

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

CORAL COMMITTEE

Renaissance Battle House Mobile, Alabama

October 22, 2018

VOTING MEMBERS

- 10 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 11 Susan Boggs.....Alabama
- 12 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 13 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 14 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS
- 15 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 16 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
- 17 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 18 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 19 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- 22 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 23 Patrick Banks.....Louisiana
- 24 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 25 Paul Mickle (designee for Joe Spraggins).....Mississippi
- 26 Robin Riechers.....Texas
- 27 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 28 Lt Mark Zanowicz.....USCG

STAFF

- 31 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 32 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 33 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 34 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- 35 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
- 36 Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
- 37 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 38 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 39 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
- 40 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 41 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

- 44 Luiz Barbieri.....SSC
- 45 Avery Bates.....Organized Seafood Association of Alabama, AL
- 46 Eric Brazer.....Shareholders Alliance
- 47 Shannon Calay.....SEFSC
- 48 Michael Drexler.....St. Petersburg, FL

1 Joel Fightmaster.....USCG
2 Traci Floyd.....MDMR, MS
3 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS
4 Tim Griner.....SAFMC
5 Ken Haddad.....Lloyd, FL
6 Joe Jewell.....MDMR, MS
7 Rich Malinowski.....NMFS
8 Lawrence Marino.....LA
9 Clay Porch.....SEFSC
10 Ashford Rosenberg.....Shareholders Alliance
11 Chris Schieble.....LA
12 G.P. Schmahl.....FGBNMS, TX
13 Jim Zurbrick.....Steinhatchee, FL

14
15
16

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....4
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps.....4
8
9 Analysis of VMS and ELB Information for Flower Garden Banks
10 National Marine Sanctuary Expansion.....5
11
12 Other Business.....13
13 Discussion of Golden Crab EFP.....13
14
15 Adjournment.....14
16
17 - - -
18

1 The Coral Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management
2 Council convened at the Renaissance Battle House, Mobile,
3 Alabama, Monday morning, October 22, 2018, and was called to
4 order by Chairman Tom Frazer.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN TOM FRAZER:** I am going to call to order the Coral
11 Committee. As just approved, the members of this committee are
12 as follows, Tom Frazer as Chair, John Sanchez as the Vice Chair,
13 and the committee members are Susan Boggs, Leann Bosarge, Doug
14 Boyd, Roy Crabtree, Dave Donaldson, J.D. Dugas, Martha Guyas,
15 and Ed Swindell.

16
17 We have in front of us an agenda, and that's Tab N, Item Number
18 1, and can I get a motion to adopt the agenda as prepared, or
19 are there any additional items?

20
21 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** Can we talk about the golden crab EFP for a
22 minute at some point?

23
24 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Yes, we can do that. We'll add that to Other
25 Business. Given that addition, can I get a motion to adopt the
26 agenda?

27
28 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** So moved.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** It's moved by Dave Donaldson. Is there a
31 second? Second by Doug Boyd. The next item on the agenda, Item
32 Number II, is Approval of the August 2018 Coral Committee
33 Minutes. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes?

34
35 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** So moved.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Motion by Leann Bosarge and seconded by Martha
38 Guyas. Okay. Action Item Number III is the Action Guide and
39 Next Steps, and Dr. Kilgour is going to lead us through that.

40
41 **DR. MORGAN KILGOUR:** Sure. We are meeting today because the
42 Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary proposed
43 boundaries might change in their final EIS. I do have G.P.
44 available via webinar, should you have anything specific to
45 that, but, at the August council meeting, I was asked to do an
46 analysis of the fishing gear types on each of those new revised
47 boundary banks, and so that's what we're going to be going over.

1 Just to remind you all, the previous recommendation by the Gulf
2 Council was based on some much larger boxes, and it was a tiered
3 approach, where there would be a no-anchoring zone, followed by
4 a no-trawling zone, and then everything outside of that would be
5 outside of the sanctuary boundary.

