

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES COMMITTEE

4
5 Webinar

6
7 January 25, 2021

8
9 **VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 12 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 14 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 15 Robin Riechers.....Texas
- 16 Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
- 17 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
- 18 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 19 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
- 20 Troy Williamson.....Texas

21
22 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 23 Susan Boggs.....Alabama
- 24 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
- 25 Phil Dyskow.....Florida
- 26 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 27 Adam Peterson.....USCG
- 28 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 29 Bob Shipp.....Alabama
- 30 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi

31
32 **STAFF**

- 33 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 34 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 35 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
- 36 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 37 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 38 Jessica Matos.....Document Editor & Administrative Assistant
- 39 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 40 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
- 41 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 42 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

43
44 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 45 Chris Conklin.....SAFMC
- 46 Peter Hood.....NMFS
- 47 Joe Powers.....SSC
- 48 Clay Porch.....SEFSC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....2
4
5 Table of Motions.....3
6
7 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....4
8
9 Action Guide and Next Steps.....4
10
11 Final Action Amendment 48/Red Drum 5: Status Determination
12 Criteria and Optimum Yield for Reef Fish and Red Drum.....4
13
14 SSC Recommendations on Interim Analyses Species and Timing.....16
15
16 Review of Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology for the
17 Gulf of Mexico and Joint Fishery Management Plans.....20
18
19 Other Business.....23
20 Update on Red Snapper Discards Counted Against ACLs.....23
21
22 Adjournment.....26
23

- - -

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

PAGE 14: Motion to approve Reef Fish Amendment 48/Red Drum 5: Status Determination Criteria and Optimum Yield for Reef Fish and Red Drum and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The motion carried on page 15.

- - -

1 The Sustainable Fisheries Committee of the Gulf of Mexico
2 Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Monday
3 morning, January 25, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman
4 Dale Diaz.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN DALE DIAZ:** I would like to call the Sustainable
11 Fisheries Committee to order. The members of the committee are
12 myself as Chair, Dr. Stunz as Vice Chair, Mr. Schieble, Mr.
13 Anson, Ms. Bosarge, Mr. Donaldson, Ms. Guyas, Mr. Riechers, Mr.
14 Strelcheck, Mr. Swindell, and Mr. Williamson.

15
16 The first item on the agenda is the Adoption of the Agenda. Are
17 there any changes or modifications to the agenda?
18

19 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Yes, Dale.
20

21 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Go ahead, Mr. Anson.
22

23 **MR. ANSON:** I would like to add, under Other Business, an update
24 on the request to receive details about how the red snapper dead
25 discards are counted against the commercial and recreational
26 ACLs.
27

28 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Okay, Mr. Anson. I've got it. Any other
29 changes to the agenda? Any other items? Hearing none, is there
30 any opposition to adopting the agenda? Hearing none, the agenda
31 is adopted.
32

33 The next item on the agenda is the Approval of the November 2020
34 Minutes. Are there any additions or corrections to the 2020
35 minutes? Hearing none, are there any objections to adopting the
36 November 2020 minutes? Then the minutes are adopted.
37

38 We're going to go through the Action Guide and Next Steps as we
39 take up each item, and so, Dr. Froeschke, would you go through
40 the action guide for Agenda Item Number IV, please, and then,
41 when you're finished, you can just go ahead and proceed right on
42 into your presentation.
43

44 **FINAL ACTION AMENDMENT 48/RED DRUM 5: STATUS DETERMINATION**
45 **CRITERIA AND OPTIMUM YIELD FOR REEF FISH AND RED DRUM**
46

47 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Yes, sir. Good morning. A couple of
48 things on Item Number IV. At the last council meeting, we had

1 noticed this Reef Fish Amendment 48/Red Drum 5: Status
2 Determination Criteria Amendment for final action. During
3 discussion of the document, there were some questions raised
4 about the pros and cons of using SPR proxies to define the
5 maximum sustainable yield for the data-limited stocks, and so
6 the council asked for a presentation to look at some of the pros
7 and cons of that approach, versus other approaches that might be
8 used.

9
10 We have that presentation, and, depending on the feedback of
11 that, we also have included the amendment in the briefing
12 materials and noticed it for final action, if you want to review
13 the document, and so that's what I have, and so we'll start with
14 the presentation.

15
16 This is just a brief overview of status determination criteria,
17 and these are the information for stocks that we manage to
18 define overfishing and overfished status, and they're important
19 to the council because fishery management plans must define this
20 for each managed stock and using measurable criteria to do this.

21
22 Just a brief timeline for this particular document, and it's
23 been on the action schedule since 2014, and there was actually a
24 motion in 2012 that started this document. However, it remained
25 a low priority. In 2017, we discussed that the Reef Fish and
26 Red Drum FMPs are not in compliance with Magnuson, because we
27 don't have some of these criteria defined for some of our
28 stocks, and so there was a motion passed to elevate this to a
29 higher priority status, and so we did that and began working on
30 it.

31
32 This is sort of just the timeline, and kind of what I want to
33 demonstrate with the slide is sort of just the schedule of when
34 the council and the SSC have looked at this and kind of the
35 items that they have focused on, and so, again, we started on
36 this in 2017, and the SSC began by reviewing the maximum
37 sustainable yield alternatives in the document, and,
38 essentially, they reviewed it and provided comment a number of
39 times.

40
41 Their feedback, in general, considered reviewing the SPR proxies
42 for various stocks, and then the early alternatives in the early
43 version of the document considered alternatives to data-limited
44 stocks, based on the annual landings. Both the SSC and the
45 Science Center had reviewed that and provided comments that
46 ultimately led to removal of those options for the more recent
47 versions of the draft that have been reviewed both by the
48 Science Center and the council, and so the options in the

1 current document are consistent with both of their
2 recommendations.

3
4 Some of the more recent reviews focused on the definitions of
5 optimum yield that included scalars based on percentages of MSY
6 and then continuing to use the escapement-based definition for
7 red drum.

