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The Spiny Lobster Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Hyatt Centric, New Orleans, Louisiana, Monday morning, January 29, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Martha Guyas.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**

**CHAIRMAN MARTHA GUYAS:** Let’s convene the Spiny Lobster Committee. Our agenda is Tab K-1, and it looks like our membership is more or less the same as before. It’s myself, John Sanchez, Doug Boyd, Roy Crabtree, Dave Donaldson, and Camp Matens. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda? Seeing none, let’s approve the agenda as written. Are there any changes or additions to the minutes? Seeing none, I will take it that the minutes are approved.

We have got two things that we need to handle today, that Morgan is going to walk us through, and the first is the report on the spiny lobster landings from this past year, and then we will go through a spiny lobster options paper for Amendment 13, and I guess we’ll start with the landings. Morgan, are you ready?

**2016/2017 SPINY LOBSTER LANDINGS**

**DR. MORGAN KILGOUR:** I am ready. Tab K-4 has the spiny lobster landings that were given to us by FWC, and we exceeded the ACT, but we did not exceed the ACL for total landings in the 2016/2017 year.

We received a letter from NMFS stating that we do not need to convene a review panel, as the Regulatory Amendment 4 will increase that ACT has not been implemented yet, and so we’re covered there, but, when that Regulatory Amendment 4 goes into effect, we would not have exceeded the ACT. It’s significantly higher, and I have the actual numbers in the action guide, but it would increase the existing ACT of 6.59 million pounds to 8.64 million pounds. Are there any questions?

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** If there is no questions, it looks like we’re good to go. We’re just waiting for the amendment to go through, and let’s go ahead and start with the options paper then.

**DRAFT OPTIONS SPINY LOBSTER 13**

**DR. KILGOUR:** All right, and so the options paper has -- We have now added the three actions that were added at the October
council meeting. The South Atlantic Council also made that motion to add those three actions, and we changed the outline of the paper just a little bit, to have the procedure to add to the protocol to the end, but it’s still there, but I would like to just walk through the actions and ask if there is any comments or edits or anything that you would like to add to the document, and now is the time. This should go to the South Atlantic Council at its March meeting, but, so far, they have been in agreement with all of the Gulf Council motions.

Action 1 is on page 7, and it is establish an endorsement, marking requirements, and gear prohibitions for bully net gear in the Exclusive Economic Zone off of Florida. No action would do nothing, and there would not be any specific bully net gear regulations, and Action 2 would establish an endorsement for bully nets and align federal regulations to be consistent with Florida regulations for spiny lobster commercial harvest using bully net gear by implementing the following.

It would require commercial bully nets in the EEZ off Florida to have a bully net endorsement from Florida. It would require that the vessel be marked with the harvester’s Florida bully net endorsement number, using reflective paint or other reflective material. It would prohibit commercial bully net vessels from having trap pullers onboard, and it would prohibit the simultaneous possession of bully net gear and any underwater breathing apparatus, not including dive masks or snorkels, onboard a vessel used to harvest or transport spiny lobster for commercial purposes. Are there any questions with this action?

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Mara.

MS. MARA LEVY: Thank you. Just reading this again, Alternative 2 says establish an endorsement for bully nets, which reads, to me, like we’re going to create some federal endorsement, but then, when you read down, it was more to require the Florida endorsement, and so I would just suggest that that alternative be more clear about that distinction.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: That seems pretty reasonable to me. I had a similar note on my notes as well, because we’re not creating something new. We are just requiring a state endorsement.

DR. KILGOUR: Okay, and so I don’t think I need a motion, but I will make sure that we make that clear, that it’s to not establish a new federal endorsement, but to require the Florida bully net endorsement, and I think that was the intent, but, with the committee’s approval, I will make sure that we make
that more clear in the wording of the alternative.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Anybody have objections to that? No? Okay. I think we’re good then. Anything else on Action 1, any other questions or comments for Morgan? Okay. Let’s keep going then on to Action 2.

DR. KILGOUR: Action 2, again, is bully-net-gear-centric, but there is also -- The State of Florida identified that there were several inconsistencies between state and federal regulations, and this is another one.