6
7 The no-activity zone and the proposed boundaries from the
8 Sanctuary Advisory Council are not very different, and you will
9 be able to see that in the map that I have provided for you, but
10 that's why we're here. This is an analysis of the fishing
11 activity in those proposed boundaries.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Okay, and so I guess we can go ahead and look
14 at the information that you have gathered.

15
16 **ANALYSIS OF VMS AND ELB INFORMATION FOR FLOWER GARDEN BANKS**
17 **NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY EXPANSION**

18
19 **DR. KILGOUR:** All right, and so this will be Tab N, Number 4,
20 and there is some text here describing what data I used, and so
21 this is the exact same data, the exact same two datasets, that I
22 used for Coral Amendment 9, and I just basically -- If we scroll
23 down to the meat of it, which will be the table, this outlines
24 the total number of unique vessels with VMS permits, or VMS on
25 them, and the total number of points for the years 2007 to 2015
26 for the VMS. Then, for the electronic logbooks on the shrimp
27 vessels, that's for the total number of points from 2004 to
28 2013.

29
30 You can see that bandit rigs reign supreme in these areas, and
31 there is one area, Bright Bank, that stands out with
32 spearfishing, but, overarching, it's bandit rig gear, and it
33 occurs on every single bank. Now, I am reminding you that the
34 Gulf Council's recommendation was to have a no-anchoring zone
35 which was commensurate with the no-activity zone, and I have two
36 maps, also.

37
38 The Figure 1 is basically -- The boxes that you see are the
39 proposed -- The orange part is the Sanctuary Advisory Council
40 proposed boundaries, and the pink boxes are existing HAPCs with
41 regulations, and the green boxes are existing HAPCs with no
42 regulations.

43
44 Then, if we move on to the next figure, we see that same exact
45 map, except for I have superimposed the no-activity zones, which
46 was the basis of the Gulf Council's recommendation over what the
47 Sanctuary Advisory Council is, and so what you can see from
48 there is almost all of the banks have significant overlap and

1 not much difference in boundaries from the no-activity zones.
2 Most of the difference is less than a mile, which we've been
3 told by law enforcement is not an enforceable boundary.

4
5 The two that stand out would be Horseshoe Bank and Elvers Bank,
6 and then, if you want to scroll back up to the table, and my
7 question is, would the council like to modify its recommendation
8 to the Sanctuary Advisory Council, seeing these new proposed
9 boundaries, which it sounds like may be the new preferred
10 alternative, and I'm not sure, or would the council like to
11 amend its previous recommendations based on this new
12 alternative? That's my question.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** How would the members of the committee like to
15 weigh-in on this particular subject? Leann.

16
17 **MS. BOSARGE:** Well, I would be in favor of supporting the
18 Sanctuary Advisory Committee's recommendation. As we went
19 through this the last time, that was one thing that was very
20 important to me, was to have the boundaries of these boxes
21 mirror the actual contours of the coral, or the hard bottom, as
22 closely as possible, and I think that the Sanctuary Advisory
23 Committee has really done a great job of doing that, which will
24 minimize the impacts, as much as possible, to our commercial
25 fishermen, and so I would be in favor of supporting the
26 Sanctuary Advisory Committee's recommendations.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Leann. Mr. Boyd.

29
30 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Do they have a final recommendation?

31
32 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Morgan.

33
34 **DR. KILGOUR:** This is where I am going to rely on G.P. to keep
35 me honest, but the Sanctuary Advisory Council's recommendation
36 were those new proposed boundaries, and the fishing regulations
37 mimic what the Gulf Council recommended.

38
39 What the Gulf Council recommended was this tiered approach of
40 having a no-anchoring zone that is the same as the no-activity
41 zone and then a no-trawling zone out to the buffers. That
42 doesn't quite make sense, since the buffer between the no-
43 activity zone and some of these boundaries is less than a mile,
44 and so you couldn't really do a tiered approach of having
45 anchoring within this little tiny sliver, and so, basically, the
46 Sanctuary regulations for fishing would go all the way out to
47 the boundaries, is I think what is able to be practiced, but
48 G.P. can keep me honest, if he wants to chime in, if I'm

1 incorrect.

