are still classified as being overfished and that overfishing is ongoing. The reason that we catch ourselves in this is discards.

As the biomass has increased, people fishing for other species are encountering red snapper like they have never seen before, and they're actually having to move to try to get away from them, and the upshot of that is there are so many discards, from folks fishing for other species, that the discards are right at, or close to, the quota, and, therefore, the discards are eating up the quota, and we have essentially a closed fishery.

We have tried any number of different things to get around the problem, and we've done descending devices and experimented with hooks, all matter of things, trying to get around the discard problem, and, unfortunately, nothing seems to have worked, and so we're going to have to do something different, and I'm not really sure what is going to happen, and it's recognized on the part of the council though that something has got to change, that something has got to give, and whether it's going to be something extremely draconian or not, I really don't know at this point, and we're still kind of searching around.

The bottom area closures are being discussed, and we'll see where that goes, and that might be where we're going, and I don't know, but it is a problem, and it's been a problem, and something has got to give. I mean, this fishery has been essentially closed for years now, and it has recovered beyond anyone's expectations, and yet they're still classified as being overfished, with overfishing going on.

Another area of interest to the council right now, and maybe of some interest to this council, is dolphin. I was glad to see the presentation that we got with regard to these -- I wrote the danged thing down, and I can't remember what it was, but other methods of doing essentially something close to a stock -- What is the name? Anyway, it's very close to being a -- Help me out here.

48 I will give up on it. I lost my train and thought, and I don't

have any written notes, and I wrote it down somewhere, but I don't know where I wrote it down, but any of these sort of methods of evaluating a fishery that don't require a full-blown -- It's not allocation, but --

DR. FRAZER: MSEs? Management strategy evaluation?

MR. BREWER: Thank you. Management strategy evaluation, and it wouldn't come to my head, and I'm sorry, and I'm really not senile, but I was happy to see that, because, with dolphin, you've got a fish that really is difficult to evaluate, because, by the time you go through a full evaluation, the fish that you were looking at are dead, and so there never has been, and so we are getting complaints from our guys in Key West, or in the Key West area, that something is wrong with the fishery, and it's apparent to them anyway that the small dolphin are there, but the bigger dolphin, which they depend upon for their customers, and for their business, are just simply not there anymore.

We don't know for sure what the cause is, and it's probably not the bag limits that we currently have, and we had a situation where there was a longlining incident, and I will call it that, that shut the fishery down in 2015, and so we don't think that's it, and there is some thought, and I'm sure, at some point, the Gulf Council may want to get involved in this, although I think the problem that is occurring is outside of the jurisdiction of the Gulf of Mexico Management Council and the South Atlantic and outside -- This is the kicker, but outside of the jurisdictional limits of the United States.

Dolphin are a highly-migratory species, and there is limited information on them, but what we do know is they appear to spawn, or whatever, somewhere south of the Caribbean and then migrate up, and not the first migration, but maybe on the second or the third, we are seeing these bigger fish, but those bigger fish aren't there anymore, and so it's not a situation that the biomass seems to be going down, and it's a situation of the size of the fish seems to be decreasing drastically.

 This has been brought up and discussed at our council, and we're not really sure which way to go with it, because it probably involves ICCAT, lord help us, and it would involve other entities to try to investigate what's going on and the best way to try to cure it, and those are the two main issues going on right now, and, with that, I will conclude my report. Thank you, and thanks to the folks that reminded me of the name that I couldn't remember.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thank you, Chester. Is there any questions for Mr. Brewer?

MR. ANSON: Just one question, Chester, and sorry to put you on the spot here, but, in reviewing your report, the South Atlantic report, there is mention of some recommendations for improving the wreckfish ITQ program, and it mentions here particularly with respect to confidentiality issues and related constraints, and can you elaborate on that?

 MR. BREWER: A little bit. A little bit, and that individual fishing quota program pre-dates all of us, and I think it may be the oldest program in the country, and it's been running pretty efficiently, and I'm not sure that a whole lot needs to be changed, but I think there's a number like eleven participants in the fishery, and it's a tiny fishery, and it's been running fairly well, with no great problems, but they are running into some problems with regard to doing evaluations, because of confidentiality, and there is, interestingly enough, a little bit of problem with regard to getting new folks into the fishery.

We're kind of looking around in those issues, and I don't think -- I didn't write that report, but I don't think that wreckfish are a tremendous problem right now, and it's a program that needs some tweaking, and they kind of would like to go to electronic reporting, as opposed to -- They literally have paper tickets that they run their program on, and it's that old, and so there's some thought about maybe changing that over, maybe to get some electronic reporting, but then you have a little bit of problem there with regard to the transparency and their secrets and their secret spots and all of that.

 Yes, that is ongoing, and, like I said, I don't think it's something that's a huge, huge issue, and I think that one is going to get worked out fairly easily. Are there any other questions?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thanks, Chester. I am seeing none, Chester. Thank you very much. What we'll do here, in a second, is take a short break, but I want to come back promptly at 11:30, because there's some very important awards and recognitions and things that we want to carry out, and we're waiting on some family members to arrive and that sort of thing. We couldn't get the Coast Guard back on the line, and so we'll pick that up at some point, as soon as we get that worked out, but, with that, why don't we take a break until 11:30, but let's start promptly at 11:30, for those recognitions, and we can also take our

lunchbreak after that, and so we'll see everyone back at 11:30.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Up next will be the presentation of the 2022 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award, and, for that, I'm going to turn it over to General Spraggins. I think he has a few things to say, and then turn it over for the presentation of their awards. General Spraggins, go ahead.

# PRESENTATION OF THE 2022 LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THE YEAR AWARD

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The 2022 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award, the council Team and Officer of the Year Award acknowledges service above and beyond duty requirements and recognizes distinguished service, professionalism, and dedication to enforcing federal fishing regulations in the Gulf of Mexico.

Nominees may be submitted from each of the five Gulf state law enforcement agencies, the U.S. Coast Guard, and NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement, and, this year, we're honored to have the 2022 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year from the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, their Senior Conservation Officers, Chance Mancuso, and I'm going to turn it over now to Scott and Kevin and let them talk about our honoree.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, General. The council is honored to present this award to Alabama's Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Senior Conservation Officer Chancelor Mancuso. Officer Mancuso enforces state and federal laws in Alabama state waters and in the federal waters off the coast of Alabama.

In addition to at-sea patrol, he regularly participates in outreach events to educate the public on current fisheries regulations. In 2022, he spent nearly 300 hours patrolling federal fisheries. During that time, he was involved in 208 state and federal cases. One of his larger federal cases involved apprehending subjects with forty-two undersized greater amberjack. He also caught a federal gillnet fisherman with illegal species onboard.

 The council understands that Officer Mancuso is always willing to put the necessary time and effort into making a big case, even if it means coming in on his off day and putting in extra hours. He is always eager to learn, and he exemplifies professionalism, while conducting his duties, and he is a model

officer to his peers. Thank you for your service, Officer Mancuso, and congratulations. (Applause)

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you, and, Officer Mancuso, I thank you so much for your service, and each and every one of you. I see a lot of you back there from the State of Alabama, and we want to take the time to give each and every one of you a round of applause, and thank you for what you do. (Applause) You all keep safe out there, and we're very proud of you. Thank you very much, sir, and I will turn it back over to you.

## MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF BILL TEEHAN

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, General. We appreciate that. We'll move forward to our next item in the agenda here. On a little more of a sad note, we want to recognize a long-term participant here with the Gulf Council work that we've done, and that's Bill Teehan. We'll give everyone just a little bit of background on Bill, and, unfortunately, he passed away in March, at the age of seventy-one. We've got some pictures up now on the screen.

 He attended college at FSU, and he graduated with his Master's in Biological Science, specializing in invertebrate zoology and genetics. He worked at FWC until he retired in 2012, and he served on the council, on behalf of FWC, from 2007 until 2012, and Bill was devoted for his work, and he accomplished great achievements, while making lifelong friendships along the way. Bill will be truly missed by all he knew him, and his legacy will live through the memories of his music, and so maybe if we could just take a few moments of silence to recognize Bill and his work that he has done for this group, it would be nice.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was held in memory of Bill Teehan.)

## COUNCIL MEMBER RECOGNITIONS

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Moving on, sadly, we've got some other council members leaving the council, and we want to make sure that we recognize them, and that's Phil Dyskow and Bob Shipp, and we'll start with Phil Dyskow, who is here in-person, and, of course, Bob is online with us today.

First, for Phil Dyskow, Phil is a longtime recreational angler with experience in both fresh and saltwater. He developed a passion for fishing in the Gulf of Mexico, both inshore and offshore, largely based from his home in Marco Island, Florida.

Phil Dyskow has served on the council since 2017, and, in his tenure with the council, he has served as chairman of the Spiny Lobster, Administrative & Budget, and Outreach & Education Committees.

The expertise and leadership that Phil brings to the council will be sorely missed. In addition to his council service, he has served in the fisheries arena with two appointments on the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee and the National Boating Safety and Advisory Council.

 Phil is the former president of the Yamaha Marine Group and is a lifelong recreational angler with experience in inshore and offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. He was inducted into the Marine Industry Hall of Fame and was named the 2015 CCC Manufacturer Man of the Year.

He also received a Kenai River Guardian Award and served as a board member for the Kanai River Sportfishing Association, a nonprofit dedicated to ensuring sustainability of the Kenai River, and he's also an honorary legacy life member of the Coastal Conservation Association. Phil, you certainly will be missed around this table, and we all thank you greatly for your service. (Applause) Phil, if you want to come up, we have a small presentation for you.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** In honor of your dedicated service to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council from 2017 to 2023, we present this award.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you very much. It's very nice of you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Next up, of course, is Bob Shipp, and, Bob, we sure hope that you can hear us out there, and we sure wish you were around the table with us today to celebrate this.

DR. SHIPP: I can hear you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Great, Bob. Thank you. Dr. Shipp's contributions to this council, obviously, are very immense, and to summarize all of those over the years would take much more time than we have here today, but I wanted to briefly just highlight a few of the stronger highlights that he has brought to this council.

Believe it or not, he has served as a council member for eight terms, totally twenty-four years, and I'm sure that's a record

that's going to stand for quite some time. In that time, he was chairman of the council three times, and he has chaired nearly every standing committee that we have ever had in existence.

Bob Shipp has spent his entire life researching and appreciating the fish and fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico. After graduating from Spring Hill College, Dr. Shipp attended Florida State University, where he earned his master's degree and PhD. Shortly thereafter, he began working for the University of South Alabama, where his fisheries biology career flourished.

He chaired the biology department and served as the Acting Director of the Dauphin Island Sea Lab before serving as the Chairman of the Department of Marine Science and the Director for the Alabama Center for Estuarine Studies.

In addition to his work with the university, Dr. Shipp served for twelve years as the Acting Executive Director for the Alabama Chapter of the Coastal Conservation Association. He has served as a judge for the Alabama Deepsea Fishing Rodeo since 1982, and he published Dr. Bob Shipp's Guide to the Fishes of the Gulf of Mexico. With that, Bob, we want to present you with an award, and Carrie will describe what it is, and we'll hopefully be able to get that you very soon and see you inperson.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Hi, Dr. Shipp, and so we can deliver this you in Florida, and so, in honor of your dedicated service to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council from 1991 to 1999, from 2005 to 2014, and 2017 to 2023. Thank you for your service.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Bob. (Applause) For the next one, I guess I've got to turn it over to our Vice Chairman, Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Greg, you're not going to get away. All right, and so I think many of you know that Greg has contributed in a very substantial way to many of the successes realized by the council, and he is undoubtedly going to be missed.

During his tenure on the council, much like Dr. Shipp, Greg served on a number of committees. He served as chair of the Data Collection Committee, the Artificial Reef Committee, the Migratory Species Committee, Red Drum, Sustainable Fisheries, Outreach & Education Committee, and, obviously, he, more recently, served as Vice Chair and then Chair, and so quite a bit of service to this group over his nine-year tenure here.

2

3

4

5

In his day job, Greg serves as the Senior Executive Director of the Harte Research Institute for the Gulf of Mexico Studies at Texas A&M University, and somehow, and I appreciate all the work that you do, manages to maintain a very active and highly recorded research program.

6 7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

Greg's ecologically-oriented research program is quite broad, and he and his colleagues have placed a notable emphasis sportfish, and, as many in this room are certainly aware, Greq was the principal investigator for The Great Red Snapper Count, a Gulf-wide collaborative research endeavor that provided the very first estimate of absolute abundance for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico, and so I think the Gulf Council certainly recognizes, Greg, your many contributions, not only to research and management, but we thank you incredibly for your service. It's been a good run for you, my friend.

17 18 19

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Tom. (Applause) Thank you, all.

20 21

22

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: In honor of your dedicated service to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council from 2014 to 2023, we present this clock.

23 24 25

26 27

28

29

30 31

32

33 34

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Well, thank you all for that. I will look around the room and see here what we want to do. Those were the two major things that I wanted to get through with the agenda this morning, before we broke for lunch, and we'll do that here in just a minute. I am thinking about maybe we come back at 1:30, if that would work, because we could --That would allow us to knock out a few more committee reports and end the day earlier tomorrow, but, if you have lunch plans and need the full time that we allotted, until 2:00, that would -- I am looking around the table, and is 1:30 going to be a problem for anyone?

35 36 37

38

39

40 41

42

43

That way, we can move through the agenda. Okay, and so we'll move that up. We'll have to start public testimony at 2:00, but that will allow us to proceed with a few other items. We don't have a very long list today of public testimony, and so we might be able to pick up even a few more committee reports, and move that along, and so, with that, we'll go ahead and break, and I will see everyone back here at 1:30 to take up a few committee reports.

44 45 46

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on June 7, 2023.)

47 48

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9 10

11 12 13

14

21 22

23 24 25

26 27 28

29 30 31

33 34 35

36

37

38

32

39 40 41

42 43

44

45 46

47 48

## June 7, 2023

#### WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at The Battle House Renaissance in Mobile, Alabama on Wednesday afternoon, June 7, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, everyone. Let's go ahead and get started. Okay. We're going to pick up with a few committee reports, as I call the council back into session. We'll start with the committee reports B, C, and D, Ecosystem, Data Collection, and Shrimp, in that order, and I believe there might be a little more discussion than we have time for for Law Enforcement, and so, Kevin, if you're ready with Ecosystem, do you want to get that started?

## COMMITTEE REPORTS ECOSYSTEM COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. ANSON: I am, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you.

MR. ANSON: Thank you. The committee adopted the agenda, Tab Q, Number 1, of the April 2022 meeting and approved the minutes, Tab Q, Number 2, as modified.

The Ecosystem Technical Committee Report, Tab Q, Number 4, council staff summarized the discussions and recommendations from the April 2023 ETC meeting. The ETC began work on the council's task to identify, prioritize, and recommend the top four fishery ecosystem issues (FEI) for incorporation into the council's Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) process. Council staff presented a draft list of potential FEIs and ranking criteria. This list is preliminary and does not represent the ETC's final recommendation or stakeholder feedback.

A committee member commented that, from the list, discards and climate change may be of higher priority to the council. Another committee member thought an urgency component under the pathway to actionability criteria should rank higher. committee member also recommended the ETC combine reducing discards and finfish depredation as a single FEI. Council staff

cautioned that the size and scope of FEIs may need some additional thought and refinement, in order to be useful to the council and inform management decisions.

The committee was encouraged to think about reducing discards as a FEI during Reef Fish Committee discussions and how it relates to the various fisheries and fleets. This may help refine the size and scope of the reducing discards FEI and ultimately provide guidance for the council to consider.

Another committee member suggested that, in addition to discards, climate change may be another FEI that could be ranked higher given that its effects span the entirety of the Gulf, for example biologically, socially, and economically. Regarding the FEI loop, the committee member recommended finding ways to engage outside funding and research entities and letting them know of research needs that would support management decisions.

The committee noted that, if offshore wind energy, one of the FEIs in the draft list, was selected by the council, the pathway to management may be limited to providing letters and encouraging extra-jurisdictional partnerships and not necessarily result in a fisheries management action.

 The Southeast Fisheries Science Center is developing an ecosystem-based fisheries management strategic plan, with offshore wind energy listed as one of its priorities, since it's also a focus of the current federal administration. Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff also suggested that, for the FEP to be successful, the priorities should be FEIs on which the council can have a direct influence beyond submitting comments and letters.

The committee recommends and I so move, to direct the Ecosystem Technical Committee to remove offshore wind energy and achieving optimum yield for the reef fish complex from the working list of FEIs.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so we've got a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on this motion? Seeing no discussion on this motion, is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Go ahead, Kevin.

MR. ANSON: Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Recommendations on a Gulf of Mexico Ecosystem Model to Support Fisheries Management, Tab Q, Number 5, Mr. John Mareska reviewed a presentation by Doctors Skyler Sagarese and Holden Harris to the SSC in May 2023 about a model to address ecological

questions and how biomass targets could be achieved via modification of fishing pressure.

The model was based on menhaden and its predators and used Ecopath to evaluate trophic hierarchy and included fisheries data. Ecosim was used to evaluate temporal drivers and Ecospace for spatial drivers. The model can still be improved with additional data on species overlap and bycatch, size of prey, environmental drivers, alternate configurations, and robust reviews. The SSC thought the model would be valuable for identifying FEIs for the council's FEP. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Anson. Is there any other business that needs to come before this committee regarding ecosystem? Susan.

MS. BOGGS: So, as I recall, in our conversation, we were talking about maybe something simple that we could work with, and so I sent a motion to staff, if you want to wait a moment to get it up, or I can go ahead and read what I've got.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: It looks like we have it there, Susan. Do you want to go ahead and read that motion into the record, Susan?

MS. BOGGS: Yes, and thank you, Mr. Chair. To direct the ETC to develop the red tide FEI and come back with management options for gag, red grouper, and other affected species by June of 2024. If I get a second, I can give just a short rationale.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Do we have a second for this motion?

DR. SWEETMAN: I will second for discussion.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. C.J. seconds the motion. Go ahead with the rationale, Susan.

MS. BOGGS: So, as I recall, talking in committee, we were thinking of something that might be not a difficult task, and, I mean, I'm not going to say it's going to be an easy task, but this might be something that we know is a problem, something that I think would fit for this, and kind of give us a way to start working on an FEI, get the ball rolling, work out the kinks, see how it's going to work. It's a very important issue, but maybe not one so broad in scope that it can be our kickoff to this FES process.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, Susan. Any other discussion regarding

the motion?

DR. NATASHA MENDEZ-FERRER: So red tide is one of the issues that we have been considering, and my concern with this motion is that, right now, we don't have the entirety of the FEP process completely fleshed out. We still have work to do with the Ecosystem Technical Committee and figure out like the pathways to continue engaging stakeholders, and so, with this motion, we're kind of limited with what we have in place.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Well, so, understanding that -- I mean, June of 2024, possibly we would have some of these things fleshed out, and it kind of gives us a goal to work towards, to getting this process in place, but, if that's not manageable by staff, we can, I guess, wait later, until the FEP is more developed, but, I mean, it's a year from now, and so I'm just kind of trying to help get things rolling with this.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Dr. Simmons.

22 23

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think this motion is just a little bit premature, to kind of build on what Natasha was saying, because remember we wanted to give the council an update on what the ETC was able to accomplish, but we still have a lot of work to do regarding other FEIs, taking it out to the public, what the loops are going to look like, what's going to be in the FEP, how they're going to be prioritized, and so I feel like we're taking one that was kind of middle priority and saying run with it.

I do agree that I think it could be more actionable for the council, based on the stocks you have up there, but I just feel like we're not there yet, because it's kind of superseding the process with the public. We're already saying, well, we've already decided that this is the one that we want to go with, would be my concern, and, also, the prioritization process that the ETC wanted to work through, and we're kind of saying we don't need that, and we want to do this one, and so those are just some concerns that I would have.

 MS. BOGGS: Fair enough. I mean, I can withdraw the motion. Again, it was just hoping to maybe kind of get the ball rolling and have some discussion about it, you know, and so thank you. I will withdraw.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Boggs, and I think we got

the ball rolling with that, and then we can come back with your motion when the time is right. Okay, and so, thinking about the procedure here, if you withdraw the motion, the seconder -- What happens with the seconder? It's just considered withdrawn? Okay.

All right, and so any other discussions regarding the Ecosystem report? Okay. Seeing none, then we will move on to the next agenda item, which will bring us to Data Collection, and so, Ms. Boggs, if you're ready to take us through that, please go ahead.

### DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

 MS. BOGGS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. Thank you. The Data Collection Committee, June 5, 2023, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab F, Number 1, and approved the minutes, Tab F, Number 2, of the April 2023 meeting as written.

Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting (SEFHIER) Program, Tab F, Number 4 and 4(a), Dr. Jessica Stephen, of the Southeast Regional Office (SERO) provided a presentation updating the committee on for-hire data collection in the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf).

With SEFHIER being set aside, several other data collection programs are still being conducted for the for-hire sector. SERO suggested giving a presentation to the committee at the October 2023 meeting to report information collected from SEFHIER that would provide context for the program's design. Several committee members asked whether a new document could be developed and brought before the committee during the August 2023 meeting. SERO staff replied that there was nothing to preclude working on a new document, but the information presented in October would be beneficial when considering objectives for a new program.

Several committee members expressed a desire for a simplified document that would include language to limit any additional data collection questions after the council approves the document. Another committee member mentioned that the survey questions could be as simple as those for the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey. The member continued that validation was an important component of a fisheries data collection program and expressed some concern that law enforcement presence at the docks seemed to be reduced since the court decision.

Status Update on Plan with Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and National Marine Fisheries Service on the Private Angler Permit, Mr. Dave Donaldson, of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, provided an update on exploring novel approaches to managing federal private anglers based on the council's recent request.

The Research Track Development Team, a subgroup of the Marine Fisheries Information Program Transition Group, suggested the commission's Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) would be the appropriate group to task with the council's request. A member from the Research Track Development Team will provide the TCC a presentation at the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission's October 2023 meeting.

The TCC will be asked to consider a number of issues, which includes costs, identify any potential hurdles, potential standardization across states, and other topics. The TCC will meet the week before the October council meeting, and it would be possible to report their discussions to the council then.

A committee member expressed concern that this effort may be more complicated than needed. He recommended that collection of private recreational effort, catch, and discard information in federal waters is important and that the states are already working on collecting these data. Another committee member followed that this endeavor could be simplified even further and focus on identifying the universe of anglers only. He continued that it should be made clear how this information was going to be used to help estimate effort in the private recreational sector.

A committee member responded that the TCC may determine that a larger licensing program may not be a pathway forward, but they have the knowledge to provide feedback on limitation, constraints, and costs. They could then provide insights on alternatives for helping better refine data collection methods.

The committee then discussed angler buy-in and terminology between licensing and permitting. Permitting is often associated with regulations and could affect participation. General Counsel stated that there was no strict definition of those terms. She continued that the focus should be more on the functionality. The committee decided to wait for feedback from the TCC and determine management objectives before finalizing any specific terminology.

Other Business, a committee member asked about the progress of a mailout being generated to inform commercial reef fish and coastal migratory permit holders of public hearings related to

modifications to the coastal logbook program. Council staff stated the mailout was being prepared for the fall public hearings. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thank you, Ms. Boggs. Is there any other discussion that needs to come before the Data Collection Committee? Go ahead, Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: So back to the SEFHIER and the data collection and about starting a new document, and is there anything that staff needs to bring something back in August, so that we can at least start working on that?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** No, and I think we're all set. You passed a motion in April for us to do that, and so, I mean, I think we have to just be cognizant that I believe Dr. Stephen is still working to try to analyze the data that had been collected previously from the program, and I do not think that would be available by August, but I don't want to speak for her, and I just wanted to make sure that that was understood.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead.

MS. BOGGS: I do understand that, Dr. Simmons, and I just want to make sure that we're not letting any grass grow under this project, and maybe at least start with purpose and need and working through some of that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. I am not seeing any more hands up, and so we'll move on and conclude the business coming out of the Data Collection Committee. Before we move into Shrimp, I understand that we have the Coast Guard representative on the phone, and there was just a few more slides that she had, and so we might try just to finish that back up, if we can get her on a better connection. Bernie, tell me when you're ready for that, and I believe we stopped off at her third slide.

MS. BERNADINE ROY: Shelby, are you able to speak now?

LTJG THRELKELD: Testing. Can you all hear me on your end?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, Shelby, and that sounds much better.

### U.S. COAST GUARD AGENCY UPDATE (CONTINUED)

 LTJG THRELKELD: Okay. Perfect. I tried my personal laptop, and then I tried the phone call, but the webinar app on my phone seems to be working just fine, and so I will begin whenever you

all are ready.

1 2

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Go ahead. We're ready when you are.

4 5

LTJG THRELKELD: Okay, and so I will just go ahead and jump into the next slide, with our domestic fisheries. In regard to our domestic fisheries for Quarter 2, we had a total of 212 boardings, and we had fifty-one vessels that were issued safety violations, and fourteen vessels were issued LMR violations.

Our observed compliance rate was 93.4 percent, meaning, 93 percent of the time, when we conducted a boarding, that vessel is within compliance for fisheries regulations, and we calculate that statistic by subtracting the total boardings, subtract the LMR violations, and then we divide that number by the total boardings and multiply by a hundred, and that's how we get that observed compliance rate.

Then, looking ahead, obviously, with the summer months, more people are going to be out on the water, and so that's going to allow our boarding teams to board more vessels and focus primarily on our high and medium-precedence fisheries, and then we're also looking to strengthen relationships internally and externally.

Most recently, we have digitalized the LMR case packaging process with NOAA, and so now we are -- We used to mail them in, but it's all electronic, and so that has improved our efficiency and fidelity of information exchange, and it hopefully speeds up the prosecution process.

In addition, we're going to continue to advocate for asset allocation for our domestic fisheries mission. It seems like the migration surge in south Florida and the Caribbean has slowed down, and so we're going to be looking to allocate more resources for LMR.

 Now we have our other law enforcement missions for Quarter 2, and so we had a total of thirty lancha interdictions and 3,500 pounds of catch that was seized. Looking ahead, we are trying to strengthen our international partnership with Mexico, to reduce the number of repeat offenders and lancha incursions, and we're continuing to improve our interdiction capabilities, with new surveillance technology with CBP. Pending any questions, this concludes my brief, and thank you for bearing with me on the technical difficulties.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Shelby. Is there any

questions for Lieutenant Threlkeld? I am not seeing. Lieutenant, I have one question for you, back on the last slide, where there's a picture of a captain conducting disposal at-sea of the catch. Is that -- Is he just trying to get rid of those fish before you all board him, or is that something that you're just asking them to dispose of that catch or what?

LTJG THRELKELD: I will give the lawyer answer, as it can happen, and it depends. Sometimes we'll have them dispose of catch overboard, and so they'll try to go undetected with having catch onboard, but, whenever we do have large seizures, we try to donate the catch to a turtle sanctuary near South Padre, but, weather depending, we may just have to dispose of the catch atsea.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? Well, Lieutenant, I'm not seeing anything. Thank you for the presentation.

LTJG THRELKELD: Thank you for your time.

### CLOSED SESSION REPORT

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, everyone. We have about five minutes before public testimony, and so, Chris, I don't believe we have time to get into Shrimp, and so, if there's any discussion, I don't want to curb that.

I do have one real short report that I think we can get through. I want to give the report on the closed session that we had a few days ago regarding selection of the Coastal Migratory Pelagics, and that's on Tab T, if you're looking, but this is essentially just reading who we appointed to that.

The Full Council was convened in a closed session on the afternoon of June 5 to appoint the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Advisory Panel members. The council made the following appointments for the period of June 2023 to 2026, and these appointees are: Steven Asher; Kesley Banks; Charles Bergmann, II; William Campbell; Joshua Ellender; Justin Fadalla; Martin Fisher; Gary Hayes; Benjamin Knight; David Krebs, Jr.; Christopher Mallory; Tom Marvel; Alex Murray; George Niles; Kelty Readenour; Lance Robinson; Will Stein, III; Edward Swindell; Ed Walker; and Robert Woithe. This concludes my report.

I am not seeing any hands up that there's any questions for the report, and what we'll do, since we're just about five minutes

ahead of public testimony, is I have a statement that I need to read, but then this will give a little bit of time for Bernie and Beth to prepare for the public testimony.

All right, and it looks like we have just over twenty people wanting to give public testimony, and we'll begin that shortly, and what I think we'll do is we'll start with the dignitaries in the room, and then we'll go back and forth between online and in the room, and we've got about six people online wanting to give testimony. I'm going to go ahead and read the statement regarding testimony into the record, so that everyone is aware.

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 at the back of the 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 will 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 if all registered in-person and virtual participants have completed their comment. Okay. With that, we will begin with in the room, and up first will be Lawrence Marino

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. LAWRENCE MARINO: Good afternoon. My name is Larry Marino, and I'm here on behalf of Louisiana Attorney General Jeff Landry. As to the IFQ program, staff and NOAA presented a good list of goals and objectives that generally covers the ideas and issues that we've heard about, and the discussions by the council were encouraging. It's taken a long time to get started, but now the council has gotten started.

It was also encouraging that the council focused on areas where improvement was needed. The program does work well in most respects, but work is definitely needed regarding allocation of the quota and reducing discards.

The list of goals and objectives that the council developed is a good starting point, as is its prioritization of the goals, but they will still have to be balanced against each other, even though they are prioritized.