When they established the bully net gear prohibitions, they also established a commercial bully net bag limit of 250 lobster per day per vessel, and they also found that there were specific bag limit restrictions for certain counties off of Florida, and so that’s what this action is attempting to address, is to make things consistent.

Action 2 would be commercial spiny lobster bully net and dive gear trip limits in the EEZ off of Florida. Alternative 1 would be no action, do not establish commercial day vessel harvest and possession limits for spiny lobster harvested by bully net gear or dive gear in the EEZ off of Florida.

Alternative 2 would establish a commercial daily vessel harvest and possession limit of 250 per day per vessel for spiny lobsters harvested by bully net in or from the entire EEZ off Florida, and that is the existing Florida regulation.

Then Alternative 3 would establish a commercial daily vessel harvest and possession limit of 250 per day per vessel for spiny lobsters harvested by diving in or from only the EEZ off Broward, Dade, Monroe, Collier, and Lee Counties in Florida, and it can be noted that both Alternative 2 and 3 can be the preferred alternatives, but, again, this was identified as inconsistent between the state and federal regulations. I am happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: I am not seeing any hands -- There we go. Doug Boyd.

MR. DOUG BOYD: Martha, a question for you. What is the daily limit now? Is there one?

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Yes, and so it is 250 for the bully nets and then 250 for diving, and so this would just match up with the existing FWC rules. Is everybody good with this? All right.
Let’s move on to Action 3.

**DR. KILGOUR:** Action 3 is the specification of degradable panels in spiny lobster traps in the EEZ off of Florida, and so, again, this was another inconsistent regulation, and I know it’s in the discussion, but this would be specific to spiny lobster traps.

Alternative 1 would be no action. In the EEZ off Florida, a spiny lobster trap constructed of material other than wood must have a panel constructed of wood, cotton, or other material that will degrade at the same rate as a wooden trap. Such panel must be located in the upper half of the sides or on top of the trap, so that, when removed, there will be an opening in the trap no smaller than the diameter found at the throat or entrance of the trap.

FWC regulations are slightly different, and so Alternative 2 would match the federal regulations to the state regulations, and Alternative 2 is, in the EEZ off Florida, a spiny lobster trap constructed of material other than wood is required to have a degradable panel no smaller than six inches by four inches or no smaller than the dimensions of the throat or entrance of the trap, whichever is larger, and shall be constructed of cypress or untreated pine slats no thicker than three-quarters-inch thick. This degradable panel must be located on the top horizontal section of the trap.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Mr. Swindell.

**MR. ED SWINDELL:** How long will it take the wood to deteriorate in the trap? Do we know?

**DR. KILGOUR:** I don’t have that answer for you. I can look, but I think the -- What my understanding is, it would be the same as what is existing in the federal regulations, but it’s specific on the types of materials that you can use for the degradable panel, whereas the federal regulations allow cotton or other material that will degrade as fast as wood.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Mr. Gregory.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** It probably depends on the bottom type the trap is put in. In Florida Bay, in the Gulf, there is a lot of worms and boring organisms, and traps don’t last as long, and so maybe a year-and-a-half. On the reef, they might last two years, or maybe three. It depends on if the trap is just left alone and not serviced or cleaned on a regular basis, like a lost trap. It will deteriorate faster than a trap.
that is regularly picked up and cleaned by the fishermen.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Mr. Swindell.

**MR. SWINDELL:** Are we satisfied that we’re going to allow this degradable panel to be there for that long of a time? I mean, are we just trying to find something that’s going to deteriorate over a certain time of two years or a year or six months? I don’t know.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I guess the concern here would be the degradable panel would be effective if the trap is lost, and so probably a year is how long it would last before it deteriorated.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Are there other questions on this one? Seeing none, I think it sounds like we’re ready to move on to Action 4.

**DR. KILGOUR:** Action 4 is harvesting restrictions near artificial habitat in the EEZ off of Florida. Currently, in the spiny lobster regulations for Florida, there are specific regulations on how far you must be from artificial habitat to collect spiny lobster, and so this, again, would try and align state and federal regulations.

Alternative 1, no action, federal regulations have no formal definition developed for artificial habitat, and there are no restrictions for harvest and possession of spiny lobster in the EEZ off an artificial habitat as defined by Florida Administrative Code.