2
3 That would be basically -- The big caveat would be that the no-
4 activity zones don't exist on Horseshoe Bank and Elvers Bank,
5 and I think there is the potential for sanctuary-wide
6 regulations to go for both of those, and that means just hook-
7 and-line fishing and no anchoring and no bottom-tending gear,
8 and so it wouldn't prevent fishing completely, but it would just
9 prevent any bottom-tending gear.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Is G.P. on the line? G.P., do you have
12 anything you would like to add to that?

13
14 **MR. G.P. SCHMAHL:** Thanks very much. Sorry I couldn't be there
15 in person today. Our travel budget for this fiscal year has not
16 quite been approved yet, but I appreciate you letting me
17 participate by phone.

18
19 Morgan is correct. The one thing I want to clarify is that,
20 right now, the advisory council's recommendation -- I can't say
21 with absolute certainty that that is the way that NOAA will go
22 forward with our recommendation. We are still in the
23 deliberative process, taking on all comments, but I will say
24 that, without going as far as that we're absolutely going to do
25 this, that the advisory council's recommendation is highly
26 likely to be the revised proposal for expansion.

27
28 As you recall, when we came out with our Draft Environmental
29 Impact Statement in 2016, there was a preferred alternative, and
30 that was the -- Those boxes are the ones that you all evaluated
31 and based your recommendation on, and, as Morgan has explained,
32 the Gulf Council's recommendation keyed in on the no-activity
33 zones that were previously determined by BOEM.

34
35 That is the same approach that our advisory council took when
36 reviewing our preferred alternative and now has -- Their
37 recommendation is very close to what the no-activity zones are,
38 and so, yes, from our perspective, as we go forward, again, it
39 will be highly likely that we will accept and go forward with
40 the advisory council recommendation, that that tiered approach
41 that the council recommended previously becomes a little less
42 distinct.

43
44 For regulatory purposes, it would be much preferred if we had a
45 single set of regulations inside the sanctuary boundary, rather
46 than separate sets of regulations, especially when some of those
47 areas would be extremely small.

48

1 I will also point out that hook-and-line fishing, what's termed
2 in our regulations as conventional hook-and-line fishing, does
3 include bandit rig gear, and so bandit rig gear is allowed
4 inside the sanctuary by our regulations, but bottom-tending
5 gear, bottom longlines, which is the other primary fishing type
6 in these areas, would not be allowed, and anchoring would not be
7 allowed. I would be happy to answer any questions specifically
8 about these areas.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, G.P. Carrie has a question.

11
12 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, G.P. Good
13 morning. Can you just remind us of the timing on this? Are you
14 guys going to -- The plan is to submit the revised or final EIS
15 and comments, and what is the timing on this, are you thinking?

16
17 **MR. SCHMAHL:** We have been given clear direction from our NOAA
18 leadership that we would like to move this process forward as
19 quickly as possible, and, to do that, there's a couple of steps
20 that we have to do. One is to provide this proposal to BOEM for
21 an analysis of what the potential impact to offshore energy
22 resources might be. That's in the process right now.

23
24 What we are looking at is coming out with a notice of proposed
25 rulemaking around May of 2019, and you may recall that, when we
26 published the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we did not
27 couple that with a proposed rule. Sometimes that's part of the
28 process, but we did not. We separated them, and so the next
29 step would be to publish a proposed rule.

30
31 That would also be open to public comment, and, after that
32 comment is received, we would follow that with a final rule and
33 final EIS at the same time, probably in the fall of 2019
34 timeframe.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, G.P. I just have a couple of
37 questions. In 2016, when this was first making its way through
38 the council process, the council prepared a letter essentially
39 suggesting this tiered approach, but it looks to me now like the
40 proposed expansion areas are relatively minor, and the existing
41 regulations are such that, and G.P. will have to correct me if
42 I'm wrong, that the sanctuary regulations don't allow bottom-
43 tending gear or anchoring in any of the proposed areas, and is
44 that correct?