It was also encouraging to see how the council was grappling with the overcapitalization concern. Overcapitalization apparently just means that the fishing fleet can catch more than the quota, but limiting the fleet to that simply can't be a goal of the program. It would decimate the industry and the fishing communities. As Andy pointed out, it would reduce the industry by 80 percent, and no one wants that. Rather, reducing overcapitalization must be balanced against social, economic, discards, and other concerns.

This includes allowing flexibility in the program. For instance, we've heard that some dual-permitted boats are picking up the slack from charter fishing to do some commercial fishing to make ends meet, and they don't need a lot of quota, but they need some quota, and so while, technically, this adds capitalization, that's a good thing and not a bad thing. The

government shouldn't be in the business of putting fishermen out of business. If someone can't make a profit fishing, they will stop. That's capitalism. If they can't make a profit, the government should -- I'm sorry. If they can make a profit, the government shouldn't stop it, and that's the opposite of capitalism.

The council's first priority goal, improving opportunities for new entrants, obviously addresses fishermen who don't have shares already, but, based on the objectives under this goal, it also addresses allocation of quota, which means that it addresses those who have some shares or quota, but not enough.

Fairness in the allocation of quota is essential. Fishermen must be able to believe that the game isn't rigged against them and that they will have a fair shot at being able to fish, and they should have a fair shot at being able to fish without paying 80 percent of their income to someone who does nothing more than act as a middle-man in delivering the quota to them and who has the power to steer this right to harvest the public's fish based on favoritism, opposing dissent, or other improper bases.

A quota bank can distribute the quota at little cost, or, even if something is charged, the money can be directed back to the benefit of the industry and the fishery, like more research. If the quota bank redistributes shares, then we'll be right back in the same position as today, and so the quota bank should allocate allocation that can be changed from year to year, rather than the shares themselves, that can't. This does require careful structuring of the bank, as to who makes the decisions, based on what priorities, and ensuring that all decisions are transparently made. Of course, since nearly all of the shares are now held by private interests, where the quota for the quota bank comes from will be a difficult question.

We have heard comments that the shareholders earned the shares by fishing, and that's not true. They earned the profit they made by selling the fish they caught, and the shares were given to them on top of that, and now they're taking 80 percent from the current fishermen, or they sold the shares to someone else, who is taking that 80 percent, and, in fact, they take their 80 percent off the top.

Fishermen now earn only whatever is left of the remaining 20 percent after they actually pay all the costs of actually catching the fish, and I don't know how anybody can survive that way, and I think you're hearing, and will continue to hear, from

fishermen who can't survive that way. That's not right, and it should be stopped, and so adaptive management to redistribute the fish to those actually fishing is imperative.

It must be done reasonably and over time, and not abruptly, but, the longer we go before starting, the harder it will be to fix the problem, and it's a very good thing that the council has gotten started on it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Marino. We will go online now, and our first online person is Catherine Bruger.

MS. CATHERINE BRUGER: Good afternoon, and thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Catherine Bruger. I'm based on St. Petersburg, Florida, and I'm Manager of Fish Conservation for Ocean Conservancy. Thank you to the council and staff for providing the option to testify virtually.

My comments today focus on the gag rebuilding plan. Ocean Conservancy has concerns about serious deficiencies in this plan. First though, I have to applaud the SEDAR team, NOAA, and council staff for integrating red tide analyses into the stock assessment and incorporating the climate vulnerability analysis into the plan. Keep up the good work. We love it, and we are eager to see these approaches applied in the future.

Now, turning to the council, the Science Center has just served up a sweet opportunity. Take advantage of this. Pair the science with the corresponding management actions and make the connection.

Next, there are only a few options for rebuilding scenarios in the plan, no removals and the maximum allowable rebuilding scenarios. It's a very uncomfortable position to have only those options, and there should be a target that balances conservation and stakeholder needs.

Regarding discards, the Tmin scenario assumes no fishing and no dead discards, even incidentally. The Tmax scenario assumes that discarding will occur at levels observed prior to the proposed compressed season. However, scientists clearly stated that a compressed season will increase discard levels. The council process for a Tmax approach means accepting maximum risk and acknowledging that discards will increase, yet the council is proceeding without a corresponding management action that reduces out-of-season discards.

The bycatch practicability analysis clearly states that, quote,

"The benefits of the ACL reduction on gag bycatch will be offset by the regulatory discards that would occur by fishermen that target other species and catch gag during the closed season for the recreational sector." End quote.

While it's true that opening the season during cooler months could reduce discard mortality, you aren't aligning other species' opening dates in support of that objective. For instance, red grouper closes on July 21. Therefore, you're accepting a high degree of management uncertainty and again increasing discards, worse potentially increasing discards for other cooccurring species in addition to gag.

Beyond accepting maximum risk, highly uncertain scenarios, the plan then proposes to increase the ACLs beyond 2024. Given the large uncertainties with this stock, which went from rebuilt to overfished in a handful of years, this represents additional management risk. To apply the bare minimum level of conservation protection, the council should be requesting a constant catch approach, paired with interim assessments, before increasing catch levels.

In summary, the rebuilding plan effectively accepts maximum allowable risk, increases discards, accepts high levels of management uncertainty, and deliberately ignores direct actions to reduce the greatest drivers of mortality, leaving a very weak rebuilding plan that provides no assurance that it has at least 50 percent probability of success, as required by the Magnuson Act. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. All right. Up next, here in the room, will be Ken Haddad. I'm sorry. It's Charlie Bergmann. I'm sorry about that, Charlie.

MR. CHARLIE BERGMANN: Good afternoon. I'm up here asking that you, when you start your debate on Reef Fish Amendment 56, that you do not consider a reallocation of the quota. I ask this because this, as well as red grouper, is a signal of the failure of the agency to constrain the recreational harvest within the allocation, and, now that we've come up with a new currency, if you will, it just doesn't make sense for the people that have stayed within their allocation and see that the agency would like to see a redistribution of that allocation. That's all I really have on the grouper.

As you prepare your letter on the whale situation, I would hope that you include the facts that, in twenty-two years of surveys of those whales, they have all been in what they have

categorized as a core area, and they've had one whale that they've seen off of Texas, but to put in a speed limit of ten miles an hour, and no nighttime traveling, it's just -- It's crazy. I understand that the whales are very limited, but, over the twenty-two years, they keep counting the same amount of whales, and so that's all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bergmann. Up next, online, will be Jim Zurbrick.

 MR. JIM ZURBRICK: Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. As always, I've got a lot on the table here. First of all, I would like to say thank you for looking like we're going to get our increase on triggerfish. It's been a while coming, but it sure goes a long way for everyone to feel good about the council, at least on that particular issue.

Second, I favor the September opening, because I'm not in the charter business anymore, and I was for many years, but it seems that the September opening is very popular, and I know that NMFS will probably have to shut the season down early, and I wish it was the same time that the snapper season was going on, so that we could not have to worry about more discards, and also AJs.

Listen. We can't end up with pounds, and we have got to end up with what we consider to be a reasonable number, and I think, personally, that number, based on what I'm looking at the data, is probably seven fish, personally.

There was a great article in *National Fisherman Magazine* this month, and hopefully a lot of the recreational interest on the council would go to it, and Gary Jarvis wrote it, and it's a very generic piece, and there's nothing in there that appears to be biased, but I would suggest it has to do with council balance, and it's a very good article by the ex-mayor, that he wrote.

Also, Mote Laboratory did a -- Peter Hood did the discussion there, led the discussion, about that exempted fishing permit, and I firmly support somehow we find 3,000 pounds of red grouper, and I'm sure there will be some people that would probably want to donate some of it, because I think the greater good is served.

I am one of the bandit boats, and I 100 percent count my catch, my discards, type of fish, and there still is not an AI component to it, and so we can't size my fish, and I wish that was, so I could just look up at a digital reading over the

camera and say, hey, there's a keeper, but, anyway, they're going to make it very elaborate, as far as being able to capture the dead discards that are undersize, and let's see how that shakes out, but surely we can get the support to move that forward, and that's about it. Hopefully everybody has a safe trip home.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Jim. We do have a question for you from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Jim, for calling in today. I want to know, one, do you target amberjack, or is it an incidental catch for you?

MR. ZURBRICK: Well, for years, I -- amberjack, because I was a -- business, right, and amberjack was a huge component of our -- I needed a bycatch, but, where we're fishing, the size of some of the ones that we'll catch, the larger ones stress out, and so we really need that bycatch number, just so we don't have to waste that resource.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Jim. I'm not seeing any other hands, and we'll come back into the room here, and, this time for real, Ken Haddad.

MR. KEN HADDAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and council members. My name is Ken Haddad from Monticello, Florida, with American Sportfishing Association. Just as a reminder, ASA is the trade organization for the sportfishing industry, with over 900 members, including manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and angler organizations.

On the private angler permit, there was a lot of discussion on the angler permit, and we look forward to Mr. Donaldson working with NOAA and the states to evaluate the issue, and options, and provide solid information for decisions.

While realizing the critical endangerment of the Rice's whale, we have concerns on the speed limit petition that has been put out for comment, and we urge the council to submit a letter outlining the council's concerns, as proposed by the Sustainable Fisheries Committee.

 On red snapper management, we just want to commend the states for their effective monitoring and management of red snapper, as evidenced, I felt, at this meeting in the data presented by each of the states.

 On gag grouper, we support the motion to proceed from the Reef Fish Committee, and we want to emphasize that the allocation conversion, based on the new SRFS data, is not a blatant transfer of allocation to the recreational sector, and it is an update of the allocation, using the same data that are now used in the stock assessment to determine OFL and ABC. The old allocation simply no longer has any rational data behind it.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman Stunz, Mr. Dyskow, and Dr. Shipp for their outstanding service to fisheries in the Gulf. We appreciate it, and we thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Ken. All right. We will go back online to Bill Dantuono.

MR. BILL DANTUONO: Hi. I live and fish commercially in southwest Florida, with other operators since 2016. I bought my own boat and federal charter permits in 2017 and my commercial permit in 2021. Slow zones in the Gulf are an agenda-driven issue, and it will be a major setback and precedent for all anglers, shipping lanes, and fuel distribution in the Gulf of Mexico.

If you look at the outrage in the North Atlantic right now about the windfarms and how many whales are washing up on the beaches, and NOAA's own data shows the wind industry allows them to have incidental mortality, which includes whales and dolphins, and you can Google that, and the only anglers affected by this would be commercial fishermen with VMS, and I don't think the rec sector will abide by these regulations, and it's so far out to enforce.

As a fairly new entrant to the commercial IFQ program, and a business owner, I feel that the current system needs reform. A big talking point is you just buy quota and invest in your business. Well, what good is that if the status quo is to substantially cut species, as we see with red grouper and gag grouper, and, if I was going to spend \$10,000 on IFQ, it would just be slashed in half, which is what we've seen. It makes no sense for me to own shares, and, under this current system, that leads me to support the reform.

 Secondly, lease prices are astronomical with red grouper, at \$2.50 a pound, gag at \$7.00 a pound, if you can find it, and red snapper at \$5.50, if you can find it, and this doesn't equate to ex-vessel pricing from years past, due to fuel increases, insurance, tackle increases, et cetera. If you don't own a permit, you should not be able to own shares. How outside

investors infiltrated this industry has to end, the IFQ system and how they infiltrated that.

How about, instead of this, you just put a limit on lease price and just say end it there? Our dayboat operation provides the best-quality fish to our public consumers, and the IFQ system is affecting that.

 Lastly, I just wanted to put in the record that I support an immediate interim analysis for gag grouper. We're seeing good numbers of them, as many anglers are across the eastern Gulf, and we do not -- We need better data, which we don't, and cutting gag, or any species, by 85 percent should be a last resort. Recent changes on gag and red grouper will increase the discards substantially and force pressure on other species. Thank you for having me.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Bill. Moving on, next is Scott Daggett.

MR. SCOTT DAGGETT: I'm an owner and operator, and I'm a Madeira Beach member of SOFA. I'm in a unique position, and I've been around long enough for -- I don't like the word "given IFQs", and I earned those. I put the catch history in, and I did the work from the original ones, you know, the 1999 to 2004, the qualifying years.

I was a young captain back then, and I think I was twenty-four at the time. I'm a lot better captain now, a lot better fisherman, and so my catch history now is totally different from back then, and so I played by the rules for all these years, and I told my wife -- We had saved up some money, and, instead of investing in the stock market, we bet on me, and so we spent, this last year, \$212,000.

If you're wondering what the \$12,000 was for, that was the lease that I had to pay him to buy the 5,000 shares, at twenty dollars a pound, and then I had to pay the lease on top of that that he would have made for the year.

What I'm getting at here is this was meant to empower the fishermen in the beginning, and I was around when we all voted for it, and it was supposed to be so the fisherman could choose when he wanted to go, and he didn't have to fish in the bad weather, and it gave the fishermen the power, and now -- I heard a lady yesterday use the term "boots on the deck", and I love that term, because it isn't boots on the deck anymore, and it's the guy sitting on the couch, making a keystroke on the

computer.

1 2 3

I have to have insurance on my boat, which is a thousand dollars a month, and I take all the risk, and I have to pay for expenses, which now is \$7,000 to leave, and then I've got to pay exorbitant lease fees, and it's -- You know, grouper has gone up to anywhere from \$1.75 to \$2.50, and snapper, on our end, is four-bucks, and I just heard that guy say \$5.50, and it all depends on who you know, and, if you say the wrong thing, you know, especially sitting up here, you don't get leases.

Luckily, I work for a guy that will match us pound-for-pound, and he's brought snapper to the eastern Gulf, which we didn't have before, and now we get to lease, but it's just getting further and further away from us, the fishermen, because you made an investment.

In the IFQ system, you know the mistakes that were made, and you can see it. When you opened it up for when you didn't have to own a boat and permits, and I watched guys put VMSs on boats, life rafts, and they sat in the side yard and never moved, and you could tell which boats are moving, which guys are fishing. You've got to take the investment out of the IFQ if you want it to work, and that's about all I've got to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Scott. Scott, we do have a question for you, please, from Mr. Geeslin.

MR. GEESLIN: Mr. Daggett, thanks for sharing your thoughts with us, and hopefully you were able to listen-in or attend our IFQ discussion yesterday.

MR. DAGGETT: I was here.

MR. GEESLIN: It certainly highlighted some of the problems, and the issues, that I think we have come to recognize, and do you have any solutions that you've thought about over the years?

MR. DAGGETT: Man, well, you know, I invested money, and other people invested a lot more money than me, but, you know, people invest money in the stock market and lose everyday too, you know, and so I don't know what the solution is, but I can tell you what's not the solution, is keeping it like it is. It's going to get worse, you know what I mean?

Snapper -- Okay. \$1.75 for grouper, and it pretty much is a seven-and-a-half return on your money, because a share is \$20.00, and it's \$1.75 to lease it, and that's seven-and-a-half

percent. What's snapper, forty, and you're pretty much -Snapper is a 10 percent return on your money, and that's why
you've got to give it back to the fishermen, or the people who
are catching it, and I don't know what the solution is, but I
know the way it's going, and it is going to keep going in the
right direction, I can tell you that, because it's getting
further --

For instance, there's only seven of us left in the eastern Gulf, and I don't know the western Gulf, and I just know the eastern Gulf longliners, and there is seven guys that still catch their quota, and we all lease at least two-times that, of what we've got, because we don't have enough, and we lease two-times that, but there's only seven of us left that are owner-operators, and, when I started this business, when I was a kid, sixteen years old, there was probably fifty or sixty owner-operators, and those were the guys that you wanted to work for, because you made more money, because the owner-operator makes more money, you know, because it does it all.

Now there is seven of us left, and I'm the youngest, and I'm fifty-two, and so that tells you what you need to know, and how do you get new people in this business when there's not a forsure business plan and they don't know if it's going to be taken away the next day, and you know what I'm saying, and it's hard to convince your wife, or your family, to, hey, let's put up all this money, but we don't know what's going to happen tomorrow, and that's -- I don't know how to fix it, I really don't.

 ${\bf CHAIRMAN}$   ${\bf STUNZ:}$  We have one more question for you from Ms. Boggs.

MR. DAGGETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BOGGS: So it's actually two quick questions. One, do you fish the Atlantic and Gulf, and, two, do you catch amberjack, and is it a targeted fishery or a bycatch?

MR. DAGGETT: No, and amberjack is totally a bycatch for me, and, to be honest with you, I cut them loose. It's not worth the hassle, because I usually don't know when the season is open, or when it's closed, and I don't want to take the risk, because I'm an owner-operator, and I don't like taking a risk having that fish on my boat, because they don't pay me enough for it, and, you know, I know guys target them, but, for me, I'm pretty much red grouper and snapper, and it used to be gags, but not so much anymore, and, you know, I'm not even going to waste my time on gag, because I think that's a foregone conclusion.

MS. BOGGS: You fish on both the east and the west?

MR. DAGGETT: No, ma'am, and I'm just strictly eastern Gulf, and that's what I meant by the east. I'm on the west side of Florida, the eastern Gulf, and that always confuses me, but just, you know, from Panama City to the Keys, and that's where I fish. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Daggett. Online, next, we have Brian Lewis.

MR. BRIAN LEWIS: Good afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for this opportunity to speak. My name is Brian Lewis, and I own the Fishing Vessel Trip Limit, and we fish for Frenchy's Seafood on Clearwater Beach. Frenchy's owns nine restaurants, one retail seafood market, employs over 200 people, and serves real grouper.

The path we're going down, pretty soon, we won't even know what we're going to be eating, if we keep trying to take away from this commercial sector and reallocating fish over to the recreational sector, based on skewed numbers, okay, and so let's just say that we're getting ready to go forward with this Amendment 56, and I don't feel like we're going to stop this train at all, and we're going to sit there and reallocate, or you don't call it reallocation, and you call it recalibration, but it's the same, okay, and it doesn't make any sense to me.

We've got a fishery that's overfished and undergoing overfishing, and we're going to reallocate fish from our sector, which, by the way, I want to comment on that too, because I had about 3,000 pounds of yearly allocation of gag grouper that I could use for actually bycatch, right, because our target -- 80 percent of our catch was red grouper, okay, and now I've started out the year with 300 pounds, okay, for the entire year, and it doesn't make any sense.

Now we're going to move forward and take away even more from our sector, and I'm going to be left with 150 pounds, maybe, next year, or the year after, and, in the meantime -- Based on SEDAR 72, right, our discards, number of fish, is nothing compared to the recreational sector's gag grouper discards over the years, okay, and so, moving forward, I would like to see an interim analysis done to keep track of the stock, to see how we're doing here, because we're seeing good numbers of fish, and I hear from other fishermen, who are throwing back 250 or 300 or 600 pounds of gag grouper a trip, okay, and it doesn't make any sense to me

how, all of a sudden, we've got these numbers, and now it's like, okay, maybe the male population really is that bad, or maybe it's really not that bad.

We don't even know, and they change sex, and god only knows, and I know we've got all this history behind us, and we know that they change sex, and it doesn't make any sense to me, but, look, I support, you know, some of the moves that you may be making, but we're not -- This is not the right one, and do not reallocate any quota from our sector until our fishery rebuilds.

I want to take the time to acknowledge Susan Boggs and C.J. on their support of what I'm talking about, and so thank you for that, okay, and thank you for this time to speak, and I am open to any questions.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. I'm not seeing any questions, and next will be Charlie Renier.

MR. CHARLIE RENIER: My name is Charlie Renier, and I was born and raised in the Keys, and my dad started fishing in the 1950s, and, since I can remember, I have been on his boat and have been fishing. When all my friends went to college, I went fishing. I got married and raised a family and had a good life, and we've struggled the whole time.

I went through the whole lobster industry, with the certificates, and the stone crab industry, and I was a gillnetter. I still have a kingfish gillnet endorsement, and I started a fish house in Key West in 1990, and I still have seventy-some boats out of Key West that fish for me, and, in the early 2000s, I moved to Madeira Beach, because I wanted to get into the snapper and grouper industry.

 It was rough on the longliners, and there was times when we had trip limits, and there were times that we couldn't fish, and you all proposed the IFQs, the individual quotas, which I thought was fantastic. Okay. Now I can go ahead and buy some boats, and I can buy my own quota, and I can own it, and you all, the council, told us that, if you guys want to control your own destiny, you all need to buy your own quota, and you have it. Once we give it to you, it's yours, and so I did.

I mortgaged my house, and I mortgaged my business, and I bought over a dozen longline boats, and I have millions of dollars tied up in quota. I catch all my own quota, and my quota goes to my boats, and I still lease millions of dollars more of quota, because we don't get enough, and, when I hear you guys talking

about reallocation -- If that happens, I lose my house, my business, my quota, and I lose everything.

I did this because you all said this was what we needed to do to control our own destiny, and now I'm scared to death. Now, on this reallocation, when you talk about reallocation, please think about the people that catch all their quota, not touching theirs, and, like Scott Daggett just said, there's only seven of the original longline fishermen left. They got their quota given to them, and they bought some.

I didn't get nothing given to me. I bought every single pound of it, and the fact that you all kept saying that, as long as you buy your quota, you're going to be able to fish, and I've got my daughter now is working at the fish house, and I've got another daughter moving down in August, and I've got a fish house in Madeira Beach with a retail, and we have about thirty longline boats fishing there, and it's a great business, a great industry, and I feed a whole lot of people in this country.

I catch a lot of snapper and a lot of grouper, and there's a lot of people that can't afford their own boat, to get on it and go out and catch it, and they want to go to a restaurant or a grocery store, and that's where my seafood goes. I take care of everybody that I can, and I send grouper all over the country, and snapper, and we've been here fighting for everything we've got, and I want to continue fishing.

I want my daughters to carry on my family's legacy. My daughters are third-generation fishermen, and it is a good business, and people love seafood, and we want to keep it there. If you all want to reallocate, just remember the people like me and these other guys, and why take quota from us, that are doing exactly what you all wanted us to do with it? You all told us that you buy it, and you can catch it, and you can control your own destiny, and, well, that's what we've done.

Like Scott said, and he just took his last \$200,000 and bought quota, so he would have it, and now he's scared to death, like I am, that you all are going to take it from us and give it somebody else, and we just want to fish, and, if there's a problem with the fishery, like the gags, maybe, and, if there's not, we want to be able to catch the gags. There is more gags than we have ever seen.

We know there's a little issue with the science on there, and me and my fish house and my boats are willing to help in any way, shape, or form to get that right, so we can see the real

numbers, because, if gags really are hurting, we don't want to catch them, but we don't believe they are. There is more gags than we've ever seen.

The last thing I want to bring up is I know, in 2024 and 2025, you all are doing a snapper count, a new one. Us in the eastern Gulf, when you all did the original one, there was no snapper down there. We would see one or two snappers a year, and we never saw snappers.

Now, since I -- Six years ago, I started leasing snapper out of the Gulf for our boats, so all of our boats could go catch them, and we catch, I don't, 300,000 or 400,000 or 500,000 pounds a year, and it's a good, viable fishery for us, and so, when you do the recount, I would appreciate if you could look at us, that we never got none to start with, and I have bought some, but now the fish that are down there -- I don't want the guys fishing Louisiana and Texas and Alabama, and I just want some of the fish we have down there, and that's what our fishermen want, because there's a whole lot of fish down there. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Renier. I believe we have a question from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for being here and bringing your family with you. About how many people do you employ and depend on your business for their livelihood?

MR. RENIER: I would say, on a hundred boats, three to four fishermen per boat, 300 to 400 people, and that's not including the restaurants that we sell to and the stores we sell to. We handle a lot of seafood, and I handle everything. In Key West, it's stone crab, lobster, pink shrimp, yellowtail, kingfish, mackerel, and, up here in the Gulf, it's mostly red grouper and snapper, gag grouper, and deepwater grouper.

Us as longliners, we don't target a gag grouper, and we target red grouper. Gag grouper is something that, when you all push us out to the thirty fathoms, and there's not a lot of red grouper, that's usually when we catch our gag grouper, and that just happens.

We just went offshore, and we have already caught all our gag grouper for the year. I mean, we have a very few left, and I think, last year, we probably caught somewhere around 150,000 pounds. This year, we're around 30,000, and we're totally out. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. We'll go ahead and move on to the online person, Matthew Sexton.

MR. MATTHEW SEXTON: My name is Matthew Sexton, and I'm a commercial fisherman from Naples, Florida. I've been fishing for about three years now, and I own my own permit, and I own a for-hire charter permit as well, and I don't have any allocation. I don't have any quota, and, anytime I get quota, it's from somebody that I lease it from who charges me an arm and a leg to get it, and so it's been kind of hard to do that lately.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

> Since I've started fishing, for the last three years, I've seen quota go up about five-times the price from what it was, if not ten-times the price, and I know some people that own shares that don't even fish, and how is that fair to me? How will I ever have access to that fish, if somebody else is already hanging on to it that doesn't even fish, who sells it to the top bidder?

19 20 21

22

23

I know that a lot of these guys that are big are on here, and I know these guys who own thousands and thousands of pounds, and how come I just can't get a thousand pounds to go on a trip to make a living?

24 25 26

27 28

29

30

31 32

33

Being a commercial fisherman, I know I was never guaranteed nothing when I started, but it would sure be nice to figure out if I could buy some shares and I could earn my way to get a fish, that I would have it for the rest of my life, but I'm afraid to go buy shares. Man, if I could even buy them, they're so much money that how will I ever afford them, and, if I afford them, what happens if I get cut by 80 percent? I will lose my life, and I will lose my permits, and I will lose my boat, and I will lose my everything.

34 35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 44

45

46

It's just a lot of everything that goes on isn't fair. recreational sector needs to be held more accountable for what's going on, for how many fish are being taken. You've got people who go out there thirty miles every day and catch their limit of grouper and snappers and never get counted for it, and, also, I think that the data applied to gag is totally incorrect. mean, I've been fishing for three years, and, after I've been fishing for just three years, I've seen the gags -- I've never caught so much gag as this year, and I can't even lease gag for more than \$7.00, or I can't even get it for \$7.00. people \$7.00, and I get laughed at, and it's like it's impossible to find these days.

47 48

If it's impossible now, I mean, twenty years from now, how are my kids ever going to get a chance to fish? It's just none of this is fair. I started commercial fishing, and I thought I would at least like get a chance, but I don't even have a chance right now, at the moment.

I had a thousand pounds of red snapper at the beginning of the year, and I went out there and caught that in one trip, and there's so much red snapper out there that I think they're eating the red grouper and the black grouper, and I think they're eating everything out there, but we can't even go catch them, because somebody else owns them that don't even fish.

Fishing, for me, is my life. I love fishing. I live for fishing, and everything that I want to do is fishing. I was affected by the hurricane from fishing. The fish house that I used to work for is no longer in service, and I've been bouncing around from place to place, trying to get ahead, and it's just - It's hard, man, and I hope that, one day, things change for the better, because, right now, it's not going on.

A speed limit for us in the Gulf, that's crazy too. I could never imagine something like that going on, and I hope things change for the better, and I don't know what to say for people that own a lot of quota that maybe one day might get it taken away from them, but you've got other people that want to at least have a chance to fish, and I hope that one day I get it. I appreciate you letting me speak today. Have a good one.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Sexton. Up next is Katie Fischer.

MS. KATIE FISCHER: Hello. Katie Fischer, Matlacha, Florida, fish house owner and also a vessel owner. I just want to say that, yesterday, the IFQ discussion was extremely encouraging. I'm from southwest Florida, and, where we are, we have a lot of small owner-operator boats, and so that discussion was definitely a breath of fresh air.

What it really boils down to is the second-generation, and, when I say second-generation fishermen, what I mean by that is fishermen who entered into the program post-IFQ implementation who were not awarded initial shares should be afforded the same opportunity the first generation did, which is the ability to work hard and earn their share of the catch, instead of leasing someone else's earned share who is no longer utilizing it to harvest, and, you know, yesterday, several council members asked, you know, where does this fish come from, and where are

we going to get this fish to, you know, distribute, and, well, when you really think about it, a lot of these fishermen are lease-dependent. I mean, even Scott, even Charlie, and, I mean, they're still leasing fish, and so they're catching someone else's fish who is not catching it, and so there's your fish right there.

I speak in support of the adaptive catch shares program, and this style of management will greatly reduce IFQ discards, and it will encourage active participation in the fishery, and it will return profits back to fishermen, and it will have the ability to adapt to changing and shifting fish populations, like red snapper in the eastern Gulf. It will also help promote a future generation of replacement fishermen, which we so desperately need, because we do really have a problem with graying of the fleet. Adaptive management, in my opinion, is the future for our industry.

I also support a recreational fishing permit. If we're going to wholly manage this fishery, we absolutely have to define our universe, and I know that a lot of you are recreational representatives on the council, and, you know, it's a tough thing, but we really need it, if we're going to have healthy fish populations for the future.

I have a ten-year-old son, and he is a born fisherman. You know, you can't like make yourself a fisherman. Fishermen are born, and my son is a fisherman, and that's why I come to these meetings, because I want him to have healthy fish populations, so he can fish in the future. A rec permit requirement equals more accurate data, which would equal better management, which would equal healthier fish populations for the future.

Lastly, if we are really concerned about protecting the Rice's whale, then why are we putting wind energy and fish farms in the Gulf? Industrialization of our Gulf is the biggest threat to all fish species and fishermen of all sectors. Industrialization of our Gulf equals less fishing opportunity for all sectors. The risk is definitely not worth the reward, and, you know, what will be the incidental take allowed by NOAA for this Rice's whale?

