1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL	
2	ECOSYSTEM COMMITTEE	
4		
5	The Lodge at Gulf State Park Gulf Shores, Alaba	ama
6 7	April 4, 2022	
8		
9	VOTING MEMBERS	
10	Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)Alak	nama
11	Leann Bosarge	inni
12	Billy BroussardLouis	
13	Tom Frazer	
14	Bob Gill	
15	Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)	
16	Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks)Louis	
17	Andy Streicheck	
18	Greg Stunz	
19	Troy Williamson	
20	Troy Williamson	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
21	NON-VOTING MEMBERS	
22	Susan BoggsAlak	nama
23	Dale Diaz	
24	Dave Donaldson	
25	Jonathan DugasLouis	
26	Phil Dyskow	
27	Jessica McCawley	
28	Lisa Motoi	
29	Bob ShippAlak	
30	Joe Spraggins	
31	ove spraggins	- PP -
32	STAFF	
33	Assane DiagneEconor	nist
34	Matt FreemanEconor	nist
35	John Froeschke	
36	Beth HagerAdministrative Offi	
37	Karen HoakAdministrative & Financial Assist	
38	Lisa HollenseadFishery Biolog	
39	Ava LasseterAnthropolog	jist
40	Mary LevyNOAA General Cour	ısel
41	Ryan RindoneLead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Lia:	Lson
42	Bernadine RoyOffice Mana	
43	Carrie SimmonsExecutive Direction	
44	Carly SomersetFisheries Outreach Special	List
45		
46	OTHER PARTICIPANTS	
47	Peter Hood	
48	Will HeymanLGL Ecolog:	
49	Mandy KarnauskasSI	EFSC

1	Laurilee ThompsonSAFMC
2	John WalterSEFSG
3	
4	
_	

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	
3	Table of Contents3
4	
5	Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and
6	Next Steps4
7	
8	Review and Discuss Contracted Draft Gulf of Mexico Fishery
9	Ecosystem Plan5
10	
11	Ecosystem Technical Committee Recommendations28
12	
13	<u>Adjournment32</u>
14	
15	
16	
17	

The Ecosystem Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at The Lodge at Gulf State Park on Monday morning, April 4, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA APPROVAL OF MINUTES ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON: I will call the Ecosystem Committee to order. The first order of business on Tab Q, Number 1 is Adoption of the Agenda. Are there any changes that need to be made to the agenda? Seeing none, is there any opposition to accepting the agenda as written? Seeing none, and I forgot, and I skipped the membership. We have Mr. Gill, Mr. Banks or Mr. Schieble, Ms. Bosarge, Mr. Broussard, Dr. Frazer, Mr. Geeslin, Mr. Strelcheck, Dr. Stunz, and Mr. Williamson.

Item Number II on the agenda is Approval of the December 2020 Minutes, Tab Q, Number 2. Are there any changes to the minutes? Seeing none, is there any opposition to accepting the minutes as written? Seeing none, the minutes are accepted. Item Number III is Action Guide and Next Steps. Dr. Mendez-Ferrer, are you on?

DR. NATASHA MENDEZ-FERRER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, everyone. For this committee, we have two agenda items, and both of them will be discussing the fishery ecosystem plan for the Gulf of Mexico. For Agenda Item Number IV, if you remember, the Gulf Council began work in 2018 towards developing a fishery ecosystem plan, but, due to the limitations, in terms of meetings, as a result of the pandemic, we were able to use some carryover funds to hire a contractor to begin work on developing this FEP, and so, today, we will have LGL presenting the results from the work that they put together in the various compilation of efforts that are basically providing a draft FEP that we can continue to work on.

At this point, while Dr. Heyman is presenting, the committee is really encouraged to ask questions about the various components of the work that they produced and begin thinking about how we can translate this into the council management process, and so, with the following agenda item, the work that LGL has put together has been reviewed by the Ecosystem Technical Committee, during their meetings in September and December. The summaries of those meetings are included in the briefing book, but what we plan to do on this agenda item is go over kind of the plan and the next steps on how we can operationalize the FEP for our

council.

4 5

I also want to mention that I believe we have Dr. Karnauskas in the room, who is the chair of the Ecosystem Technical Committee, and so, if you have any questions, I'm sure she will be able to provide some more discussions on what was talked about and the recommendations by the ETC, and so we're really looking forward to getting some feedback on where to move this document, and a lot of work has been put into it, and so I'm looking forward to a fruitful morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. That will take us to -- Any questions about the action guide? That will take us to our next item, would be a presentation by Dr. Heyman, Tab Q, Number 4(a). Dr. Heyman.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS CONTRACTED DRAFT GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY ECOSYSTEM PLAN

DR. WILL HEYMAN: Good morning. Thanks for the opportunity to be here with you, and I'm going to give you a presentation about what we've been working on, backing up the council on the fishery ecosystem plan, and we're going to present kind of a draft Version 1 of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the Gulf of Mexico.

A word of introduction, before I start, and, again, I'm Will Heyman, and I work with LGL Ecological Research associates in Texas, and I'm relatively new to the Gulf. I've only been working here for about seventeen years, but, fortunately, it comes with some history at LGL, and Benny Gallaway, as you know, has been working here for close to fifty years, and he's been key.

Anyway, the first slide I'm showing here is a picture of the Flower Garden Banks of Stetson, and, you know, I came out of the tropics, and I did a lot of my work in the tropics, and, when I first came to the Gulf of Mexico and looped at the bay and saw that water, I thought, wow, this is not as clear as I'm used to.

 Then I get to do a little bit more research and find out a little bit more and realize that the Flower Garden Banks has some of the healthiest coral reefs in the world, and I do a little bit more digging and realize it also has bluefin tuna and some of the most productive wetlands in the world and an enormous oil and gas industry and marlin and whale sharks, and just an incredible diversity and productivity that is second to none on the planet.

1 2

4 5

This is just kind of to remind us that this system is so valuable, and I guess I want to start with a little bit of reverence, recognize the awe that I have, and probably share with everybody here, of this resource that we are allowed to managed, and so, from there, we'll go onto the next slide.

Again, we're with LGL, and this work has been done on a contract with the Gulf Council, and we're appreciative of this opportunity and of the trust that you've given us, and so hopefully we'll come back with something valuable for you.

From there, I just kind of want to move into the next slide and acknowledge a bunch of people. First of all, again, acknowledgement to the council itself for the funding, to the ETC that has kind of taken the charge on, and I see us in service to the ETC, and to the staff, to Carrie and Natasha and John particularly, who have been really helpful in keeping us on the rails and giving us good guidance throughout this process.

Also, to Mandy, the chair of the ETC, and again kind of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Environmental Branch, if you will, Mandy, and so lots of also recognition to a bunch of other people, and I'm not going to read the names, and there is far too many, but we've had to reach out and learn from the experiences of people not only all through the Gulf, but also all through the nation and internationally, and so trying to put the experiences to bear on this process, and so, again, thanks to many.