8
9 At the September meeting, after review, the document was
10 approved for public hearings, and we held the public hearings
11 virtually in November, and Emily provided a summary of the
12 comments and feedback received in November, and, again, at that
13 time, the council requested a presentation about the pros and
14 cons of using SPR proxies for these data-poor stocks, and that's
15 where we are today.

16
17 In the document, there are four actions, maximum sustainable
18 yield proxies, the MFMT, or maximum fishing mortality threshold,
19 the minimum stock size threshold, and the optimum yield. Based
20 on previous discussions at the council, it seems the Actions 2,
21 3, and 4 seem fairly certain in the council's choices, and so,
22 again, this presentation is just going to focus on Action 1.

23
24 Maximum sustainable yield proxies, there are different ways this
25 could be done, but maximum sustainable yield is considered the
26 largest long-term average catch that can be taken from a stock
27 or complex without depleting the stock, and, essentially, in the
28 graphic in the bottom-right panel, it's consistent with the OFL
29 on an annual basis.

30
31 For assessed stocks, we typically use proxies, because we don't
32 have the data, necessarily, to estimate directly maximum
33 sustainable yield. In general, lower SPR proxies allow higher
34 catches at higher risk of overfishing the stock and depleting it
35 at some point, based on perhaps factors other than fishing. In
36 general, stocks -- We have used SPRs between 30 and 40 percent
37 for reef fish stocks, with the exception of red snapper and gray
38 snapper, that are now managed at SPR 26.

39
40 Action 1 contains four alternatives directly related to the SPR
41 and then a fifth that's more of a housekeeping kind of thing,
42 and so I will focus on Preferred Alternatives 2 and 3, and this
43 is sort of the basis of the discussion last time, and so
44 Preferred Alternative 2 is for stocks and complexes that do not
45 have an MSY proxy. The MSY proxy is the yield when fishing at
46 30 percent spawning potential ratio.

47
48 This preferred alternative would encompass stocks both that are

1 assessed as well as some stocks that are considered data poor,
2 or data limited. In the Gulf, the way we typically consider
3 these stocks is they do have reliable estimates of historical
4 landings, but they may or may not have other kinds of
5 information that are useful for determining harvest levels.

6
7 Preferred Alternative 3 addresses goliath grouper, and the issue
8 is sort of the same. The difference is that goliath has some
9 unique biological characteristics, in that it's long-lived and
10 large, and it may not be as resilient to fishing as other reef
11 fish stocks, and, from a management perspective, this is a
12 harvest-prohibited species.

13
14 This table, if you can see it, summarizes the stocks and
15 complexes that are encompassed by the various alternatives in
16 the document. In the bold, black text, it indicates the species
17 that have an accepted stock assessment. The not-bolded stocks
18 are what we would consider data-limited stocks, and there are
19 several of those included in complexes, and the subsequent
20 slides will sort of summarize some of the tradeoffs of using
21 either the SPR approach that we're using now in the document as
22 the current preferred versus some of the other options that
23 could be considered.

24
25 Again, this comes from the council request at the last meeting
26 for a discussion about the pros and cons of using these proxies
27 for data-poor stocks.

28
29 What I have here is just a small table, and this is by no means
30 an exhaustive list of some of the pros and cons of using the
31 SPR-based proxies for MSY, and, on the pro side, this is
32 consistent with how we've managed both reef fish and coastal
33 migratory pelagic stocks.

34
35 There is a strong scientific rationale for this approach,
36 linking the productivity of the stock to the harvest advice, and
37 this is the approach that's been recommended by the Science
38 Center and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center that is
39 responsible for doing the stock assessments and providing the
40 basis for management advice.

41
42 In terms of the cons of this, this is really a data-rich
43 requirement to fully make use of this, and not all stocks that
44 we have are assessed, and some may or may not be assessed in the
45 future, and then there's concern that this proxy-based approach
46 may not be as directly measurable as some of the landings-based
47 approaches.

1 The alternative in the early versions of this, just to reiterate
2 what we have, is an alternative based on using annual landings,
3 based on historical catch, to define maximum sustainable yield.
4 There was a lot of discussion at the council level and at the
5 SSC meetings, as well as input from the Science Center.

6
7 The primary concerns about using landings, from the SSC, was
8 that the way we've done it in the past -- For example in
9 defining annual catch limits for data-limited stocks, we have
10 used average landings and the variance about that, and I think
11 there is general scientific consensus that this can be used to
12 generate sustainable levels, but not necessarily a maximum
13 level, and there wasn't any confidence that this information
14 could be used to define a maximum that's consistent with the
15 definition of MSY.

16
17 In terms of the calibration issues, these data-poor stocks have
18 not been calibrated to the FES, and so there could be some
19 concerns about how to define an MSY based on currencies, and
20 this would need to be changed, perhaps, when currencies are
21 updated for management context. In terms of doing assessments
22 on data-limited stocks, SEDAR 49 attempted this for several
23 stocks, and only lane snapper was considered adequate for use,
24 and, again, these data-limited stock assessment models require
25 more input information than just landings, and they also don't
26 produce MSY-based outputs, in terms of stock status.

27
28 Based on these kinds of information, the SSC acknowledged that
29 there may be some challenges in implementing or measuring this
30 information, based on the SPR proxies, but it is consistent with
31 a sound scientific approach. In the event that we get this
32 information, we'll be able to directly use it in management.

33
34 Just to summarize the concerns articulated from the Science
35 Center and the SSC with the landings-based approach, it's that
36 there is no confidence that the values that would arrive from
37 the calculations that we've done, for example, in the Generic
38 ACL Amendment, based on Tier 3 of the control rule, would
39 achieve a maximum value, and it could probably produce a
40 sustainable value.

41
42 In terms of the mechanics of using the landings, it would
43 require selections of reference years and criteria that would
44 need to be developed, and they generally revolve around
45 stability of trends and things like that, and it would require
46 some process, and it's unlikely to result in an outcome that is
47 encouraging or consistent with the best scientific information
48 that we have.

1
2 In terms of calibrating historical data, this would require
3 routine updates, or, if the historical catch information
4 changed, it may require frequent changes to the definition of
5 MSY, using this approach.