If you -- I'm sure that everybody pays attention to the news, and there's a lot of wind energy up in the Northeast, and, I mean, every other day, you've got whales that are floating ashore, and this is not going to be good for our Gulf. Once it happens, these effects are irreversible, and so I think -- I really appreciate, after the presentation today, that you guys

had some questions, and that was great, because I haven't heard that in the past, and so I really appreciate that, but that's all I've got today. Thank you, all, for the opportunity to speak, and it does feel good to be here again in-person and not on the webinar, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Katie. Ms. Boggs has a question for you.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for being here, Katie, and so, just really quickly, do you, and/or Casey, do you own your own quota, and do you fish your own boats, or do you have boats that fish for you?

MS. FISCHER: Both. We own a small amount of -- Well, it's small now, and it's way smaller than when we started, but, yes, we do own a small amount of quota, and we fish our own boats, and then we also have owner-operators that fish for us. We're a pretty good mix. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Katie. Up next is Greg Abrams.

MR. GREG ABRAMS: I'm Greg Abrams, from Panama City. I own a fish house, and I own boats, and I own quota. The first three boats that I bought from the auction was the Arizona, the Alaska, and the Adam Sea, and they were tuna boats, and so I was tuna fishing during the snapper derby. I didn't get no snapper.

I borrowed \$1,600,000 from Johnny Petronis, that owns Captain Anderson's Restaurant, and he's ninety-five years old, and I paid him back. I borrowed \$500,000 from Hancock Bank, and I've just about paid them back, and so this -- Nobody gave me nothing. I had to buy it. I got a little BP money, and I bought more quota. It's a business, and you run it like a business. That's real quick on that.

Amberjack, I got a call last night on the way home, and the boat said how many jacks can I keep, and he's in 900 foot of water, and I've been preaching this for a year, and my tilefish boats, and yellowedge boats, is catching amberjack out the butt, but it's 900 to a thousand foot of water, and that means the bait has moved in deep water, and there's no shallow-water bait, and that's the reason that jacks has moved. They get too big, and I'm telling you the truth, and I'm not going to lie to you.

I wish that Mr. Porch, Clay, was here, because I would tell him the truth, and he don't want to listen to the truth, and gag grouper -- They took -- Ed's son, big trucking company yesterday, they killed thirty-nine gags to get his snapper

quota, and thirty-nine now. You all, the science department is the problem with the discards, and it ain't the fishermen. They're there.

If you look at the records, back in 1997, 2009, we was catching two-million, a million, million, million, and all them fishermen that were catching them, right here, Mike Carr, John Amick, Robert Andrews, David Weeks, Jerry Key, Eugene Key, Jimmy Douglas, Bubba Key, Ivy Key, -- David, Dwight Martin, Red, Steve Fiddler, Larry Mullis, Carl Roberts, Tan Bale, Ziggy Jackson, Bubba Hanson, Mike Dunn, Trey Hems, Jack Amick, John Petigene, Tommy Niquet, Buster Niquet, Ray Ward, and they've all passed. You can't bring them fishermen back, and we don't have the fishermen to produce the fish that's out there.

There's a lot of fish out there, but you all are creating a problem to create a job in the scientific world, but that's the reason that Mr. Patrick is not here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Abrams. Trenton Knepp.

MR. TRENTON KNEPP: Hi. My name is Trenton Knepp, from Nokomis, Florida. My parents got into commercial fishing when I was a kid, and they've still got longline boats, and my brother is involved with them with that, and I do day-tripping for grouper and commercial stone crab.

I keep hearing how the fishermen earned the rights to those shares, and, looking at it from our perspective, when they, quote, unquote, earned it, they didn't have to pay for the right to go fishing, and so they got a free ride then, and then they've got another free ride, and I'm not saying take any fish away from the guys that earned it, that are still fishing, but, when it got sold off and sold off and sold off, now it's turned into a racket, and it's nothing more than sharecropping.

I mean, back in the sharecropping days, the landowners at least put up the money to let the people work the land. Here, we have to put up insane amounts of money, and groupers went up three, four, five-times the amount of what it was, and it costs -- The shareholder is getting wealthy, rich, and we're -- We're not even making it, man, and it's ridiculous.

It clearly states, in the law, that no value is to be placed on these shares, and so, I mean, I can think of a thousand different things that are illegal, and so, if I go out and buy a boatload of heroin, or cocaine, can I say, well, you can't take it from me, and I paid for it. Well, it doesn't matter if I

paid for it or not. If it's illegal, it's illegal. If it's not written in there, that is what it is, and, just because you did what it said not to do, it doesn't make it right, and it doesn't change things, just because you gave money for it.

There's a bunch of other things that I wanted to say, but it's left my mind, and that's probably why I should prepare with paper, but I appreciate the moves you're making, and I -- I know what one of the other things was, and we keep saying where is the quota going to come from, and, well, if you're not fishing it, you should -- The adaptive catch shares sounds great, and you should have to work your way out, and so we had the Great Snapper Count, which showed we have mountains more red snapper than we thought, and, well, why don't we give some of that quota to guys like me, who have been busting our butts forever, and we just want our shot.

 Like my parents, and they had boats that were down that were in major overhauls during the time that quota was handed out, and so they got a miniscule amount. I mean, they've been fishing since day-one, and they got a pocketful of rocks, I mean, in perspective, and so that's all I've got, and I appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. Jane Black-Lee.

MS. JANE BLACK-LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your time and membership. If you will indulge me, I would like to speak to future council membership. I know that none of you actually make the selections of who are going to be the members, and that's not your position.

The position starts hopefully, for future membership, within the industries, and then it goes to the state level, in the wildlife and fisheries departments, and then it goes to the governors, and then it goes to the Secretary of Commerce, who makes the final decision.

I would hope, in the future, that you would first listen to the industry, and I feel the most certain that, in particular, the reef fish industry is going to be knocking on your doors telling you who they think should be there, and they're not going to wait until the last minute, and they may start tomorrow and tell you, look, this is our choice, and help us. When it goes to the state, perhaps it's an at-large position, and every state can participate, and it isn't necessary that the person is a member or resident in your state, and you can promote a person from another state, and then let's see if we can't get some of these

reef fish people to the governor's office.

1 2 3

Well, then he gets to the governor's office, and who is going to speak on his behalf? Where is that going to come from? Well, I can tell you that the industry is going to be doing it, and then to the Secretary of Commerce, should he get out, and we don't really know how many that are recommended within the reef industry ever even leave the departments of wildlife and fisheries. Perhaps they don't leave like we thought they would.

One thing I would ask you if you could do is please don't speak against membership within the commercial fisheries industry on the council in the future, and I'm not saying anyone ever did, and I would be so bold as to ask you not to, but help them, so that you can listen and hear, first-hand, from the people that comply to the multiple, multiple, multiple regulations that they must comply to, and it's not an easy job, and it's not an easy job at all.

You will have immediate answers to the issues on-hand, and you will have insight about IFQ, and you will have insight about things right here at your hand, and just be ready, and they're going to be knocking on your door, because they're going to get ready this time, and they're not going to wait until the last minute. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Ms. Black-Lee, and, also, thank you for your past service to this council as well.

MS. BLACK-LEE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Up next is Alicia Paul.

MS. ALICIA PAUL: Good afternoon. Alicia Paul, and I have two dually-permitted vessels in Panama City. I am going to start with amberjack. Action 1, modifying the recreational fixed closed season for amberjack, Dr. Sweetman mentioned that there's a need for the Florida fishermen for spring, and I know the guys in the western Gulf need the fall, but we have built a business on it in the Panhandle, and, over the years, those same people still come in May. I run over fifteen catch-and-release trips in May for amberjack, and those people want to keep them, and so my preferred alternative is 6. Give us May, and give the western Gulf the fall.

 There is no scientific, proven scientific, evidence supporting that amberjack spawn in May, or any particular time of the year, for that matter, and a hundred fish is a hundred fish, regardless of the time of the year of the spawning stage.

22 23

As for the commercial side, that sector is getting screwed, you all. You know, they started with 2,000 pounds, 1,500 pounds, 1,000 pounds, and now there's talk of 250 pounds, or seven fish, and I hate to inform you, but seven fish, at a minimum thirty-six-inch size limit, they're going to weigh more than 210 pounds, or 250, for that matter. For example, my vessel, on two different trips in February, landed a little over the thousand-pound trip limit with less than twenty-two fish onboard, and that's approximately a fifty-pound average.

The document states that, since the effectiveness of the current trip limit in May of 2020, 60 percent of those trips harvested less than 500 pounds gutted weight. I urge this council to utilize that information and add an alternative to reduce the trip limit to 500 pounds, if you've got to continue to cut the commercial sector. These guys need it, and these fishermen fish for them, and they catch them. The restaurants want them, and, you know, if we've got to continue to cut it, let's consider 500 pounds.

I will say that, from what I've seen this year alone, we've had one of the best recruitments of amberjacks that I've seen in a long time, and I'm going to move on to gag grouper.

I ask that you consider a one-fish-per-person bag limit in the recreational sector, and maybe even considering a vessel limit of six, something like that, and reallocating a stock that is overfished and undergoing overfishing, that's a ludicrous plan. You want to take allocation from a sector that's fully accountable and place it into a sector that there's no accountability measures, and it makes no sense to me.

After listening to the votes and discussion this morning on Amendment 56, it's very clear how biased and unfair and imbalanced this council is, and it's very disheartening. I would like to see you all please continue to work on rebuilding the SEFHIER program for our fishermen that want it, and we need it, and we want to be accountable. Also, continue the discussion on working on the recreational sector, through permits or licenses, whatever that may be, in order to quantify the numbers.

IFQ, I have a lot of thoughts on IFQ. As Katie stated earlier, I'm a second-generation fisherman, and I came in behind the IFQ program, and I bought into it a little bit in 2013, in red grouper, and I didn't buy much, but, what I did buy, I lost my

butt on it, and it was a poor investment for me at the time, and, watching what's happened with it over the years, it makes it hard for me to take a second mortgage on my house or, you know, take out big loans and go out there and take that risk, to put all that money into something that, if you all make one wrong decision, I will lose my ass on. I just can't do it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ms. Paul, we need you to be wrapping up here shortly, please.

 MS. A. PAUL: Understood. I am going to leave it at that, and I do like the thoughts of the adaptive shares, and give us that shot. We're out there working it, and we're catching it, and we're leasing it. Give us that opportunity. Thank you.

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

MS. BOGGS: No, and I just wanted to compliment her for coming to the podium and trying to give us solutions and not just telling us what we're doing wrong, and so I appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. A. PAUL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Up next is Devon Ledbetter.

MS. DEVON LEDBETTER: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Devon Ledbetter, and I'm working for the Shareholder's Alliance, and I have been asked to come and give public comment today on behalf of Bill Wright.

He writes: Dear Gulf Council members, my name is Bill Wright, Sr., and I've been a commercial fisherman for my entire life. I have fished all over the Gulf of Mexico, and I currently fish out of Galveston, Texas. I really appreciate the job that you must do, balancing commercial, charter, and recreational interests, while making sure that we leave enough fish in the ocean to ensure that there are viable fisheries for everyone in the future.

I have lived through the red snapper derby days. I saw how bad things could get and how poorly managed the fishery was and how tough it was to run a successful business. Nearly everyone on the Gulf Council today wasn't there when things were tough, and so I hope that my comments help to provide you with some information about a world that I really don't want to return to, one where fish stocks are in bad shape, fishing is unpredictable, discards exceed landings, and economic stability

does not exist.

I don't catch many gag grouper in the western Gulf. However, I don't think that taking fish from the commercial sector and giving them to the recreational sector is the right thing to do. I am onboard with improving the recreational data, but not with a reallocation at the same time. It's divisive, complicated, and something controversial enough that it should be analyzed on its own.

The same thing is true with amberjacks. You can improve the data, but taking quota from the commercial fishermen and giving it to the recreational sector should be considered in a separate action. I think that the IFQ discussion is a very good one, but, before the Gulf Council gets stuck in the weeds, it should really answer a few simple questions, what it wants to do, why it wants to do it, and why that's not happening right now.

This is a complicated issue, and there are many unintended consequences that also must be considered, and you must think this through and understand what's happening, and that's where we can help. We know the business, and we know the markets, and we know how the commercial fishery operates, and so we can help explain what is likely to happen if certain changes are made. I am concerned that you may be underestimating the impacts of some of the ideas that you've been discussing.

The fish stocks in the fishery are in better condition now than they were in the 1980s. Very few of the people at these meetings remember these times, and I'm here to help make sure that history doesn't repeat itself and that someone still fights for the most important thing that you need to consider, the fish. Thank you, Bill Wright, Sr.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you. Up next is Hugh Cipparone.

 MR. HUGH CIPPARONE: Good afternoon. My name is Hugh Cipparone, and I work with the Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance. I'm a graduate of the fisheries management program at Duke University and a former fisheries observer. I have three points.

 First, it is irresponsible to allocate gag catch towards the sector that contributes 99 percent of dead discards in this fishery. Second, a seven-fish commercial trip limit for greater amberjack eases enforcement and balances the need to lengthen the fishing season with the need for fishermen to diversify their catch, and, third, I applaud the progress made over the last few days on the incorporation of ecosystem issues into Gulf

Council management.

Gag grouper, dead discards are wasted fish, and we all know this. Between 2010 and 2019, the recreational sector produced 99 percent of all dead discards in the fishery. That is a waste of over 3.3 million fish. Reallocating catch to this sector is, as Dr. Sweetman and Ms. Boggs indicated, unwise, given the health of the stock, and I will remind the council that they can meet their obligation under the Magnuson-Stevens Act without this reallocation.

There is no need to race through both reallocation and catch limits. The council can set aside the controversial reallocation for a later discussion, control catch during this meeting, and meet the requirements under the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Second, the greater amberjack commercial trip limit, the council must balance the need to extend the length of the season with the need to support existing and new entrants to the fishery, for whom a diversity of catch is particularly valuable. Alternative 3, the seven-fish commercial trip limit, is the best available option. It lengthens the season, permits smaller-scale fishermen to land more fish, and make economic gains, which has been a focus of discussion at this council, and it facilitates both enforcement and compliance in a way that has already been proven to be effective in the gray triggerfish fishery.

Finally, I just wanted to congratulate the council on their progress incorporating ecosystem issues into the management process. By narrowing in on the priority fishery ecosystem issues, with a focus on those which the council can directly impact, the council tangibly advances the health of our fish stocks as the ecosystem is changed in the future. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. Up next is Kelia Paul.

 MS. KELIA PAUL: Good afternoon, council. My name is Kelia Paul, and I have two dually-permitted vessels out of Panama City Beach. Thank you for allowing me the time to speak today. I was very encouraged yesterday during the IFQ discussion, but I would like to caution this council on getting caught in the extremes on both sides of public auctions, divesting of old shares, et cetera, and, on the contrary, that this system doesn't need some kind of reform. Make sure that we're not trying to reinvent the wheel.

I spoke on this in Gulfport in April, that there were 397 boats who executed the 2021 red snapper commercial quota. Start with those boats, and find out, out of those, who don't own their quota, who are going out with the expense of the insurance and the risk and all that, and then start with those boats and come up with something for them.

The comment was made that the initial shareholders were not given their fish, but they worked for them, and I wholeheartedly agree. I would add to that though that there are those of now who are now working for the same fish, taking all the risk, all the expense, and we would like a plan that doesn't involve jumping into debt that we could be left with by one bad decision by this council. It's not the most sound business investment, despite the comments that I've heard at this podium over the years.

That being said, we don't want anyone else's fish, by any means. The increases, the holdbacks, et cetera, should be where the start of these shares come from. What absolutely needs to change is non-participants owning shares and driving lease and purchase price and keeping those shares out of the fishermen's hands. This was a mistake that needs to be rectified. To own shares, you should have been active in the fishery at one point or actively be fishing now.

With that, I do want to take a second and talk to you about the actions the council is taking as a whole and the repercussions that I'm sure may not be considered. Some of you know that I joined the steering committee for the MREP program last year, and this year the planning team, as a moderator, and so I was excited.

This is an amazing program, and, as an educator, I was excited to educate people about coming to this podium and talking to you all and making real changes in this very, very transparent process that most governmental processes are not, and, because of the things that I'm going to talk about in a second, it's left me conflicted and frustrated, and it's going to be really hard to stand in that room in November and make those same commitments and those same things that I have said about it being such a transparent and such an amazing process to come and be a part of, because of the things that are happening.

Like in Texas with the red snapper that all asked for and got anyway, or didn't ask for and got anyway, and then with gags, and we just pushed 56 ahead today, for the sake of pushing it, even though we all know that reallocating any kind of a quota

with a stock undergoing overfishing, and being overfished, is irresponsible, and all of these people are standing up here, and have stood up here, and said the same thing, and, for the most part, we voted to do it anyway.

It's really hard, as a part of MREP, and such a big part of MREP, to have all these conversations with all these stakeholders who don't know anything about the process and for me to be able to stand in that room and say, you know what, the council hears you, and they want the best for the fishery, when we're making actions that are not, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Ms. Paul. Up next is Austin Abrams.

MR. AUSTIN ABRAMS: How are you all doing? Thank you all for taking the time and coming out here and listening to us. I'm Austin Abrams of Abrams Seafood, Tarpon Dock Seafood Market, Hunts Oyster Bar, and I can see both sides of recreational and commercial, with the restaurant and the market.

There was a couple of things that I wanted to talk to you about, starting off with the gags, and we have issues with the status of gags. As you all know, over the years, under a number of stock assessments done, with numerous models, the gag stock has been declared not overfished and not undergoing overfished, and vice versa. In 2014, it was declared completely rebuilt, and the last stock assessment shows it has been overfished and undergoing overfished for the past thirty years.

During this time, permit closures, seasonal efforts to provide protection to gag spawning, has been created, and there is something bad wrong with this picture, as apparently gag have not responded to the protection provided, or there are issues with the modeling. With all the protective measures to reduce quota, the commercial IFQ program, size and bag limit changes, closed areas that prevent fishing, and recreational closures for five months, we should see improvement in the stock, yet the stock continues to go down, based on the models.

As stock holders, we need to understand where the problem lies, and so, with reallocating gags from commercial, when you know what we're catching, and you see what we're doing, and you're going to reward another sector, when you have no idea what they're catching, that makes no sense. If you want to protect a fishery, you shouldn't do that.

We feed the 95 percent of people that do not have the means to go catch it themselves. We take care of the grocery stores, and

we take care of the restaurants, and we take care of the wholesalers up north. We feed those people, and you want to take care of a small sector, and what about that 95 percent of people that don't have the means to do it? What are you doing to them?

We do that for them. You know, we employ 150 people, and we buy tackle, and we do this, and it's a trifecta of what you do when you close us down, and it messes everything else up, everything.

 With the gag, or with the amberjack, the seven fish, I don't think that should happen. That's ridiculous. They're going to catch one fish, and then the next fish they're going to catch is bigger, and they're going to throw that one back, and your discard rate is going to get higher. You should just have a set pound limit and not seven fish, but a set pound limit, is what it should be.

Allocation of snapper, I have seen my father struggle from the moment he started, and he gave it everything he had, and did everything he could to get where he's at today, and that's not rewarding, to take something away from somebody when they've worked their ass off for it. You know, when we said we didn't want the snappers, and you all gave it to us anyways, take that. Take the people that are up north and buying quota and just leasing it, and take it from them, because they don't have an active permit, and they don't have a boat.

In 2012, you all said anybody can buy it, and that's where you all messed up, and not you all exactly, but whoever was on the board. In 2012, you all should have left it for the fishermen that catch the fish, the people that don't have it, the little guys. They need it. You all want this commercial industry to thrive? Then give it to the people that don't have it. That's who needs it. Don't give it to the people that already have it. Give it to the people and give them a chance to get into this industry. That's it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Abrams. Up next is Scott Taylor.

MR. SCOTT TAYLOR: Good afternoon. My name is Scott Taylor, and I'm from Ocean Springs, Mississippi. I've been a recreational fisherman in the Gulf of Mexico for six years longer than Michael has been alive, around forty years, something like that.

I appreciate the opportunity to come and speak regarding the snapper calibration, or recalibration, in the recreational

sector. I want to speak in support of Alternative Number 2. The Alternative Number 1, according to the SSC, as I understood it and read it, the SSC said it does not use the most recent data and is not consistent with the best scientific data available.

Alternative 2, as I understand it, uses more recent landings data, as opposed to the MRIP surveys, and a valid consideration, at this point, is the best that we can hope for, as recreational fishermen in Mississippi, is that we lose 50 percent of our fish. The worst that can happen to us is we lost 60 percent, and, obviously, we have an interest in making sure the best information is out there, and not that I'm able to produce any of that, but I think it is out there.

 Alternative 2 uses more recent landings data and is less reliant on the MRIP surveys. I think MRIP surveys have been shown to be inapplicable, for some reason that I don't understand, to Mississippi. The trip surveys, I think, from last year, the MRIP trip surveys from last year, if they were accurate, that would mean that every licensed saltwater fisherman in the State of Mississippi took fifty-seven trips, and that just didn't happen.

I don't know why it is, and it doesn't apply to us. It doesn't apply to Mississippi, for some reason, and I'm not smart enough to understand why. There is a source of information, I think, that would be more reliable, and that's Tails 'n Scales. It's said to be 95 percent reliable. I wasn't aware that we did anything 95 percent over there, but maybe we do, but it's a much better source of information. The MRIP surveys are just not reliable, as it relates to Mississippi. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Up next is Dennis Parker.

MR. DENNIS PARKER: Hello. My name is Dennis Parker, from Rockport, Texas. I moved my boat from Freeport to Port Aransas and started fishing in 2012 out of Port Aransas. In 2016, I obtained a federal reef fish permit, and I currently own shares, with about 7,300 pounds of allocation. I also am a co-owner with my son, who manages the business, of Coastal Marine in Rockport, Texas, and we basically have private anglers that are the majority of our business, and so I see both sides of this thing.

I wasn't planning on speaking today, and the only reason I'm going to do it is because I have some experience fishing out of

Port Aransas, now for the past seven years, and I have seen a very large decrease, in the last couple of years, in my opinion, of the size of the fish, and the quantity of the fish, in the places that I've been fishing.

When I looked at the data presented yesterday from Texas, on the recreational landing information, I have a lot of questions about the accuracy of that data. You know, this is key information necessary for the State of Texas to give good stewardship on the red snapper resources.

I made some notes in listening to the reports yesterday, and Mississippi is leading the way on a good, robust program to account for recreational red snapper landings, and they claim that their program is 98 percent accurate, and nobody disputes it.

Texas indicated that they haven't changed anything for their management system since the state took over in 2018. If you compare the benchmark data between Texas and Mississippi, supposedly Texas caught 149,000 pounds of fish in 2022, and Mississippi caught a-hundred-and-fifty-one-some-thousand pounds of fish in 2022. If you compare the metrics of the two states, that seems incredible, with the miles of coast, number of boats, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

 I am going to skip around on this, and I've got a presentation, as you can see, and so my perspective comes from both sides, and, in my opinion, this number is being driven by the ACL target for Texas being so ridiculously low, and I don't know how it makes any sense to rehash how it ended up there for the recreational sector, and that doesn't make any sense, but, going forward, if they're actually going to manage this thing effectively, they've got have a reasonable ACL for the recreational sector. Other states will be impacted if you change it, the commercial fishing, and even recreational forhire boats in Texas.

I am running out of time, and so I'm going to skip ahead, and so, basically, I do have a proposal, and I have some other things in this document that —— I worked in the refining business for years, and, when we had a business plan, something we wanted to address, and we had an unknown, we would take a known metric, and for example the State of Mississippi's data, which is pretty much bullet proof, and apply that with the stuff we know from Texas, run a probability analysis, and you can come out with a bell curve that says what's the actual probable number of fish that Texas caught in 2022, based upon the

percentage chance. If you do that as a council, I think you'll get some information that you can possibly use. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Dennis.

MR. PARKER: Any questions?

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I don't see any hands up. Next up is James Bruce.

MR. JAMES BRUCE: James Bruce, commercial snapper fishing, and I've been through it all. There's nothing wrong with the IFQs until two boats catch 26 percent of the quota. Then something is wrong. You know, if you don't have no allocation caps, and you're making one amendment, and you've got two different IFQs.

Snappers don't have an allocation cap, and you need an allocation cap, and let's talk about the 10 percent overages in shares. You all want to know where they get the shares at, you know, and, when you go over 10 percent on your last trip, how are you supposed to pay back, when you lease your quota? So let's take these shares and don't give them to us. Just give me my fish to catch and get the money out of the system.

If you get rid of the shares, you get the allocation to the permits that is catching them, and you put your allocation cap, and I think that's going to slow it down. Then you all can go with your adaptive catch shares, and, next year, don't give us our shares. Just give us our fish and allocate the fish to the permits that caught them.

People who bought the fish, and are catching the fish, ain't going to lose nothing, not a doggone thing. You know, you make laws, and anybody can break laws, and you've got a few good people that's pretty good at breaking them, you know, and that's 26 percent of the quota, and that's a lot.

 As far as not having no fish, I have fished the same area the last four years, and it's only getting better. Not worse, but better, and so, the ones that don't catch fish, I guess they don't know how to fish, or they just come up here and lie, because a lot of people come up here and lie. If you all want to fix this, don't give us our shares. Take that off the computer itself altogether, and just allocation, and then you will have to harvest it.

47 Let them trade. They can trade, but, if you put a cap, it's going to stop them at a certain point, and they will find ways

around it, but they've got to be punished when they find ways around it. You all have got to start punishing people and not just, oh, put it under the rug. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. There is no questions. Okay. Anthony Colletti.

MR. ANTHONY COLLETTI: Good afternoon. How are you doing? I would like to start off with the amberjacks. I've been commercial fishing out of Louisiana, Leesville, Louisiana, for fourteen years. We've been in a steady downward spiral with trip limits, reductions, and we went from 2,500 to 2,000 to 1,500 to 1,000 to just about nothing here soon.

My question is why hasn't the recreational sector been shut down when the commercial sector is shut down, if you're trying to rebuild the stock? I have watched our amberjacks go, slowly but surely, and our gags went, and red groupers went, and what are we going to have left, at the end of the day? It's something to think about.

I started buying shares, and they get taken away from me. Every category I started to purchase is slowly getting taken away from me. We have VMSs on our boats, and we have logbooks that we have to fill out. We are fully held accountable, and then, as far as the recreational side goes, I've had people taking pictures of lesser amberjacks, and other species of jacks, thinking they're greater amberjacks, and they don't even know what they're catching, but we're the problem. I don't think it's fair.

Personally, I would like to see more commercial representation on the council, and that might help out a little bit. I'm not sure, but I could hope. Fourteen years, and I've watched the steady, downward trend, and this is my business, and that's all I've got to say.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Colletti. We have a couple of questions for you, and could you remind us what port you fish out of again? I didn't get that.

MR. COLLETTI: Leesville, Louisiana.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COLLETTI: I will say -- You know, I've heard a lot of people say the jacks are hurting, and there's plenty of jacks, and you have to look for them. You have to go fishing. A lot

of oil rigs are gone, and they're not there anymore, but the fish are there, and you have to go look for them.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thank you. Ms. Boggs and then Mr. Schieble.

MS. BOGGS: I guess I kind of have multiple, but they're quick, easy questions, and so you target amberjack, and is that correct?

MR. COLLETTI: I used to.

MS. BOGGS: Okay, and then I'm -- You're saying the jacks are out there, and we heard testimony earlier that they're just in deeper waters, and is that what you're saying?

MR. COLLETTI: They're in deeper waters, and they're on natural bottom. I mean, just because an oil rig isn't there anymore, it doesn't mean that the fish just disappear, and I will say that less of the commercial guys are targeting them anymore, because it's not realistically worth it.

I mean, I still target them, to a degree, but I'm catching other stuff along with it, red snapper and beeliners, some grouper, and you can't just target jacks anymore and expect to make a check.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Chris.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: That was part of my question. Thank you, and I figured it would be, but the other part is, out of the alternatives in the amberjack amendment, and there's the 250-pound trip limit that it's being reduced to, or five or seven fish, and do you have a preference for any of those?

MR. COLLETTI: That's a tough one to say, because I've had averages of fifty-seven pounds, and I've had fish that are twenty pounds. I mean, 250 pounds -- I mean, it's enough for, I guess, just bycatch, but I wouldn't be able to target them again.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I didn't want to take up too much time, in case he was going to ask some other questions, and so, if you can, very quickly, you mentioned that you bought shares, and then they were taken away, and can you explain, if you bought the shares, how they were taken away?

MR. COLLETTI: Well, the gags I had bought, and we had a reduction, and, I mean, the red groupers I bought, and then we had a reduction, a major reduction.

MS. BOGGS: I just wanted to make sure that's what he meant when he said that, and so thank you.

MR. COLLETTI: Yes. I mean, it's hard to keep investing into a business where there's not much incentive for later on.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Colletti.

MR. COLLETTI: You have a good day.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Bubba Cochrane.

MR. BUBBA COCHRANE: Bubba Cochrane, from Galveston, Texas. I own and operate a commercial fishing boat, and I primarily catch red snapper, and I catch my own quota every year, and normally I have stuff written down to say, but I think, at this time, since we are usually talking about the same thing at every meeting, I can kind of wing it, and so hopefully I don't ramble on too much.

 Red snapper, that seems to be the thing we're always talking about, whether it's reallocation or the damaged IFQ system that it's under, and "reallocation" is now called "recalibration", which is, to me, the same thing, but it's just a fancy way of putting taking fish away from the commercial sector. It's a little bit easier to disguise, because we're just correcting a mathematical error, and we're not taking any fish away from the commercial sector, but that mathematical error always seems to fall in favor of the recreational fishery, for some reason, every species.