I would also like to thank my co-authors and co-workers on this, and I mentioned Benny, but we've also got Pete Mudrak and Taylor Beyea and Nathan Putman here, as well as Steven Scyphers, who joined us as part of the key working group. Thanks.

What is ecosystem-based fisheries management? Well, NMFS defined it in their policy of 2018 as a systematic approach to fisheries management in a geographically specified area that contributes to the resilience and sustainability of the ecosystem, recognizes the physical, biological, economic, and social interactions among the affected fishery-related components of the ecosystem, including humans, and seeks to optimize benefits among a diverse set of societal goals.

 Well, that sounds easy. So we checked that off in the first week. No, and it's a complex thing. It's really complex, and, as complex as it is to manage any given fishery resource, imagine thinking about this on a holistic basis, and so, that

said, if we can pull it off, it would be an incredible benefit to work at the ecosystem scale, and, again, I think we've come a long way in that, and we're going to have to go a long way to actually fully implement this, but it's -- I don't want to scare anybody, and it's an incremental approach, and we really have to think of this as getting there very slowly, incrementally, which we're well on that path already.

4 5

Again, there's been a tremendous amount of work that's been done on this in the past, and I would like to point to just a few of these, and we've got, starting at the bottom of this, the National Marine Fisheries policy and roadmap guiding the efforts, from 2016 and 2018. Following that, some of the work of Essington and his team with the work that they did with Pew Oceans Commission and following up with Marshall and their work, really going through how you would go about fishery ecosystem planning. It's been started well before this, but this was a take on what's the next generation of doing fishery ecosystem plans, given that they were not terribly effective.

The first set were not terribly effective, as they grappled with this enormous issue, and so some more recent work has given us more quidance and structure, and then, finally, Link and Marshak did a great job, first in this manuscript in Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries, giving a really systematic look at all the work that's been done in the nation, council-by-council, and looking at the resource and looking at the differences a very kind of cetera, socioeconomics, et balanced systematic look at it, and then, as part of the work that we've done here, we looked also at case studies and lessons learned from around the nation, but less systematic and more focused on what can we, as the Gulf of Mexico, harvest that's most relevant from the experiences around the nation.

Giving you a little bit more history of where this came from, the Gulf development of the fishery ecosystem plan, and I'm going to get to this slide in a second, but I think it's worthwhile starting a little before that and going back to 1871, when the Fish Commission was started in the Northeast, with the idea of trying to determine if fish populations had been diminished and/or what the causes of those were and how to potentially address them, and that was, again, 1871, and it evolved into the Northeast Fisheries Science Center.

Subsequent to that, there's been all kinds of things, but now I'm going to jump to 1996 and the Sustainable Fisheries Act, when optimal yield was redefined as the greatest overall benefit to the nation, including food productivity, recreational

opportunity, and ecosystem protection.

4 5

That really kind of put us on the track, and, indeed, it also recommended that fishery ecosystem plans ultimately replace what we have now as fishery management plans, and, again, that's still a work in progress.

Now we'll get to 2004, and the Gulf ecosystem establishes the SSC, and, again, I don't want to read too much of this, and we've got a lot to get through, but there's been a lot of specific work here in the Gulf.

Let's jump to Magnuson Stevens reauthorization in 2007, and, you know, essentially, the focus at that point, as we all know, has moved more to a single-stock management paradigm, and it's been great. I mean, we've made a lot of progress, in terms of managing stocks, and we've seen turnarounds, and we've seen some recovery, et cetera, and so that's been great, but then, again, in the background, there is still this desire to work at the ecosystem scale and to think about it holistically, and so, in 2011, NOAA launched the, or I guess in 2010, the Integrated Ecosystem Assessment Program, where they tasked councils with kind of describing what it is the fishery ecosystems are and how to measure them using indicators.

That was an enormous task towards trying to get at this how do you manage the ecosystem holistically, and, in 2013, and then again in 2017, Mandy and her crew put together indeed an ecosystem report, ecosystem status report, for the Gulf of Mexico, following the guidance of these integrated ecosystem assessments, and they were tremendous pieces of work, but, again, how do you capture the status of the Gulf of Mexico in 2013? There were 100 indicators, but that's too big to grasp, and how about seven bodies of indicators in 2017, and it's still really hard. The thing is big and complex, you know, and then, even then, even if you could capture it, does that really give you the guidance to do ecosystem management?

 ETC gets the task, in approximately 2010, and does a great job of trying to take this down to something systematic, something that can move forward, and then, in March of 2010, everything kind of grinds to a halt, and one silver lining is, without as much travel, there was more money around, and we are grateful to have been able to support the ETC, through this consultancy, and have now offered what we have before you, the body of work that we put together, and a Draft Version 1 FEP.

At their March meeting in 2020, the Ecosystem Technical

Committee came up with a mission statement for the fishery ecosystem plan as follows: To provide a framework for integrating ecosystem science into the council's decision-making for long-term ecological and socioeconomic sustainability of Gulf of Mexico resources.

That's good, but the council also said it's got to be actionable, okay, and, based on all the experiences we've seen in the past, that's the key. We've got to be able to not just talk about it, but do things, and so that was the challenge before us.

To get to that, we produced the following deliverables to get to that fishery ecosystem plan at the end that we're presenting today, and the first piece that we worked on was this case studies and lessons learned from fishery ecosystem planning efforts around the nation, and, obviously, that's in your briefing book, and we also, since there's been a big push for indicators, we were asked to, and did produce, a document on indicators specifically and how to use them in fishery ecosystem planning, and, again, since this is such a complex process that involved so many people, we were asked to, and also produced, this process document, in terms of stakeholder assessment and concept mapping. How do you really bring stakeholders into this fishery ecosystem planning process?

We developed those as part of the contract, and we also developed, and I haven't put it here, but a dashboard, an online visualization dashboard, to be able to look at some of these complex indicators in space and in time in a way that is very visually -- Potentially able to help a lot of stakeholders understand some of these complex interactions.

 A lot of process, and we're going to boil it down to five recommendations that we took largely from our work on the best practices and lessons learned, again first starting with a common vision. We've got to -- If we're going to try to do this, we need to, in spite of or embracing the diversity of environments and cultures and people and industries and points of view -- You know, if we're going to get to this holistic ecosystem-based management, we're going to need a common vision, and, to do so, we're going to need a tremendous amount of stakeholder engagement and effective stakeholder engagement, and it will be in addition to the existing stakeholder engagement processes that are working well here at the council, but directed towards something else.

Another way to do so is we're talking about more cooperative

research, engaging people through cooperative research, and also addressing extra-jurisdictional issues, and I'm going to go into each of these in a little bit of detail later on, and so I'm not really going to go into detail here.