6
7 One suggestion, from public comment, was to consider the
8 technical guidance being developed through the CCC sub-groups,
9 and they are working on a report that would create tiered advice
10 for data-rich to data-limited stocks, as far as stock status
11 requirements, and I have not seen this report, and it's not
12 publicly available.

13
14 The timeline is expected to be in the coming year, but we
15 haven't seen it, and I don't know when it would be available.
16 One concern is that the guidance from this may not address the
17 data-limited stock that we have and that the guidance may
18 require more information than we have.

19
20 One approach is that we set the MSY definitions based on the
21 preferred alternatives that we have now, and, in the event that
22 new scientific information is available, it can always be
23 revisited in the future, just as we do for all stocks.

24
25 To kind of wrap this up, the Magnuson Act and the National
26 Standard 1 require stock status determination criteria for each
27 managed stock. The current preferred alternatives in the
28 document would satisfy this requirement. In the event that new
29 scientific information is available, the council can always use
30 this to revisit or modify the definition for SDC for any managed
31 stock.

32
33 The SSC and the Science Center are in support of the current
34 preferred alternatives, and have reviewed them a number of
35 times, and so what we're looking for here is do you have any
36 additional questions on this issue, and, if not, do you want to
37 revisit the document and consider taking final action? I think
38 that's my last slide. Any questions?

39
40 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Dr. Froeschke. Any questions for Dr.
41 Froeschke?

42
43 **DR. FROESCHKE:** If not, Mr. Chair, just a brief -- I don't think
44 we've received any new public comments on this since the last
45 time I reviewed the document, and do you want to review the
46 document?

47
48 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** This document is up for final action, and so, if

1 you can go through it quickly, and then -- We've been through it
2 a number of times, and if you will just hit the actions and the
3 preferreds, and then we'll see where the committee wants to go
4 with it when you finish that, Dr. Froeschke.

5
6 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. Let's bring it up. I'm ready. We'll
7 started with Action 1, and it shouldn't take long, because we
8 just covered this one. Action 1, as we just discussed, would
9 define a maximum sustainable yield for reef fish stocks and red
10 drum, and the Preferred Option 2b would set the yield when
11 fishing at 30 percent SPR, and this would include a number of
12 reef fish stocks and complexes.

13
14 Preferred Alternative 3 addresses goliath grouper separately,
15 and, again, we mentioned this briefly, and it has some unique
16 characteristics. It's less resilient to fishing, perhaps, and
17 so the preferred option of a 40 percent spawning potential ratio
18 would not affect the harvest on prohibition for the stock.

19
20 Preferred Alternative 4 addresses red drum, and red drum is
21 managed quite differently than the reef fish stocks in the Gulf.
22 There is an inshore fishery that's quite extensive, and harvest
23 is prohibited, and it has been in federal waters since 1988.
24 It's not an assessed species, and the current management is
25 based on an escapement rate of juvenile fish to -- From the
26 inshore areas to the offshore waters where the spawning stock
27 resides, and it's based on a goal of 30 percent of those would
28 have escaped, had there been no inshore fishery. This Preferred
29 Option 4a is consistent with that current approach.

30
31 Preferred Alternative 5 is sort of a housekeeping procedure that
32 would allow the council to expedite incorporation of new
33 scientific information if they receive guidance on an updated
34 MSY definition from the SSC, based on the outcome of an
35 assessment, and they could directly implement this by noting it
36 in a plan amendment, rather than going through a document with
37 actions and alternatives, and so just two points to this. This
38 recommendation from the SSC does not obligate the council to
39 accept it, and so, if they prefer not to do that, they don't
40 have to do that.

41
42 In the event that happened recently, where the SSC provided a
43 range of options for MSY, as they did with gray snapper, then we
44 would still go through a procedure with an action and
45 alternatives for the council to consider, and so those are the
46 preferred alternatives in Action 1. If there are no questions,
47 we can go to Action 2.

1 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Proceed, Dr. Froeschke.
2
3 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Action 2 defines the maximum fishing mortality
4 threshold for stocks that this has not been defined, and it
5 would apply the MFMT equal to the fishing mortality based on the
6 MSY proxy determined in Action 1. This is would ensure that the
7 maximum fishing mortality threshold and the MSY proxy are
8 compatible for the managed stocks, and there is just two
9 alternatives in this one. Again, the council selected this
10 Preferred Alternative 2.
11
12 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Any questions for Dr. Froeschke on Action 2? I
13 am not seeing any. Can you proceed, Dr. Froeschke?
14
15 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Sure. Action 3 addresses the minimum stock size
16 threshold, and this is essentially a biomass-based target, or
17 threshold, in which, for a given stock, there is a biomass, a
18 corresponding biomass, at MSY. However, it's acknowledged,
19 through the process of management and uncertainty, that this
20 biomass estimate may fluctuate through time, and this threshold
21 allows the biomass to fluctuate below the biomass at MSY by some
22 specified amount, such that the stock is not declared overfished
23 and requires rebuilding until this amount. This adds some
24 stability to the fishery and is consistent with how we've
25 managed other stocks.
26
27 Alternative 2 is the way that MSST was historically defined for
28 many stocks, using this one minus M approach, where M
29 corresponded to the natural mortality, and this was given some
30 consideration, and sometimes -- In some cases, the mortality
31 rate is very low, and so you end up with a minimum stock size
32 threshold that's very close to MSY, which can be problematic, in
33 the event that the mortality estimate changes can change your
34 definition of MSST.
35
36 In recent years, the council has gone away from this approach
37 for some stocks, and the preferred alternative is MSST equals 75
38 percent of the biomass at MSY, in contrast to the Alternative 4,
39 which is the 50 percent, and this is the lowest that could be
40 set. The 75 percent tries to balance conservation with the
41 feasibility for management, and there was some information
42 provided by the Science Center that suggests that biomass was
43 unlikely to fall below this level, in absence of some
44 overfishing or stock depletion, and so this balances those
45 needs.
46
47 Preferred Alternative 5 addresses some jointly-managed stocks
48 with the South Atlantic Council, including goliath grouper,

1 mutton snapper, yellowtail, and black grouper, and it manages in
2 a consistent -- I think there's a table below, and so,
3 essentially, it's a consistent with the Preferred Alternative 3,
4 with the exception of goliath grouper. I think there's a little
5 table, if there are no questions. Otherwise, we can go to
6 Action 4.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Any questions for Dr. Froeschke? Mr. Anson.