The other thing, I know there's a lot of discussion about the IFQ system and giving new entrants better opportunities, more opportunities, and the word "new entrant" confuses me, when we talk, at the same time, about overcapitalization, and so we talk about new entrants, and then we talk about overcapitalization, and then we change the word "new entrants" to "replacement entrants" or "next generation" or whatever, but the point is opportunities, and there have been opportunities from the beginning of the IFQ.

I have been in it that long, and the opportunities are being able to lease quota, being able to buy shares, and then what I

call the open opportunity, which, after five years of the initial red snapper IFQ, they opened it up to everybody, and that one I never -- I didn't understand it then, and I still don't understand it now, but I feel like that has gotten us to where we are now, with people owning shares and not landing them.

We have a lot of different conversations about how to solve that, and, Troy, I'm not trying to pick on you, but you are from my home state, and so wiping the slate clean and starting over and putting everybody out of business, I definitely can't get onboard with that one, but I understand that there are some things about the red snapper IFQ that aren't working for everybody, and I think trying to build a system that is going to make everybody happy is probably very unlikely.

I know that some type of redistribution is a very popular idea, but, if I was renting a house to somebody, and the government said, well, you're renting your house to this person, and, every year, they own a little bit more of it, I would probably stop renting it out to them, and I don't think that any kind of redistribution is really going to help the guys that are coming up here wanting to get into the fishery, and I think it's going to hurt them.

I think the people who are leasing their quota are going to stop leasing their quota, or find a way around it, or maybe they will buy a boat, and maybe they will catch the fish. If everyone was like me, and landed their own fish, and didn't lease any, I think you would have people up here upset about that, and apparently that was the way the system was supposed to work in the first place, and so thank you.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Mr. Cochrane. Up next is Randy Boggs.

MR. RANDY BOGGS: Good afternoon. Randy Boggs, Orange Beach, Alabama. The Rice's whale thing, it pretty much goes without saying that it's a very endangered species, and that species has been out there for many, many years, and there's not much evidence about vessel strikes impacting the population, and we've seen some whales that have been injured and have been picked up on the bow of the ship, and, to close the close the area they're looking to close, it would decimate the fishery, commerce, everything in the area.

I mean, this is -- I mean, my heart bleeds for the whales, and I hope that none of them ever get hurt, but we're dealing with a

very small population. If we had a smaller core area that we could deal with, but I don't think that anything we do, with a population of fifty animals, is going to change the outcome.

Charter/for-hire needs a data collection system desperately. I am going to run through a bunch of things, and, guys, I think this is an oversight on the council's part, and I cannot believe that we have turtle handling gear required on commercial and charter/for-hire, and the recreational fishermen get a huge section of the fish, and there's lots of turtles off of Alabama, and I'm hearing more and more about turtle interactions with these smaller boats, and they don't have to have the turtle release books, and they don't have to have the gear. They don't have to have the dipnets, and they don't have to have any of the handling equipment that we do, and I think it's absolutely a shame that we don't require this on all the recreational vessels that are out there and put the education forth to save these turtles.

Now, I don't have a dog in this fight, but I've been doing this a long, long time, and I've been at the council process for many, many, many, many years.

 When this IFQ program was formed and put in place, it was put in place to reward the fishermen that endured the hard times. When we started this, and the derby fishery, and everybody was trying to ramp up, to make sure that they had good catch of the fish, the fish prices got down to a dollar, or a dollar-fifty, a pound, and people were running over to Louisiana, and they were hunting everywhere to get these fish, and to get their quota up, and this program was put in place to reward the fishermen that stayed in the program.

New entrants have the -- Everything has gone up. The hundred-dollar-bill now has replaced the twenty. You go and you steal twenty-bucks, and you could fill your car up with gas, and now it's a hundred-dollars to fill your car up with gas. The quota has gone up, and the fish prices have gone up, and the fuel prices have gone up, and, you know, there was never anything said about the new entrants in this fishery, and it was not planned to be that way. This was to reward the fishermen that stayed in.

If you want to solve the problem in the commercial fishery, put it back like it was in the initial time, in the first five years. If you own fish, you have to have a permit, and you have to go fish your fish, and that solves your problem. Don't worry about new entrants and anybody else. They will buy their way in

if they want to.

1 2 3

It's the same way with charter/for-hire permits. We lose 10 percent of the charter/for-hire permits every year, and, you know, the biggest thing that I see is we really need to go back to the way it was to start with, and then the fish stay in the fishery, and they can't be owned by the outside entities, and somebody has got to be on the boat and go harvest the fish. It's pretty much simple, and thank you, guys, a lot.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Randy. Up next is Jay Mullins.

MR. JAY MULLINS: Good afternoon, council. My name is Jay Mullins, eastern Gulf longliner, owner and operator of the one of the seven that Mr. Daggett was taking about. I really want to put this in perspective when I start this.

The only natural resource in the United States that is under federal jurisdiction that we do not pay the federal government to harvest, and we harvest it, and then we have to pay a private individual if we get up here and talk about what they want us to talk about, and if your idea is different from those who own all this quota, we're going to blackball you.

I would be so happy to say that I spent \$200,000 last year on leasing allocation, and I don't get that chance. I have spoken out about this problem, and it's a true travesty of this fishing heritage, and this is -- You're talking about commercial fishing heritage, and it's gone. It has turned into either kiss my ass or we're not going to give you nothing. I know the boys, the men, that I grew up around, that I looked up to, thank god they're not still alive. Anyway, I really don't want to go too much more down that road.

Discards, years ago, when we cut the size limit from twenty to eighteen inches, we had a long discussion about discards, and, if it was up to me, we wouldn't have a size limit, and, hell, didn't you ever think about increasing the hook size? I brought that idea up, and Mote Marine, that is here, took that idea and did a research project on it, and there was a 30 percent reduction in undersized discards alone.

I come here and speak about conservation movements, because that's what I care about, and I've got two young boys that I take offshore with me when they're able to go, and they grew up, and their uncle -- They idolized their uncle, my brother, that passed away, and they want to be like that, and they love seeing the porpoises, and they love seeing the fish offshore. We're

fishermen, whether you're recreational fishermen, if I'm north salmon fishing or if I'm down here, and it doesn't matter. a fisherman, but, at the current rate this program is going, we're destroying it.

4 5 6

7

8

9

10 11

2

3

We all are, and I pray, I pray, by God, that you all fix it. can't be going around paying private individuals, and the best thing is I don't know if you all even paid attention, and, hell, I can go give you \$200,000 cash, and you can write it down as a gift, and it don't even get counted on your taxes, and that's how dirty this system actually is, and you all need to really look at it. Thank you.

12 13 14

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. We have a question for you from Dakus.

15 16 17

MR. GEESLIN: Mr. Mullins, I know you were here yesterday, and I saw you in the audience, and where would you start?

18 19 20

MR. MULLINS: Excuse me?

21 22

23

MR. GEESLIN: Where would you start, if you were sitting in our position, to overhaul, or make some changes, to the IFQ system? Where would you start?

24 25 26

27

28

29

30

MR. MULLINS: You asked the right one. If you actively harvest the fish, you deserve the right to fish. If you ain't out there risking your life, and what's the only, you know, thing you can't pay for? That's time. When I go offshore for fourteen days at a time, tell me what that time, fourteen days, is worth away from my family.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

38

I just missed fourteen days of my family's life, and how much money is that worth? You can't put a price on it. You've got to put it back in the hands of who is actively harvesting the We qualified at 150,000 pounds of grouper from 1999 to 2005, for the qualifying years. We didn't have a snapper fishery in the eastern Gulf, and we were given 211 pounds of red snapper to go with all that grouper.

39 40 41

42

43

I go out now, which is no problem, and I just did it again, and 18,000 pounds of fish, ten days fishing, thirty-two sets, and we didn't get the access to the red snapper in the eastern Gulf, and that's what I am asking for.

44 45 46

48

You all really need to pay attention to how these fish are 47 distributed. You got the Great Red Snapper Count, and you know how many fish are where they are, and that's the best science

available, right, and distribute the fish equally and equitably amongst us fishermen. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Mullins, I have a brief question for you,

MR. MULLINS: Okay.

and hopefully it will be a brief answer.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: This discard rate of amberjack, this discussion we've been having about seven fish or number of pounds, and there's some concern, and some discussions, and I want to make sure we're not putting in an unintended consequence or, you know, artificially increasing bycatch, because of that issue, but what is your opinion?

If you have seven fish at the deck, versus a poundage allocation, and is that going to increase or decrease the discards, or what's your on-the-water experience for something like that?

 MR. MULLINS: That brings me to the idea of pulling up to a boat snapper fishing for a tournament, right, with 500 or 600 pounds of snapper floating behind the boat, because it was a tournament, you know, and the little ones don't win the tournament. It's the same with our recreational bag limits. We go by weight and not by fish. If you go by fish, you're going to keep them right there, and, if you catch a bigger one, you're going to throw them back in the water and keep the bigger one, and it's just like bag limits on recreational. Put bag limits in pounds, or inches, on recreational fishing, or anything, and you would reduce discards. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Mullins. Okay. Up next is Randy Sobieraj.

MR. RANDY SOBIERAJ: Hello. My name is Randy Sobieraj, owner and operator of the Commercial Vessel Last Sight. Thank you today for letting me talk today. I am a predominantly deepwater and kingfish fisherman, and, as much as I try not to, I do catch red snapper, just being where I'm at in Leesville, Louisiana.

We have such a high lease price that it almost is easier to release them than it is to catch them, even though I only make two-dollars a pound for them, but, in 300 foot of water, they don't exactly swim back down, and the Magnuson-Stevens Act clearly states the need for set-asides for new entrants and participants, and the allocation policy of 2016 warrants a review, if such a thing is happening.

1 2

I'm a first-generation fisherman of the Gulf of Mexico. As with every other fisherman here, at one point, whether they're second, third, fourth, et cetera, generation, every family had a first. As with everything in life, there's pros and cons, but talks to modify the catch share program is an unsolvable feat, but, with certain rules that are already in place that could be implemented, like set-asides, and opportunity is all that is needed to get a foot in the door for my business and any future fishermen, because, as you can see, most fishermen here are aging, as I'm probably one of the few young fishermen left in this industry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Randy. We have a question for you from Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for being here today, Randy, and so you said that you fish the deeper waters, and are you seeing the amberjack out there, or is that --

MR. SOBIERAJ: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BOGGS: Do you encounter -- That's a bycatch for you or a targeted species?

MR. SOBIERAJ: At less than a thousand pounds, it's hard to go straight amberjack fishing, especially if you're running sixty miles, and so it's more of a bycatch fishery, and then plus we're out for ten to fourteen days, and so it's not worth targeting anything, really, at that point, you know, yellowedge grouper, tilefish, scamps, whatever, and so it's just an added bonus for us.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SOBIERAJ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Up next is Jason Delacruz.

MR. JASON DELACRUZ: Good afternoon. First, I want to thank Greg for your service. It's been a long time here, and it's been fun. It's been challenging, and, also, Mr. Dyskow. The conversations we've had about business has really been a good thing, and I've enjoyed having you here, for somebody that sees the business side of what we do, and I've appreciated some of your comments for that.

48 Let's get into the amberjack thing, real quick, just because

it's easy. It needs to be a counter fish, and I will tell you which it needs to be a counter fish. It's easy to say a lot of other things, but I live in the real world that, when my boat pulls to the dock, or when I pull to the dock, and I have a guesstimate of weight, and you have a young, new officer that's trying to make a name for himself, if I'm off on that weight, you're going to get me a \$5,000 or \$10,000 fine, if we have such a low weight, at like 250. If you give me seven fish, I can make sure that I have seven fish.

As far as the high-grading thing goes, yes, that's a possibility, but I think that's a lot more acceptable than you guys putting me in a position to get fines, when I've done nothing wrong. You know what I mean? You're estimating a fish, a really big fish, and that's a challenging fish to deal with.

Gags are ridiculous. Reallocating away because it's a recalibration, and giving more to a sector that is killing so many fish already -- When we said three-million fish earlier, how many pounds of fish is that? I mean, that's insane, and we have to do something about the recreational discards in this fishery, or we're just wasting our time. We're just simply going to continue until we get down to nothing, and then there will be them and not us, because we have to catch fish for a living.

The IFQ stuff, I actually like the fact that we're getting really serious about it. It's time to get wrapped around the axle on this issue. Let's show everybody the reality of what's going to happen with the rules that you guys are talking about, and we talked about it in this philosophical way, and we need to chance for you guys to put things on paper that we can see, and then you can get an opportunity to have input that's going to show you what's really going to happen, or at least for me to imply it, because there's a lot of realities that a lot of people will think these things are going to fix that may cause way worse problems than they realize.

 I think it's worth it for us to have that discussion and that timeframe to have a that discussion. That was how I approached my time, when I was on the advisory panel, and I tried really hard to dig into the weeds, so that we could have some deep discussions with everybody, and so, anyway, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Jason. Marshall Gross.

MR. MARSHALL GROSS: How are you all doing? I am Marshall Gross, and I fish out of Leesville, and I run Wayne Werner's

boat. May he rest in peace.

I will start with the jacks. Jacks was closed last month, and I was fishing, and I probably threw back 2,500 pounds in a trip. Where we're at, there's no problem with jacks or gags, and, you know, I have zero pounds of gags left, and they're going to float off and die, and, no matter if we catch one or thirty, they're going to die, and the jacks, too. If you catch a jack in a hundred foot of water, he will probably swim down, but, 300 or 500 foot, it floats off, and it don't live.

 Now, the snapper, I don't know what you could do with that, because one thing is it's all about money and fish and pounds, and everybody wants it, and everybody can't have it, and so I've been fishing for my uncle for twenty years, and I've managed to buy 5,000 pounds of quota. I want to buy more, but I'm scared, and I don't know, if I buy another \$250,000 worth, and they cut it in half, you lose \$250,000, and so I don't make the money to play and buy the fish that much, and so I'm sort of stuck where I'm at with the 5,000 for now, but we just hope to keep fishing.

Like 250 amberjack, or seven a trip, I probably throw back 1,500, every trip, and I catch my thousand pounds of jacks just fishing, and I don't even try for them, every trip, when they're open, and it's just like incidental, I guess you would say, for the fish, but that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Marshall, we have a question from Mr. Schieble.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you for coming here today, and this is quick and easy. So, if you don't have allocation of red snapper, would amberjack be a directed fishery for you?

MR. GROSS: I mean, honestly, you can't go to catch a thousand pounds of jacks and even make money, with the price of fuel and nothing, and I don't care if you had a boat with a go-kart motor in it, and it ain't enough. Now, I don't know. If you had to go five miles to catch them, yes, somebody might do it, but, right now, there is nobody going to just catch jacks, and it's not happening. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Marshall. Up next is Kindra Arneson.

 MS. KINDRA ARNESON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the council. Thank you for your time today, and I would also like to take a brief moment to thank my colleagues today for coming today, the men and women behind me, to come and share their

passion with you. I think the common denominator is that this program is broken, and we're here to talk about fixing it.

Back when the Gulf IFQ system was created, some permit owners had never stepped foot on a vessel during the time the catch was landed, and some owned multiple permits. This created the environment that allowed for the actual books-on-deck fishermen to be gamed out of our way of life.

Comments have been made that suggest this wild-caught, renewable resource should continue to be owned and passed down. I disagree with this statement. The only part of our business that should be passed down is our knowledge, vessels, and equipment.

This system needs to be changed, to ensure American access for future generations. Number one, an income qualifier of 51 percent from landing commercially-harvested fish, shrimp, and crabs should be one qualifier. Number two, a vessel cap of no more than 150,000 pounds of any IFQ species, in the name of conservation. When two boats land such a large percent of the quota in the Gulf of Mexico, that does not -- I repeat. That does not imitate conservation in any way, shape, or form, when it comes to the resource.

 This is -- All of what I have just said is especially critical in light of NOAA's recent equity and environmental justice strategy. If NOAA is to achieve any of its EEJ goals, this council must put significant reforms in place as soon as possible, sooner rather than later.

Split of all Gulf quotas, the recreational sector participants represent less than 10 percent of the American population. There is only a portion of that 10 percent landing reef fish, yet the split in quota, rec versus commercial, is designed to permit those who own a recreational vessel, or can access a recreational vessel, through the charter sector, to take the lion's share of the quota out of the Gulf of Mexico. The percentage of American population that holds a recreational saltwater license is far less than 10 percent.

The split in overall quotas give the wealthiest portion of America's population access and eliminates access to those who do not fish, but purchase at the market at an unfair rate. Shifting quota from the commercial sector to the recreational sector should be reconsidered. This is especially true in respect to Amendment 54. Please keep a fair split in the quota that truly represents all Americans in the country, not just the

elite.

On the greater amberjack, we've discussed seven fish versus a pound limit, and different places and spaces, different depths of water, we catch different sizes of fish, and my preferred alternative would be to not change the fishery and to shift the quota back from the recreational sector, back into the hands of the commercial sector, and this 80 percent/20 percent split is the most ridiculous thing that I have ever heard.

If I'm offshore, and I'm catching large fish, I am going to put them in my boat, because I want those other fish to be there for the next day. If I'm closer to shore, and I'm catching smaller fish, I'm going to put the seven on my boat, because I want the rest of the fish to be there the next day. To suggest that commercial fishing participants would produce bad practices, or participate in bad practices, when it comes to conserving our fish stock, is disparaging myself and my colleagues, and I am tired of the public, and individuals, painting my fishermen as rapists and murderers of the sea. It is not fair, and it is not appropriate, and it is out of line. That's all, and I will take any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We have two questions. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: I am very curious, and you made the comment that only the knowledge, the vessel, and the equipment should be handed down, and so what are you proposing happens with the fish once you get out of the fishery or -- I mean, if you've got a next generation coming down, you're saying they need to go -- Help me understand.

MS. ARNESON: Well, I can help you understand the opposite side of that. A friend of mine passed away after the BP oil spill, three years later. His wife is still leasing out his allocation. She sits on her sofa at home, and she's in her seventies, and she's retired.

For me, I would like to see, and for a lot of our future generation fishermen, those allocations come back to the system and be leased from the system, and not in an auction manner, but why are we paying to fund this, for our own management of our system?

Personally, I believe, and I feel, that there should be no couch surfing allowed in this program. Why are taking \$4.50, to \$4.80, per pound, out of coastal communities, underserved, underprivileged, marginalized citizenry, and taking those funds

that could be in my community, and communities like mine, in coastal communities, as much stuff as we have to deal with to live that life, and removing that money and putting that economic impact to New York or California?

Some of these people don't even live in the Gulf, but yet they sit on their sofas, or behind their desk, while we go out and risk life, limb, vessel, and have to have -- Have to be within the letter of this letter that we operate under, in order to harvest a product to benefit someone that sits on land? If I was king for a day, and that's the question, right?

I will tell you, and I would rather pay a dollar, a dollar-fifty, two-dollars max, back to the National Marine Fisheries Service system, and NOAA, in order to fund what you all do to manage this fishery before I send it to a shareholder somewhere off the Gulf coast.

A lot of people would disagree with me about this, but what I'm stating is fact. I can't go out there and risk life and limb and sell at the dock in Venice and only be paid a dollar or a dollar-fifty over the lease price. It is not feasible, and, unless I create a whole separate section of my business and become a full-scale dealer, at the state and federal level, I have to sell in Venice. I have no choice, and they don't pay a lot of money, and so I'm stuck.

Then, when the amberjack keeps reducing -- Like the other gentleman said, and I haven't been able to fish it. If I go out three days fishing, and I'm a dayboat. The first day, I catch a thousand pounds, and the second day I only catch 300, and the third I catch zero, because the wind, moon, whatever may -- They might just not be biting.

Then that one day of money has got to cover the three, because I didn't make no money the second day, and so that's the situation this council, or maybe not you people on this council itself today, but prior people that have sat in these seats have literally picked my business apart since the change in this fishery to IFQ allocation, year after year after year, and the shareholders have created a situation, or gotten into a situation, manipulated a situation, however you want to put it, that has created where we are sharecroppers as business owners, and, I'm sorry, but, for me, that's wrong, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Chris.

MR. SCHIEBLE: You answered part of my question already for Ms.

1 2 3

MS. ARNESON: I can't hear you.

4 5

6

7

8

MR. SCHIEBLE: I said thank you for coming down here and talking today. I will ask you the same question that I asked Captain Gross back there. If you don't have access, or didn't have access, to allocation, or shares, would amberjack be a directed fishery for you?

9 10 11

12

13

14 15

16

Currently, at a thousand pounds -- Like I just MS. ARNESON: said, I don't have access, and I don't own shares, and they priced me out of the shares, and so amberjack is not currently feasible. I just got my life raft packed, and I'm going to go give it another shot and see if maybe I can increase my price at the area where I deliver them, and maybe make a day or two, you know, here and there.

17 18 19

20

21 22

23 24

I mean, just, at this point, no, it's really not feasible, not even at a thousand pounds, and changing it from a directed fishery to a bycatch fishery only serves one group. There is only one group that that serves, and that's your big shareholders. That's who that serves, and that doesn't serve You heard the gentleman say how many amberjack he had to throw back.

25 26 27

28 29

If we're talking about conservation here, we need to be able to bring these fish ashore and feed our country. that's that we do. We feed our nation. Not someone on the Gulf coast, but everybody in this country, and so thank you.

30 31 32

33

34

35

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. We need to move up. Up next is Dustin Howell. I am not seeing Dustin Howell. If he is here, we can call on him at the end here, after we get through the last four people here on the list. Dustin is not available, and so Johnny Williams.

36 37 38

39

40

41 42

43

MR. JOHNNY WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. Johnny Williams, Williams Partyboats, Galveston, Texas, a third-generation partyboat operator out of Galveston. Back in 1989, when I first became involved with the council, I wrote them a letter, and I told them that, you know, we needed enough fish to maintain our businesses, but we wanted to have fish out there, so that future generations would have those fish available to them.

44 45 46

47 48

I have a daughter, and she was like just born in 1989, and I envisioned that maybe she might get into the business at some point in time, which she did, and she's the only female

partyboat captain on the Gulf coast that I'm still aware of, and she's been a captain for about ten years, and I have a grandson, that that's his ambition now, and so I think I have a pretty good grasp on things.

I didn't want to go out there and kill every fish in the Gulf, and I wanted to have fish available for generations in the future, and I've seen that sometimes you all depend a little bit too much, I think, on the scientific data.

 Amberjack, you all started managing amberjack in 1990, and they're in worse shape now than they were back then. After all these years, we haven't really accomplished anything. I have been whining about king mackerel for a number of years, and I was just looking on the internet today, and the commercial sector, in the western Gulf, so far, as of yesterday, has caught 30 percent of their quota for the year. The fish just aren't there, and so it's just an asinine thing to go from a two-fish bag limit to a three-fish bag limit. You do a ten-fish bag limit, and the recreational sector is not going to catch their limit. The fish just aren't there.

I think what we need to do is not just depend on what the scientists are telling us, but look at the facts. I mean, you know, the commercial industry -- Wayne Werner, and bless his heart, and I loved Wayne. Last year, we had a disagreement, and he told me, this year, that the commercial sector was going to catch their limit of king mackerel, their quota, and they didn't come anywhere near it, unless they catch 70 percent of it in 7 percent of the time that they have to fish for the rest of the year.

As far as red snapper, some of the new technology that's coming about -- This bottom shading, and people are more fluent, and they're getting more boats, and the recreational sector is going to be hard to constrain there, with their catch efforts, and they can find spots that only we had before, and we called them weekend warriors, because, you know, they had a regular job, and they didn't really know too much about running a boat, but you can look at the bottom shading, and you can see rock formations, and wrecks, and this and that and the other out there, that were not available to them before, and so that's going to be a real problem in the future, and I hope you all get a little proactive with some of these fisheries.

If you recall, pretty much everybody in the commercial sector, and the for-hire sector, was against increasing the red snapper quota for the year, and I have been dealing with this council,

like I said, since 1989, and we're supposed to recover the fishery in 2032, and I certainly hope that you all take some measures in order to do some and not fall prey to some of the wishes of some people that want to increase the quota, when it probably shouldn't be done. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you for being here today, Captain Williams. With amberjack, we're looking at the season, and, right now, I think the preferred is a September and October, and I can't remember if we picked the one that would have a possible May season, and do you have any preference on that? I understand you said the fish aren't there, and so it may not matter, but --

MR. WILLIAMS: If you're asking me about the fish in October and not in the summer, and is that your question?

MS. BOGGS: We're looking at a September and October opening, and then, if there's quota left, possibly reopening in May.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, you know, one of the big issues that I think we have in the red snapper fishery, in the summer months, is we have so much pressure out there at one time. The commercial fishermen, they have markets that they need to satisfy, and so they have to be out there on the water.

The recreational fishermen, they generally want to go in the summertime, when school is out, and their kids are out of school, and the weather is generally nicer, and stuff like that, then, and so I think there's a lot of pressure from them. Then, with the for-hire industry, we're constrained to start on June 1, and end whenever the quota supposedly is reached, which I don't know why we couldn't figure it out until just a few days ago, and there was quite a clamor there in my office, with people calling and asking how long the season was going to be open, and we couldn't tell them until just here recently.

Anyway, there's a lot of pressure at one time, and there's a lot of wasted fish at that time, and it's hard to pound these spots, you know, over and over again, day after day in the summertime, from all three sectors.

 My advice to you all would be to initiate Amendment 42, where we had our choice of prosecuting the fishery the way we thought best. You know, what's best for me might not be best for somebody else.

 You know, I'm going to figure out how to survive one way or the other, I think, and I'm pretty dynamic, but, you know, I'm just concerned about the fishery right now. With more people becoming affluent, and having more and more boats, and more faster boats, and this new technology that's coming onboard, it's going to be devastating for the fish, I think, and I think you all need to be proactive and realize what's going to happen. I don't want to have to come here four years down the line and say, see, I told you so, just like I did with king mackerel. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Up next is Richard Fischer.

MR. RICHARD FISCHER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Richard Fischer, representing the Louisiana charter/for-hire industry. Thank you for your time and attention this afternoon. First of all, I want to thank you, Mr. Chair, as well as our two other outgoing council members. We've had wonderful interactions over the years, and I've enjoyed working with you all. You all will be missed, but I wish you all a lot of luck and happiness in your new life away from this process.

I will focus most of my comments on amberjack, and I think we would be fine with the preferred alternative, as well as most of the alternatives that were listed within the options, and the — As long as amberjack is not opening on January 1, I think you will find that the Louisiana fishing fleet is going to be fine with however things shake out, but what did disappoint me a bit about the amberjack document was, while we talked about the months that it could potentially be open, we didn't talk about the possibility of state management for amberjack.

It was the will of this council, ten months ago, for you all to be able to deliberate the validity of going to a state management approach with amberjack, and, you know, let's bring it all on the table, and it was also the will of this council, ten months ago, to talk about sector separation for amberjack and other reef fish, and I'm not saying that's necessarily something that the Louisiana charter fleet would be in favor of, but, if it's this council's will to debate and deliberate certain things, it would sure be nice if we didn't have to wait ten months and still be wondering when that was going to happen.

You know, I've heard that there may have been a time, in the past, when this council had a bit of power to dictate, with staff, when things would come up, and how things would come up, and I would like for that possibility to be coming up at some point again here in the near future, and so I definitely want to

urge discussion on state management for amberjack here in the very near future, and I am going to round out my comments with that, and I'm happy to take any questions. Thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Fischer. I'm not seeing any questions.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Next is Sean Heverin.

 MR. SEAN HEVERIN: Hi. How are you doing today? My name is Sean Heverin, and I run a couple of fish houses in Madeira Beach, and I sell fish out of Louisiana. I own three longline vessels myself, and I recently stepped off the boat, a few years ago, to sell fish full-time.

One thing that I want to mention here is I would like to see more equal representation on the council with commercial, charter, recreational members equally. It seems like, every time there is something that is voted on, it's imbalanced, whether it's red grouper being reallocated towards recreational, gag grouper being reallocated towards recreational, and amberjack and so forth.

I feel like we need more commercial representation on the council, as we're lacking that, so we don't have to keep on going to lawsuits every time we have to fight against a vote from the council for reallocation from commercial to recreational.

The recreational side, I mean, like Mr. Williams was saying, with the technology there being more advanced nowadays than maybe in the past, and they have spot-lock trolling motors that can hold their boat on position and hover over these areas, and they see it on the relief shading, and, with no limits on the recreational growth, for how many fishermen in that sector, and I feel like they're catching a lot more fish than maybe what you guys are estimating, and it's taking away from the commercial sector, making our job harder.

You know, not only that, but we have dolphins and sharks that are smarter and more abundant, and their predation on our fish is making our job harder, and so I'm against reallocation. I would like more equal representation on the council.

48 As far as the gags, I think that you guys' science is a little

bit lacking or behind. In Madeira Beach, everybody has been complaining about having to throw gags back every trip, and we have a trip limit on gags, to conserve the gag allocation that we do have, and I think that, if anything, we need to increase the gags for the commercial sector, for what we're allowed to catch, because the fishermen are seeing more and more of those fish out there.

Amberjacks, I feel like, you know, we shouldn't be decreasing it, but, if we are going to decrease it, for the commercial sector, it's hard to do a trip limit with pounds, because, you know, let's say, if I'm trying to shoot for 250 pounds, and I catch an eighty-pound fish, and a thirty-pound fish, and it's not like a beeliner, that is one or two pounds, and you can get to your pound limit easier, but the -- You might have to go to like a fish limit, to be in compliance. Otherwise, there's going to be a lot of fines being handed out to fishermen who overestimated, or underestimated, their fish.