In terms of joint visioning, I did this in two ways. One, and most importantly, in terms of this process, it's got to be systematic. We've got to be very systematic, in terms of coming to a joint vision, and be very explicit about it, and so I've got a process there that is relatively straightforward, but it entails a lot of stakeholder engagement, going out into communities all throughout the Gulf and trying to pull and put together a holistic vision that then comes together, presented in draft to this committee, gets batted around, and then, again, goes out for broad public comment and ultimately comes down to a joint vision of what ecosystem-based fisheries management might look like in the Gulf of Mexico.

Based on learning from other councils, the South Atlantic particularly, it needs to be kind of timed out, and like what do we want to see the Gulf of Mexico look like and managed in about say ten years, and we could pick a timeframe, and I'm not going to prescribe that, but, if we're going to get there, first of all, we've got to envision it, okay, rather than kind of plodding forward day by day, and so that's the point of this exercise.

I guess, as we think about a future vision, to me, it's really important to look backwards, and so this slide was taken in 1937, off of the Galveston jetties, when this was not an uncommon thing to see, and all of us here in the room remember a Gulf of Mexico from ten or fifteen or fifty years ago that is a lot different from the Gulf of Mexico we know today.

As we look forward, I think it's really important to bring the perspectives and bring the experiences that all of us together that we've had -- To look back and then think forward and look at the trends that we've been seeing.

We've been seeing a -- Again, the ecosystem status report makes a lot of these real clear, the big increases in population, increasing temperatures, increasing frequency and intensity of hurricanes, increasing coastal development, increasing hypoxia and red tide events, increasing effort, and an increase in the technology that's available.

In the 1920s and 1930s, maybe with a compass, or maybe with a small engine or a sailboat, and then evolving into LORAN-A and

then a huge jump with LORAN-C and people actually getting right back to spots that they've been able to mark, and then now GPS and four-stroke engines, which increases the range tremendously where people can go.

Shaded bathymetric maps are available on Garmin, with all the best fishing holes right there, and it's just astonishing what has evolved, in terms of technology, and, again, it's nothing bad, and it's nothing good, but we just need to recognize these things, okay, as trends that we've seen in the past.

Again, we've also seen some real developments, and I don't want to be doom and gloom here, but we've seen a council process that has developed that is really pretty functional. I mean, it's not always easy, but it works, and we address these issues, and we have a process that engages stakeholders and addresses issues and brings science to bear on these complex issues, and so, you know, and we have really been focused, again, since 2007, largely on this single-stock management approach, and, if we can do that fairly well, and there is kinks, and things can always be better, but it's functional, and let's move forward and try something else into the future, and can we, together, recognizing the magnificence of the Gulf and our dependence on the Gulf for so many different things, and the trends that we're seeing in the Gulf, and try to look forward and get to somewhere where we would like to see it go.

In terms of this, one of the key aspects, and this is coming out of the lessons learned from around the nation, but everybody says stakeholder engagement, and you need to have a lot of stakeholder engagement, and, again, you know, this council is, right away -- There are a lot of stakeholders engaged in this formal process, and there are a variety of formal processes to get to the fisheries management plans and amendments that are guiding management now, and so public meetings and scoping and public hearings and final action, which, again, moves to rulemaking, but there is all this systematic involvement of various stakeholders.

There are lots of different places and times where stakeholders can put their input into the process, but, for FEP, there is some differences, and we're trying to do something different. We're trying to do something that's more holistic, and I think, from the research that we've done, and looking at the experiences of other councils, there are some additions that may be required, and so these are some recommendations.

Again, joint visioning, we've talked about, and one that we're

really going to focus on is this idea of fishery ecosystem issues, and so, rather than thinking about the Gulf holistically, how do we do ecosystem management in the Gulf and with using indicators and trying to -- It's too big. It's too unwieldly, and so we'll burrow down into fishery ecosystem issues, and we'll look more at that in a minute.

4 5

The idea of more cooperative research, and, again, there's been a lot of people on the water for a long time, with a tremendous amount of experience, and we've also had a lot of scientists that have been here and thought about it and studied the Gulf in various ways, and other stakeholders, and, to the extent that we can take those diverse bodies of experiences and really direct them into the science that we need to address these complex issues, we recommend expanded cooperative research.

Similarly, and there is some overlap here, but research and institutional partnerships, and we've got all kinds of institutions out there doing all kinds of things, and can we harness some of that, more specifically as the council, to support the process of ecosystem-based management.

Finally, on this list, addressing extra jurisdictional issues, and there's all kinds of things that are outside the scope of this council, and yet affecting, in many cases negatively affecting, the resources that we're supposed to manage, and so how do we address some of those things?

We have kind of simplified all of this, again with the idea of trying to get to the bottom of actionable ecosystem management guidance. We essentially suggest, in this Version 1, three primary ways to get there. One is fishery ecosystem issues, as I mentioned, expanded institutional partnerships, and expanded Cooperative Research Program, and we'll go into some more details on those.

One of the primary, the primary, recommendation that came out of the guidance documents, having seen a first round of FEPs come out through the nation, and seeing them as actionable, the guidance documents came up with something they called the FEP loop, the fishery ecosystem planning loop, which, you know, is also mentioned as next-gen, or next-generation, fishery ecosystem planning, and it's a fairly systematized process for doing fishery ecosystem planning.

The thing that we really -- We've kind of adopted this almost exactly for the Gulf of Mexico, with some tailoring, and so this is really looking at FEP at the scale of the nation and the

scale of the entire -- Sorry. The scale of the Gulf overall, and so it's a pretty broad process, but, again, assessing where are we now and trying to articulate a vision of where are we going, how are we going to get there, and we need real specific goals and objectives, again at the EBFM -- At the Gulf scale, to try to get there.

4 5

We need some process, and we need to institutionalize it, and, again, these are suggestions, and you can take it or leave it, but we are suggesting to institutionalize the concept of these fishery ecosystem issues as a way to drill down into subregional issues of concern.

Again, expanding cooperative research and defining performance measures, and how will we know if we've arrived at this vision ten years from now, and so getting real specific about what it looks like and then run it, okay, and do all these things and then look back and say, both along the way and looking back, using an updated ecosystem status report that -- Using a variety of pre-defined metrics, how did we do on our yardstick? Did we do this? Did we develop these programs, and have we approached, or gotten closer, to what our vision of EBFM has been?

Then we do it again, and, in the Marshall paper, they talk about this is a process that might take about ten years, and, you know, it's looping around, and it's an incremental move forward, and so that's great, and we'll certainly help, and I strongly urge that we follow this next-gen FEP loop.

That said, it's still too broad to drill down into some of the issues. If you want to be actionable, we've got to get to more spatial and temporal specificity to drill down in some of these issues, and so we came up with the concept following what two other councils have been really effective with, one in the North Pacific and the other in the Pacific, drilling down into these fishery ecosystem issues, which we define here as serving as the operational unit or focal scale for fishery ecosystem planning.