9

10 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Froeschke, I'm just
11 curious, and I can't recall, but why does the South Atlantic
12 have jurisdiction over goliath? Is that because of historical
13 landings were higher in the South Atlantic's jurisdiction, or is
14 there some other reason? Do you know?

15

16 **DR. FROESCHKE:** It's a joint stock. They don't have
17 jurisdiction, necessarily. It's a single stock in the South
18 Atlantic and Gulf region, and they have previously-established
19 MSY criteria for goliath, whereas we have not.

20

21 **MR. ANSON:** Okay. Thank you.

22

23 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** All right. I am not seeing any other questions,
24 Dr. Froeschke. Would you proceed to Action 4?

25

26 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes. Action 4, a couple of things. It's
27 divided into two sub-actions, if you will, and 4.1 addresses
28 reef fish, the reef fish stocks included in Action 1, as well as
29 hogfish. Action 4.2 that we'll discuss in a minute covers red
30 drum. The reason they're separate is that the no action
31 alternative for reef fish and red drum are different, and so we
32 addressed them in separate actions.

33

34 Preferred Alternative 2 would define the optimum yield as a
35 percentage of MSY. Earlier versions of the document was based
36 on percentages of the yield at FMSY, and the Science Center
37 advocated for using this approach, which the council concurred,
38 and 90 percent of MSY is thought to be consistent with the yield
39 at 75 percent FMSY.

40

41 Preferred Alternative 3 addresses the shallow-water grouper, and
42 this complex is broken because of nuances with black grouper,
43 and black grouper is a jointly-assessed stock, and the
44 assessment is quite old, but, in terms of the OFL, overfishing
45 limit, in the Gulf, it's undefined, and so this group is broken
46 out separately, but the preferred option, again, is 90 percent
47 of MSY.

48

1 Preferred Alternative 4 addresses goliath grouper, and, again,
2 this stock is different, and the council selected this formula-
3 based approach, and Preferred Option 4d is kind of a two-part,
4 and there's a formula for using the annual catch limit divided
5 by the overfishing limit times MSY, or the proxy, or, in this
6 case, since the ACL for this stock is zero, and has been for a
7 long time, because of the harvest prohibition, the OY would
8 remain at zero, based on that tag, where it says "or zero if the
9 ACL equals zero". This is OY for reef fish stocks. Any
10 questions, or we can go to red drum.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** I am not seeing any hands up, Dr. Froeschke.

13
14 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. Action 4.2, again, this is broken out
15 separately from the reef fish stocks, because the no action
16 alternative, Preferred Alternative 1, there is an existing
17 definition of optimum yield for red drum that was defined, I
18 believe in Red Drum Amendment 2, and it states that all red drum
19 harvested from state waters, landed consistent with state laws
20 and regulations, under a goal of allowing a 30 percent
21 escapement of the juvenile population.

22
23 This is an escapement-based management approach, and it's
24 consistent with how management is implemented for this stock.
25 The Alternative 2 in the document uses more of an MSY approach,
26 similar to what was discussed in Action 4.1 for reef fish, but,
27 given this is consistent with the existing definition and how
28 the fishery is currently managed, the council has selected
29 Preferred Alternative 1, no action.

30
31 Those are the actions and preferred alternatives for the four
32 actions in the document, and I don't have anything else, unless
33 you have questions.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Any questions for Dr. Froeschke? Dr. Stunz.

36
37 **DR. GREG STUNZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have a
38 question for Dr. Froeschke, but it's just as much about this
39 document, and I'm pretty much ready to move it forward, if
40 you're willing, Mr. Chair. If you are, I am happy to make that
41 motion.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Yes, please, Dr. Stunz. Proceed.

44
45 **DR. STUNZ:** What would help with that motion is our normal text
46 for moving forward for final action documents like this, and I
47 don't know if I should wait, Mr. Chair, for the normal --

48

1 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** I think that staff has our standard motion
2 prepared, and they're pulling it up, and so there it is right
3 there, Dr. Stunz. Okay. We'll take a minute while they get
4 that on the board, and we'll read it, and then we'll see if we
5 get a second.
6
7 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Mr. Chair, if I could interrupt just one moment
8 before you --
9
10 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Go ahead, Dr. Froeschke.
11
12 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One change that you may want to consider in this
13 motion is there is not rulemaking associated with this document,
14 and so there won't be any codified text, and so that part
15 wouldn't be necessary.
16
17 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Okay. Would it end at "implementation", and the
18 rest of it would just be --
19
20 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I would just strike that part right there that's
21 highlighted.
22
23 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Okay. Dr. Stunz, are you okay with that
24 language?
25
26 **DR. STUNZ:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Would you like me to read that
27 into the record?
28
29 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Please.
30
31 **DR. STUNZ:** I move to approve the Reef Fish Amendment 48/Red
32 Drum 5: Status Determination Criteria and Optimum Yield for Reef
33 Fish and Red Drum and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of
34 Commerce for review and implementation, giving staff editorial
35 license to make the necessary changes in the document. The
36 Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes as
37 necessary and appropriate. Mr. Chairman, that's my motion.
38
39 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Dr. Stunz. Dr. Stunz has put forth a
40 motion. Is there a second?
41
42 **MR. ANSON:** I will second.
43
44 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Mr. Anson. All right. The motion is
45 made and seconded. Ms. Levy, you had a question or a comment?
46
47 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Just that that last sentence -- I know you took
48 out the codified text, but the whole thing really goes to the

1 codified text. **The prior sentence already gives staff editorial**
2 **license to make changes to the actual amendment, and then what**
3 **the act refers to is the council deeming the codified text as**
4 **necessary and appropriate, and so my suggestion would be just to**
5 **delete the last sentence.**

6
7 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Dr. Stunz or Mr. Anson, do you all have any
8 objection to removing that last sentence?