45
46 **MR. SCHMAHL:** Yes, that is correct. The way our regulations are
47 written is that essentially all gear is prohibited, with the
48 exception of conventional hook-and-line gear, and that can

1 include single line with -- Single vertical line with multiple
2 hooks.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** I have another quick question. With regard to
5 spearfishing, what are the regulations in that regard?
6

7 **MR. SCHMAHL:** Spearfishing gear is currently prohibited in
8 sanctuary regulations, and so, if we were to apply these across-
9 the-board to these expansion areas, spearfishing would not be
10 allowed.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Okay. I am looking around at the committee.
13 I mean, it looks like we might have an option here of preparing
14 a brief letter to the sanctuary with some suggestions, perhaps
15 agreeing that we're happy with the no bottom-tending gear and
16 the proposed new sanctuary boundary areas, but perhaps that
17 we're in favor of allowing the spear fishermen to fish in these
18 areas, and it seems like there is a fair amount of activity, at
19 least in one or two of the spots, and I think I'm happy to work
20 with staff to do that, but are there any other recommendations
21 coming from the committee, perhaps? Mr. Boyd.

22
23 **MR. SCHMAHL:** I would like to point out that our advisory
24 council did have a recommendation of their own relating to
25 spearfishing in the expansion areas, and they also were in favor
26 of allowing spearfishing in the expansion area, but by breath
27 hold only and not the use of scuba gear, and that's because, to
28 our knowledge, a lot of the spearfishing that does occur in
29 these areas, because they are so deep, typically what they're
30 going for are pelagic species, amberjack and wahoo and things
31 like that, which is -- I would just point out that our advisory
32 council had a recommendation related to spearfishing as well.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, G.P. Mr. Boyd.

35
36 **MR. BOYD:** A question for G.P. The use of bandit gear would be
37 allowed under the sanctuary proposal. My question is, and I'm
38 not totally familiar with all of the gear that is used, but the
39 weights are pretty heavy to get down that far, and do they go
40 all the way to the bottom, and could they damage the coral if
41 they're using bandit gear?

42
43 **MR. SCHMAHL:** It's my understanding, of course, that they're not
44 trying to leave gear on the bottom, and so, in most cases, they
45 are putting their lines down in a way that it would not impact
46 the bottom. I think that there is certainly a chance that some
47 of those weights could impact the bottom, and then they would
48 pull those lines up to get them off the bottom, and so I think

1 that there is a slight chance of injury to coral, but, in
2 general, we felt, especially the size of -- They are pretty
3 small, and it's very short impact times, that it would not be a
4 significant impact.

5

6 **MR. BOYD:** Thank you.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Leann has a question for G.P. Go ahead, Leann

9

10 **MS. BOSARGE:** G.P., it's I guess maybe a little off the subject,
11 but I was wondering -- I noticed, on that Horseshoe Bank, that
12 we have a good many VMS pings, and so we have a lot of reef fish
13 fishermen there, commercially, and I was wondering, as you went
14 through this process, have you talked to some of those
15 fishermen?

16

17 The East and West Flower Garden Banks are just on either side of
18 that Horseshoe Bank, and those two have been closed for quite
19 some time. Are they fishing that Horseshoe because they can't
20 get to those other two spots, because we have had them closed
21 for so long?

22

23 I guess that's been kind of my thought process as we've been
24 through our coral amendment and then looking at your process, is
25 that, as we close more and more of these areas to commercial
26 fishing, essentially, because we're outlawing a lot of the gear,
27 are we going to end up just putting more and more pressure on a
28 couple of little spots, instead of spreading the pressure out?
29 They have nowhere left to go, and so they're all on top of one
30 or two spots, and, from an ecosystem standpoint, is that really
31 the best route? I am just wondering, but did you get any
32 feedback from those people? Is that what was going on there?