They are bounded in space and time, with a conceptual model of the fishery ecosystem. From my perspective of cooperative research and cooperative work with scientists and fishers and other people, my thinking is that a lot of these would come from the observations of people that are on the water all the time. Hey, we've observed this or that, and let's -- Then discuss that with various people and scientists and other people and develop a conceptual model that kind of grows into something that's a fishery ecosystem issue, but it could come from other places, and it doesn't necessarily need to come from a fisher, and I

just want to embrace the experience that all of us have.

Then, again, the issue is designed to address or mitigate or resolve very specific issues, by generating actionable management guidance that leads into addressing these issues.

How do we choose them? How should they be chosen? Do they address an ecosystem process? Is it an important fishery resource? Is it important to stakeholders? Can the council actually do anything about it? These are some of the criteria that can be used to select FEP focus and FEI focus.

How could it be operationalized? We envision that FEIs, as concepts, come bubbling up from various sources as issues. Wow, red tide is affecting coastal ecosystems that are affecting grouper stocks, and that could be one of them, and there could be many others, but, eventually, as I said, they get discussed, as things do, in hallways and at meetings, et cetera, and, ultimately, they could be formalized into what we're calling an FEI and that we're suggesting at a process level that a champion would take that FEI and write it up and submit it to the ecosystem technical committee for their consideration.

The ETC can look at it for scientific integrity and potentially bounce it back to the champion in their group and ultimately vet the thing and ultimately pass that up as an issue that might go into something like what we're describing as an FEI hopper, where various ideas can sit in a digital repository for consideration on a regular basis for selection by this council.

On a very regular basis, probably annually, or it could be more frequent, the council will take a look at that hopper and say, well, gee whiz, which of these are really most important, and which of these might we try to address, and pick one, and empanel a taskforce, and say, hey, go after it. Tell us what to do, in terms of this FEI, and that taskforce would define objectives and a workplan and a budget and be tracked by the ETC, and, again, through that ETC, be reporting back to this council, in terms of the progress of this FEI, on a very regular basis. Ultimately, we're suggesting that that would lead to pretty specific actionable management guidance.

 If you haven't fallen asleep yet, this should help. Seriously, the thing about these FEIs is that we trying to, again, systematize how to go through this, and this is pretty complex, but I am going to go through it quickly, and we can talk about it, with the idea being that this is an FEI loop, rather than an FEP loop, and this is something that could be accomplished in

four to six months, or maybe a year or two, and it's not a tenyear process. It's not a whole-Gulf process. It's something specific.

The same kind of thinking, and where are we now? We've got to come up with a status, and where are we going? We need a workplan. We need a very specific set of objectives and guidance and planning and budget.

 Sometimes these FEI taskforces are going to need some money. They may or they may not, okay, and then, when the taskforce has an idea of what's needed, it may be that they can just talk about it, think about it, talk with the appropriate people or whatever, and that's it. Make management recommendations, and that's it. It might take four months, and they think it through and like, oh, this might work, and they can recommend that directly for council consideration for action.

It would go through some kind of MSE process, tradeoff analysis, and then it could go directly to this council for consideration, a fast track, and maybe that's possible, and maybe it's not, but I do hope that some things may be able to go this way. More likely, and more commonly, we're going to need more information, and we're suggesting that there are potentially various ways to get that information.

 One might be through the existing Cooperative Research Program. It becomes a priority, and it gets put into the RFP, and people apply to get that money, and they take a typically one-year-grant-funded study and come up with information, and it comes back to the taskforce, and it comes back to others, and they look at that, and they use that, and then they make recommendations for action that, again, goes through this process of vetting and MSE and tradeoff analysis for council consideration, in terms of options.

That's one way, and the other way, and, again, there is some overlap in these things, potentially, but, just for clarity, the other might go through recommending extra-jurisdictional partnerships and advancing some extra-jurisdictional partnerships for addressing some of these specific issues.

 Let me come back to the middle, and they're recommending -- One of the ways that could be recommended would be going through the existing CRP process, but it might not cover everything. It might not be fast enough, and it might not address the kinds of issues or have the best fit for the kinds of information needs and the timeframe that the FEI taskforce feels they need for

information, and so we're talking about various other ways that could address that, one being cooperative research and one being something that SEFIS could do directly and one potentially that institutional partnerships could be developed, with institution like a university or whatever, but we want to give everybody options for how to support these taskforces with information needs that they can use make recommendations that are functional.

The council can take management action, and it might be a single-stock management action, or it may be more of an ecosystem-based management action, but, ultimately, that action gets taken, and, again, let's watch it go forward and make evaluations. Did it work? If not, let's learn and adjust, and let's get more information, and let's loop back, and/or we solve the issue, and what a concept. Anyway, that's the green star at the top, and hopefully we'll get to it quickly on multiple FEIs.

Just I talk a lot about cooperative research, and we mentioned citizen science briefly, and I think it's worth kind of going to — Those words get bandied about, and I think they're not real clear as to what they mean, or many different people have different definitions or thoughts, and so I thought it was worthwhile to explain where I'm coming from, where we're coming from, in terms of what public participation in science really looks like and the various levels of that collaboration in public participation in science.

The one -- Starting at the top, somebody could be contracted, and either a fisherman might be contracted by a scientist, or the council might contract a scientist, and sure that is cooperative research, but, as you raise up, in terms of this collaborative process, a fisher might be asked to collect data that supports a program, or a scientist may be asked to input information into somebody else's process, and that's an increase, a contributory role.

As you move up, real, true collaboration starts when, for example, a fisher -- As an example, a fisher that has noticed some process, or some issue that has led to a fishery ecosystem issue, starts talking about it with scientists, for example, and they, together, might design -- Is this real? Let's design some questions, and it comes together from the experiences on the water as well as the experiences from scientists and the skills to develop peer-reviewed publications and studies that are robust and really take it from that all the way to asking the questions and designing the study.

Again, there's some -- This is a continuum, but, ultimately, you get to this co-creation of information that's really not possible by either a fisher or an individual research group or a scientist coming up with on their own, and I have spent my career doing this, and the co-creation of information and knowledge is, in my opinion, priceless, and so I'm hoping that can -- It does occur, and I'm hoping it will increase and be brought more into this process, particularly for ecosystem-based management, which is so complex.

4 5

One of the examples of cooperative research that we found really valuable is in this Northeast Fisheries Science Center work, in their Cooperative Research Program, and, again, I'm not suggesting that we copy, and they've got a lot more -- They've got that scallop fishery just generating amounts of information and money that we're not likely to see in the near future, and so we can't just kind of emulate a program like this with twelve full-time staff for cooperative research or whatever, but, again, this is an incremental process.

If we decide we want to go in this direction, it offers a really nice set of potential examples. One includes a study fleet, a bunch of boats that are already certified and ready to go out and collect certain bits of information. We already use this, kind of.