9
10 **DR. STUNZ:** No. **If that helps clean it up, that's fine with me.**

11
12 **MR. ANSON:** My only comment to that would be that the Council
13 Chair would actually be the final say, whereas, in my mind, if
14 you remove that last sentence, then it would just give staff
15 editorial license without any oversight.

16
17 **MS. LEVY:** Can I respond to that?

18
19 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Go ahead, Ms. Levy.

20
21 **MS. LEVY:** I mean, that's fine, but, even in the normal course
22 of things, staff has editorial license to make changes to the
23 document, and we clean it up and do editorial things to the
24 actual document, and that never goes back to the Chair. The
25 only thing that we would send back to the Chair, in the normal
26 practice, are changes to the codified text.

27
28 **MR. ANSON:** Understood. I mean, it's not anything critical, but
29 it's just my thoughts on it, and I will accept the change with
30 the removal of the last sentence.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Mr. Anson. Any other comments or
33 questions about the motion before we take a vote? Dr. Simmons,
34 this is a committee motion, and I don't believe it requires a
35 roll call vote, and is that correct?

36
37 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Correct. Not at this time,
38 Mr. Chair.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** All right. **I am not seeing any hands up at this**
41 **time, and so is there any opposition to approving the motion?**
42 **Hearing none, and seeing none, the motion carries.**

43
44 I want to thank the staff and everybody that's put a lot of hard
45 work into this document. We've been working on it for about
46 three-and-a-half years, and it's a very complicated document,
47 and I appreciate all your help, and especially you, Dr.
48 Froeschke, for taking the time to try to explain it to us on so

1 many occasions, and we appreciate it.

2
3 We're going to move on in our agenda, and so the next action is
4 Agenda Item Number V. Mr. Rindone, do you want to introduce
5 that item, and then we'll have Dr. Powers do his presentation?
6

7 **SSC RECOMMENDATIONS ON INTERIM ANALYSES SPECIES AND TIMING**
8

9 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** Sure, Mr. Chair. I have sent our draft
10 schedule to Meetings, and my apologies if that was tardy getting
11 to you guys, the draft interim analysis schedule. At minimum,
12 if that could be brought up, just to provide some context.
13

14 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** I don't think it was in the briefing book.
15

16 **MR. RINDONE:** It wasn't, and my apologies. It was an oversight.
17 This is what the SSC -- What you guys see on your screen right
18 now, this is what the SSC discussed, and, essentially, what
19 we're trying to do here is to, in a matrix, decision-making
20 approach, schedule what we think we might need for interim
21 analyses, considerate of things like Science Center workload,
22 which representative index of abundance would apply to each
23 species, when that index is typically available, like when the
24 data are available, which also helps determine the terminal year
25 and the delivery date, and then the delivery date is also
26 affected by things like fishing seasons, things we anticipate
27 being on the SEDAR schedule, and things we anticipate the SSC
28 having to review.
29

30 There are many, many moving parts that are all kind of meshed
31 together on this thing to get us to where we are right now, and
32 then, at the bottom, you see some points to consider, and so an
33 interim analysis we say could take approximately three months,
34 and some will take much less time to complete, like red grouper,
35 of which we've had a couple of iterations now. Others, like the
36 one for red snapper, using the Great Red Snapper Count, could
37 take more time, and so just to budget about three months to be
38 completed, and, as they're repeated, they should take less time.
39

40 The SSC typically meets five times a year, and 2020 was
41 definitely extraordinary, in terms of how many times the SSC
42 met, but, typically, the council plans on five SSC meetings a
43 year, and so five opportunities for review, and then it
44 typically takes NMFS about six months to implement a management
45 change, once it's transmitted to them by the council, and so you
46 guys tell us to do a framework action, and we do it, and you
47 guys say let's go final, and the clock starts then at about six
48 months or so after the council submits that action to NMFS for

1 implementation. All those things kind of fold together into
2 this, and so the SSC discussed all of these factors, and, Dr.
3 Powers, if he's on, can speak to their deliberations.

4
5 **DR. JOE POWERS:** I don't have any presentation, but, basically,
6 I'm giving you the SSC discussion and some of the concerns, and
7 not really concerns, but rather things to think about as you go
8 ahead.

9
10 Remember that these interim analyses are essentially designed to
11 use an existing assessment and then updating it with a
12 particular index of abundance and that sort of thing, and so, as
13 Ryan mentioned, there are several key things there, and interim
14 analyses take approximately three months to complete, and he
15 mentioned that red grouper takes less, and, as we'll discuss
16 later in the meeting for red snapper, it will have to take less.
17 Then it takes time to actually convert that to TACs and so on.

18
19 There are some things that you should be -- Not only the
20 council, but the -- Particular indices being used and how they
21 get collected, and one of the things we mentioned was, for
22 example, the larval survey is used for estimating trends in
23 spawning biomass, but that larval survey has a fairly long lead
24 time, in terms of the sampling process for those data, and so
25 you have to be concerned with that as well.

26
27 Also, because the interim analysis is trying to focus on
28 fishery-independent data, this year, 2020 anyway, has really
29 been affected by the COVID pandemic, and so we may have to
30 adjust these sorts of things.

31
32 All in all, basically, what we're saying is that the SSC thinks
33 it's a good idea, and thinks that you have to be flexible in
34 dealing with this, and so these sorts of schedules have to be
35 revisited continually, and my last comment is that we -- At the
36 SSC, we had this discussion about the interim analyses, and,
37 then, later, we had discussions about the implementation of
38 this, in terms of red snapper for this year, and so red snapper
39 essentially violates some of those original assumptions about
40 being able to do it within three months and so on, and so we
41 have to be flexible, in terms of that, and we'll have a
42 discussion of that, I think, later in this council meeting as
43 well, but, in general, the SSC is supportive of the interim
44 analyses and recognizes that we have to be flexible and be aware
45 of some of the idiosyncrasies of the individual indices being
46 used. Thank you.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Dr. Powers. So is there any input

1 from the committee? Mr. Anson.