As far as the IFQ system, I'm just trying to figure out what you guys are trying to do, and I would like to invest in buying some shares. I bought a little bit of shares, but it's hard to justify spending more money to invest in shares if they're going to be taken away, or cut back, and so I would really like to just kind of get an idea on what's going to happen, so we can kind of conduct our business and then plan accordingly. That's it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Heverin. Chad Hanson.

 MR. CHAD HANSON: Good late afternoon, everybody. My name is Chad Hanson, with the Pew Charitable Trusts. Thank you very much for allowing us to speak today, and it's good to see you guys. It's been a little while.

Before I begin, I would like to thank and wish Dr. Shipp, Dr. Stunz, and Mr. Dyskow well, and thanks for your time commitment to working on the resource, and I look forward to crossing paths with you all in the future.

 We would also like to thank staff and the Ecosystem Technical Committee for all their work in developing the fishery ecosystem plan, or the FEP. The Ecosystem Committee had great discussions this week on continuing that process, and I realize that the committee report was already approved earlier, after lunch, but my comments are going to be directed toward the FEP, as that moves forward.

 The FEP will be a good framework for addressing challenging issues affecting multiple species and fisheries. The plan will help alleviate problems, while providing management strategies for long-term sustainability. In other words, addressing issues identified by fishermen and other stakeholders iteratively will help smooth out the ups and downs commonly occurring in fisheries.

Addressing fishery ecosystem issues, or FEIs, through the FEP process shouldn't be thought of as a separate activity from the council's ongoing management planning process. It's tool to plug into that process. FEIs should be identified and prioritized according to council needs to develop management strategies to tackle difficult problems.

 Once such fishery, of course, is gag, which has been overfished and subject to overfishing several times in the past few decades, including now. The status of gags, among things, is affected by the red tide, discards, and the historically low level of males in the population.

Amendment 56 broadly addresses these issues, by increasing the spawning potential ratio target. However, integrating an ecosystem approach into management can provide strategies to more directly and robustly address those issues, but, since the timing doesn't work out for this amendment with the FEP and the FEIs, gag management strategies can be included within FEIs, such as red tide and discards, in the future.

The council previously directed the ETC to develop a case study looking at red tide mortality as an initial FEI. The ETC could be developing this FEI, since all agree that it's basically teed-up and ready to go, and come back with management options with stakeholder input for gag, red grouper, and other affected by species by June of next year. That's our suggestion.

This will serve as an FEI case study and provide helpful management advice. This will also allow them to help pave the way for developing future FEIs as they also finalize the FEP process, and so thanks for the discussion on that today, after lunch, and we think the ETC can do the things that it needs to do over the next few months and still work on red tide as an FEI by next year. There is a sense of urgency, as red tide seems to emerge every year.

 We also recommend convening the ETC and the Outreach and Education Technical Committees as soon as possible to finalize the FEP prioritization process, select FEIs, begin development

strategies for those FEIs, spell out the initial FEP process and finalize that, and develop a stakeholder engagement plan.

Lastly, we encourage the council to adopt an annual cycle for addressing ecosystem issues into management, as discussed in the Ecosystem Committee. This will set the timeline and keep the process flowing for useful management advice to plug into the council process. Thank you very much for your attention.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Chad. I am going to call on Duston Howell one more time. He wasn't available earlier on. Okay. With that, there are no other names on the list, and that will bring the public comment session to a close. It's about 4:15, council, and what I think we'll do is let's take a break until 4:30, and we may be able to use the last half-hour to knock out a few committee reports and save some time for tomorrow, and we'll go ahead and take up the Shrimp Committee next, if you're ready for that, Chris, and we'll meet back here at 4:30.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

22 23

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. If everyone wants to find their seats, we'll begin here. Chris, we'll pick up with the Shrimp Committee, and we'll get that pulled up on the board here in a bit, and it looks like we've got just about everybody, Chris, and so if you want to go ahead, whenever you're ready, with the Shrimp Committee.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS (CONTINUED) SHRIMP COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. SCHIEBLE: I am ready to operationalize the Shrimp Committee report. The committee adopted the agenda, Tab D, Number 1, with the addition of a brief discussion of reopening of Section 7 consultation with the shrimp fishery, due to recent interactions with giant manta rays, under Other Business. The committee then approved the minutes, Tab D, Number 2, of the April 2023 meeting as written.

Next Steps for Congressional Funding Budget for Shrimp Vessel Position Data Reporting, Tab D, Numbers 4(a)(i), 4(a)(ii), 4(b), and 4(c), Dr. Walter presented an updated spend plan for the congressional funding for shrimp vessel position data reporting, Tab D, Number 4(a)(i). He reviewed the three-part approach, timeline, and spend plan for establishing a modernized electronic location recording program to monitor trawling effort in the Gulf shrimp fishery by 2025, while noting that shrimpers

will need to continue returning the secure digital cards until a new program is implemented.

He added that more details on the line items in the updated spend plan can be found in the accompanying document, Tab D, Number 4(a)(ii). Dr. Walter noted that data from devices in the testing phase will be transmitted directly from the vendors to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

Dr. Freeman reviewed the Shrimp Advisory Panel summary, Tab D, Number 4(b), and highlighted feedback and questions the AP had, along with the AP's motion. The Shrimp AP Chair, Ms. Bosarge, commented that the Shrimp AP thought the proposed timeline in the spend plan was overly ambitious and may need to be extended.

She noted that the financial burden will substantially shift to the shrimp industry under the proposed programs to replace the cellular electronic logbook program. She added that monies in the spend plan presented by Dr. Walter included salaries for National Marine Fisheries Service personnel as well as projects that could be considered wants instead of needs for shrimp management, which the AP felt should be diverted to establishing a new program, as noted in the AP's motion.

She further reviewed the categorical shifts in the proposed budget that the AP had suggested and provided rational for those shifts, Tab D, Number 4(c). Ms. Bosarge stated that it was unclear how the data would be transmitted from vendors to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and emphasized the importance of this data transmission pathway to the Science Center being capable of handling information from roughly 500 shrimp vessels.

 A committee member stated that he heard from shrimpers in Mississippi that prices were so low that some vessels may not be operating this year. Ms. Bosarge responded that not only are prices low, but there are docks currently unable to purchase shrimp. As a result, it may take longer to find vessels that can volunteer for the testing phase. Ms. Bosarge stated that vessels in Texas that will operate after the Texas closure are most likely to participate in the testing phase.

Another committee member inquired what the approximate costs of the devices may be. Dr. Walter responded that the devices would be, on average, \$1,200 to \$1,400, plus monthly cellular fees. The committee member then inquired what the financial burden would be for the shrimp industry and if any reimbursement would be available. Dr. Walter noted that there are monies from the Office of Law Enforcement for devices that are NMFS, National

Marine Fisheries Service, type-approved, but that the early adoption program proposed in the spend plan would reduce the financial burden for the shrimp industry.

The committee member then asked if the Southeast Fisheries Science Center would have the personnel to handle the data from a new program for roughly 500 shrimp vessels. Dr. Walter responded that some of the monies from the spend plan would address integrating that data stream, along with other data streams. Dr. Porch added that the data management component is extremely important and must be set up in a manner to ensure continued running in the future.

 A committee member inquired if the proposed monies for hardware costs would need to increase if the number of devices to be tested was to be increased. Dr. Walter responded that additional funds may be needed, but that the agency was trying to be cost-effective in its approach. Another committee member asked if the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission was amendable to processing data from the SD cards through 2025. A committee member responded that, at this time, it would be feasible for the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission to do

A committee member inquired if funding would be an issue once a new program is established. Dr. Porch responded that funding would need to be maintained somehow into the future. Another committee member asked if the choice of the recipient of the data, whether OLE or the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, would impact the cost of a new program, specifically if it would cost less if Office of Law Enforcement was the recipient of data. Dr. Porch responded in the affirmative, that it would be cheaper to use the existing path for data, which includes OLE.

Under the Other Business section, Mr. Strelcheck informed the committee that his Sustainable Fisheries Division has requested reinitiation under the Endangered Species Act of Section 7 consultation on the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Shrimp Fisheries.

 The consultation needs to be initiated to address unanticipated giant manta ray mortalities in shrimp trawls and to consider new information on both giant manta rays and smalltooth sawfish. The 2021 shrimp opinion's incidental take statement anticipated an average of 1,678 giant manta ray non-lethal takes per year. No lethal takes of giant manta rays were anticipated, because there were no records of such at that time.

However, since the 2021 shrimp opinion was completed, four incidents of lethal takes of giant manta rays by the shrimp industry have been observed by NOAA Fisheries, with two occurring on the same trip in 2023. In addition, there are new publications on giant manta rays and smalltooth sawfish that may contain new information revealing shrimp trawling effects that were not considered in the 2021 shrimp opinion. The reinitiation of consultation will focus only on giant manta rays and smalltooth sawfish.

SERO has developed a tentative schedule for preparing the information necessary to formally conduct the consultation on these species and for collaborating with the councils while doing so. SERO will provide more information about this reinitiation at the August council meeting. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

## EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Chris. Is there anything that needs to come before this committee regarding the shrimp report? Seeing none, that will conclude our business for the Shrimp Committee. Thank you, Chris.

Next, we probably should move on to the exempted fishing permit. We put off -- If you all recall, we put it off to hear the public testimony, which I think we had one person speak in favor of that, and so, at this point -- Peter, I'm kind of looking to you, to make sure -- I think what you probably want from this committee is just a motion or something that would recommend approving that EFP, should everyone feel that way, which I think that's the case, and so, unless there's any more discussion on that, would someone be willing to make that motion, that we recommend approval of the exempted fishing permit? I don't know if it has a title, Tom, but go ahead. Kevin, go ahead, and we'll pull up the title of it, or you might know. Go ahead.

MR. ANSON: Just to make a motion to approve, I guess, or to --

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: To recommend approval.

MR. ANSON: To recommend approval of the Mote Marine Laboratory's exempted fishing permit application.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: C.J. seconded that motion. We'll wait a second here to get it on the board. Okay. That's simple enough, and does that look all right, Kevin?

MR. ANSON: If it's too simple, I can add to it, but, yes, that's my motion.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Is there any discussion regarding this motion? All right. Is there any opposition to this motion? All right. Seeing none, the motion carries.

All right. The other committees might take us a little bit longer, and there is a few items in Other Business, and maybe we can move to those. Carrie, you had a question about some of the focus groups and how to handle those APs, and do you want to talk about that?

## OTHER BUSINESS DISBANDING IFQ AND SHRIMP FOCUS GROUPS

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I requested this under Other Business, and so we have two focus groups currently, the IFQ Focus Group and the Shrimp Focus Grouper. Staff was under the impression that the work that's been done by these focus groups is completed, and so what we're asking is do you wish to disband them at this time, or do you think it's necessary to keep them around?

I think, if you wanted to use something like the IFQ Focus Group, as you move forward with the efforts for looking at changing the program, you would need to advertise and repopulate such a group anyway, and so I will just throw that out there as well. Thanks.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Is there any discussion regarding disbanding those two groups? Chris, and then, Dale, did you have your hand up?

MR. SCHIEBLE: I can speak to the Shrimp Focus Group for sure, and it seems like they've accomplished their duty, and I don't see any need to continue that, and, if we needed one, it would be for something utterly different than what they were called for in the first place, I think, going forward, and so, if we need a motion to disband the Shrimp Focus Group, I will make it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Please do, Chris.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Motion to disband the Shrimp Focus Group.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: The motion is to disband the IFQ and Shrimp Focus Groups. Are you seconding that, Billy?

MR. BROUSSARD: Sure.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I can include the IFQ Focus Group as well, if you would like, and that's fine.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, please.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I agree, for the same reason, and I don't think they would be tasked with the same duty that there were to begin with, if they were to continue in existence, if we go down this road, with all the new objectives that we talked about yesterday. That's not the same as what they were asked to do to begin with, and I see duplicity with the IFQ AP anyway, and so we can -- I can make the motion to disband the Shrimp and IFQ Focus Groups.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you. Billy, if you're still good with that, that was your second there. Is there any discussion on this motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to this motion? All right. The motion carries. Carrie, did you have any --

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** That was it.

## LETTER REGARDING NATIONAL STANDARDS 4, 8, AND 9

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: We had some discussion that we said that we would put in Other Business regarding a letter regarding our presentation on the MSA and revising National Standards 4, 8, and 9, and I think the intent, or some of the discussion, was that there was -- That we might have some input on that regarding -- Because some of those National Standards directly affect a lot of the things we're discussing around the table.

The discussion point, if you recall, was we could bring a letter back to you all in August and then submit that for their September deadline, but I didn't know if we needed to have any discussion on that, and I think maybe the preference might be, and, if this is not, let me know, but let the staff put that in the briefing book for the next meeting, and we would all have a chance to look at that, and, Tom, obviously you will be dealing with that, if that's okay with you, and then we can comment and review that at that meeting and move it forward, but, before—I wanted to make sure that everyone was good with that, before we move in that direction, and I don't think we need a motion for that or anything, but are you — You're clear on that, Carrie?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In listening to the presentation, I think that some consideration should be given to changing National Standard 1, because apparently, the way it's being interpreted, there is very little that can be done from the standpoint of -- What's the right word to use? I got hung up earlier on another word, but, anyway, I will go by way of example.

We had -- The recreational sector had some legislation passed to explore other methods of setting forth the different ways that we might go about managing fisheries, and we had this whole workgroup that was a joint workgroup with the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and, as we worked through that, we were told that anything like say taking a look at a two-year management period and whatnot -- That we could just pretty well forget it, because we had to have a yearly ACL, and that could not be changed, that that was written in stone. Now, some confusion comes up, because we just heard the -- What was the dolphin thing, and that was the one that I couldn't -- I am going through words that I can't remember.

 But the MSE, was it, and they were looking at three years, and it was like, what, and so I am told that a lot of that hinges back to, and I can certainly be corrected, that the language that is in National Standard 1, and I will just throw it out there, because, obviously, I'm not going to be on the council, but I will throw it out there that that probably needs to be looked at as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Point taken, Chester, and I think Dr. Simmons has a comment on that.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I was just going to suggest that the SSC is slated to receive the technical memo from Headquarters on the National Standard 1 Guidelines updates, and so, when that comes to the council in August, with the letter, you can figure out if it's appropriate to provide that comment as well, at that time, would be my suggestion. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thank you, Chester. Clay.

 DR. PORCH: I just wanted to contribute to that. I think there is some flexibility within NS 1, and certainly the way you determine overfishing can involve three-year averages, and the

trick is how you interpret the accountability measures section, and there may be some creative ways, and so I think it's worth putting together a small working group, whether it's an IPT or something else, to look at that carefully and see if there's some flexibilities that we can take advantage of.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thanks, Clay. Carrie, how would you want to handle that, regarding -- Is that something that you all want to think about and then get back with us, or what do you recommend?

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think, Dr. Porch, you're referring to the presentation that you provided, and maybe having the IPT investigate that a little bit more, regarding the multiple ACLs, or moving averages, and I think we're going to go through that tomorrow, under the Sustainable Fisheries Committee, I believe, and so we could talk about it a little bit more there, if that's okay.

DR. PORCH: Yes, and I'm happy to talk about that again, but it was relevant to Mr. Brewer's point.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. All right. Thank you. Well, Mara, we did have a place on here for a litigation update, and I think you kind of did that earlier in the meeting, but I wanted to make sure we don't skip over that, if there's any other litigation updates that we need.

## LITIGATION UPDATE

MS. LEVY: Well, I guess I can just let you know -- So, with the Amendment 53, the red grouper lawsuit, right, and so we had a favorable decision, the agency had a favorable decision, at District Court, and it is appealed to the D.C. Circuit Court, and so briefing for that is now complete.

I have not heard whether the court is going to hear arguments or not, but, right now, we're just kind of waiting for the court on that. I also can't remember if I sent Carrie the briefs, but I am happy to do that, so she can circulate them, if I did not.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Mara, for that. General Spraggins, would you be up for tackling one more, and I think this is a very short report, and I think there might be a motion with it, but I think we can probably can tackle that, and then we'll call it a day, and that will make for a much lighter day tomorrow, and, if you're willing, would you lead us through the Law Enforcement Report, and that will be it for that day.

# 1 COMMITTEE REPORTS (CONTINUED) 2 LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

3 4

GENERAL SPRAGGINS: If it will make you happy, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to do that. All right. Law Enforcement Committee, June 5, the committee adopted the agenda, Tab L, Number 1, and the minutes, Tab L, Number 2, from the October 2022 meeting were approved as written.

LETC Meeting Summary from March 2023 Meeting, Tab L, Number 4, staff reviewed the summary report from the March 15, 2023, meeting of the LETC and noted that recommendations pertaining to the recently-completed action to modify trip limits for commercially-harvested gray triggerfish.

 The LETC noted that, for stocks with small quotas or ACLs, trip limits set in numbers of fish are more enforceable than trip limits based on weights. The LETC further noted that weighing fish at-sea is more difficult than counting fish and preferred a numbers-based trip limit for greater amberjack in the framework action that is being developed.

The LETC also discussed Reef Fish Amendment 56 that would establish a rebuilding plan and modify management measures for gag. In regard to the recreational gag fishing season that is being modified as part of this action, the LETC suggested that in-season closures are more difficult for officers than fixed closed seasons. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, General Spraggins. Chris does have a motion. Go ahead, Chris, or has a comment, at least.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Apparently I have nine minutes to go through this, at the end of the day here, but I would like to have a discussion, and I would have brought this up in committee, but we're not on the committee, and not able to make motions at that point, and so I sent you all a PDF with some information from a recent enforcement action, and there it is, and that's what we need.

This took place over the course of the past year, but this news release came out in April, I believe, April 20, from our department, and, also, I believe it got transmitted on the fishing wire nationally as well, and I wanted to bring your attention to this, because I've been talking with our enforcement agents for quite a while about these types of cases taking place in Louisiana, and this one is the most gross

negligence of the cases that I have seen so far, or at least the worst offense.

In particular, two individuals were cited for this, and one of them received their third, fourth, and fifth offense for violating the IFQ system, regulations, to commercially harvest red snapper, and so they also got cited for false public records, which is the falsification of trip ticket information for the department.

Over the course of 2022 through 2023, there were three separate fishing trips that these pertain to, and they landed an exact amount of red snapper with the advance landing notifications, correct when they came to the dock, and they filed the trip tickets and claimed that those were true and correct.

The agents, that worked under the JEA to do the dockside intercepts, and I guess we could call it that, for the advance landing notifications weighed those, and they actually weighed the snapper coming in, and there were some instances where those weights were several hundred pounds off from the weight reported, and they went undocumented, those snapper, and they were not removed from the yearly quota allotted to this individual for the given year, and so his allocation did not have these deducted from them, and that's a total of 1,268 pounds of red snapper were not included in his weight reported to NOAA.

I thought that's a pretty large amount to not be reported in the IFQ system, and so what I was trying to get to in this motion that I think you guys have, and I sent it up, and, if not, let me know, and I can resend it, but --

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: We're going to go ahead and pull up that motion.

MR. SCHIEBLE: We'll get the motion up, and we'll elaborate a little bit on it. I could not find a simple way to write this, and so it's fairly long and complicated, and maybe I need a little help with it, I suppose, but what the goal is, it's to have the Law Enforcement Technical Committee, coming up here in October, address this issue and to look at the number of advance landing notifications that, across all five Gulf states for the red snapper IFQ that are placed and the amount of intercepts, and I guess we could call it that, for enforcement that go with those landing notifications and then how many of those are associated with an amended landing report on the backend.

IFQ fishermen have the ability to amend landing reports after the fact, for up to, I believe, fifteen days, I think it is, and I can't remember the actual rule, but I am trying to find out how many of those are directly associated with an interaction with enforcement or not, and so sometimes, when I looked at the data from our enforcement, there are cases where individuals actually reported too much, and then they did amended landing reports, after they weighed in fish, and some allocation was given back to them, and so it's not always in the wrong direction, I guess, but what I'm trying to find out is how prevalent this is, because I can't find where that 1,268 pounds is then documented in the system as a payback.

The idea is that, if that person has allocation, that they were over by 1,268 pounds, it would automatically be deducted from the allocation that's given to them the next season, right, the next fishing year, and that's how the system works, just like it does for the private rec states, but I don't know where to find that.

I looked at the IFQ website, and I see the landings for this year, currently, that are on there, and it doesn't speak of any payback that was done from the previous year, for any of these violations, and I'm sure this is not the only one that has taken place this year, and maybe this is a Louisiana-centric problem, but I doubt it, and so the task is -- Do you need me to email the motion again?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I just re-forwarded it, Chris, and so they should be pulling it up here in just a second.

MR. SCHIEBLE: The task is written in the motion, and I can read the very long motion here in a minute, when it comes up.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. As soon as they get it up, and, if you all recall, and some of you may not, because you weren't on the council, but we had a discussion over this very thing, and there were several state agencies, law enforcement officers, talking about the potential for this, and, at the time, I don't think there had been any cases made, or something, and now it looks like they're starting to pay more --

MR. SCHIEBLE: It appears to be that way, and I have no idea, but it seems like a simple ask of the LETC, at their October meeting.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so there is your motion, Chris, if you want to read that into the record real quick.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Okay, and so the motion is that the council requests that the Law Enforcement Technical Committee, at its upcoming October meeting, research all IFQ red snapper advanced landing notifications from 2022, among all five Gulf states, and formulate a comparison report of the proportion of inspected to non-inspected red snapper IFQ landings and subsequent proportion of amended landings reports for each category and the quantity of pounds amended by category. Further, provide a comparison of the number of non-inspected amended landing reports that adjusted poundage higher versus lower along with the frequency of occurrence and the magnitude of adjustments in pounds and whether any patterns exist. The LETC should provide a report back to the council at its January 2024 meeting in the Law Enforcement Committee.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Chris. We need a second, if anyone is willing to second that motion. Susan. Okay. We've got a second from Susan. Chris, we've had pretty good rationale, and if there's anything else that you want to add, or if there's any discussion.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Just I have discussed this individually with different law enforcement folks, and it was, obviously, led by Major Aucoin, Dean Aucoin, in our department, and I work with him, and he's on the LETC, and I spoke with Scott Bannon and other enforcement agents about this, is this a doable ask, and is this going to bog them down tremendously or not, and they seemed to think that this is a workable problem, or a workable solution to the problem, to be able to present this back to us in that timeframe, and so I don't see a huge issue with asking them for that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Discussion? Kevin, I see your hand is up.

MR. ANSON: For background, to inform whether or not I have a question related to this motion, going back to the announcement that Louisiana LDWF had with the violations, in that specific instance, this was an individual, or individuals, who had quota, allocation, and they were also dealers, and is that correct, and so they were fishermen and dealers, correct?

MR. SCHIEBLE: There was a relationship between the fisherman and the dealer that caused the situation.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Kevin.

MR. ANSON: I am wondering, just because there's going to be a rather deep dive in looking at the data, and the data analysts will already be in there, I'm wondering, in addition, as far as the information that would be provided in this report, if it would include kind of the breakdown, or relationship, of those incidences, or those tickets that are in that type of relationship, where there is a dealer who also has the share. I wonder if that's information that we ought to include, or ask for, as well.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I have no objection, if you have some verbiage that you want to insert in there to that point.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kevin, go ahead, if you -- I am not clear exactly what --

MR. ANSON: To further provide a comparison of the number of -So, before the "LETC should provide a report back", before that
sentence, perhaps include, in addition, the report should
include incidents of mismatched reports and amended landing
reports as to the relationship of the dealer and the fishermen
in the transaction being the same entity or not. So the
relationship of the dealer and the fishermen being the same
entity or not.

MR. SCHIEBLE: What about related?

MR. ANSON: Well, I mean, related, inasmuch as that information is available, you know, and it may be that it's seafood dealer ABC Seafood, who is owned by John Doe, and then John Doe is the fisherman, but they don't know is John Doe is also ownership of ABC Seafood, and I don't know, but, if they do know that John Doe is the owner of ABC Seafood, then they ought to be able to make that match.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I think that sentence, Bernie, goes before "The LETC".

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan, when they get that fixed, are you going to be okay with that, as the seconder of that motion? Was your hand up for a comment, Susan?

MS. BOGGS: So, based on the conversation that Chris and Kevin were having, my understanding, Chris, is the fishermen and the dealer were two separate entities, if you will, but they had some kind of relationship, family-wise, et cetera? Okay. Thank you.

MR. SCHIEBLE: I don't think that it necessarily has to be that way. Sometimes the fisherman is their own dealer, right, and so that should be revealed with what Kevin is asking.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Right. Exactly, and so we can learn more about that as this report comes together, I think. Mara.

MS. LEVY: A question, and so research all of the red snapper advanced landing notifications, and so you're talking about the advanced landing notifications that are submitted through the IFQ system, correct, and so what you're expecting to happen is for NMFS to provide all of these IFQ landings notifications and potential dealer reports?

I guess part of me is just wondering what we're expecting NMFS to provide, and another part of me is thinking that we need to think about whether the information is confidential or not, under the Magnuson Act, and how much can be provided, and I don't have the answer to that, because I haven't thought about it enough to figure it out, and so I guess I'm just throwing that out there, but I don't know what the implications of this are and what NMFS would say about that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Chris.

MR. SCHIEBLE: To that point, I get it. I totally get it. There's a lot of moving parts going on here, and my thought was that enforcement already has the advanced landing notifications. Otherwise, they wouldn't know when to go, right, and so there's got to be individual landing notifications already present within the enforcement offices, because they get told they can go or not to intercept, and that's their choice, and then what I'm looking for, at the backend of this, in the report, would basically obscure any confidentiality problems, because it would just be numbers.

 It would be total numbers of advanced landing notifications, amended landing reports, and enforcement interactions, and it's not going to list the individual fishermen that this happened to, and we don't need that, and we just need to know the numbers, right, on the backend, because what proportion of those have interaction with enforcement that are then amended on the backend.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Well, thank you, Chris. I'm not seeing any more hands up for more discussion. Is there any opposition to this motion? All right. Seeing none, the motion carries. All right. Thank you. Chris, go ahead.

2

MR. SCHIEBLE: We only went five minutes over, and that's --

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Not too bad, and that's what I was going to say. Thank you for bearing with that, and I think that will make for -- I don't want to jinx us here, but that might make for a lighter day tomorrow. That leaves us with Sustainable Fisheries and Reef Fish, which aren't too packed reports, I don't think, and so, with that, we'll adjourn for the day and meet back here tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. I will see everyone tomorrow.

11 12 13

10

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on June 7, 2023.)

14 15

June 8, 2023

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

16 17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24 25

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at The Battle House Renaissance in Mobile, Alabama on Thursday morning, June 8, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right, everyone. We'll go ahead and get started. Welcome back to the council meeting. We have two main agenda items to get through today, and we've covered everything else in the agenda, unless I'm missing something, and that will be Sustainable Fisheries and Reef Fish. We will go ahead and start with Sustainable Fisheries, and so, C.J., if you're ready, go ahead.

34 35 36

DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37 38

39

40 41 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: C.J., let me make one more announcement, real quick. We are prepared to use our voting clickers today too, and so that's up and running, and so I just want to give everyone a heads-up on that, and so when it comes to the votes, if necessary. Okay, C.J. Go ahead.

42 43

### SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES COMMITTEE REPORT

44 45 46

47

48

DR. SWEETMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Okay, and the Sustainable Fisheries Committee report. The committee adopted the agenda, Tab E, Number 1, and approved the minutes, Tab E, Number 2, of

the April 2023 meeting as written.

1 2 3

Overview Presentation on Rice's Whale Status and Recent Speed Limit Petition in the Gulf of Mexico, Tab E, Number 4, Mr. Baysinger summarized the 2019 presentation and noted that Rice's whale is the only year-round resident baleen whale in the Gulf of Mexico. He provided a status update and indicated that Rice's whale's core distribution area was identified in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Baysinger indicated that, in 2021, NOAA Fisheries received a petition pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act. The petitioners requested that NOAA utilize authorities under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) to establish a vessel slowdown zone to protect Rice's whales from collisions with vessels and noise pollution. Petitioners requested a year-round ten-knot vessel speed restriction within the vessel slowdown zone. Petitioners requested additional restrictions, including no vessel transits at night within the vessel slowdown zone.

On April 7, 2023, NOAA published a notice of receipt of the petition and requested public comments on the petition by July 6, 2023. Mr. Baysinger stated that NOAA Fisheries is seeking comments on several topics, including the advisability of and need for regulations to establish a vessel slowdown zone, the geographic scope of any such regulations, and alternative management options for regulating vessel interactions with Rice's whales. Mr. Baysinger indicated that, following the comment period, NOAA can either initiate rulemaking or decide not to proceed with the petitioned action.

The committee stated that the limited information available on Rice's whale strikes may not be sufficient to support the petitioners' request. Committee members noted that speed limitations would adversely impact several sectors and activities, including, charter, shrimp, and transportation.

The committee further noted that major adverse economic effects would result from restrictions based on two reported incidents. The committee inquired about the impacts on Rice's whale's recovery expected from the petitioned measures and asked whether there are data indicating that Rice's whales were more susceptible to strikes at night. Mr. Baysinger replied that Rice's whale recovery time was not yet determined.