For example, for the red tide studies, if we need water quality, if we need measurements of hypoxia in various places, the Science Center can say, hey, listen, fisher, if you're going to be here anyway, drop a bottle, and let's see, and take some water samples, and that's great, but imagine if there were, you know, twenty, forty, fifty boats ready to roll, already trained in research and data collection standards, already having data sheets or what have you, and then, for a specific study, getting a very specific set of data to be collected or whatever.

Then, all of a sudden, you've got this resource that is not really very expensive to put in play, but that could really expand the level of information after specific questions to support specific needs for information, and I could go into all kinds of details, but I think it's obvious what kinds of information could be brought to the table there, and, again, it's got to be done cooperatively, and it's got to meet the strict standards of peer review and robust data collection and analysis. It can't be, hey, just go and collect us some water, and that's anecdotal, and it doesn't help, okay, and so it's -- Hopefully you're understanding what I'm getting at there.

Again, in talking to the staff, as we suggest cooperative research as a key tool to implementing ecosystem-based management, they were very helpful in telling us that, hey, we already have a Cooperative Research Program, and it's like, yes, that's true, and that discussion was really valuable to help us articulate, but this is different. This is, yes, we love the existing stuff, and it can help us do all kinds of things that we're suggesting here, but, in addition, if we expanded the CRP, it could do a couple other things that aren't being done that could meet some of the needs, for example, of these fishery ecosystem issues, or these FEIs, and I will give a couple of examples.

4 5

I mentioned the study fleet, but there is others. What happens if there is a quick, emerging issue that there's a big hypoxia event off of Mississippi that we haven't seen before, or there is some kind of issue that's emerging, or there's an oil spill? No problem. We've got fifty boats, and this is what we sampled, and this is where we want them to sample it, and let's get out there before the thing dissipates, and boom.

The Cooperative Research Program is excellent, but the competitive grant cycle is not going to allow us to do what a study fleet could, and so, similarly -- This could be really responsive. Similarly, if, for example, a stock assessment is coming along, and this is, again, a benefit of a cooperative research program, not only for fishery ecosystem planning, but also for single-stock management, and we need a real wide diversity of -- To get a good growth curve, we need tiny fish of the species, and we need the enormous fish of the species, to get a really accurate growth curve.

Put that out. Put a bounty on some of these things, and you're going to get the kind of diversity of samples that you may not get other ways, and is it representative or whatever, and that's just another example that could be used, and I'm sure you can think of lots more that sampling could be done differently, more efficiently, more cost effectively, using this cooperative research approach.

Another is the idea of long-term integrated ecosystem monitoring programs. Looking at the North Pacific, they've got this cooperation between state agencies and federal agencies and scientific groups, private industries, and I'm not saying we don't, but I'm just saying that, in talking with the people that run their cooperative research program and environmental --Sorry, but ecosystem planning programs, and those are really institutionalized and can address the kinds of monitoring that's

expensive. I mean, to keep track of a thousand temperature loggers, or some of these issues that are -- To send a NOAA ship to collect a thousand temperature loggers is expensive, but to send out a fleet of a bunch of people that are going to be anyway, and pull up the loggers and download it. These are expansions of, additions to, the potential that the existing CRP offers.

4 5

Another one, and this is really simple, but I think of it kind of like a dating app, where a fisherman, or a scientist, might put their little profile on this place and say like, wow, I'm a scientist, and I really want to do cooperative research, but I don't know the right people and the right place, and then they look on this and say, oh, this person -- Vice versa with fishermen. I want to do cooperative research, but I'm not going to walk the halls of the university to try to find somebody, and so we put up a dating app, and it's silly, in a way, but, as simple and cheap as it is, I think it may really help us out.

This is a sticky one, and not that the others are simple, but, anyway, again, lots of issues affecting Gulf resources that this council does not have jurisdiction over. Climate change might be one that you might consider, and upland sources of pollution, and what's coming down the Mississippi River and enormous dead zones, or hypoxic areas, in the Gulf and their effects on fisheries resources that this council is responsible for managing, and you can't tell everybody what to do, and you can't -- You don't have the jurisdiction to deal with that, like hypoxia, that we're seeing more and more of on the west coast of Florida.

Do we throw up our hands? Do we say, oh, listen, red tide is --This is the kinds of effects that red tide might be having on these fisheries, and so that's affecting the stock, and that's part of mortality, and so we have to reduce what we catch, et cetera, and all of that makes perfect sense, and there's been some expansion and some tremendous work that's been done in that way, but, also, what I'm suggesting as a way to address some of these things is to build more partnerships and build more discussions and relationships that are specifically addressing these issues, through collaborations with NGOs, state federal regulatory agencies that are responsible for water quality, industries that could change their practices, potentially, and make more money, because they're not putting the types of pollution out.

Now, again, that steps into ecosystem-based management, as opposed to ecosystem fisheries management, ecosystem-based

fisheries management, and I don't want to go down that road, because they are different, and, really, we're being tasked with ecosystem-based fisheries management.

By the same token, if the staff had a little bit more bandwidth, and if some of these issues were identified, or were part of a specific fishery ecosystem issue, this body, and our collective partnerships and industry and recreational and all the other -- We've got a lot of relationships that I'm just saying that, gently, we could potentially move some of these things along.

It's a big, complicated thing, and I'm just putting a seed here, and I'm not going to solve this, but I'm putting a seed here for you guys to think about.

This is the summary, and this is Version 1.0. It's an incremental process, and we offer this for your consideration. Again, based on the guidance we've got, it's designed to be actionable. It provides a structured planning process and decision support tools to implement ecosystem-based fisheries management in the Gulf of Mexico.

It includes the next-generation FEP loop, okay, with is stateof-the-art in the nation, but it adds this FEI loop as the operational scale to implement the FEP, focusing on specific issues and specific times and places, and it includes expanded mechanisms to increase stakeholder participation, including, as I said, the Cooperative Research, expanded Cooperative Research, Program, research institutional partners, and jurisdictional partnerships to address some of these issues, and I didn't talk about it a lot today, but we also developed a fishery ecosystem planning visualization dashboard that has a variety of datasets in there, social and economic fisheries-dependent data, environmental data.

It's very beta, but it's something that allows anybody to get online and visualize some of the relationships in space and time, not by just here's the landings in the Gulf, but this is the landings by stat zone, and by year, of each species and compare that recreational and commercial, and so it just gives you a lot more spatial granularity and temporal granularity that the public, stakeholders, can look at and go, oh, I see these trends, and I see they may be related, and so, anyway, we offer that up as a beta. If people have interest in seeing that move forward, or changing it, or doing anything to it, that's there as well, and so let me stop there. Again, thank you so much for this opportunity.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Dr. Heyman. That was a very thorough presentation. Do we have any questions from the committee? Mr. Broussard.