2
3 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a point of
4 clarification, if either Ryan or Dr. Powers could maybe answer
5 this, and I thought the interim analysis also typically used
6 information, and this is fishery-dependent information, that
7 would then just be added for the number of years or the year, to
8 get the terminal year, as identified for the interim analysis,
9 and is that correct?

10
11 **DR. POWERS:** Yes, that's correct, and I focused on the fishery-
12 independent, because those are the things that are affected by
13 things like what has happened this year in the COVID, but, if
14 you look at that table, take, for example, the NMFS bottom
15 longline index that's being used for red grouper.

16
17 Also, it's being updated by the actual catches that occurred in
18 that interim period, and so, from that standpoint, it's all
19 fishery-dependent, because you're using the catches that
20 actually occurred, from what you know about the catches that
21 actually occurred, and so both of those sets of information go
22 into sorts of independent analysis, interim analysis. Excuse
23 me.

24
25 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** All right. Any other questions for Dr. Powers
28 or Mr. Rindone? Any other input related to interim analysis?

29
30 **MR. RINDONE:** Mr. Chair?

31
32 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Go ahead, Mr. Rindone.

33
34 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, sir. Just to add that this isn't the
35 only time that you guys will see this. Like you guys
36 periodically see the SEDAR schedule, we will periodically bring
37 this in front of you as well, and just as a heat check, to make
38 sure that we are trying to capture the council's needs as we're
39 looking forward into the future about things that you guys might
40 want to consider taking another look at what the catch limits
41 are for a species, or, at a minimum, doing a heat check on a
42 species that might be in a rebuilding plan or that the public
43 has had questions about, and so you guys will see this
44 repeatedly in the future to gather more input. Thank you.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Ms. Guyas.

47
48 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I like the table, and

1 I appreciate you all for putting this together and having all
2 these in one place. I guess the only thing I would say is that
3 I think maybe we as a council need to keep thinking about ways
4 that we can streamline the process once we get these interim
5 analyses, so that we can actually implement that management
6 advice in a timelier fashion. I feel like, if we're getting
7 annual updates, six-plus months, I guess, to implement, after
8 we've taken action, is a long time, and that's just my only
9 thought, is I feel like we need to keep thinking about how to
10 streamline that process.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** I agree, Ms. Guyas. All right. I don't have
13 any other hands up. If anybody has any more comments, they
14 surely can make them at Full Council. Being as we don't have
15 any more hands up, we're going to move to the -- Mr. Anson.

16
17 **MR. ANSON:** Sorry about that, Mr. Chair. I'm a little slow.
18 Picking up on that comment that Martha just made, I mean, is
19 that something that maybe could be added to a future agenda,
20 relative to the process that is used by other council and other
21 regional offices. Like on the west coast, for the commercial
22 fisheries at least, I mean, they're pretty quick, and, granted,
23 it's not as complicated, the assessments for a lot of those
24 species, because it's just a single-sector harvest, but maybe
25 there is something in there that, mechanically or
26 administratively, they've been able to implement or use to allow
27 those updates and the advice from those updates to be
28 implemented and used more efficiently or quickly.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** That's a good idea, Mr. Anson. Mr. Strelcheck.

31
32 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Just to add to Kevin's comment, I think
33 that's a great suggestion, and we can certainly investigate
34 that, and we can talk about, obviously, our current process and
35 why there is a lengthy period of time in order to implement
36 rulemaking, and we could certainly come back to you, and, if
37 there's ways to streamline that and speed that up, then I'm sure
38 we could bring that to you at a future meeting.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Ms. Bosarge.

41
42 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think one thing
43 the council can do that we don't need to rely on anybody else in
44 order to do is to get in the habit of, when we receive the
45 interim assessment results and the catch advice from the SSC,
46 that we need to put that in a document that addresses nothing
47 but that issue.

48

1 I think we're so used to getting an assessment and really taking
2 those results and trying to look at the fishery holistically and
3 say, okay, well, based on these results, do we want to change
4 some bag limits, or do we need to change some seasons, and what
5 do we want to do, but I think, with the interim advice, we're
6 really just going to have to focus on implementing that catch
7 advice and not adding anything else to that document, and I
8 think that will speed up the process, at least a little bit,
9 from the portion of the process that the council actually
10 controls.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Ms. Bosarge. I don't have any other
13 hands up at this time, and so we're going to take some of the
14 suggestions that were recently made and kind of look into those.
15 We're going to move to the next agenda item. Dr. Froeschke, did
16 you want to introduce that next agenda item, before we get
17 started on it?

18
19 **REVIEW OF STANDARD BYCATCH REPORTING METHODOLOGY FOR THE GULF OF**
20 **MEXICO AND JOINT FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

21
22 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, I'm happy to do that. This is Item Number
23 VI, and it's going to be a presentation, I think from Mr. Hood
24 at the Southeast Regional Office, and it's going to summarize a
25 bit of work to-date and a plan in the future regarding bycatch,
26 and all of our fishery management plans are required to have a
27 process to collect, record, and report data on bycatch. There
28 was a rule, final rule, effective in 2017 that defined
29 standardized bycatch reporting methodology, and NMFS, in
30 collaboration with the council, need to develop a document to
31 define some of these methods and our procedures and practices in
32 our region for our various fisheries.

33
34 The Southeast Regional Office will begin working on this, and
35 we've had a few meetings, but this is going to be a process that
36 will be carried out in the coming year, and they're going to
37 give us a brief presentation on the progress to-date and the
38 obligations for the council in the future.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** I believe he said Mr. Hood is going to do the
41 presentation. Are you ready, Mr. Hood?