33

34 **MR. SCHMAHL:** I guess that -- Yes, we have talked to a number of
35 fishermen that fish in these areas, and I think that specific
36 issue didn't come up all that often. The fact that the East and
37 West Flower Garden Banks has been restricted to fishing for a
38 very long time, and the original HAPCs for those areas pre-date
39 the sanctuary designation, and I forget, off the top, when those
40 were implemented, but in the 1980s, I believe.

41

42 It was almost like -- I guess there's not that many people that
43 used to fish those areas and now are still fishing, I guess, and
44 I don't know, because it just didn't come up. I think the
45 concern is a real one, and we have to look at it from the big
46 picture, and I will also point out, looking just at the VMS
47 data, there are some pings still within the East and West Flower
48 Garden Banks, and Stetson Bank, and that, I'm assuming, is

1 because we do allow for bandit rig fishing in those areas
2 without anchoring, and so that is -- I know that we have sighted
3 those types of boats inside the sanctuary boundaries, and that's
4 perfectly okay, as long as they are not anchoring.

5
6 I guess I don't really know the answer to your question, but I
7 think, in general, that concern is one that we all have. We
8 certainly don't want to be targeting and putting more pressure
9 on other areas by restricting access to other areas, but, at the
10 same time, the purpose of this process is to protect sensitive
11 coral communities, and, at least in my opinion, that outweighs
12 what I think is a relatively minor impact to existing fishing
13 pressure.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, G.P. I have just a follow-up, and
16 it relates to Leann's question. Those pings that are in the
17 Horseshoe area, they represent data from 2007 through 2015, and
18 so not quite a decade, but a lot, and so, Morgan, when you were
19 looking at those data, was there kind of a temporal trend in the
20 number of pings? Did they increase with time, for example?

21
22 **DR. KILGOUR:** I am looking at it right now for Horseshoe, and
23 there was definitely a peak in 2012, but there was anywhere from
24 200 to 1,000 in any given year, and most of the years were
25 between 400 and 600 pings.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Morgan, and so I guess that's a
28 legitimate question, and it's something we have to be thinking
29 about as we move on into the future. As you restrict areas and
30 you displace fishing activity, it can create some unintended
31 consequences, and so that's just something to pay attention to,
32 moving ahead. Any other comments at this point from the
33 committee? Robin, go ahead.

34
35 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** On the ELBs, obviously those were -- Well,
36 I don't know, because I don't know which years they came from,
37 but the ELBs weren't full coverage of all vessels, and so the
38 fact that we have some represents that there is fishing going
39 on, but not necessarily the full magnitude, number one, unless
40 it's come along in years where we had greater coverage, and so
41 can you share that a little bit? Do you know?

42
43 **DR. KILGOUR:** Leann is here to keep me honest on this, but,
44 based on what I have seen, and from the data that I have been
45 blood, sweat, and tears for, the ELB indicates to me that the
46 shrimpers are not shrimping on these coral banks at all, and the
47 few pings that we see on that table indicate that they were
48 possibly transiting or futzing with something, but they were not

1 fishing in these areas, and so we actually -- In 2016, when you
2 made the recommendation, there was one bank that we asked for a
3 modification of the boundary, because that was a very clear
4 shrimping line, and so they actually changed that boundary, and
5 I think it was MacNeil Bank, but the ELB data -- Granted, it is
6 only on about a third of the vessels, and the ELB data has also
7 been filtered to active fishing points, but that just means that
8 the speed, the distance between the two points, was sufficient
9 to indicate that they were at towing speed and not that they
10 were towing.

11
12 When there is shrimping activity, it's very clear. It's not two
13 or three points like this, but it's hundreds, and so this
14 indicates to me that the shrimpers are not messing with these
15 coral banks at all.

16
17 **MR. RIECHERS:** No, and they wouldn't for very long, because it
18 will tear their gear up, and so I definitely agree with Leann
19 that they're not really trying to go in there and shrimp. A
20 second question, just for clarification in committee, is, when
21 we talk about the mile enforceability, that does work on both
22 sides of that line, does it not? Meaning, if we can only
23 enforce down to a mile, no matter where that line sets, it's a
24 mile inside of that line and it's a mile outside of that line,
25 and let's just --

26
27 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Yes, I think you're correct in that regard,
28 Robin. Leann.