MR. BILLY BROUSSARD: Thank you for your presentation. I was just -- At some point, you had said that the Gulf was too large to be under one ecosystem-based fishery program, and I wouldn't hold you to it, but what would you envision, or how many subdivisions of the Gulf, or at least the council's range, would it take to effectively put each area under an efficient system?

DR. HEYMAN: Thank you for the clarification. I am not recommending that the Gulf be sub-divided for management. What I am suggesting is we need both the FEP loop, to look at the Gulf holistically, and a series of specific issues that may be brought up to address specific issues in specific places at specific times, and so, for each of those issues, we're suggesting that the taskforce would look at that.

If you're going to look at red grouper, you don't look off of Corpus, and so it's a way to focus things. It's not we're going to sub-divide the Gulf and make this workgroup do eight times the work, and does that help answer your question? It's issue-by-issue.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Geeslin.

 MR. DAKUS GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Heyman, as you went through this, there was a lot of good information here. One thing that I'm kind of struggling with, and maybe it's because I'm the new kid on the block, but how do the constructs that come out of the FEI either crosswalk or inform all the other committees and really bridge the gap in informing some of the decisions that come out of the other committees that we have?

DR. HEYMAN: Again, an excellent question, and, before I dive into some details there, let me step back and say that every fishery ecosystem plan that's been developed also has a fishery ecosystem implementation plan that comes with it, and those are the kinds of nuts-and-bolts details that are going to need to be hammered out, but there's clearly a broad amount of potential utility.

I mean, so, to answer your question, in terms of how we've been thinking about it so far, depending on an FEI for example, if it's dealing with a specific issue and a series of reef fish issues, then the Reef Fish Committee would be well represented

on the taskforce, and they may be leading the taskforce, and they may be a role, along with the Ecosystem SSC, in monitoring the progress of the taskforce of that FEI. There is absolutely loads of ways to integrate the existing infrastructure and committees in this process.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other questions? I've got Mr. Gill.

MR. BOB GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the presentation, Will. As Dakus said, there's a lot here to explore and think about. You mentioned, at the beginning, that the report, or the FEP document, was a draft, and does that mean that input from this week will be potentially incorporated into it or that it's in the internal rewrite cycle before final submission?

DR. HEYMAN: Can I ask Carrie to answer that? Our consultancy is done, and so this is all yours, and so I would ask Carrie to answer that question.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, yes, these are the final deliverables by LGL Ecological Research Associates, and I just want to thank you guys, again. I enjoyed working with you, and I would thank the team.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Did that answer your question, Mr. Gill?

MR. GILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Ms. Bosarge.

MS. LEANN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Excellent presentation, Dr. Heyman. I appreciate it. It was very thorough. I just wanted to point out, I guess, a couple of things, mainly for staff, that I picked up from your presentation that I keyed in on and I really liked, and one of those is -- Well, first off, I just love this dating app.

I know you were being flippant, to a degree, but I really -- In my years with the council, I have seen, so many times, that there is just a disconnect between the two people that really need to be talking to each other, and maybe they don't even realize that the other one exists, and it could be fishermen and scientists, or it could be scientists and scientists, or it could be managers and scientists, and lots of different levels, and you were trying to find a way to incorporate that and put those people, I guess, at each other's fingertips, or at least let them know the other one exists, and that's great, and I

think that's definitely something that we have to key in on as we go down this path.

The other thing that I really enjoyed, that I think you found a way to bring into the discussion in a more formal way, that we've kind of grappled with, are those extra-jurisdictional partnerships. I think that's key.

We manage a certain portion of the ecosystem, right, that water-based side, but there are so many things, as you pointed out, upland, or upstream, that affect us, and I have always enjoyed, when I would go to the CCC meetings and I would listen to the Hawaiians speak, about some of the ecosystem-based management that they do, and one of the pros that they have is that they—Because it's somewhat of a smaller map that they're dealing with, right, versus us here on the Gulf coast, they can almost manage from the top of the mountain down, you know, and they can really get all of those people in the room together sometimes and make some great progress, and we have issues with that here, just because we are so broad.

We need to go from the top of the river down, right, and it's a big one, the Mississippi River, and so that's hard. That's hard to get all those people in the room to maybe listen to what our portion of the ecosystem, our fishermen and stakeholders and scientists, really need to see happen for us to institute change here on the Gulf coast.

You have found a way, I think, if we'll incorporate that in our plan, in our FEP, as we progress with it, if we can actually incorporate that as a section, those extra-jurisdictional partnerships, and that formalizes some of our issues, and, once it's in writing and it's formalized like that, I think that gives us the platform to maybe bump it up the chain to whatever arm of the government needs to start dealing with that, and we can say this is it, and these are our actionable items, and can we work on this together, and so I really like that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mr. Chair, and thanks, Dr. Heyman, for your presentation. More of a comment, but I certainly welcome your reaction, or your response, and so I really liked, obviously, how you've laid out the FEP and, in particular, these FEIs, fishery ecosystem issues.

One of the things that I think managers have struggled with, over time, is kind of dealing in the abstract with ecosystem-

based management, versus actually tangibly being able to implement ecosystem-based management actions, and we've kind of got stuck on limitations with data and single-species stock assessments.

I think you've laid out an approach where it takes incremental steps and compartmentalizes the issues, and so, from my thought process, what you've laid out, in terms of stakeholder engagement, some of the cooperative research initiatives, really can be valuable in kind of setting the stage for using ecosystem indicators for management, but the FEIs, in particular, and I think, in order for the council to fully grasp and utilize those, they need to be kind of clearly identified and prioritized by the council and by researchers, so that they can then influence management and then have those kind of regular conversations being brought back to the council and the SSCs and others with regard to FEIs and what information, what data, they will provide, obviously, to inform management.

I'm curious, with regard to knowing where we're at now with management at the Gulf Council and how you could see us standing this up and really effectively reacting to, or implementing, such an approach for management, going forward.

 DR. HEYMAN: Thanks, Andy. Those are comments much appreciated, and I will take a quick stab, but I think, again, it's incremental, and so taking some of the low-hanging fruit, the data app, institutionalizing it, if the council thinks this is a good idea, and kind of accepting the thoughts, in principle, and guiding council staff to begin to try to implement bits and pieces of this and put a little bit more meat on the bones of defining what an FEI is and trying and FEI or two, because we're going to learn a tremendous amount just by doing it.

I think that the council is going to need some bandwidth, and the council staff will need some bandwidth, and it may be that the Science Center needs some bandwidth, because we are recommending some things that are kind of outside the existing scope, and so gently, and I will answer your question that way, in addition, and so I hope that gives you some seeds.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. We have -- Leann. Let me -- We had an hour budgeted for this committee meeting, and it was supposed to end at 10:15, and so we have other items on the agenda. I don't want to certainly stifle any conversation, while Dr. Heyman is here, but certainly just keep that in mind, and so I have two hands up, that I know of, and I will recognize Ms. Thompson first and then Leann.