42
43 **MR. PETER HOOD:** Yes, I am. This presentation was developed by
44 Dan Moors, who is on the Gulf Branch, and he's one of our plan
45 coordinators, and he was going to provide this update, but his
46 life is a little chaotic right now. Anyway, he was trying to
47 call in, and he was running into some problems, and so I'm sort
48 of taking over for him.

1
2 The purpose of this presentation is to remind you basically of
3 the requirements to review the SBRMs, which John touched on as
4 being part of that final rule, and what that needs to do is
5 outline what should be in the SBRM review and then also discuss
6 progress and timing of the review. I should also add that this
7 is just an update, and so we're really not asking you anything,
8 and so you can relax a little bit.

9
10 What are SBRMs? The definition is an established, consistent
11 procedure or procedures used to collect, record, and report
12 bycatch data in a fishery, and the purpose of an SBRM is to
13 collect, record, and report bycatch data that, in conjunction
14 with other information, are used to assess the amount and type
15 of bycatch, and there are SBRMs in each of our FMPs.

16
17 The council needs to review their SBRMs by February 21, 2022,
18 and so that's roughly a year from now, and then review it once
19 every five years, and what the plan looks at, or the review
20 looks at, is basically the characteristics of bycatch occurring
21 in fisheries, the feasibility of the methodology, from a cost,
22 technical, and operational perspective, uncertainty of the data
23 resulting from the methodology, and then how the data resulting
24 from the methodology are used to assess the amount and type of
25 bycatch occurring in the fishery.

26
27 In terms of bycatch characteristics, it's basically looking at
28 the amount and type of bycatch, the importance of the bycatch,
29 and estimating fishing mortality and the effect of the bycatch
30 on the ecosystem. Feasibility is basically just -- It indicates
31 that the methodology must be something that can be done, that
32 it's feasible, and it's capable of being implemented.

33
34 In terms of data uncertainty, basically, the methodology must be
35 designed such that uncertainty associated with the resulting
36 data can be described qualitatively or quantitatively, and,
37 basically, the council should try to minimize that uncertainty,
38 where possible. Different degrees of data uncertainty may be
39 appropriate for different fisheries, which could be as a result
40 of just data quantity or quality. Then understanding the data,
41 and so it certainly will assist in management, and it certainly
42 is important when we do stock assessments.

43
44 In terms of data use, the council must address how data
45 resulting from the SBRMs are used to assess bycatch in the
46 fishery. The rule requires consultation with the SSC and/or
47 Science Center staff to design considerations, such as data
48 elements, sampling design, sample size, and reporting frequency.

1 Then the council must consider methods and techniques available
2 to improve quality of the bycatch estimates.

3
4 Right now, where we are is we have a team set up that consists
5 of both SERO and council staff, and we're working on a review,
6 and it's going through FMP-by-FMP, and it's touching on those
7 points that I just addressed, and then, this summer, we hope to
8 have a draft ready, and we'll let the SSC review it, as well as
9 you, and we'll take comments that we get from the SSC and you,
10 and we'll put together a final document for you to finalize, and
11 then NMFS then will provide a determination as to whether it's
12 sufficient or not, and, as a result of this review, it may be
13 that the council will want to take some further actions, and so
14 that could result in an FMP amendment. Again, that's basically
15 where we are, and, if anybody has any questions, I would be
16 happy to answer them.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Any questions for Mr. Hood? Mr. Anson.

19
20 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Peter, for the
21 presentation. I am just curious about the Reef Fish FMP example
22 slide, where it mentions state cooperation or other grant-funded
23 programs, and so, in relationship to then use of any of that
24 data from state or an outside program, that would just have to
25 go through a review of the SSC, as long as it meets the criteria
26 established in the plan?

27
28 **MR. HOOD:** If I understand what you're saying, yes, that would
29 be something that would be brought in. I mean, in essence,
30 we're sort of looking at what are the data elements that are out
31 there and are there any -- With regard to the bycatch, are there
32 any holes, and so, certainly, if there's some state information
33 that is relevant to bycatch, that certainly would be included in
34 the review.

35
36 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** I am not seeing any other hands up. We're going
39 to see this again, and we'll get staff to bring it back to us as
40 they make some progress. Ms. Bosarge, you had a question?

41
42 **MS. BOSARGE:** No, and so I think there was another slide in the
43 presentation that I had printed out, and it was the slide that
44 really kind of caught my attention, and it was an example of
45 possible SBRM for the Reef Fish FMP, and it's talking about
46 adopting the ACCSP release, discard, and protected species
47 modules as the preferred methodology, and that that methodology
48 wouldn't replace what we have, and that would be another

1 requirement on that fishery, in addition to everything that they
2 have currently, and I don't know.

3
4 In light of seeing that that may be a result that's already out
5 there before we do the review, I sure would like to emphasize
6 that, as we're going through this review, and we are starting to
7 look at additional regulations to improve bycatch reporting
8 methodologies, that I hope that any additional regulations would
9 really be focused on wherever the greatest uncertainties are in
10 the bycatch.

11
12 Although we have some questions sometimes about the observer
13 data for some of those reef fish fisheries, and is it possible
14 that it's a little bit higher than what we're seeing in the
15 observer data, that's still independently-verified data, and
16 it's not voluntarily reported or anything -- It's being verified
17 in some form or fashion by an independent group, and I think you
18 can see that even in the assessments, when you look at the
19 confidence that we put into what some of these removal numbers
20 are between the different fleets.

21
22 The commercial fleet usually has the highest confidence level in
23 what our data actually is for removals, whether it be bycatch or
24 actual landings, and so I just -- You know, keep that in mind,
25 and I feel like, you know, we tend to be the target most of the
26 time, but this is more than just commercial, and we need to keep
27 that in mind.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Ms. Bosarge. Okay. Any other
30 questions for Mr. Hood? Seeing none, we have one other item
31 under Other Business. Mr. Anson, I know you had requested an
32 update on red snapper discard counts against the ACLs, and maybe
33 you could explain a little bit about what your concern is, and
34 then we'll see who the appropriate staff member is to address
35 it.