Alternative 2 would be no person shall harvest any spiny lobster from artificial habitat. The harvest and possession in the water of spiny lobster in excess of the recreational bag limit is hereby prohibited within ten yards of artificial habitat, as is consistent with the Florida Administrative Code. For spiny lobster, “artificial habitat” means any material placed in the waters of the state that is reasonably suited to providing cover and habitat for spiny lobster. Such material may be constructed of, but is not limited to, wood, metal, fiberglass, concrete, or plastic, or any combination thereof, and may be fabricated for this specific purpose or for some other purpose. The term does not include fishing gear allowed by rule of the Florida FWC, legally permitted structures, or artificial reef sites constructed pursuant to permits issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or by the state regulatory agency.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Questions or comments on this action? Mara.
MS. LEVY: Thank you. This is the one action in here that seems a little bit different from the others, in terms of the need for it, and so the purpose and need is to make things consistent and to aid enforcement and such, but, here, we’re talking about an in-water restriction, like prohibiting within ten yards of an artificial reef, and so it’s not clear to me why we would need to do that in federal waters for enforcement consistency.

Meaning, if you’re in the water, you’re in the water. You’re either in the EEZ or not, and I have a little bit of concern, just because it’s so broad. The definition of artificial habitat is so broad, and so I just think it would be good to have some discussion about the purpose we’re doing this in federal waters.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: John.

MR. JOHN SANCHEZ: I don’t know if this answers your concern, but, in the Keys, what was happening was a lot of people were throwing out their own structures to create habitat, so that they could turn around and go fish them within season, and that was inconsistent with the intent of the sanctuary, et cetera, et cetera, just having people go out and, at will, throw all manner of structure all over the federal waters around the Keys. I guess this is an attempt at trying to dissuade that from being able to happen.

MS. LEVY: So I guess then, to me -- Like I said, it’s a little bit different than needing consistency for enforcement purposes, and is this really a problem in the EEZ, and I don’t know what the Law Enforcement Committee or law enforcement will have to say about it, but it seems fairly hard to enforce.

I mean, we’re talking about possession within ten yards of an artificial habitat in the water, and so those are just some concerns that I think you all might need to talk about and hear some feedback on.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: With this fishery, I can tell you that I think there have been cases where we have divers in the water, law enforcement, that are monitoring things that are happening. This has been, as John mentioned, an issue in the past, with, again, people dumping refrigerators or concrete blocks or whatever, but just potential habitat that there could be for lobster. They like structure. They like to be under things.

I think there is the potential for law enforcement to enforce
this, even though it sounds a little far-fetched, perhaps, and this has definitely been a known issue in the Keys in the past, and so I saw Roy about to put his hand up. Go ahead.

DR. ROY CRABTREE: It does concern me as well, because it’s so broad, and then, some parts of it, it’s not clear to me -- I mean, reasonable suited to providing cover and habitat for spiny lobster, and it seems, to me, virtually anything you put out would meet that.

Then we have big areas where we have all kinds of artificial reef material being put out, chicken coops and a whole host of things, and, at least to a lot of people, they are perceived as positives and good things, and I am not so sure that I agree with that, but what is it about this case that what we often say is a positive and here we’re saying it’s a negative? It’s just not clear to me.

I guess this would -- I mean, since this is a Keys problem and related to the Sanctuary, could we -- Is the intent of this to make this definition throughout the EEZ, or just in the EEZ off of Florida, or is it specific like that?

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Can you speak to that, Morgan? It looks like, from the way the alternative is written, it’s not specific to Florida.

DR. KILGOUR: It’s in the action title, and so it is for the EEZ off of Florida. It’s not for the entire EEZ, but it’s near artificial habitat in the EEZ off of Florida.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Right. Okay. So it is off of Florida, and there is a note in here that it would exclude legally-permitted structures, and so artificial reefs that go through the right process, and this does apply specifically to spiny lobster. John.

MR. SANCHEZ: It does mention that it’s in excess of the recreational bag limit, and so it’s kind of addressing intent to throw out what is called in the Keys a casita, some fabricated structure for the purpose of aggregating lobster for commercial harvest.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Kevin, go ahead, and then Tom.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I’m not on your committee, but, Martha, obviously there is Marine Pollution Act consequences for folks that are caught putting material in the
water that they are not permitted to do, but did the state recently increase any fines associated with illegal dumping, particularly in the Keys?