1 2

4 5

MS. LAURILEE THOMPSON: Thank you. That was a great presentation, Dr. Heyman, and I was about to pass over here, and let me see if I can pose my question without stepping on some toes, but, for many years, I was on the Deepwater Shrimp AP for the South Atlantic, and we offered, numerous times, to take scientists out on the shrimp boats, out to the rock shrimp grounds, so that they could see what was going on, and we were always told, well, no, no, no.

We've offered to take them out on our longline boats, and, again, we were told no, no, no, because it would be like the captain knows where to go catch the most fish, and so the data would be skewed, because the captain knows where to go catch the most fish, and so am I detecting a shift in the acceptance?

I mean, I love your Slide Number 18 and your dating concept, and so am I seeing that there's a relaxation and a welcoming of information coming from members of the public, including the commercial fishery industry, in assisting the scientists now? I mean, we were literally told to go find an academic institution to try to get a grant to do what we were offering to do for free, and so am I seeing what I thinking I'm seeing here?

DR. HEYMAN: Do I get to answer that? I can't speak for the council, but what I can say is, from the time I was about this big, I have spent my life on fishing boats, and, for my scientific career, I did get on a NOAA vessel once, and I got on a research ship that wasn't NOAA once, but all the rest of the fieldwork that I have done in my thirty-five years has been out of commercial fishing vessels, and I have a respect that you can't imagine.

I mean, if you can catch fish, it also means you know how to fix a diesel engine, and you know oceanography, and you know ecology, and so I am kind of tearing up a little bit, because I've been there my entire career, and anytime a fisherman says, would you like to go out with me, I'm like, sure, and, as part of this process, I spent four days on a longline vessel, and I spent bunches of time on longline vessels in the Gulf, and I've been on shrimp boats, and how can you, as a scientist -- In my opinion, how can you, as a scientist, trying to manage a resource, an offshore shrimp industry or anything else, and manage the people that -- Again, without stepping on toes, it would probably help the scientists quite a bit to spend that time on the water with those people and see what they see, and so is it being adopted? I sure hope so.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Leann.

4 5

MS. BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief. The other comment that I wanted to make was in regard to the FEIs. I really like that idea, the fishery ecosystem issues idea, and, although I think, if you start with something like red tide or something, that may be somewhat overwhelming, even though it's a specific issue, right, and not Gulf-wide, and I think it still might be too big for a starting point, and so, personally, I could see like an FEI, and I would like to see more data on rainfall, right, across the Gulf of Mexico over time.

I watch things about climate change, right, and I'm not a scientist, and so I have to rely on TV and things like that, PBS mainly, right, and that's a step above Google, maybe, and, from what I understand, climate change -- We think of it as temperature, but it seems that the rainier places are going to get rainier, and the dryer places are going to get dryer, and, obviously, that's going to have impacts here for us. We are typically a more rainy environment, right, along the Gulf, relative to a dry environment.

I want to see that kind of data. That helps me understand what might be changing in our fisheries, and so things like that, but you've got to pull that together. We don't have that here at the council level. There is a lot of state surveys that collect things like that, and there's a lot of NOAA surveys that collect things outside the fisheries side of NOAA that collect — That might be a small, you know, thing that we could address and try and tackle, and I think that will help inform management as we go forward, for various different fishery management plans that we have, and so I think small things like that might be something we could tackle, as a starting point.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Thank you. I don't see any other hands, nor any on the board. Dr. Walter.

 DR. JOHN WALTER: Thank you. I'm not a member of your committee, but thank you for the opportunity to weigh-in here, and thank you, Dr. Heyman, for the great presentation. I noticed that, a couple of times, you brought up the idea that this is something that is going to be maybe similar to the way that we think about and prioritize stock assessments, that we're probably going to need to compile a list of the different FEIs that might be desired by the council and prioritize them and then get them actually in action.

Since there are so many different things that could happen, and

our resources could be put forward, that process I think needs to be developed, and some attention, as to do we address rainfall, do we address red tides, do we address predator-prey interactions, or depredation, things like that that are ecosystem issues, but we do have limited resources, and the Science Center is devoted to addressing the ones that they can, but we can't lose sight of our single-species stock assessment bread-and-butter that we also have to do.

I guess is that going to be in the summary, in the next presentation on steps towards implementing these FEIs and getting them off the ground?

DR. HEYMAN: Thanks, John. Great question, and there's a lot to absorb in the three huge documents that we put out, but one of the things that -- Again, trying to make this actionable, with guidance from the staff, we do have a series of decision support tools, as appendices and within the FEP document, that address those kinds of things, and so these are the criteria by which things should be selected, and these are the -- Again, it's -- These are recommendations, but absolutely. I mean, it's really complicated, and so we have to have a systematic process for defining priorities and -- So yes.

That's critically important, and we've offered some tools to do so in the draft FEP, in the appendix, and it's critical. I guess one other thing, on that, is that, depending on bandwidth, you don't have to do one at a time, and you could have several rolling operationally. It may be that additional resources — Yes, this is bigger than single-stock, and it is — We are talking about more work, and yet what I am hoping, and what I'm seeing in other places, is, if you take this approach, it eases some of the burden on some of the single-stock work.

For example, in the Pacific Council, we're seeing that kind of benefit, and so if that helps, and I want to go back to one comment, and, again, without going too far off the rails or stepping on toes, and I guess that the other side of that involvement is that scientists have a tremendous amount to offer.

One of the things, the mistakes, that people have made is to say, oh, well, if a fisherman observed it, or is a fisherman even measured it, then, well -- I have fallen into this trap, you know, and it's cooperation, and it's collaboration. The study needs to be designed in a way that data that are collected are robust and will pass muster at the SSC, and so it's that collaboration and cooperation to have both the participation as

well as the robust science. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. No other hands, and so, Dr. Heyman, thank you very much for coming and providing your information. We really appreciate it.

DR. HEYMAN: It's a pleasure, and I'm here all week, and so look for me at the bar.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Okay. That will take us -- We have about eleven minutes, ten or eleven minutes, left in our allotted time, Dr. Mendez-Ferrer, if you want to maybe go to Item 4(b), I guess, and start some discussions there, and I think that's the meat of what we're having the committee for, if that would be okay, and that would be Q-4(b).

DR. MENDEZ-FERRER: Mr. Chair, it will be my presentation on 5(c) for the next steps.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Then let's go to the next steps.

ECOSYSTEM TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

DR. MENDEZ-FERRER: Thanks. Originally, I wasn't planning on going through each one of the Ecosystem Technical Committee Recommendations, as those have been focused on the individual projects that LGL delivered, and the recommendations have been incorporated, and so, kind of going off of what Dr. Heyman just presented, how do we go about operationalizing an FEP for our region?