Committee members remarked that the petition does not detail how the speed limit was generated. Committee members noted that

technology to assist in avoiding strikes is still under development. The committee unanimously approved the following motion.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to write a letter to NOAA Fisheries outlining the council's concerns as they relate to the proposed Rice's whale petition. The motion carried with no opposition.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Dr. Sweetman, and so we've got a committee motion regarding writing this letter. Just to remind everyone, that is due in July, and so we wouldn't have time to bring that forward to the council, and that would rely on Tom, as council chair, and others, the staff, to put that forward, and so is there any more discussion on this motion for the letter? Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I thought we were going to ask if maybe we could get an extension on this.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Carrie, do you have any comment on that? Is an extension possible?

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we asked, in committee, if it was, and I'm not sure that we received a response yet from Sustainable Fisheries.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Peter, did you --

MR. HOOD: As far as I know, we haven't -- Andy may be checking on this, but I haven't heard anything about whether we can get one, but we can certainly ask.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: The discussion we're having is when it was due, and Carrie mentioned that it was due in July. Under the other letter, it was due in September, I think is what you're thinking about. I mean, one suggestion, Susan, is, if we can get an extension in the meantime, then, of course, bring that back to the council for us to review. If we have to get it in, then we go ahead and get it in, and I was not seeing, you know, overwhelming support around the table, or public comment, regarding this initiative, and so, I mean, I think the tone of the letter is going to be, you know, that's not something we're going to support, but, you know, staff can follow-up, and maybe Carrie can email everyone, in the meantime.

MS. BOGGS: That's fine, and I just thought that we had asked, during committee, about that, as a potential, or as a

possibility, and, of course, yes, in testimony, we heard that no one is a fan of this, and so I'm okay.

Okay. I am not seeing any other comments

CHAIRMAN STUNZ:

regarding this motion. Kevin.

MR. ANSON: I am just curious, procedurally, and sometimes, when we write motions, where we direct staff to kind of draft letters, that we have that the chair will provide, I guess, oversight, or comment, to the letter, before it's written, and so we're going through a transition period, and so you -- I see the chair still having responsibility all the way through to the next meeting, and so is that going to be -- Is it going to be under the chair's signature or the executive director's signature for this letter?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, and that's a great question. Kevin, I was just thinking about that, and, Carrie, did you want to comment on that? I mean, technically, Tom and I work very close together anyway, and so this would be done jointly, and so I don't think that that's really an issue, in my mind, and I finish up a little later this morning, but, I mean, tying up a few loose ends that we need to do officially, and my signature and that kind of thing, I think to make sure this gets done, but go ahead, Carrie.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Often, if it's a council motion, it will be the chair that signs, and we can -- Oftentimes, it's the vice chair and chair that review letters, before they're distributed, but always the chair would review before it's distributed, if their signature is on the letter.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Andy, I see that your hand is up. Go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Greg. All I was going to say is recommend the council shoot for meeting the July deadline. If we're able to extend that deadline, then I would let Carrie and the council know as soon as possible. I don't have an answer for you on the extension or not.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Andy. I am not seeing any more hands up then, and so we'll move forward with that plan that we've just discussed there, if that's okay with everyone, and so let's just dispense with this motion. Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. C.J., go ahead.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Mr. Strelcheck stated that the council should be as specific as possible in its letter. Relative to the end of the comment period, Mr. Strelcheck indicated he would consult his team to determine whether the comment period could be extended.

Due to the Administrative Procedures Act, NOAA has to respond to the petition within a reasonable timeframe. NOAA is also generally required to designate critical habitat for endangered species. Mr. Baysinger indicated that the area under consideration for designation as critical habitat is a continuous area within the Gulf of Mexico, from the Texas-Mexico border in the west to the Florida Keys in the east, between 100 and 400 fathoms.

Committee members asked about the number of petitions received by the agency. Mr. Baysinger replied that there are two petitions, one for vessel speed limitations and one for critical habitat. Committee members noted that specific concerns to include in the comment letter to NOAA could be further discussed in Full Council. Dr. Sweetman indicated that some of the ideas formulated in Florida could be useful.

## CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara.

MS. LEVY: Thank you, and so I just wanted to make one slight correction, and so the petition was on the vessel speed limit idea, right, and critical habitat is not necessarily a -- Is not a result of the petition, and it's a legal requirement under the ESA, and so they're different there, and the public would have a chance to comment on any proposed critical habitat when NMFS issues a proposed rule, and so what happened with critical habitat is a lawsuit was filed because NMFS had not designated it within the statutory timeframe, and so there is now, you know, a push forward to try to get a proposed rule out to designate that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Mara. C.J., go ahead.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thanks, Mara. Review of Multiyear Annual Catch Limits, Tab E, Number 5, Dr. Clay Porch, of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, presented the merits and drawbacks of using multiyear averages for setting and monitoring annual catch limits, or ACLs. He demonstrated various scenarios of how a multiyear ACL might be functionally implemented for a fictional stock.

Generally, if landings in a given year were estimated to be

higher than the annual OFL, then the current system is obligated to address the perceived overfishing immediately, even if that estimate was highly uncertain. However, if a three-year period were used, anomalously high and low landings estimates will tend to average out, reducing the likelihood of triggering unnecessary management actions. He added that using a moving average could be problematic when the uncertainty in the landings estimates is high.

Dr. Porch said that the implicit carryover and payback of landings during three-year monitoring periods has been simulation tested and is sustainable. He also said that sector-specific allocations, or the presence of IFQ management, is not expected to adversely affect the precision of using multiyear ACLs or in related adverse effects on the stock.

Council staff asked about implementing accountability measures (AMs). He said that overfishing determinations could be made every three years, as opposed to annually, and recommended an interdisciplinary planning team investigate some of these nuances prior to the council adopting a multiyear ACL approach.

NOAA General Counsel (GC) pointed out the difference in using a three-year time block, versus a three-year moving average, in that, in the former, evaluation of the risk of overfishing would not be reevaluated until the end of that time block. NOAA General Counsel also noted that the overfishing limit is applied to the stock, or stock complex, and that variability in one sector's landings would implicitly affect another sector. A committee member stated that the concept of using a multiyear ACL approach is currently a topic for discussion related to the council's recreational initiatives.

SSC Recommendations on Report from the MRIP Transition Team on Red Snapper and Other Species in Gulf State Supplemental Surveys, Tab B, Number 8(a), Mr. Mareska reviewed Dr. Richard Cody's report from the MRIP Transition Team on red snapper and other species in Gulf state supplemental surveys from the May 2023 Gulf SSC meeting.

The MRIP Transition Team is investigating non-sampling error in recreational landings estimates and the council's interest in a recreational angler landing permit. Thus far on these topics, fifteen studies have been completed, three are ongoing, and six have not yet started. All scheduled projects are not expected to be completed in time for integration into the SEDAR 74 operational assessment for red snapper.

The Texas landings calibration, recommended by the NOAA Office of Science and Technology, has not yet been addressed by the SEDAR 74 Assessment Development Team. This proposed calibration was heavily debated at the SEDAR 74 data workshop. The SSC recommended that the Gulf transition plan include integration of project findings into stock assessments when evaluating how project deliverables would be used.

SSC Recommendations on the Evaluation of Interim Analysis Process, Tab B, Number 8(a), Dr. Mareska reviewed a presentation on the interim analysis process. The SSC indicated a preference for the use of a fishery-independent index of relative abundance, accompanied by other complementary data, as available (e.g., length compositions from directed fleets, Fisherman Feedback). Mr. Mareska also noted the potential for evaluating indices for species or complexes as part of a management strategy evaluation (MSE).

A committee member asked about the availability of indices for doing IAs for certain species. Staff noted that some species lack appropriate fishery-independent indices. However, those stocks may have other representative catch-per-unit-effort indices, such as the headboat CPUE index for lane snapper and cobia. Mr. Mareska added that the SSC favored a tiered approach for evaluating the available information, beginning with consideration of the health of the stock based on presented data, and using that to determine whether a revision to catch advice was warranted.

SSC Recommendations on Management Strategy Evaluation Workshop, Tab B, Number 8(a), Dr. Steve Saul (SSC) reviewed SSC discussions of a series of talks presented to the SSC about management strategy evaluations, which allow the council to test management efficacy before it goes into place. MSE is used to simulate the interactions between data collection, data analysis (stock assessment), and fishery regulations. MSE is a simulation-based analytical framework used to develop a robust, consensus-driven, and realistic management procedure and involved dialogue between scientists, managers, and stakeholders. Dr. Saul stressed that stakeholders would remain integral throughout the MSE developmental process.

Dr. Saul discussed when to apply MSE, such as when considering difficult policy decisions, intractable stakeholder conflicts, disenfranchised stakeholders, ecosystem changes, and when scientific uncertainty threatens the integrity of the current management approach or when status quo management is clearly failing. He then reviewed some recent examples of MSE being

implemented.

1 2 3

Dr. Saul noted that the SEDAR Steering Committee did not want MSE being conducted through the SEDAR process and that council staff thought the council should provide direct feedback before beginning an MSE effort.

 Ultimately, the SSC recommended that the council pursue MSE as a decision support tool with applications to stock assessments, ecosystem issues, and council decision-making. Further, the SSC recommended the council pursue opportunities to incorporate social and economic performance indicators and human behavioral responses in MSE.

A committee member asked how the council should proceed with requesting an MSE and how it would function. Dr. Saul reiterated that MSE should be reserved for addressing critical issues and that clear objectives were needed before embarking in the process. Council staff also clarified why the SEDAR Steering Committee was opposed to running MSE through SEDAR, due in part to the information presented at the time to that committee and the variability in the time required.

Another committee member noted an uncertainty in the support necessary for developing an MSE and its potential cost to the stock assessment process. The committee member shared the other's concern about costs with regard to workload and overall analytical product throughput.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center confirmed that, for some applications, the workload for MSEs can be considerable and may require reducing the number of assessments conducted. However, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center thought it necessary to explore different approaches, in light of challenges observed in the increasing complexity of the stock assessment process against the perceived gains in management. It may be possible to address multiple issues across species through MSE.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center stressed consideration of MSE, appropriately applied and parameterized, as a way to address perennial issues faced by the council. A committee member asked whether MSE could be used to pare down the data considered for a stock assessment to the most essential data streams. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center replied that a desk MSE could use simulation testing to determine the data necessary to adequately assess a stock.

Council staff asked about the ongoing efforts with the SEDAR

Steering Committee regarding obtaining more timely advice about data-poor species that may not require the same level of complexity.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center noted that data-limited approaches have been ongoing within the Southeast Fisheries Science Center for some time and that it was possible to review the dispositions of those data-limited species and their associated data to evaluate whether any of those species could be assessed using a data-limited analysis. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, C.J. I am looking around the room. Is there anything else that needs to -- Kevin.

MR. ANSON: I don't recall, during committee, if this was answered or not, but I'm going to ask this question to Dr. Porch, and so, in regard to the last paragraph here and the data-limited species, what is the timeline that we would expect to see results of the dive into the data-limited species and evaluating what data is available and whether or not that could provide us some insights on the status of the stocks, for those particular stocks?

 DR. PORCH: Sure. Thank you for that question, and, obviously, it depends on the scope of the deep dive, right, and how many species that we want to look at. The methods are pretty well established, and it's mostly just identifying what data are available and then what's the most appropriate method for that data.

You know, an initial triage, that could be arguably done in months, given that we've done this before. To actually do all the analyses and go through a review process could take the equivalent of, you know, a SEDAR benchmark, or a research track, timeframe, and so a year or more for a full review of everything.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kevin, a follow-up?

MR. ANSON: Yes, and so I recall that there was some intent to do, you know, a kind of review, or look at some data-limited species, and so I'm just wondering, and do you all -- I'm sure you all have that kind of organized, as to what you've done internally, maybe, in looking at kind of specific species and such, and so could maybe a summary table of kind of what are data-limited species, and then maybe ones that you have looked, and have already evaluated, ones that could be evaluated, that

type of thing, maybe, kind of just a quick summary of that?

DR. PORCH: Yes, and so that would be akin to my initial triage that I was referring to, which I think we have the foundation for that already, and so, yes, that could be done probably in a matter of months.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dale.

 MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I came into this meeting, after reading the SSC report, thinking that we would probably tee something up for one of these management strategy evaluations, and we did not during the committee, and I'm not going to make a motion to do it now, but I listened to some of the stuff, and I heard Tom say, you know, that there's none of them with a proven track record, but the SSC spent a lot of time with this, and they did come up with a motion saying that they liked this approach, and they thought it was -- Their motion was something we should try for the future.

Clearly, what we're doing now is not great. You know, our stock assessment approach -- A lot of times, we get stock assessments, and the terminal year is three or four years old, and we're trying to manage a fishery that has changed in that three or four years, and folks are telling us that, on the water, it's different than what we're managing to, and we've tried, with the stock assessment process, to make it faster.

We went from the old way that we used to do it into the new way we're doing it now, but it's now faster, and it's slower, if anything, and our throughput is slower than it was before, and so I don't know. I am not going to make a motion here, but Clay said we need to look at doing something different, and we do have to look at doing something different, to manage some of these things more effectively.

While I was thinking about this, I thought of amberjack, and somebody else said this, but I thought that amberjack probably was a great candidate. Clearly what we're doing is failing, and that's one of the things that they say that you should consider if you're doing something that's not working at the time, and so, anyway, at the next meeting, I might put some more thought into it and bring this back up, under Other Business or something, to consider something, but I would like to talk to some other people and make sure that it's something that we should try, but, you know, they're doing them in other areas.

Time will tell if they succeed there, but we might be five years

down the road before we figure that out, if the ones that the South Atlantic are doing are successful, or some of the other ones that is going on, and so I just wanted to mention that, and I do have some pause that the SSC made that recommendation, after a thorough review of it, and we're not really doing anything, and so all right, and that's enough. Thank you.

CHATDMAN CE

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Tom.

DR. FRAZER: I just want to follow-up, real quick. It's not that I don't think that MSEs are a valuable, or potentially valuable, tool, and, in fact, I think that they are, right, and my concern is that we just can't go straight to MSE and forget about the stock assessment process. At some point, even if we have MSEs, we still have a need to assess the stock, and so the time interval may be longer, right, and my bigger concern was the fact that there's not -- At this time, there's not a lot of examples to point to that say this is working well, and that was it.

Also, because there is so much going on, right, particularly at the Science Center and involving various stakeholders, that we keep asking people to do things, right, and we never ask anybody to stop anything, and the resources are not changing. They are steady, and so, if we want to pursue MSE, and the Science Center wants to pursue MSE, that's cool, but is it 25 percent of their kind of portfolio or what? I just want to know what they're going to commit to, right, and it's almost like an R&D exercise that's on the side, and I just don't think that it's ready to be incorporated immediately into the process, and that's where I was going with that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I did clearly understand, when you said that during committee, and that's what gives me pause, because I think you made valid points. Prior to you saying that, I had intended on making a motion to start an MSE on AJs, but I think you make some valid points, and I think some more thought needs to be put into it, but I just wanted to bring it up here, because the SSC reviewed it, and nobody opposed us looking at this as a method to go forward with, and so okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: Just to follow-up on those comments, which I appreciate very much, one, I would say that, for instance, amberjack would be a good candidate for MSE, and I appreciate

the fact that we would still need to develop some management advice, since folks invested a lot of money in the Great Amberjack Count, but we're going to learn a lot about those animals from that, and I think that could be used to structure an operating model, and then we could look at maybe other ways to manage the stock, and so you don't always need a stock assessment.

If you can develop a management procedure that's robust in the simulation environment, and so a harvest control rule, for instance, that's keyed to an index of abundance, then you could arguably use that for your management, and not do stock assessments, but behind that would be all the simulation testing that's using models that are even more complex than what we would do in a stock assessment, and so there's a lot of work at the frontend, but, once you vet the harvest control rule, there is less work.

I would say it's used fairly widely in parts of the world, in Australia, south Africa, and they have very well-established programs, and some other places as well, and ICCAT is now using them for bluefin tuna and swordfish and others, and the U.S. is a little behind in that, because we have a very prescriptive law in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and trying to figure out how that lines up with some of the guidance in NS 1 is going to be a little bit of a challenge, but I think it's doable.

We just have to figure out how we can think outside of the box a little bit, but still meet the essential requirements of the law, but, again, I think amberjack would be a great opportunity, and we're having to regroup with it anyway, with the Great Amberjack Count, and maybe something like cobia, which is difficult to assess, because it's really multiple populations, and we don't have a good fishery-independent index of it, and so maybe looking at other ways that you can manage that stock, and vetting it through MSE would be useful.

I think it's something that we absolutely need to pursue. I do recognize that there's workload challenges, and something would have to come off the plate, at least for the Science Center to be heavily engaged. Thank you.

## CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kevin.

MR. ANSON: To expand upon what Dr. Porch just said, I don't know what the schedule is for amberjack, as far as the next assessment, but maybe, if it aligns with the Great Amberjack Count being completed, is that maybe that slot that is devoted

for an assessment actually is an assessment/MSE, or an MSE dive, and to try to do that very thing, is to maybe look at it a little bit differently, and it's kind of a research track assessment, and the research track in line with an MSE kind of organizational structure, and that might be how we might want to approach it, and that would be maybe our first foray into trying to do that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thank you, Kevin. Carrie is looking that up right now. Kevin, and so it's looking like it may be 2025 for that fishery, and so that would probably match up pretty well with the results of the amberjack count, and so, Tom.

DR. FRAZER: I just wanted to step back a little bit and think about some of the discussion that we did have in the committee, and in the committee report, and, I mean, I think the SEDAR Steering Committee was pretty adamant, right, that they didn't want to have MSE as part of the SEDAR process, right, and so —I understand what you're saying, and there's a lot of effort in that space, Kevin, going on at the same time that could be coupled, and this is where it gets to the workload issue, because we still need the analysts from the Science Center, right, to do the assessment. Those same types of people, with those same types of analytical skills, or related skills, right, would be working on potentially the MSE, and there would be some, you know, back and forth.

I am just trying to make sure that we understand that there's a lot of effort involved in this, right, and I don't mind putting the effort in there, but I just want to make sure that we're still getting stuff done, right, and that's it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kevin.

MR. ANSON: I recognize that, and, you know, I might be pretty simplistic, or simple minded, in the way that I was looking at this, is that, if all the NS 1, you know, requirements are met through an MSE, or you set that up through an MSE process, that those would be addressed, and so we would have management advice out of an MSE, and that's all I was saying, is that take that time that was allotted for the assessment, and the resources, but set it up, going into it, knowing that you're actually going to be doing an MSE, an MSE that will provide management advice, and that's all, instead of an assessment.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Ryan.

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Thanks. I just wanted to echo a little bit of what Tom was saying about how resource-intensive all of this is, and another note about the actual start date for amberjack, and it's going to be in 2026. It had to be bounced down a little bit, to accommodate some of the other schedule changes at the last SEDAR Steering Committee meeting, and, also, the research track is going to be run as a benchmark, in the way that the Steering Committee is now interpreting the benchmark, which is pretty similar to what it was before.

One of the things that we are likely to ask for, as a result of that, is what the Science Center has referred to as right-sizing for the assessments, and, you know, making sure that the right tools, the right modeling environment, the right amount of complexity, is being applied for a given species, based on the data available.

In the past, we've done some pretty tough, pretty data-intensive approaches for greater amberjack, and it may be that we could explore something that is not quite so data-intensive, that doesn't necessarily give us an inferior product, but can result in some resource efficiencies, in terms of, you know, manhours and the amount of people that are having to provide information.

 That is what you guys ought to be thinking about, is what we're going to be looking at for the assessment part of it, and, for doing any kind of MSE part of it, one of the key things is to be extremely explicit and committed to what it is that you want that MSE to do. What is the whole purpose? What is the big picture?

Everything about how the MSE is going to function, throughout its development, until it gives you something useful, is going to keep circling back to does this meet the why, the why we're here and why we're doing this, and so, similar to what you guys did with the IFQ program the other day, something similar would have to be done for amberjack, and what is it that you want out of amberjack, and it might be that you can make that decision based on all fisheries all put together, like we just want to see it rebuilt, and maybe that's what it is, that we just want to see it rebuilt, but maybe it's that each directed fleet, the commercial, the for-hire, the private, have slightly different views about what they want, and so that might create a more complex environment that is going to require some compromising in between competing interests to get you to your final product management advice that's ultimately going to and the recommended.

It's not just as simple as saying, hey, Clay, I know you're busy right now, but can we drum up an MSE, and there's going to have to be some development on the frontend by the council to inform whoever is going to do it what they need to continually think about in the process.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Carrie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we talked a little bit about this yesterday, with the Ecosystem Committee, and the other thing that I think could happen, as we go through this FEI process, prioritization process, and then the ecosystem loop, is it could result in the need for an MSE, and so the other concern, with just deciding on amberjack now, without going through that process, is we may not be able to do a different one at the end of that cycle, and so I think we could have -- I think Ms. Boggs was trying to get at, with her motion, trying to nail down some of these FEIs, and I think that is one of the things that really comes out of that process, and really tries to help us with that process, and so I will just remind everybody of that as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Porch.

DR. PORCH: I appreciate the comments that have been made. I wanted to come back to the model complexity issue and a comment that Mr. Diaz made about the process getting slower and slower, which it has. The assessment process has gotten slower, compared to when I first started, and we just had the Mackerel Stock Assessment Panel and the Reef Fish Stock Assessment Panel, because it was a small group doing the assessment, a much less transparent process, fewer data partners.

 When we went to SEDAR, the intent never was to run every single assessment through SEDAR, and somehow we evolved in that direction, and SEDAR is intended to be a very thorough process, with a heavy amount of review, and bring lots of players to the table.

The consequence of that is we have an ever-increasing number of little pieces of data that we try and sew together into the stock assessment, and each little piece of data is not necessarily that informative, and, the more little pieces you try to sew together, the harder it is to put together the stock assessment, more opportunities for error in the data processing, and you end up having a very long, laborious process, and a very complicated model, but it's not clear that you're actually getting better management advice, and so that's sort of one of

the gifts of SEDAR, is getting lots of people to the table, but then also lots of people that have pieces of data that we try and put together, and it's just kind of gotten out of control.

I would say we're probably cranking out assessments at half the level we would be if we were using the old system, but relatively few people participated, and I'm not saying we want to go back to being less transparent, but that is a consequence if you run every assessment through something like SEDAR, with so many people involved, is more and more pieces get stitched together.

What's happened now is things are much slower, and a lot of labor goes into each assessment, including non-assessment scientists, all the data providers, and, again, it doesn't necessarily produce better management advice, and so we need to do something different, if you want to increase throughput, and I think we have to bite the bullet and tackle some MSE-vetted harvest control rules for certain species, and amberjack is a good candidate, since we haven't been able to rebuild it anyway, and we have this potential for a big reboot, with the Great Amberjack Count, and so I think it's important to consider that one, and we can develop some parallel processes.

At the same time, if we start thinking about maybe we don't need the most complicated assessment models on the planet for some of these species, then we can reduce the workload, and, if we can come to the table with some advice on that, and hopefully, if we all can come to an understanding that maybe we don't need 500 pieces of data stitched together, but just the most important ones, and the assessments are simpler, and they take less time, and maybe some assessments don't need to go through SEDAR, and that frees up time to do the key work to think outside the box.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I am not seeing any other hands up, and that was some very good discussion, I thought, and thank you, Dale, for bringing that up. I mean, I personally am a big proponent of the MSE, and maybe what I hear is we're not just quite ready yet, but, I mean, I sure would like to see amberjack or something move forward, or even cobia perhaps, but, anyway, that was good discussion, and so I'm not sure what the next steps were, and, Kevin, I will call on you in just a second, but I agree, Clay, and any way we can speed up the processes, and so I don't -- Maybe we can all think about how we want to proceed on something like that, or what you're proposing or discussing about creative ways to get more throughput, but that would be something that would definitely be beneficial, around the table, for sure. Kevin.

1 2

 MR. ANSON: You brought up exactly what I was going to ask, and so how do we get there, Clay? I mean, what we do we need to do in order to get more throughput? I mean, we get people that come up here in public testimony, and they tell us, time and time again, it seems like, that, you know, our assessments, and the data that we're making decisions on, is out-of-date, and so what can we do, and, if we have to put it on the agenda for the next Sustainable Fisheries, we ought to put it on the agenda, so that we can kind of determine it, because, I mean, it's great if it's the gold standard that we get every time, but, if the gold standard is out-of-date, it really doesn't mean that much, and so we need to, I think, devote some time to do that very thing, is to try to talk it out, see what the benefits are, see what the pros and cons are, so that we can try to come up with a better plan.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Kevin. I've got you, Ryan. To that point, Clay, with that, and deciding how to proceed, and would that help, to have some directed time on the agenda to discuss this, and sort of talk about next steps, or how we could make these kind of things work?

DR. PORCH: Sure. I think that would be useful. It's always good for us to talk about those things. Internally, we're also looking at this, and we'll be talking with the staff from the various councils about the kind of data that's available and which species maybe we step back in the level of complexity, which ones we could assess in the future, that we've never assessed, just simply for lack of time, and then other ones that maybe are candidates for simpler harvest control rules.

Of course, one of the things that you all have started to do, and you're kind of leading the curve on, is with the index-based interim analyses, because that comes as close as we can to realtime data and the stock trends and adjusting the catch, where that index goes up or down.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Well, Clay, if you're having those discussions internally, maybe you all can talk with the council staff about when the timing would be right, so we can have the most meaningful discussion around this table, when you have the information that you need and that sort of thing, and, Tom, I guess, as I am moving out, that's what I would recommend that we move forward, and I know you had your hand up, Ryan. Go ahead.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to encourage all of you, voting and non-voting, when we're talking about the

stock assessments, to try to be mindful of saying things like "the gold standard", or, you know, "top tier", as far as assessments are concerned, because, like Dr. Porch was alluding to, and like I had said earlier as well, it may not be that including all of the little pieces of data is what is going to get you the best model at the time, given the information that's available.

It may be that there's this whole suite of information that, albeit very interesting, actually doesn't contribute very much in reducing the uncertainty about what we are estimating with the stock, and so including all of that might not make anything better, and it might be interesting work, but it might not really help anything, from an assessment standpoint, and so just to try to think about that when we're inclined to say, oh, the gold standard, or anything like that, because those sorts of things, of course, are heard by the public, and they trickle down from there, and the expectation could become like it had been, that, oh, if we don't include every single piece of information, then we've somehow done something short of what would be best, when in fact what's best could be not to include that, because it increases the uncertainty inherent within the model.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Ryan. Andy, I see that your hand is up online. If you're there, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I really like the conversation, and I really support this coming back to Sustainable Fisheries at the next council meeting. What Clay and I, and others, have talked for some time is, you know, the challenges with the stock assessments, time, quality, cost that goes into those, and I think it would be really beneficial to start having conversations with the council in looking at the benefits and tradeoffs.

We recognize, or I recognize, that, you know, there are certainly many in the public stakeholders that are kind of frustrated with the length of time that the stock assessment process takes, and, on top of that, then the length of time management takes to react to that process, and so the other thing I would note is Carrie presented to us, and we have been working with the Gulf Council staff, about how we also speed up the management process, right, and so how do we react to the new scientific information, and how we are able to implement that more quickly, right, and so I think those two conversations really go hand-in-hand. How can we get the science and react to it quickly, and how do we maybe simplify the processes around

that science, and then how do we move forward as a council to implement those actions, once they come before us, and so I look forward to talking about both of those, going forward.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Andy. I am not seeing any other hands up, and that was some very good discussion, and I guess we'll talk a little further about what are the best ways to proceed forward. Any more discussion that we need to have for Sustainable Fisheries? All right. Seeing none -- Clay.

 DR. PORCH: Thank you. I just was wondering about next steps, in regard to examining the potential of the multiyear ACLs, and again another area where we need to start thinking a little bit outside the box, within the parameters of the law, and forming some kind of working group that would explore that a little bit more, to figure out exactly how it might be best implemented.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thanks, Clay, and we're kind of regrouping here, to see what would be the best way to -- I mean, I think the agreement is we needed to start having that discussion, but can we do it in time for the next meeting, or, Carrie, I don't know if you wanted to comment.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thanks, Mr. Chair, and so I think we do need to put a group together to continue looking at it, what you presented, and I don't know that we could promise that it would be ready by August, and we're getting a pretty full agenda right now, a pretty heavy workload between now and August, and not that much time, and so just be cognizant of that, and we'll do what we can, but, yes, I think we should keep working on it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Clay.

DR. PORCH: That's mostly what I'm looking for, just to, I mean, remind folks that MRIP wasn't designed with the idea of doing in-season monitoring, and most of the state surveys, for most of the species, can't do in-season monitoring, and, when I speak to folks on the hill, and speak around the table, and speak to the states, I am not seeing a lot of new resources likely to come into the system to triple or quadruple the sampling that would be necessary for in-season monitoring, for most species, and so, that being the case, it means, to me, that we have to do something different.

 The South Atlantic Council sponsored a working group, with our Office of Science and Technology, and they were recommending working with three, or even five, year averages, and so I think

we need to -- We can springboard off of that work that was done and then just think about how it could actually be implemented in the council process.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Tom.

DR. FRAZER: Clay, just to that point, did that working group provide a product of any kind that they could share with this council?