29
30 **MS. BOSARGE:** Morgan, I don't think we have this issue at all,
31 but did we reach out to our royal red shrimpers, just to make
32 sure that none of those pings were them? I don't remember, when
33 we through these, and it was so long ago, but I don't think
34 there are.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Morgan.

37
38 **DR. KILGOUR:** I did not reach out to the royal red shrimpers
39 about these particular areas. Like I said, it's very clear,
40 when I look at the data, where there is shrimping activity, and,
41 granted, there is only a handful of those guys, but, when they
42 came to meet with us about Coral Amendment 9 areas, this was not
43 an area that they had heartburn about. It was the Pinnacles
44 Trend Area and that South Florida Area that they used for royal
45 red shrimping, and so I did not do my due diligence and reach
46 out to them about these, based on the historical or past
47 conversations I have had with them.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Okay. Are there any other comments from the
2 committee? All right. Seeing none, I guess we are in a
3 position now to prepare a letter, perhaps, on behalf of the
4 council giving our recommendations to the sanctuary, and I
5 think, if I was to capture some of those recommendations here,
6 it would be that we agree with the sanctuary's kind of existing
7 policy of no bottom-tending gear within the designated sanctuary
8 areas, and I think we would also agree with the Sanctuary
9 Advisory Council that there might be an exemption for those that
10 are spearfishing in some of these areas. I am looking around to
11 see if there are any other potential things that people might
12 want to have in that letter, before we direct staff to draft it.
13 Morgan.

14

15 **DR. KILGOUR:** I am going to summarize your summary.

16

17 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** That's always a good thing to do.

18

19 **DR. KILGOUR:** Staff will prepare a letter stating that, in the
20 event that the Sanctuary Advisory Council proposed boundaries
21 are the preferred alternative, that the council recommends the
22 existing sanctuary regulations, with the caveat that
23 spearfishing be allowed in the areas that were outlined by the
24 Sanctuary Advisory Council.

25

26 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** I think that captures everything. Leann.

27

28 **MS. BOSARGE:** Essentially, in our last letter, didn't we support
29 Preferred Alternative 3, and so now we're more in support of the
30 Sanctuary Advisory Committee's recommended boundaries? Is that
31 okay?

32

33 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Yes, I think that's okay. Is that enough
34 direction, Morgan? Okay. Before we get out of this committee,
35 Ms. Guyas, do you want to talk a little bit about the golden
36 crab trap issue?

37

38

39

40

**OTHER BUSINESS
DISCUSSION OF GOLDEN CRAB EFP**

41 **MS. GUYAS:** Yes, and I'm hoping maybe Roy or someone from NMFS
42 can give an update on this. I saw that there was a public
43 comment period, and I know we asked for them to adjust their
44 area a little bit, and I think they did that, but my
45 understanding is there may be conflict with some of the HAPCs
46 that were just designated.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Sue, do you want to address that? Thank you.

1
2 **MS. SUSAN GERHART:** Yes, and so we consulted with our Protected
3 Resources office, and they had some concerns about the original
4 area that the council had looked at, and that was in the
5 application, concerning sperm whale areas, and so they asked the
6 applicants to shift their boundaries a little bit, and we're
7 aware that they overlap a little bit with some of these new
8 HAPCs that are being developed, but the area they give is just a
9 box, and remember that, with EFPs, if we choose to issue those
10 permits, that we do include terms and conditions for the
11 applicants, and one thing that we would certainly do is require
12 them to stay out of those areas.

13
14 We do have the comment period open now that we've published in
15 the Federal Register, and I think it was on October 15th, or it
16 might have been the 16th, but the comment period is open through
17 the 31st.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN FRAZER:** Thank you, Sue. Is there any other comments
20 about this issue from the committee? Okay. Seeing none, we
21 will move on. That was our Other Business, and so this
22 concludes the Coral Committee meeting.

23
24 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 22, 2018.)

25
26 - - -
27