The way that I kind of envision this, the FEP is what lays out the framework, the step-by-step, on how to incorporate and address fishery ecosystem, EBFM, efforts, and then the FEI would be the individual modules that would then address the specific management issue, using the steps laid out in the FEP, and so I guess a way to oversimplify this is the FEP is the cookbook, and the FEIs are the recipes.

 I am stealing this figure from LGL, and it seems like the recommendation from -- One of the main recommendations from the Ecosystem Technical Committee was to operationalize the fishery ecosystem issue loop or include developing the fishery ecosystem issue modules, and so I'm going to, on my next few slides, kind of walk through some of these steps and what can these look like, if we were to take the approach of using FEIs as part of our FEP.

Like I mentioned, the Ecosystem Technical Committee provided recommendations to LGL during their September and December 2021 meetings, and their overall recommendation was to operationalize these FEIs.

Before we move forward with continuing work on this document, we would like some feedback and some direction from the committee, in terms of do you agree with this approach of basing our FEP around these fishery ecosystem issue modules, and, from the discussion that we just had, it seems like there is some positive -- Like you seem to be liking this approach, and, if so, if FEIs are something that we want to use, moving forward, what would you like to see, or how would you like them to inform making these management decisions?

I can stop here for some discussion, or I can leave you thinking about these questions as I go and present sort of an example of what an FEI might look like, using some of the resources that we currently have.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I would say try to go through the example.

DR. MENDEZ-FERRER: Okay. I'm sorry, Leann, but the example for today is going to be red tide, and so one of the FEI loops is identifying the issue, and, at this point, this can be identified via the council process, and we already have the --We have the fishery feedback tool, and we have advisory panels, and one of the things that we also need to figure out is how to prioritize these FEIs, and we can incorporate -- We can use the IPT and the Ecosystem Technical Committee and other council advisory bodies to be able to come up with a way to prioritize these FEIs.

The example for today is red tide, and, as we know -- Well, we're selecting red tide because there seems to be a lot of data and efforts that are actually put out there that we have not been able to necessarily translate into management actions, but there seems to be a lot of movement going on right now, and so it might be an example FEI that we could kind of tinker with and see if this something that we want to pursue.

 Step 2 is to kind of come up with that workplan with the Ecosystem Technical Committee and the SSC. What do we want to know, and so why do we care about red tide? What do we want to understand? Come up with those questions. What effects do red tide events have on a particular fish stock, or what kind of impacts does it also have on our fishing communities, for example, and so this would be at the stage where we could come

up with those questions, and it would drive kind of like the rest of the legs in which we can continue developing the module.

We would need to assess the data available. Right now, for red tide, there are several data collection and modeling efforts that are currently taking place at the state and federal level. As we have seen in previous council actions, red tide mortality has been incorporated into the interim analysis for red grouper, and there are more red tide studies right now that are modeling the severity and the extent, the spatial extent, of red tide events and how this translates to mortality, and so we're kind of already doing that here, and, again, we can incorporate the IPT and the SSC to figure out how all of these data can be then operationalized to inform management decisions.

In the implementation portion, and, of course, throughout this whole process, we would be bringing it to the council to gather some feedback, but data gaps would be identified. There are studies out there for red tide that specify, or point out, the need to understand the relationship between red tides and hypoxia events, for example.

There are also ongoing monitoring efforts that inform yearly red tide and the conditions out there in the ocean, as well as we have indices, and we have models, that can be incorporated into stock assessments, and so I know that red tide is not -- We don't manage red tide, and we don't manage water quality, but we do -- Our resources are influenced by these kinds of events, and so, right now, there are also some partnerships, at the state and federal level, that are working together towards this effort. Some of them, for example, is, in the State of Florida, the Harmful Algal Bloom Taskforce, as well as state and federal long-term monitoring efforts that are going on.

 One of the things that would be helpful, and maybe this is not a question that we would need to answer right now, but really think about, in terms of if these issues arise that would require more partnership with state or agencies outside of our region, it would be, I guess, fruitful to think about how to go about this and how do we -- If the council would like to participate or let know these additional agencies that, hey, these issues are affecting our stocks, and I think we should work together for relaying some data, and this is something that you should consider when also making your management decisions.

Then Step 4 would be the management actions, and so, at the IPT level, it could be determined if the FEI should be a stand-alone document or if relevant portions should be included into

amendments, and sometimes they might not necessarily be a management action, per se, but it could provide additional information that could strengthen the rationale when the council is making decisions on catch advice, for example, based on what we know about status and trends of red tide and why an alternative was selected over another one.

As usual, throughout this whole process, we would be considering feedback from the council and the stakeholders before these modules would be put out for -- Would be finalized.

Where are we right now? If the committee agrees with FEIs and kind of as a path forward, we do have an IPT that we have not been able to convene yet, due to some of the limitations that we have in terms of time and the pandemic, but we can bring this work, the work that LGL has put together, to the IPT level and to the Ecosystem Technical Committee to continue developing, and so, if you have any questions, or any specific things that you would like to see, or steps that you would like to see outlined in the FEP, please bring those up.

The more information that we get from you, the more useful this document is going to be, because, in the end, we want to make a document that is useful and not just something that we reference every once in a while.

Another thing to keep in mind, as we're selecting these FEIs, is we don't want to have a really large list of issues that then may give some false hope to our stakeholders if they don't have enough data available for us to be able to address it, and so, when selecting the list of potential FEIs that we want to look at, and the way to prioritize it, it's something that we need to consider, as well as staff time and council priorities, when moving forward.

The next slide kind of summarizes what I just said, and so I can open the floor for some discussions and directions to staff on what you would like to see outlined in the FEP, as well as the FEI modules.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Natasha. Mr. Chair, just to be clear, maybe take a few question related to Dr. Mendez-Ferrer's presentation, but she laid out some, I guess, asks, of the committee at least, and maybe we can bring that up at Full Council, for further clarification or discussion, relative to whether or not this FEP/FEI concept is agreeable to the council and that type of thing, and bring it up at Full Council, with a little bit of time possibly there, but at least maybe to address

immediate questions right now, and is that okay, because we're at the end of our committee time.

MR. DIAZ: Yes, I think that's a good plan, Kevin, and some folks might want to stew on this a little bit and have some idea at Full Council. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, and so we'll just answer just a couple of questions, if they're out there. Mr. Gill, I saw your hand up.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Not a question, but I would hope, relative to your comment and the Chairman's comment, that we allow sufficient time at council to have a more robust discussion on this complex subject. Some of the questions are fairly easy with yes or no, do we like it or whatever, but there's more to it than that, and it will take some time, I think, to have that discussion, assuming there is interest around the table, and I hope we allow the time and availability to do that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other committee member that has a specific question related to the presentation? All right, and so, with that, we're at the end of the time, and there was no other business, and we'll go ahead and conclude the Ecosystem Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on April 4, 2022.)