DR. PORCH: Yes, and there's a white paper. It doesn't go through the mechanics of what a multiyear -- It's just talking about, when you have high PSEs, how many years would you need to work across to stabilize those estimates, but it would be useful for the conversation.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Carrie.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think it might be a good item for the regulatory streamlining IPT maybe to work on, which we have not put together yet, but we could add this task, I think, to that group, maybe, to consider, because they seem to go hand-in-hand, in my mind. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Are there other items for Sustainable Fisheries? All right. Seeing none, good discussion, and that will move us into Reef Fish, our last committee report. We do have a lot of ground to cover in that report and committee meeting summary, and so I think, Tom, if you're ready, we'll go ahead and go into that. If we need to take a break in a little while, to have folks check-out and that sort of thing, Tom, we can do that when the time is right, but I will make sure that I keep that -- Whenever you're ready, Tom.

## REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

 ${\tt DR.\ FRAZER:}$  Thanks. The committee adopted the agenda, Tab B, Number 1, and the minutes from the April 2023 meeting were approved as written.

 Individual Fishing Quota Objectives, Tab B, Number 4, Dr. Jessica Stephen, of the Southeast Regional Office, reviewed the existing goals and objectives for the red snapper and grouper-tilefish individual fishing quota programs, discussed the catch share review outcomes, and presented a list of potential goals and objectives for consideration by the council in its effort to revise the programs' goals and objectives.

The five draft goals presented by Dr. Stephen were as follows: maintain flexible fishing options and economic stability within the IFQ programs; increase IFQ market transparency (eliminates information asymmetries); improve technical efficiency (reduce costs per unit harvest); reduce IFQ discards; and improve opportunities for participants to enter the program. Dr. Stephen then provided a bulleted list of potential objectives for each of the aforementioned goals.

Committee members discussed several issues, including IFQ share caps, overcapacity, new entrants, IFQ shares withheld by NOAA, allocation banks, and shareholder accounts. The committee indicated its agreement on the suite of goals proposed and proceeded to prioritize the goals. Committee members emphasized the importance of improving opportunities for participation in the programs. Committee members noted that some of the goals overlap.

Other issues discussed by the committee included flexibility measures, public auctions, the importance of reducing discards, adaptive catch shares, the quota needed to seed allocation banks, and the diversity of business approaches adopted by program participants. The committee agreed on the goals and objectives below: Goal 1: Improve opportunities for participants to enter the program. Objectives: to evaluate the merits of share ownership and implement, if appropriate, limiting alternative mechanisms for equitably redistributing shares and allocation to accounts harvesting IFQ species; limit share ownership (maintaining and obtaining shares) to accounts that are harvesting IFQ species; identify barriers inhibiting limiting participation by surveying participants and those wanting to enter the fishery; create an allocation bank to reduce barriers to fishing privileges. Goal 2: Reduce IFQ discards. Objectives: improve collection of discard information from IFQ vessels; create an allocation bank to further reduce bycatch and discards of IFQ species; evaluate additional or new flexibility measures to reduce discards; Goal 3: Maintain flexible fishing options and economic stability within the IFQ programs; Goal 4: Increase IFQ market transparency (eliminates information asymmetries); Goal 5: Reduce costs per unit harvest.

The committee requested that staff develop an additional objective under Goal 1 to address the inheritability of shares and their ownership in perpetuity. A proposed objective is as follows: recover and redistribute IFQ shares and allocation held previously by a deceased shareholder to accounts of fishermen currently harvesting IFQ species. I think this might be a good place to stop. We might need a motion to provide some

direction.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, and that's exactly it, Tom, and I wanted to say a couple of things, just to set the stage. One, I received a lot of feedback about the large amount of time we dedicated to this, and I appreciate everyone's preparedness and what I thought was a very good discussion. I thought we had some really good testimony on this, and, in fact, some of it fairly compelling.

 I don't really want to lose the momentum on this, and so I don't know if it's a needing further guidance on what to do, and, I mean, we kind of worked, in this, whatever you want to call it, session, but in a consensus-driven way, and, of course, we didn't make any motions or that kind of thing, and I think that was the right way to do it, so we could cover the kind of ground and get these sort of things on the board, but, at this point, you know, I think we're where we need to formally do something, and so, with that, I will kind of open up the floor for discussion. Troy.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. This is really mostly a question, and are we moving towards formulating a new amendment and doing away with 36?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Tom, to that point.

DR. FRAZER: I mean, to that point, Troy, I do think that's where we're going. If we're going to review and revise these goals, that's a plan amendment, right, and so I do think that we're moving in that direction, and probably my suggestion would be that we capture at least the goals and objectives that we have to-date, right, to initiate the development of that plan amendment.

 That doesn't mean that you have to bring the whole plan amendment to the council, but I think we could certainly — Again, we made some good progress, and, you know, there is certainly three of those goals anyway, or at least the first two, that are indicated as priorities, with some clear objectives, and that would allow us to start putting a document together and then kind of maybe prioritize our efforts, moving forward, and so that's my view on it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Troy, to that, I think we've got the other two amendments out there, but I think that this kind of gave us a fresh start. I mean, my recommendation would be for starting a new fresh plan amendment, and there is definitely good things

still that we have worked on that we can bring out of those amendments that are relevant to a lot of the stuff we talked about here, but I think starting fresh and clean might be, you know, a good way to go with that. Susan, did you have your hand up? Andy, I see your hand, and I will call on you next.

MS. BOGGS: So this goal would be added to -- The recovery and redistribution -- I mean, we already have two things under Goal 1 that deal with ownership, taking back shares, to limiting ownership, and all three of those, to me, seem to be a little bit redundant, but I do want to be careful, if we do go in this direction, to add this under the goal.

You know, if a deceased shareholder -- I guess I don't know where we plan to go with this, because, if I have a thousand shares, and I die tomorrow, why can't my daughter get them? It sounds, to me, like we're saying, okay, we're going to go do this and take this away, and I know this is a document under development, but we already have a couple of goals that look at how we would redistribute and re -- I just think this is a little redundant, and I am just concerned how this might go. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I don't know, Susan, and that's kind of why I think my point was, at this point, that a lot of this was conceptual, and we need to have those kinds of discussions, and that sort of thing, when we begin developing a full amendment, if that's where we end up going with this, and so I don't know if anyone else has a -- I don't have a good answer, Susan, other than we would vet that and have those discussions as this moves forward. I see your hand up, Kevin, but Andy had his up, and I will call on you first. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Greg. I have several comments, and so, one, I really appreciated the council's discussion on IFQ goals and objectives. Like you, I've gotten a lot of, I think, positive feedback with regard to the discussion, and I think, from my standpoint, obviously, these are going to ultimately be inserted into a future amendment, and I hope we can kind of keep these as a living document, and we'll probably need to be improving and modifying these, as appropriate, as time goes on.

 With regard to the inheritance, or maybe the one that's being proposed, I tend to agree with Susan, now that I look kind of back at the objectives we adopted, and I'm wondering if it's needed, or if we kind of -- If a new objective is needed, versus we just kind of capture this as a note, and this is something that we would be looking at as part of Goal 1, under the

objectives that have already been identified.

Then another comment that I have heard, since we had our discussion, is there's been recommendations -- Although we don't, or can't, make modifications to the fisheries finance program outright, that there may be a benefit to having an objective about just better communicating out about fisheries finance program opportunities and the council recommendations and input on how to improve that program to NOAA Fisheries, and so I just wanted to mention that, because I think that's another to potentially Goal 1, as well as Goal 3, that could be built into this process. Thanks.

MR. ANSON: I think I was the one that kind of recommended that we provide, or create, a new objective, of which is included now in the report, that council staff has offered, and I made the recommendation so that it was, you know, a little bit clearer, and I understand the idea of, you know, having it fairly vague at this point, and kind of digging into the details, as we had further discussions later on, but, you know, my point, committee, was to make it clear, if that was the intent of the council, to try to look at that very specific item, because that is an issue that a lot of people bring up, and, you know, when you start, you know, allaying that objective, and these other objectives, against what the agency now has come out with with their EEJ language, you know, the whole idea of equity comes into play, when you start talking about, you know, passing on those shares to future generations, relative to other folks that are on the outside looking in.

You know, I don't -- I can go either way on this, as far as including it. Again, my intent to include that as an objective was to make it very clear that that would be under discussion, going forward, by the council, because, again, that is part of the issue that a lot of the folks that don't have shares have umbrage about.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kevin, I think an option -- Obviously, that's in the record, and there wasn't a motion here or anything like that, and, as this begins to develop and take shape, that can just get -- I mean, I think I was hearing a lot of support for that around the table, and that can get built-in as necessary, as, you know, we formally move through shaking up the document, and, I mean, the way I'm reading it, it was the committee requested to develop that in, and I think having that there gives that a placeholder to build-in to one of the objectives that are already up in Goal 1, and so, I mean, I think we've got it, and, at the next few meetings, or however this pans out, we

can decide how to integrate those into the actual document. Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Well, while we're having this discussion, I would like to bring up Goal 3, which I know we really didn't spend a lot of time on, but the flexible fishing option is to continue the year-round fishing opportunities for the commercial interests, because that has worked well for them, and I know it's probably something that has already been achieved, but I think, at the same time, we don't need to lose sight of that.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan, that's a good point, and I don't -- Maybe I missed something, and I didn't recall -- I mean, I think maintaining that flexibility is still definitely very much the intent of at least everyone around this table, to be able to fish as needed within that program. Tom.

DR. FRAZER: I think, to that point, I mean, that was an objective under the goal that was in the presentation that Dr. Stephen provided, and I think my recollection of the discussion is that we recognize that this particularly goal, Goal 3, that there had been some successes to-date, right, and we just wanted to make sure that remained a goal in our plan, and so I guess probably I would agree with Greg.

I mean, I think the discussion was good, and I felt like it was productive, and we have a lot of kind of momentum here, and, in order to keep that moving, I think we probably need to start something, right, and so, Greg, we could just make a simple motion, right, to use these goals and objectives discussed during the committee meeting to initiate a plan amendment.

DR. FRAZER: Well, I mean, I think I'm suggesting that we do that, but I want to have some discussion before I move forward.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so you are or not moving that?

DR. FRAZER: When we get ready, I would like to keep us moving.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so Tom is sort of making a motion, but he wants to have some discussion whether he should make the motion or not, and so, Troy, go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I think it's absolutely imperative that we make this motion, and we've had great discussion, but that doesn't

get us to where we want to go, and so we've got to make a motion for this amendment, to incorporate these goals and objectives, and so, you know, I fully support the motion.

One thing, or another thing, that concerns me is going into the future, and we devoted four hours to this subject, and it was a great four hours, from my perspective, and then the public input yesterday was also right on point, and so are we going to be able to -- I know we're not going to be able to devote four hours to every meeting, and I guess we don't, but, if we only have forty-five minutes, like we do for most of these things, then we're going to be years down the road again, and there are people whose livelihood, either positively or negatively, is being impacted by this subject, and so we need to not only have this discussion, but we need to have resolution of these issues, and we need to do it expeditiously, and so, with that, I will be quiet.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Troy. I'm not seeing any other hands, and I agree, and Carrie just -- Since I won't be around to really discuss this, I think, to reiterate, that was a good discussion, and Troy's part about, you know, just dedicating a short period of time doesn't really get us where I think where we want to be, and so, Tom, as you all are developing the agenda, I would suggesting dedicating as much time as we possibly can to make sure we can move forward, at least in these initial stages, when we're in this really formative kind of thing, but is there any other -- Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I didn't know if Tom wanted to make the motion. If not, I was going to make the motion for him, but I will second it.

DR. FRAZER: No, go ahead, Susan. I think it's better that the Reef Fish Committee chair doesn't make that motion.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes.

MS. BOGGS: Well, that's kind of where I thought you were getting at, and so I was trying to help. To incorporate the following goals and objectives discussed during the Reef Fish Committee meeting, and I am not going to read all of that, or do you want me to read all of that into the record?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: No, I don't think it's necessary to read all of that. We've got that fully in the record, in multiple places, but I think -- Is that the end of your motion, or is there more towards it? I think that needs to have "into a plan amendment",

or something like that, Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Excuse me. To incorporate the following goals and objectives discussed during the Reef Fish Committee meeting into a plan amendment.

DR. FRAZER: Or you could say -- I might suggest "to use the following goals and objectives discussed during the Reef Fish Committee meeting to initiate a plan amendment".

MS. BOGGS: That sounds like a wonderful motion.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Susan. We will need a second for that motion.

MS. BOGGS: Initiate a plan amendment.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Diaz seconds the motion. Okay. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Kevin.

MR. ANSON: This kind of goes to Mr. Williamson's point about the amount of time, relative to the lift that we have here, and so we talked, during committee, about, you know, Goal 5, at least, may be outside of really what the council should do, could do, you know, and we kind of prioritized these, as to what would be most important, and so I'm just leery that, if we throw everything in there, that that's going to just bog the process down that much more.

You know, I don't necessarily think that I will vote against it because of that, but it is a concern of mine, is that that would just slow up the process, if we had everything as it is currently contained.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, yes, Kevin, and we certainly don't want to slow the process, and that momentum, and so, I mean, maybe we can just be sensitive to that, moving forward, and keep reiterating that, as we're having these discussions, or you all are having the discussions. Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Well, I understand what Kevin is saying, and I tend to agree with Troy as well. I mean, this is scary, and the motions we're making, they're really getting complex, and we have the reef fish initiative, and we have all these different things, but, unfortunately, this is something that we are going to have to tackle, and we are going to have to take on, and what I dislike is like what happened with Amendment 36. When you start breaking everything apart, then what happens? I don't

remember specifically, but we were looking at 36C, and I brought up the point that, well, if you do this, then it's going to affect this, and I think you have to keep it together.

Yes, it's a big task, but I think this council realizes the importance of doing this, realizes the importance to the commercial fleet, and, unfortunately, I think it's just something we're going to have to do, and I think, unfortunately, we're going to have to spend four hours at council meetings until we get through this, because it's very important, and I think it's something that we need to do, and we need to tackle, and just take the bull by the horns, and let's go.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Susan. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: This is kind of a follow-up on Mr. Anson's point also, and I agree with everything that he said. I would just like to add that to try to keep this towards the top of the Reef Fish agenda. In the past, IFQ has been towards the bottom, at the end of the day, and most of us are spent, and so it doesn't have to be the first thing on the agenda, but towards the top of the agenda, in my opinion, would be a lot more productive.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Dale, and I think we're hearing, loud and clear, that this is a priority and dedicate the necessary primetime kind of attention to this, and I think, you know, just the perspective of some of you, and I know some of you were here as well, and, you know, there was a time, several years ago, that we couldn't even talk about this around the table, and, you know, I mean, it was just the heated tensions, and all that kind of thing, and so we're in a very different place now, I think, from those old 36A, B, and C, to where now we can revamp and really just -- Like you're saying, Susan, we've just got to tackle it and move forward and do it. Did you have your hand up, Peter? Andy does? Okay. Well, Dale is in the room here, and, Andy, we'll call on you next.

MR. DIAZ: I am not disagreeing with you, Greg, but I think, when we get into dealing with these things, it's going to be the same difficult discussions we had before, and, a lot of times, we would have real close votes, and things failing, and, you know, Susan is talking about moving one big document, and I guess, if things are connected, that's the way we've got to do it, but, to me, it might be we'll just see how this thing goes, and, if something is --

If we've got a consensus on one thing that can move forward, and we've got other things that will take forever -- I mean, I can

see, in the future, that we pull things out that there's agreement on, and, actually, if they're intertwined at the hip, like Susan is talking about, it might not be possible, but, you know, the way I'm looking at this, there's some compartmentalized things that have been talked about, and, as we get those things ready to go, we should consider if they should go into their own document, to try to move this along.

If we wait to try to move everything as a package, I can guarantee you there's things that we're going to get stuck on that's going to take an enormous amount of time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Very good point, Dale. All right. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mr. Chair, and I agree with Dale's comments, and others' comments, that have been made. You know, I'm supportive of the motion, but to tackle all of these goals and objectives in a single plan amendment I think is unrealistic, and very ambitious, and so I think what we're going to want to do is, obviously, adopt these goals and objectives in an amendment, but then strategize, compartmentalize, you know, what we're going to prioritize first, what we can work on to accomplish kind of in a reasonable timeframe and manner, so that we don't end up with the next 36B or C document that lingers for quite some time.

The other thing that I wanted to ask is to maybe council staff, and can you remind me, or us, where we're at with 36B and C? I believe they're just tabled at this point, and, if they are, I mean, my suggestion is that this is going to kind of augment, or replace, 36B and C, and we probably should be explicit in stopping work, or ending work, on those, and this is going to be essentially in place of those amendments going forward.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, Andy. Carrie, to that point, and I have Susan and Mara.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will start, and Dr. Diagne can fill in any of the gaps, but, I mean, they're just on our action schedule, and we have not been actively working on them. We were focusing on the IFQ Focus Group, and getting those meetings together, and the report to the council, and then, in January, the series of discussions, goals and objectives, and so those are quite outdated, I believe, as far as data and permits go, but we're not actively working on them right now. If you want to make a motion to cease work, or postpone, that's fine, and there could be things that we could pluck out of there, but I think most of it is

pretty old.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara, was it to that point, or Susan had her hand up. Okay. Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Well, so, to Dale's point, and I was trying to look it up, but Jessica Stephen -- When she gave her presentation, she had that Venn diagram, and maybe we look at what overlaps, and tackle it that way, and that might be a good way to look at it as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Good point, Susan. Mara.

MS. LEVY: Well, actually, Susan kind of make my point, is I don't think there's any problem with looking at things separately, but these are the goals and objectives of the program, and so, at some point, they have to be collectively your goals and objectives, and, whatever you do under each one, if there's a weighing or balancing or taking from the other one, you've got to acknowledge that, and so, you know, I think identify the goals and objectives of the program, and decide what you want to work on, but make sure that you're looking at the impacts to the goals and objectives that maybe you're not working at at that point in time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Well, we've had a lot of good discussion on this motion. Is there other -- Troy.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I guess I would conclude my remarks by, if we don't take our direction from what we heard yesterday from the public, and focus on Goal Number 1, I think we're going down the wrong path.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Troy. Others? Well, seeing none, we'll dispense with this motion. I am not detecting a lot of objection around the table, and so maybe we'll just try. Is there any opposition to this motion? Before we do that, sorry, Bob, and I did not see your hand up. Go ahead.

DR. SHIPP: Early on in this meeting, someone made the comment about taking a bite of the apple one at a time, and, following-up on what Troy just said, I think -- I mean, the honest truth is the elephant in the room is how are we going to generate some additional shares to be made available, and so I would stick to Objective 1, and let's focus on that, which is the most difficult and the hardest part, and putting all these together -- It doesn't seem to make a difference, to me, whether we vote this one up or down, but the truth is we're going to have to go

down the list, and, the process we use to do that, we'll just have to wait and see. Again, I go back to the -- We've got to recognize the problem, and the problem is where are we going to get those shares? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Bob, and, yes, of course, I think this motion here just really gets that whole process started. To move forward then on this motion, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion carries, and we will move on. Thank you, Tom.

DR. FRAZER: All right, and so Review of State Survey Private Angling Landings and Discards for Red Snapper, Tab B, Number 5.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Sorry. Susan.

 MS. BOGGS: So do -- If we make -- If I made a motion to stop work on Amendment 36B and 36C, I mean, we can still go back and pull things out of it and use it, but that -- To me, that would give us a fresh start, and so I would like to make a motion to discontinue working on Amendment 36B and 36C.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay.

DR. FRAZER: I just have a question with regard to procedure, right, and I thought that they were officially tabled, right, and, in order to even discuss them, we have to -- They are not tabled?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: No, and they're just --

DR. FRAZER: Okay. Then, yes, and I wasn't sure. I mean, I don't know, and so I don't think it hurts to have that motion, and so I'm just saying.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, I think it will make it cleaner. Susan, is that your -- Go ahead, and is that your motion?

MS. BOGGS: Well, I mean, if it can be that simple, yes. I just want to make sure -- I mean, we can use it as a reference, but this -- Now that we're going down this path, I think -- Because whatever we do in this new plan amendment is going to affect whatever happens, I'm sure, in 36B and 36C, and so I think -- I will look to Dr. Simmons, but it would make it a little cleaner, and that gets a little bit of work off the plate of the staff.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Chair, and I think it does make it cleaner, or clearer, as to what we're doing, and we

can look back and say what did we do here, and so I think I would appreciate it, and we can take it off the action schedule if you do that. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, and we've got it in the record, and I think there's no issue with pulling parts from that, as needed. Andy, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will second the motion, if it hasn't been, and I support it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Andy, and so we have a motion and a second. Is there any more discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Assane.

DR. ASSANE DIAGNE: I was just waiting until you dispose of this motion, and then I will --

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right, Assane, and so I'm not seeing any opposition to this motion, and so this motion carries. Assane, did you have something?

DR. DIAGNE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank you. Based on the previous motion, then we are going to, in short order, assemble an IPT and start looking at these issues. By, I guess, first estimation, probably we'll bring you something in October, and that would be, I guess, the sufficient timeframe for us to collect the data and update what needs to be updated from previous actions, and also start developing alternative courses of action, and so October would be the timeframe that we'll be looking at.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Diagne. Is that fine? I'm seeing a lot of nods around the table. Okay. Tom, now we can go ahead.

DR. FRAZER: All right, and so we'll start from the subject header here, Review of State Survey Private Angling Landings and Discards for Red Snapper, Tab B, Number 5, the five Gulf states reported on their private angling landings for red snapper for the 2022 fishing season and provided projections for their 2023 seasons.

For-hire vessels were generally observed landing larger fish than private vessels. Florida clarified that, while it conducts in-season monitoring, that effort does not allow for in-season quota monitoring, as it does for other states that were reporting at finer time scales, for example weekly reporting. All states' landings were below their respective 2022 ACLs, Alabama and Texas by approximately 50 percent. Gulf states are anticipated to tailor their 2023 season durations considerate of revised MRIP calibrations for red snapper.

Final Action, Recalibration of Red Snapper Recreational Catch Limits and Modification of Gray Snapper Catch Limits, Tab B, Number 6, council staff reviewed a framework action to recalibrate red snapper recreational catch limits and modify gray snapper catch limits.

For red snapper, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi have updated their respective calibration ratios using more recent landings data. For gray snapper, updating the catch limits is necessary following the results of SEDAR 75.

A committee member asked if implementation of the framework would be finalized by the end of 2023. SERO staff replied that it would commit to moving the document through rulemaking expeditiously once received from the council.

NOAA General Counsel noted that the values presented in the codified text corresponded to the recently revised red snapper catch limits that are expected to be implemented as soon as next week. After reviewing the document, public comment summary, and codified text, the committee retained the preferred alternatives and proceeded with a recommendation to take final action.

 The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend the council approve Framework Action-Recalibration of Red Snapper Recreational Catch Limits and Modification of Gray Snapper Catch Limits and forward it 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, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you. We've got a committee motion, and, in fact, a final action motion, and so that's going to require a roll call vote. That motion is up on the board, and so if you all give us just a minute, and we'll use our clickers for that. Carrie, go ahead.

 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to say that the final rule published today for the red snapper increase, and it's going to be effective on July 10, and

so we'll be revising the document quickly, before we transmit, with those numbers.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Staff, are we ready to begin voting, or do you need a minute? Okay. It looks good. Go ahead and vote when you're ready, please. Bob Gill is absent, and did Bob Shipp definitely vote no on that? Okay. Bob, if you're there, just to clarify if you're a yes or no vote on this motion, please.

DR. SHIPP: I am a no vote.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Bob. Okay. This is the last call, before we close the vote here.

First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs	Yes		
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Dlaz	Yes		
Phil	Dyskow	Yes		
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schleble	Yes		
Joe	Spraggins	Yes		
Greg	Stunz	Yes		
Cl	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Bob	Shipp		No	
Andy	Strelcheck	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (14)	No (1)	Abstain (0)

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. The vote is closed, and that motion carries fourteen to one with two absent.

DR. FRAZER: Draft Framework Action: Modifications to Recreational and Commercial Greater Amberjack Management Measures, Tab B, Number 7, substantial reductions in catch limits, as a result of Amendment 54, warrant modifications to the greater amberjack recreational closed season and commercial trip limit to reduce the likelihood of overharvest.

Council staff reviewed recent management measures, alternatives,

and interdisciplinary planning team (IPT) suggestions. In Action 1, the IPT recommended removing Alternatives 2 and 4 and suggested two new alternatives for consideration.

A committee member asked about the timing of the development of the framework action. Council staff asked that the committee be considerate of the council being short a social scientist as the IPT works to finalize the document in August 2023. A committee member wanted to have the proposed regulations in place by 2024. SERO replied that the commercial season begins on January 1, which would be difficult to meet, even with final action in August. However, the regulations could be in effect before the start of the 2024 recreational fishing season.

During committee discussion related to Action 1, a committee member asked why the council would consider any alternative that opened the recreational fishing season during May, when greater amberjack is documented to be spawning. They added further that the March through May commercial fixed season closure is during this time period and intended to promote conservation of the stock. Another committee member cautioned removing alternatives for which little data exist to analyze the effects, because such choices may become more appropriate to consider in the future.

The committee recommends and I so move, in Action 1, to move Alternatives 2 and 4 to Considered but Rejected. Alternative 2 is to modify the recreational fixed closed season to be September 1 through July 31 (open August 1 to August 31). Alternative 4 is to modify the recreational fixed closed season to be August 1 through October 31 and January 1 to July 31 (open from November 1 to December 31). That motion carried without opposition.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. We've got another motion on the floor from the committee. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Susan.

MS. BOGGS: I just want it on the record that I think I'm going to oppose this motion. I agree with Alternative 2, and I am the one that put Alternative 4 in the document, but we keep talking about thinking outside the box, and this is a way, even though there's not a lot of data, and I understand that, but, if we get pressured, and nobody wants to see the season closed, but you still have access, and I think I'm going to oppose it, just because -- That's just an alternative that maybe we need to take a look at at future dates. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Susan. Since I don't see any

other hands up for other discussions, we'll need to take a vote on this motion, and so if we can pull the clicker system back up again. Okay, and so the motion is on the board. Please register your vote when ready.

B.7.1 in Action 1, to m	nove alternatives 2 & 4	to Considered k	out Rejected	
First Name	Last Name		•	
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs		No	
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Dlaz	Yes		
Phil	Dyskow	Yes		
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schleble	Yes		
Greg	Stunz	Yes		
Cl	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Bob	Shipp	Yes		
Andy	Strelcheck	Yes		
Result - Passed	Subtotals	Yes (13)	No (1)	Abstain (0)

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so that motion carries thirteen to one with three absent. Okay, Tom.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A committee member indicated that many Florida anglers would like the opportunity to harvest greater amberjack during May, but thought that harvest during spawning was not appropriate when the stock is overfished.

The committee member thought there were benefits in lining up the greater amberjack recreational fishing season opening with the proposed gag grouper season opening (September 1st). They continued that doing so might reduce discards on both and aligns with recreational data reporting.

A committee member reiterated the concern with closing one sector during greater amberjack spawning and not the other. Another Committee member replied that fishing effort is expected to occur regardless of fishing season, and so the question becomes whether fishing effort disrupts spawning. Some species might be more susceptible to fishing mortality during the spawning season, depending on their behaviors during that time. For example, some species form spawning aggregations and that additional susceptibility could have a negative effect on the

stock's ability to reproduce.

Council staff added that differences in the minimum size limit between the sectors, as it related to expected sex-specific harvest, was a consideration in the current recreational and commercial fishing seasons.

A committee member thought that the greater amberjack fishery was different in the western Gulf than in the eastern Gulf and that discard mortality could be a considerable issue. Further, the committee member reminded everyone that the council had previously passed a motion to consider regional management for greater amberjack. Another committee member supported a recreational fishing season start date of September 1, considerate of how the recreational landings data are collected and reported.

The committee recommends and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 3 the preferred. Alternative 3 is modify the recreational fixed closed season to be August 1 through August 31 and November 1 through July 31 (open September 1 through October 31). That motion carried without opposition.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We have a committee motion on the board. Any more discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Okay. The motion carries. Go ahead, Tom.

DR. FRAZER: Okay, and so the committee discussed removing additional alternatives from Action 1 to decrease the analyses expected across both actions in the document. A committee member noted that Alternative 5 is expected to result in a similar recreational season duration as Alternative 3 and included the possibility of harvest during the May spawning period. The committee decided to also remove Alternative 5 from the document.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to move Alternative 5 to Considered but Rejected. Alternative 5 is modify the recreational fixed closed season to be August 1 through August 31, November 1 through April 30, and June 1 through July 31 (open September 1 through October 31 and May 1 through 31). That motion carried without opposition.

44 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We have another committee motion. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? The motion carries. Tom.

DR. FRAZER: With regard to Action 2, a committee member asked

which alternatives might result in the fewest number of dead discards. Council staff indicated that they would check with the IPT data analyst to address that question. In general, discards should be assumed to increase with decreasing trip limits, unless fishermen proactively modify behavior and target other species after reaching the trip limit.

A committee member asked what was the expected recreational season duration for greater amberjack in 2023. SERO staff replied that the recreational fishing season will open August 1, 2023, and the season duration projection would be forthcoming. The committee member thought that the council should consider using numbers of fish for the commercial trip limit, as requested by the Reef Fish Advisory Panel, or AP, and the Law Enforcement Technical Committee.

Another Committee member asked about timing for the development of the document. Council staff replied that the document would have Chapters 3 and 4 added, and a video would be produced for the public prior to the document being presented for the final action.

A committee member asked about a motion from the Reef Fish AP to set the commercial trip limit at five fish, with a step-down to two fish once 75 percent of the commercial annual catch target, or ACT, was met. Staff replied that such an alternative was not included, because no closure is expected under a five-fish commercial trip limit. Staff noted that commercial trip tickets are still going to be reported in pounds, but with commercial fishermen monitored on the water using numbers of fish. The committee decided to defer selection of a preferred alternative for the trip limit action until after public testimony. Based on that public testimony, would you like to discuss this at all?

## CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

 MS. BOGGS: Well, I mean, the public testimony, to me, yesterday, and I would like to discuss this, if that's okay, just for a moment, was kind of all over the board, and I think it's going to be a hard decision for this council to make, if it's going to be fair, and I don't know if that's quite the word, to the commercial fishermen as well as fair to the recovery of the fishery itself.

I am not ready to make a motion, and we are going to have to come back, I'm guessing, with a preferred in August, and I would just encourage this council to kind of really think about where to go with this. I mean, I heard some good comments yesterday,

but it just seemed like there was no consistency, with the commercial sector yesterday, in what we should do. I think the consensus was number of fish, but it varied in the number of pounds that we would be looking at for that, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Susan. Dale.

9 w. 10 h. 11 i: 12 w. 13 g. 14 g:

with this in August, but high-grading is something that I do have a little bit of a concern with, if we go with numbers instead of pounds, and it has nothing to do with the fact that we're talking about commercial fishermen right now, and I think, given the opportunity -- I know for sure fishermen will high-grade, and recreational fishermen do it at times, and charter fishermen do it at times, and so we're introducing an opportunity where high-grading can be profitable, and so we just need to be mindful of that, whether we go to number of fish or pounds.

MR. DIAZ: I think, and we're going to have to decide what to do

We'll have to sort through that in August, and I don't know if it's enough of a -- If it's consequential enough for us to worry about, but I do think, going to number of fish, that's the disadvantage.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Tom, I am not seeing any other discussion, if you want to proceed.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara, go ahead.

MS. LEVY: I just want to make sure that you have all of the alternatives here that you want, moving forward, right, and the expectation is to have an analysis done -- I don't know what the timeline is, but you're talking about looking at it again and picking preferreds, and, if you don't have all of the potential alternatives you want, and so I just encourage you to make sure that you have the range that you want at this time.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Dr. Hollensead.

 DR. LISA HOLLENSEAD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to give a little context, and I would just remind the council that, currently, those averages for commercial harvest is based on 2019 to 2021 landings, and it equates to approximately thirty pounds per fish, and so, for example, if you're thinking about it, 250 pounds would equate to approximately eight fish, and 500 pounds would be approximately sixteen fish, and then 1,000

pounds would be about thirty-three fish, if that helps.

Carrie just asked if it would be good to have the alternatives consist, and I think -- Potentially Emily could weigh-in on this too, but, going out to the public, it would be helpful if they were all sort of standardized in that way, and so, certainly, if the council determined that you would like to go pounds of fish, and, I don't know, Mara, if you would like to speak to that as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara, go ahead, and, Andy, I see your hand is up, and you're next.

MS. LEVY: As long as it's clear that whatever we end up implementing in the regulations is pounds or numbers, right, and so we show the numbers, and we say that the pound equivalent is approximating, but, if we're implementing numbers, we need to be clear that's what we're implementing. If we're implementing pounds, it's a poundage, and it's 210 pounds, right, and so we just need to be very clear, when we move forward, about what you're actually going to be asking people to comply with.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I raised it in committee, and I would recommend this for Alternative 2, that we specify in numbers of fish, to be consistent with the other alternatives, and it was also raised, in I guess some of the council testimony, about a 500-pound trip limit, with a possible step-down. I'm not a big fan of step-downs, just because there are challenges with data coming into the agency and how quickly we can react to that, especially if we're looking at fairly short seasons, but I wanted to, obviously, mention that, if we're going to add anything, we probably should add it now. Otherwise, this is going to be kind of the range of alternatives when you get for final action.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

MS. BOGGS: To Dale's point, yes, I think the high-grading could possibly be an issue, and I always felt like the commercial fishermen didn't really want the bigger fish, just because of the fillet size, but, if we go to numbers of fish, and it seems like what I heard a lot of yesterday, and I asked some of the fishermen explicitly, and this is a bycatch.

I am wondering though if we should do -- I heard several comments, I think, about eight fish, which I can't remember what

that would equate to, but, you know, maybe we -- I would like to make a motion to add an Alternative 5 to establish a commercial trip limit of eight fish, just to see what that looks like.

We have never met the 75 percent, where you would have to do a step-down, and I kind of looked at maybe doing something that went up there, but this gives them the opportunity to maybe alleviate discards, for those not directing -- You know, if it's a directed fishery, that might be a little different, and it may not be exactly what they want, but I think that maybe we look at eight fish, because I did hear that a couple of times yesterday. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Susan, just to be clear, did you make that? You're making that motion? Okay. Let's get it up on the board here. Go ahead, Carrie.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I guess I will just ask Dr. Hollensead, and is that essentially Alternative 2, if we think the average size of fish you said was thirty-one pounds?

22 23

DR. HOLLENSEAD: Yes, and that would be correct. We've got here 260 pounds, and it's difficult, because the average is about thirty, and we're looking at fractions of fish, but, you know, 250 pounds would be about eight fish, and so that's very similar to Alternative 2, and it's also a little similar to Alternative 3.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Go ahead, Susan.

 MS. BOGGS: So I am going to talk through this, so I know what to do. If this were to pass, then I could come back and make a motion to move Alternative 2 to Considered but Rejected, because I can't amend Alternative 2, as it is.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, I think you could. Well, I'm going to look to staff on what's the best way to move forward on this. While they're thinking about that, Chris, go ahead.

 MR. SCHIEBLE: I'm just going to say that I would speak in support of this, but I think it's different than Alternative 2, because we heard public comment talk about how, if they come in with the 250-pound limit, they may or may not be over, right, on their reporting, and there could be an enforcement problem, and this is counting fish. Even though they may be the same weight, it alleviates that potential problem of having an enforcement problem, right, and so it is a different -- It's not the same as

Alternative 2.

pound limit.

1 2

3

4 5

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Carrie.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Yes.

your hand up.

then I will ask my question.

this motion, Susan. It's seconded by Chris?

6 7

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Potentially, but remember they're still reporting on trip tickets in pounds of fish, even if they're not interdicted by law enforcement.

8 9 coming in with eight fish, and then they report by weight after 10 11 that, right?

12

13

14

15 MS. LEVY: 16 alternative that would have a pound requirement, as opposed to a 17 fish requirement, and so, if the council wants to change to saying it's a fish, as opposed to a pound, limit, then you just 18 19 change Alternative 2 to be eight fish, and it's equivalent to whatever approximate pounds, right, but, if you're unsure of 20 21 that, and you still want an alternative that's going to require

22 23 24

25 26

27 28 29

30 31

32 33 34

35 36

37 38 39

40

41 42

43

44 45

46 47

48

action, or alternative, and then remove the Alternative 2, and we could do it all in one.

162

Right, but they will conform to the rule by

I think the question is do you still want an

people to comply with pounds, then maybe you want to leave Alternative 2 as-is, but it seems like you're moving towards

requiring people to comply with a fish limit, as opposed to a

MS. BOGGS: Well, we can dispense with this motion first, and

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so then, if my understanding is

right, we need to care of the motion here, and we'll move

forward with that, but I don't believe we've got a second on

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so any further discussion on the

motion? Okay. Is there any opposition to the motion? Andy, go

ahead, and we'll back up to discussion here, and I didn't see

MR. STRELCHECK: I was just going to say, rather than add a new Action 2, to amend Alternative 2 to establish an eight-fish

commercial limit, and I don't think that we need to add this

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We'll back up a little bit, Susan, and it sounds like you have a comment.

4 5

MS. BOGGS: Well, so I can withdraw the motion and amend Alternative 2, and I just don't know if there's people that want Alternative 2 in there, and so I guess I could withdraw this motion and make a motion to amend, and then, if that doesn't pass, make another motion, and I don't really know what to do here, and that's why I'm looking to staff.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, I don't either, Susan, and so hold on. Let me ask Dr. Hollensead, and put her on the spot, because there was some discussion that this captured a component that Alternative 2 did not, and so I guess we're trying to all get to the same place, but we're just trying to figure out what's the best way to do that and make sure we capture the full intent in the document for these alternatives.

DR. HOLLENSEAD: I mean, I think you could add an alternative that says basically -- It would be Alternative 2, but number of fish, right, and then you also leave that option, and, like you said, if there's people that perhaps are concerned about high-grading, or whatever the case might be, you could leave it in poundage, and you do that, too.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Go ahead, Carrie.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I think, as Ms. Levy said, the final question is do you want to manage in pounds or fish, and we just need to be clear, and so, if you want to maintain Alternative 2, then we'll move forward with this motion.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Then I think -- We have an opportunity to further develop this, if we need to, at a later date, and so then what I'm hearing is let's -- If there's no other discussion, let's keep this motion on the floor, if you're good with that, Susan, and we'll move forward to that, and I'm not seeing any more discussion. Is there any opposition to this motion? All right. Seeing none, the motion carries. Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Okay, and so, based on what Ms. Levy said, do we need to amend Alternatives 3 and 4 and take out the pounds and just look at fish, and then the pounds can be part of the discussion? That way, if we pick Alternative 3, we're not tied to a poundage issue, and I'm just trying to clean it up.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara.

 MS. LEVY: I mean, I don't think -- I think the way that Alternative 3 is worded is that the trip limit is seven fish, and you're just providing information about the pounds, but, because we're mixing them, right, I just want to make it clear, you know, when you move forward, that some of these are in fish, and some of these are in pounds, and, also, just to comment, I heard, again, something about picking preferreds, and I don't know what the action schedule says about this, but, if you expect to have an analysis done for the next meeting, and to pick preferreds, then you should probably nail down what you want these alternatives to be.

I will just point out that, yes, you left Alternative 2 there, but now that's the only one that is in pounds of fish, right, and so now you're saying, if you want to manage in pounds, that's the only one we're picking, is 250 pounds. If we want to manage in fish, we have all these options, and I'm not going to tell you that you have to take it out, but it just seems like you're setting yourself up for there's one option to manage in pounds, if that's really the way that you wanted to go, which doesn't seem like you really do.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Well, in all the testimony yesterday, I don't think anybody had any heartburn about the numbers of fish, and so I will make a motion to move Alternative 2 to Considered but Rejected.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We've got a motion on the floor. Chris Schieble is going to second that. Okay. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion on the motion, is there any opposition to the motion? Okay. The motion carries. All right, and so hopefully that cleans that up. Susan, go ahead.

MS. BOGGS: I would like to make a motion that in Action 2 that Alternative 5 be the preferred.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Chris, are you seconding that? Okay. Give us a second here to get that up. Hold on one second, Dale, and let me get this motion on the board. Okay. There we go. Susan, you might want to look at that. Susan, is that your motion right there? That was seconded by Chris. We'll open it up for discussion. Dale, go ahead.

MR. DIAZ: I mean, basically, where we're at now, this is a bycatch fishery, and I did ask the question of which one of

these got the biggest bang for the buck for us on alleviating dead discards, and I don't think we're probably going to get an answer on that, and, right now, without an answer, in my mind, something that keeps it open all year, to deal with discards, is better than something that will close during the year, and so eight fish will close sometime during the year.

Everything but the one with five fish closes during the year, and so I'm going to speak against making a preferred at this time, until I see more information that would lead me to believe that this is the best one to deal with dead discards.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Dale. C.J.

 DR. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I agree with Dale, and I'm going to speak in opposition to this, simply for that reason. I mean, we've got one alternative in here that keeps the fishery open year-round, and can deal with some discard issues, versus -- I mean, actually, I guess I have a question here too, and so this is effectively -- Would this effectively be equivalent to -- I mean, we probably need to run some analyses on this, which is part of the reason why I'm not comfortable selecting this as a preferred, but maybe directed to Lisa here, and is this effectively equivalent to what we have in Alternative 2, potentially, for an early season closure on September 11?

DR. HOLLENSEAD: Yes, and we would have to see the results of the analysis, but I believe that they would be similar, yes.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Any other discussion? Susan.

MS. BOGGS: I don't mean this ugly, but I'm afraid it's going to come out that way. I understand what Dale is saying, and the only way we're going to get away from discards is full retention, and I don't know how we get there either, and so, you know, I don't know what the right answer is, and I'm just trying to move this thing along, and so I have no angst one way or the other, honestly.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, it sounds like we might need a little more analysis as well, but we can just take a vote and see where -- We can take a vote and see where we're at, or we can --

MR. DIAZ: To Ms. Boggs' point, we're just down to so few fish that there's no good options. Every option is bad, and which of the bad options is the best bad option is where we're at.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Froeschke.

1 2 3

8 9 10

11 12

15 16 17

14

13

18 19

20 21 22

23

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Just one thing to think about is, if you switch to numbers instead of pounds, it's kind of a -- There's going to be some potential for changes in the behavior of the fishermen, and so, for example, if they know they can harvest any size, to get their seven or five or whatever, they can get the really big ones, and, if they're able to do that, particularly like the spear fishermen.

When the season closes between March through May, they usually go through and update the landings, and so it could be that we're farther along towards reaching that ACT, because the sizes are bigger, you know, based on when it was done a different way, and so you may not get as much bang for the buck on the numbers basis that we're anticipating now.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Good point, John. Thank you. Okay, and so any more discussion regarding this motion? I think we're going to need to pull out the clickers for this one, because there's a little bit of mixed opinions around the table. Okay. It looks like that's up, and let's go ahead and vote.

B.7.4 In Action 2, to n	nake Alternative 5 the	Preferred		
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson		No	
Susan	Boggs		No	
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Dlaz		No	
Phil	Dyskow		No	
Tom	Frazer		No	
Dakus	Geeslin		No	
Michael	McDermott		No	
Chris	Schleble	Yes		
Rick	Burris	Yes		
Greg	Stunz			Abstain
Cl	Sweetman		No	
Troy	Williamson		No	
Bob	Shipp		No	
Andy	Strelcheck			Abstain
Result - Failed	Subtotals	Yes (3)	No (10)	Abstain (2)

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. It looks like everyone has clicked in with the voting. I will close the voting, and I will give a moment or two more. Okay. It looks like everyone has had a chance, and we'll go ahead and close the voting. Okay.

looks like this motion fails, with ten in opposition, three in favor, and two abstentions and two absent. Okay. I'm trying to remember where we left off here, Tom, and so we're right at the SSC. Go ahead, Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Can we take a short break?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: You know what? Good point. Yes, and I let that time slip away, and I think some of us do need to check out. Thank you, Susan, and so why don't we take -- We will meet back here at 10:30, and so thank you for catching that, Susan.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and it looks like we've got everyone back, and so we'll pick back up with the Reef Fish Committee report. Tom, go ahead.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'll pick up with the SSC Summary Report from the May 2023 Meeting, which is Tab B, Number 8. Black Grouper and Yellowfin Grouper Catch Limits, Mr. John Mareska, of the SSC, summarized the SSC's comments and recommendations relative to black grouper and yellowfin grouper.

 SSC members reviewed recent combined landings trends for both species and expressed concern over the lack of correlation between landings and fishery-independent indices. The SSC thought it appropriate to apply Tier 3a of the council's Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule and recommended an overfishing limit (OFL) of 359,255 pounds gutted weight and an ABC of 307,752 pounds gutted weight, with the catch limits expressed in Marine Recreational Information Program's Fishing Effort Survey (MRIP-FES) units.

Committee members discussed the potential implications of the black grouper and yellowfin grouper catch limits on the IFQ program, particularly on the shallow-water grouper share category.

 The committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to modify the amendment for scamp and yellowmouth grouper OFLs, ABCs, and ACLs to include black grouper and yellowfin grouper SSC catch recommendations. In the amendment, consideration should be given also to implications to the IFQ fishery involving the shallow-water grouper complex. That motion actually carried without opposition, Mr. Chair.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Tom. We've got a committee motion. Is there any more discussion on the motion? C.J.

DR. SWEETMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the conversation that we had about this in committee, and I just wanted to kind of point out here that we do -- There will be an assessment for black grouper coming on down the pipeline, I think after FWRI runs the mutton snapper stock assessment, and that could potentially be an entry point for us to try and make some changes, based on that assessment.

We do have a little bit of concern regarding splitting out black grouper here, and there's the potential for outliers and how that could shut down that fishery, with an overall reduced quota, but, overall, we're generally supportive of this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, C.J. I am not seeing any other hands up. Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Go ahead, Tom.

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you. Midwater Snapper Complex Catch Limits, Mr. Mareska summarized the SSC's review of the midwater snapper landings, sans wenchman, per its previous motion that wenchman be removed from the midwater snapper complex.

The SSC thought it appropriate to apply Tier 3a of the council's ABC Control Rule for the three remaining species (blackfin snapper, queen snapper, and silk snapper), using landings data from 2012 through 2021. The SSC recommended an OFL of 107,904 pounds whole weight and an ABC of 96,689 pounds whole weight, with the catch limits expressed in MRIP-FES units.

 The committee discussed removal of wenchman from the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan (FMP), which would require a plan amendment and evaluation of ten factors for such removal of a species from federal management, per the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

 A committee member asked about the relationship between the historical annual landings of the three remaining species relative to the SSC's recommended catch limits. Staff replied that the SSC's proposed OFL would not have been exceeded in the last ten years, and the ABC would have been exceeded twice. Staff continued that the council could be thoughtful in its approach to the accountability measures, recognizing the rareevent nature of the remaining species in recreational data

collection.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to consider removal of wenchman from the Reef Fish FMP and to set ACLs and AMs for the remaining species in the midwater snapper complex (blackfin snapper, queen snapper, and silk snapper). That motion carried without opposition and with one abstention. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We have another committee motion. Any discussion on this motion? Peter.

 MR. HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was talking to Dr. McGovern earlier, and the South Atlantic has, you know, removed species before from some of their FMPs, and what they do is they develop a white paper, which considers the ten factors for stocks that require conservation and management.

I just would think that, you know, it might be worthwhile to sort of have, you know, staff, and our staff, maybe flesh that out a little bit, so you can see it and then sort of make sure that, yes, okay, this is what we want, and then we could go forward with an amendment, if that's your desire, and I'm sure that Ryan has thoughts.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Ryan.

MR. RINDONE: So I think we could also do that as part of the development of options, and, further, as it pertains to wenchman, because of the nature of the data, we can't show them to you guys, and they would have to be aggregated in such a way as to mask strong confidentiality issues, and the best that we could show you would be five-year averages, as far as the data precision are concerned, and so, knowing that, and knowing all the testimony and everything, like we can certainly summarize the things that the council has heard, as part of the background in developing the document, to capture basically where we started, and I guess it was almost a year-and-a-half ago to now, from the public comments and the SSC evaluations and things like that, to detail where we are, when you guys start to work through those ten factors.

 CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Ryan. Any other comments? I think that's fine, Carrie, if you all are good with Peter's suggestion. All right. Seeing no other hands, or discussion, is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Tom.

DR. FRAZER: All right, and so we're moving to a final action

item, Draft Amendment 56: Modifications to the Gag Grouper Catch Limits, Sector Allocations, and Fishing Seasons, Tab B, Number 9.

SERO staff noted that the gag interim rule was implemented on May 3, 2023, and is effective for 180 days. It may be extended for an additional 186 days thereafter. Council staff reviewed feedback received during virtual and in-person public hearings and in written public comments.

Staff presented the actions and alternatives to the council, noting the preferred alternatives. A committee member asked about the recreational buffer in Action 4, and staff clarified that the projected recreational fishing season duration, based on the council's aforementioned preferred alternatives, would result in a recreational fishing season duration of fifty-nine days in 2024, given a September 1 start date (Alternative 3).

A committee member asked if SERO could take into consideration extreme weather events if the council continued with a September 1 opening in Action 4. SERO replied that it could consider such weather events in determining when to close and whether to reopen the recreational fishing season. A committee member disagreed with the idea of reallocating at this time, but thought the need to end overfishing and implement the rebuilding plan was most important.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend the Council approve Draft Amendment 56: Modifications to the Gag Grouper Catch Limits, Sector Allocations, and Fishing Seasons and forward it 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 with one opposed, two abstentions, and two absent. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Tom, and so we've got a final action committee motion, which will require a roll call vote, but, before we do that, is there any discussion on the motion? All right. Seeing no discussion on the motion -- C.J. Andy, I see your hand, or go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to make a couple of comments, generic reasons, and we went quickly through them during our committee discussion, and so the language, with regard to reopening, Mara and I have corresponded a little bit on that,

and our intent would be to make it clear that I would have authority to reopen if the ACT was not reached. Right now, that authority pertains specifically to catch limits, and not catch targets, but the same rationale would be used, and needed, for reopening, if the catch target is not met, and so that would be our intent, just to update that reopening provision.

The other thing that, or couple other things, that I think are really important to talk about, and so there was some criticism that the council was not using a key target for the rebuilding plan, and we have a Tmin, which is eleven years, which indicates that we would have to prevent all fishing mortality, including discard mortality, to rebuild, and, obviously, that's not practical, and we also have two scenarios that rely on equations to determine the maximum rebuilding timeframe, and one is eighteen years and one is twenty-two years, but my view, with regard to T target, is that we have to, obviously, balance kind of that minimum timeframe, eleven, with the twenty-two-year timeframe, which is the maximum, and we have chosen a rebuilding plan that falls within that range.

It minimizes some of the socioeconomic consequences, and it also provides for conservation benefits, and so I just wanted to note that, since there was comments made about us not -- Of being very risky, with regard to the rebuilding plan.

Then the last comment I will make is that I think, you know, it's very clear, to me, that more work needs to be done to successfully recover gag, and one of the areas that I think we need to really work toward, with a follow-on framework action, is provisions that can help with recovery of gag, including further ways that we could reduce discards, going forward, and so I hope that we can prioritize any future framework, following this action, and move that forward as quickly as possible. Thanks.

DR. SWEETMAN: Ultimately, I will support this motion. I think we need to, very much so, move forward on this, because of the status of the stock, and get it recovered. This is a Florida fishery. I will say that, even though I will support this motion, as I mentioned earlier, I am not in favor of the reallocation discussion that we've been having, and the current preferred there, simply from the perspective that we should be following the allocation review process that we have set up and not getting put into an amendment like this. I do understand though the importance, and urgency, of moving forward on that, and so I will vote in favor of this motion. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will be speaking in opposition, or voting in opposition, to this motion, because of the reallocation discussion in the document. I am not a fan of dividing documents up, but I do believe, when it comes to reallocation, that's something that needs to be by itself. I do understand the urgency and the issues that we're facing with gag, but I don't -- I am not in favor of the allocation that we picked as a preferred. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Susan. I'm not seeing any other hands. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I probably am not doing a good job of explaining myself, and everybody has got their own perception of reallocation, fishermen, council members, staff, but, every time we change to a new data program, there's a proportional change that takes place, whether we like it or not, and, if you don't reallocate, you have reallocated, and so it's so complex, and it's so hard to -- My perception is my perception, and it's different from other people's perception, and I understand that, but it's really hard to explain to the public that there's a proportional change, just from that one thing, using a new data collection program.

In this case, we're using the same years, in the alternative that we're moving forward, as we did with the old data collection program, and so I think, from that point of view, we're trying to keep it as fair as possible, but I understand that fairness is a point-of-view issue, from where people sit, but, whenever we communicate on this, if -- I'm sure people can say it a lot better than what I'm saying right now, and I'm not sure that I'm even explaining it good while I'm trying to talk, because it's complicated, but, if we could communicate as good as we can to the public, whenever we do news releases on this, and explain what I am talking about, it might help a little bit, but, if you're on an end where the percentage is changing against you, I can understand that that's a reallocation, and so, anyway, anything that we can do, when we communicate on this, to help the public understand, I think it would be very beneficial. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Good point. Thank you, Dale. Tom.

DR. FRAZER: Again, I mean, I will follow-up on Dale's comments here. I mean, I do think that there are different views on this topic of allocation, right, and my view on this is that, when we

change the data currency, it's essentially a correction of that historical data, right, and so the resulting allocation is part of the math that went into that.

I am not arguing here whether or not the allocation is correct, or justified, moving forward, and what I'm saying is it's the process that's in place, right, to correct historical data and move forward. We've applied that process to red grouper in Amendment 53, and we applied it in Amendment 54, and it's important, for me, to have consistency in the way that we're doing business here.

I am not opposed at all, right, in reconsidering what an appropriate allocation might look like for any of those species, moving forward, but I don't view the process that we've embarked upon here as a reallocation process. I just don't -- I fundamentally don't see that, and I think it's math issue, and so, for that reason, I'm going to say that I will be in support of this, but, to Andy's point, moving forward, I mean, we can certainly do some things, in a follow-up framework action, to deal with the discard issues, which I think will be fine, but we could also have subsequent discussions about what is the appropriate allocation among the sectors, if we wish to do that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Good discussions on this, and I am not seeing any more, and so I think it's time we bring this to a vote. This will be a roll call vote, and so if you all get your clickers out, and it looks like Beth has got it up there, and so please vote, and we will end that here in just a minute. Okay. It looks like we all have voted. We still have two absences, and so just a moment or two more here, to make sure that everybody has got their right vote locked in.

Grouper Catch Limits, Sector Allocations, and Fishing Seasons				
First Name	Last Name			
Kevin	Anson	Yes		
Susan	Boggs		No	
Billy	Broussard	Yes		
Dale	Dlaz	Yes		
Phil	Dyskow	Yes		
Tom	Frazer	Yes		
Dakus	Geeslin	Yes		
Michael	McDermott	Yes		
Chris	Schleble	Yes		
Rick	Burris	Yes		
Greg	Stunz	Yes		
Cl	Sweetman	Yes		
Troy	Williamson	Yes		
Bob	Shipp	Yes		
Andy	Streicheck	Yes		

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. I am not seeing anything, and so we'll go ahead and close the vote. The motion carries with fourteen in favor, one opposed, and two absent. Tom, go ahead.

Yes (14)

No (1)

Abstain (0)

Subtotals

Result - Passed

DR. FRAZER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The council will be updated on how management to the ACTs will be placed in the codified regulations during Full Council. I wonder if we need to pull up the codified text one more time, given this statement. Mara.

MS. LEVY: I think the plan is to have NMFS just revise the general 622.8 provisions that talk about the opening generally, so it would apply across-the-board, because, right now, it just refers to quotas and ACLs, but NMFS can revise it to reflect that some stocks are managed with ACTs, and it would be the same rationale, right, for allowing reopening for those stocks.

DR. FRAZER: Great. Thank you. All right. The next item in the report is the Draft Snapper Grouper Amendment 44/Reef Fish Amendment 55: Catch Level Adjustments and Allocations for Southeast U.S. Yellowtail Snapper, Tab B, Number 10.

Council staff outlined the proposed management alternatives for Snapper Grouper Amendment 44/Reef Fish Amendment 55, which evaluates modifications to the southeastern U.S. yellowtail

snapper management. Amendment actions and alternatives are based on an interim analysis that was performed as an update to the most recent SEDAR 64 stock assessment.

At the end of the presentation, committee members were alerted to a potential issue with some historical landings data. A committee member stated that the discrepancy in the data was between the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and MRIP for 2008 through 2016, where landings adjacent to the Dry Tortugas were applied to the Gulf instead of the South Atlantic, due to a coding error. The concern was that this error was likely not addressed in 2016, due to other amendments that were ongoing for the south Florida species.

 Council staff proposed confirming with FWC and the Southeast Fishery Science Center that the proper landings data were used for the historical jurisdictional allocation as well as the proposed alternatives in this amendment. A committee member thought it important to evaluate proportional landings between the directed fleets when considering the jurisdictional allocation.

 The committee confirmed that yellowtail snapper landings in Monroe County, regardless of origin, are attributed to the South Atlantic. Another committee member suggested that, while the data are being investigated, council staff may provide a general statement, on behalf of the Gulf Council, to the South Atlantic Council, in advance of their upcoming meeting, that jurisdictional changes in allocation that would lead to a seasonal closure in the Gulf not be considered. This would assist the South Atlantic Council in its discussion of this amendment during its council meeting next week. Staff will work through these concerns and bring a revised document to the Gulf Council in August.

Other Business, Discussion of Private Angling Allocation for Red Snapper, a committee member asked for a timeline update on the development of the requested document to modify the private angling component allocation for red snapper between the Gulf states. Council staff noted a need to meet with SERO staff about the development of the document and thought that work could be initiated in October 2023. The committee member appreciated beginning document development in October. Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you, Tom. Is there any other business that needs to come before the Reef Fish Committee report? All right. Seeing none, I think we're going to get out

of here early today. We covered Other Business yesterday, but is there any other last-minute business that we need to deal with? Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I got to personally talk to you and Mr. Dyskow, as you all were leaving, but I did want to just, on the record, thank Dr. Bob Shipp for all of his leadership to this council over the years, and to me personally. It's been an honor to get to work with you, Dr. Shipp, and, in the future, I am going to tell people that I worked with Dr. Bob Shipp, a fisheries giant, and so I just wanted to be on the record and let you know how much you're appreciated, and don't be a stranger in the future. You always have friends here at the Gulf Council. Thanks again, Dr. Shipp.

DR. SHIPP: You are most welcome, Dale. Your usual hyperbole, but thank you, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Well, I think that's it. That's a great way to end it there, Dale, and I have really enjoyed working with all of you as well, and so nine years, as I mentioned, goes fast, and I will miss you all, and I'm sure that I will be back here and there, and so, anyway, with that, unless there's anything else, we will conclude the meeting for this time, and we'll see everyone in Austin.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 8, 2023.)