Then the second question is I know there have been some efforts by the state to clean up those casitas and some of that illegally-dumped material, and can you give an idea as to how successful that’s been?

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** I will have to check about the penalties. I don’t think anything has changed recently. I will tell you that the regulatory, I guess -- Regulations about dumping structures like this are somewhat complicated. There is a lot of different agencies that have some kind of jurisdiction here, particularly in the Keys, where you have the Sanctuary and you have our Department of Environmental Protection and you have this FWC rule. You have the Army Corps, and there is a lot of agencies that are involved with this.

Yes, we do have clean-ups from time to time, not only for this, but for traps as well. Traps is an annual thing, and I will have to look and see the last time that we made a concerted effort to clean up these kind of structures, at least our agency, and there may be other agencies that are working on that more frequently. Tom, go ahead.

**DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thanks, Martha. I am not on your committee either, but I was looking -- I wanted to follow up on Mara’s point, actually. The action relates to harvest restrictions near artificial habitat in the EEZ, but the third sentence in that Alternative 2 defines artificial habitats as those habitats being in the state, waters of the state, and so I don’t think it captures the full breadth.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Good catch. All right. We have had some good discussion on this one. Is there anything else?

**DR. CRABTREE:** Kevin, I don’t know if it would be an issue, but it seems to me that, off of Alabama, there probably isn’t anywhere that is not within ten yards of an artificial reef, and so would it prohibit spiny lobster harvest?

**MR. ANSON:** Well, if I heard correctly, this would be outside of or above the bag limit that this would apply.

**DR. CRABTREE:** I guess it’s just off of Florida, and so --

**MR. ANSON:** It is off of Florida, and I would like to meet the
person who would meet their bag limit off of Alabama, or exceed it, have a chance to exceed it.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Okay, and so it sounds like, if we keep this off of Florida, we’re probably okay, and, again, the intent here is lobster and not to mess with things that are going on in other states. Anything else on this action? If not, I think we have one more to walk through. Morgan, go ahead.

DR. KILGOUR: Just for clarification and to have it on the record, I have taken it, for this discussion, for that third sentence, or third line down, fourth line down, that, for spiny lobster artificial habitat, it means any material placed in the waters of state or federal waters off of Florida, and that’s what I will change that to, so that it’s consistent with this discussion. Again, I apologize for that. I pulled that definition straight from the FAC, and so I didn’t want to change that too much, but I will make that change.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Okay. I was going to ask if you need a motion, but I saw Mara’s hand go up really quick, and maybe that’s what she was about to say.

MS. LEVY: I don’t think you need a motion, but I would just say, and we can talk about this more, Morgan and I, but I would just leave it in the EEZ off of Florida, meaning we don’t want to include the state in our federal definition, necessarily, but we can work that out.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Okay. Let’s move on to Action 5.

DR. KILGOUR: Action 5 is to establish an enhanced cooperative management procedure for federal and Florida state agencies for the management of spiny lobster. Just to refresh your memory, we are having this particular amendment because there was a protocol in place for this council to do a framework action for any of these changes, but there was no procedure for Florida to go directly to the National Marine Fisheries Service and say, hey, we have these regulations, and can we implement them at the federal level.

This will have the procedure in place, where Florida can directly recommend specific regulations, and so Alternative 1 would be no action, and do not establish an enhanced cooperative management procedure for the management of spiny lobster. The councils must develop an amendment to the Fishery Management Plan for the Spiny Lobster Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic to establish new federal regulations consistent
with new Florida regulations.

Alternative 2 would be establish an enhanced cooperative management procedure that allows Florida to request changes to the spiny lobster federal regulations through NMFS rulemaking. Following is the proposed language, which has been adapted and updated from Amendment 2, which had the original procedure, for the procedure to be added to the existing protocol, which was established in Amendment 10 to the Spiny Lobster FMP and is also included in Appendix C. I can read through the whole entire procedure, or how do you want me to handle the procedure?

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: What is your pleasure, everybody? Do you want to know the details of this or read it on your own time? I am seeing head shakes no to no movement at all, and so I think that was you don’t want her to read it. Okay. Is there questions or discussion on this? Go ahead, Doug.