36
37 **OTHER BUSINESS**
38 **UPDATE ON RED SNAPPER DISCARDS COUNTED AGAINST COMMERCIAL AND**
39 **RECREATIONAL ACLs**

40
41 **MR. ANSON:** Sure. Thank you. I brought this up I believe at
42 the October meeting, and my question, or concern, is as it
43 relates to the fish that are caught in the recreational fishery,
44 and this applies to the states where the federal survey is
45 conducted, and so Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, but my
46 concern is that the fish that are caught and released dead,
47 thrown back dead, that those are being accounted for and tracked
48 against the recreational ACL.

1
2 If that is the case, I wanted to confirm that, in the commercial
3 side, that it was also being applied as the discards were being
4 tracked against the commercial ACL, and that's all I was looking
5 for, was to see whether or not the dead discards were being
6 tracked against the ACL and then confirm, or determine, how the
7 commercial dead discards were being tracked against the ACL and
8 then as it pertains to the assessment, and so it's a circle, a
9 full circle.

10
11 You've got dead discards from both sectors that are going into
12 the assessment, so that you can account for the mortality from
13 the fishery, for fishing activities, but then, likewise, when we
14 have the outputs for management, and use in management, I just
15 wanted to make sure that it was still being applied or those
16 fish are being tracked equally, and so I was looking for a
17 status of it.

18
19 We got a partial last meeting, with half of the question, and
20 that was as it related to the accounting of the fish in the
21 assessment, but then the other part was missing, relative to the
22 ACLs.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Dr. Porch, would you be the appropriate one to
25 respond to that?

26
27 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Certainly with the recreational, we count the
28 B2 when we're developing the ACL advice, and the B2 are
29 basically fish that died, but the sampler didn't see them, and
30 so it's not just fish that were thrown back already dead, but it
31 could be fish that were kept that were not seen or fish that
32 were used for bait or anything like that.

33
34 We calculate those as part of the landings in the assessment,
35 which means the ABC implicitly includes those, and so they
36 should be monitored with the recreational fishery landings, and
37 so it's landings and fish that -- Basically, landings or kill
38 that wasn't seen.

39
40 Commercial, we don't have exactly the same category like that,
41 and presumably they're regulatory discards, and so we don't have
42 a category that records, necessarily, that they were dead or
43 alive when they hit the water, but I can just triple-check on
44 that and get back with my staff that compute the commercial
45 discards, but the bottom line is the ACL and ABC advice
46 implicitly include B2 for the recreational, and so we monitor
47 that way.

48

1 The ABC advice, and the way we allocate the quota, I don't
2 believe it includes something similar, because there isn't
3 exactly the same category, and so, therefore, I don't believe we
4 monitor them like that, and so I don't know if anybody else,
5 like Andy, wants to chime in on that, but I will double-check
6 with staff, to make sure that I'm correctly characterizing this.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Mr. Strelcheck.

9

10 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Thanks, Chairman Diaz. Just to add to what
11 Clay said, and I can't speak to the commercial fishery, but,
12 with regard to recreational, I think the issue that Kevin is
13 raising pertains to MRIP and the B1 catch, which is harvested,
14 but not observed catch, and so that is included in the catch
15 limit setting, and that's done by the Science Center, or through
16 the SEDAR process, and we are using that, as well as landed
17 catch, to monitor against the annual catch limit.

18

19 I think that certainly is something that could be revisited, and
20 it's been a long-standing practice in the SEDAR process, and my
21 understanding is, for most species, the B1 catch represents a
22 small amount of the overall catch, but I certainly understand
23 Kevin's concerns that it is counting against the quota and that
24 the B2 catch, the discarded catch that's not observed, gets kind
25 of deducted off the top, before catch limits are set, and so
26 that's excluded from the catch limit monitoring.

27

28 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Go ahead, Mr. Anson.

29

30 **MR. ANSON:** I know that everyone is busy, and you've got COVID,
31 and I'm just wondering if that's a possibility that could show
32 up on the next meeting, as far as getting to the bottom of it or
33 finding out and having some information relative to that and how
34 it is tracked?

35

36 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Dr. Simmons, I'm going to refer to you. Is that
37 something you think we could have an answer for by the next
38 meeting?

39

40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we
41 had a portion of this ready for the November council meeting,
42 but we didn't have time to cover it, and I think there was a
43 section that we didn't have ready yet, and I believe that will
44 be ready in the spring, and I'm not exactly sure when in the
45 spring it will be ready, and I think we would prefer to have
46 both of those pieces before it goes back before the council
47 again.

48

1 I was just talking to the Chair, and so perhaps we could put
2 together just some information on how the B1 and B2 are handled
3 and just have that available definitely in April, and we'll do
4 the best we can to have the rest of it together by April. Thank
5 you.

6
7 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** Thank you, Dr. Simmons. All right, and so I
8 think we have a path forward, and we will be communicating with
9 you, Kevin, on how this is proceeding. Dr. Porch.

10
11 **DR. PORCH:** We do have the answer, as far as it pertains to the
12 so-called B1s, and we're consistent. The ACLs include the B1s,
13 and so, therefore, we monitor with the B1s. The question that I
14 understood is Mr. Anson wanted to know if the commercial fishery
15 is treated similarly, in that the equivalent of B1 are counted
16 against the ACL, or counted in the ACL, and then monitored as
17 such, and that's where I wanted to be certain.

18
19 We do have disposition codes in the commercial data, and I am
20 just not absolutely certain that it's incorporated -- You know,
21 the ones that are dead and just not observed somehow, if they
22 are incorporated in exactly the same way as the recreational
23 B1s, because they are not exactly the same thing, and I can
24 probably get an answer before the council meeting is over.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** If you wanted to -- If you do get an answer, and
27 you want to respond when we get to this at Full Council, you
28 certainly could do that, Dr. Porch.

29
30 **DR. PORCH:** All right. Thank you.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN DIAZ:** All right. I don't see any other hands up. Is
33 there any other discussion on this item? Is there any other
34 business to come before this committee? Seeing none, that
35 concludes our committee.

36
37 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on January 25, 2021.)

38
39

- - -