MR. BOYD: I am looking at it, just perusing the language, and is our attorney okay with the language?

MS. LEVY: Of the procedure? I am fine with the proposed procedure. I think, last time, we had a discussion about Florida taking a look at the process, like how the process does is described and their obligations and making sure that FWC is okay with the way their obligations and procedures are described, and I don’t know if you’ve done that.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Yes, we’ve talked about this some, and we have coordinated with Morgan, and so I think this is okay. We probably will need to, and maybe we need to talk offline about step-two and exactly what we would need to do, what FWC would need to do, for analyzing things more like the council does ahead of our meetings.

We may just need to coordinate on that, and one other kind of thing that I noticed here is we’re starting off with the based on the best available scientific information, and, a lot of times in this fishery, we’re dealing more with user conflicts more than a resource issue, and so, how we handle those kinds of situations, we probably would maybe need to talk about that here.

Then I had one question about the timeline that we have in here, and I know we’ve talked about this before, but FWC would need to complete -- Hand over the package to NMFS before February 1, and then it would get implemented by the August 6 opening of the season, and is this process one of those processes that the
Regional Office works through, or does it go through Headquarters at all? I am just wondering if this is a realistic timeline or if there are ways that it could be seriously delayed.

**DR. CRABTREE:** Well, if there is a rule, it goes to Headquarters, and they have to send it to the Federal Register, and it will have to go through various clearance processes up there, and so Sue would be better to comment on is the timeline realistic.

**MS. LEVY:** It’s just that it also anticipates the councils looking at it too and having like a veto type of process, and so, if you think February 1 -- We’re looking at a March South Atlantic meeting and an April Gulf meeting, and so I don’t know. I think NMFS would have to speak to the timeline, but then you have to do the rulemaking, and so it seems like it, to me, might be a bit tight.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** I will defer to what you guys think, but, presumably, FWC would have done the bulk of the stakeholder work, and hopefully, if we’ve got everything tight and together when we do the state rule -- Hopefully it’s a clean handoff to the federal system, but I know that you guys have a number of courses of action that you have to take when you’re implementing your rulemaking, and some of them are out of your control, and so this is still okay, the February 1 and August 6?

**MS. SUSAN GERHART:** Maybe we can reevaluate that. Generally, it takes about six months to get the rulemaking process, which that incorporates, but, if it also has to go to the councils and the SSCs before that, then maybe we need to extend that timeline.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Any other discussion on this? Morgan.

**DR. KILGOUR:** I guess I will talk with NMFS and figure out what we need to do for the dates, or perhaps we take those dates out completely, so that nobody is tied to those. I know that Regulatory Amendment 4 was submitted in June, or July, and it hasn’t -- We don’t even have a proposed rule yet.

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** I think the dates could be helpful, because I do think the reminder that the fishing season starts on August 6 and we need to get all of these things done well in advance is somewhat important.

This is a fishery where, if we’re going to make rule changes, we want to have them done well in advance of the start of that
season, so that everybody can get ready, especially if it deals with people having to change how they’re doing their traps or tags or anything like that, and so that is somewhat helpful, and it gives us at least something to shoot for and be mindful of, but, if it’s an unrealistic timeline, then that doesn’t really help us. Anything else on this one? Mara.

**MS. LEVY:** Just a question. Does FWC normally develop alternative rules? I mean, when you do your rulemakings, do you do an alternatives analysis, like it talks about here in Number 2, or is that not the normal process?

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** I would say we often do something like that, but not nearly as formally as we would at the council, and it’s not always that way. If the commission sees a path forward, they may say, okay, staff, we think that, based on everything we’ve heard from so-and-so-and-so-and-so-and-so, this is what we need to do, and then we’ll develop a rule package based on that.

Yes, I think we probably need to talk more about what we would need to do to satisfy what you all need to move forward with the federal rulemaking side, because I think our processes are different enough that we -- I don’t know, but we need to understand how they’re different and, if there are things that we need to do differently, we need to know that from the get-go.

Maybe what we need to do is look at how we’ve implemented our process the last few times that we’ve made lobster rules and have you guys look at it and see if you think that that would be enough to move forward in the future and like, if we did that in the future, what would we need to do differently? I don’t know, but what are your thoughts on that? We can do that offline, and we don’t need to do that right now, but --

**MS. LEVY:** Yes, that might be helpful. I mean, it also refers to the Florida Administrative Procedure Act, and I don’t know how -- I haven’t looked at how similar that is to the federal act, and do you all -- Is the FWC generally bound by following the Florida Administrative Procedure Act?

**CHAIRMAN GUYAS:** Yes, and that’s something that our commission would be following in our meetings. There are some things, and I will have to look to see exactly how it may apply to our agency. Since our agency is constitutional, there are some things that we don’t necessarily have to follow, but we do, just in good governance, but I don’t know that this is one of them, and I will have to check.
We can coordinate on that, I think, offline. Anything else on Action 5? If not, is there anything else that we need to cover in this amendment, Morgan, and can you tell us kind of where we’re going from here? I know the South Atlantic is going to look at it in March, but is this coming back to us for final action in June, when we’re in Key West?

DR. KILGOUR: One last thing about Action 5. I will be adding the protocol and procedure together, so it’s all in one place for Appendix C. Right now, they’re still separated, and, I believe, at the October council meeting, and also in the December South Atlantic Council meeting, they wanted them combined all in one place, so that they can’t be separated again, and so I just wanted to alert you that it will all be combined in one place in the appendix for future reference.

The South Atlantic is going to look at this document and look at the Gulf Council motions at their March meeting, and I am not sure if we will have enough time to bring a public hearing draft back to you in April. We’ll try, but it just depends on what the motions of the South Atlantic Council are.

If we are, we would have a public hearing draft either in April or June, and that’s one thing that I would like to discuss right now, if possible, on if the committee feels like this needs to go out to formal public hearings or if the webinar would be sufficient, and so if the committee could discuss that.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: I will chime in here. I think the webinar and the fact that our June meeting is in Key West is probably good enough here. We have already been through the process, at least with the actual changes that we’re making and not the procedure.

We’ve gone through that at the state level, and I think the South Atlantic has had some webinars already on this as well, and so I think we’ll be just fine with, even if it’s not at the public hearing stage, just having the discussion in June in Key West will be helpful, and we’ll have -- We will be in the right place to get feedback from people on this, and I don’t know if there is other thoughts. John.

MR. SANCHEZ: Just a question. Has the South Atlantic picked preferreds on this at all, or do we not have to?

DR. KILGOUR: We are still at the options stage, and so we don’t need to pick preferreds, unless you would really like to, and the Gulf Council sees the draft before the South Atlantic. We are the lead council on this. The South Atlantic did have two
scoping hearings in January, which was a little bit after when we would normally have a scoping hearing, and those were both by webinar.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Okay. I think we’re done with this amendment. Let me flip back to my agenda here. Go ahead.

DR. KILGOUR: I just wanted to make sure that everyone knew that we’ll be bringing this with the new three actions that weren’t in the document in October to the Law Enforcement Technical Committee at the March meeting as well.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Okay. Great. Is there any other business to come before the Spiny Lobster Committee today? Seeing none, the committee is adjourned.

LT. MARK ZANOWICZ: The LETC comments, are we going to talk about that?

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Sure.

LT. MARK ZANOWICZ: It was on there, and so --

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: I wasn’t sure if that was the comment, if they’re just going to discuss it in March.

DR. KILGOUR: They did see Action 1 and the new Action 5, which is the bully net regulations and the procedures and protocol after the October council meeting, and so, if you would like to hear what they had to say about those, and then they will be seeing the three new actions at the next Law Enforcement Technical Committee. Let me pull them up.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: While Morgan is looking for that, when we set up the tables, we put all the microphones around the edge of the table, but there is plenty of room, and you can pull the microphones closer to you, so you don’t have to lean so far over.

LETC COMMENTS

DR. KILGOUR: We reviewed Action 1 and informed the Law Enforcement Technical Committee that there would be three additional actions, and the committee basically felt that consistency between state and federal waters was beneficial, and that’s about all they had to say about it.

CHAIRMAN GUYAS: Okay. Awesome, and so we’ll look forward to
the rest of the feedback from them the next time we pick up this amendment. Now, is there any other business for the committee, and did I miss anything on the agenda? It looks like no, but --
In that case, the committee is adjourned.

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

---