1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	261 ST MEETING
4	ZOI MEELING
5	FULL COUNCIL SESSION
6	
7	IP Casino & Resort Biloxi, Mississippi
8	
9	OCTOBER 17-20, 2016
10	MORELING MEMBERS
11 12	VOTING MEMBERS Leann BosargeMississippi
13	Patrick BanksLouisiana
14	Chris BlankenshipAlabama
15	Doug BoydTexas
16	Roy CrabtreeNMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
17	Pamela Dana
18	Dale DiazMississippi
19	Tom Frazer
20	Johnny GreeneAlabama
21	Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley)Florida
22	Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller)Mississippi
23	Campo MatensLouisiana
24	Robin RiechersTexas
25	John SanchezFlorida
26	Greg StunzTexas
27	Ed SwindellLouisiana
28	David WalkerAlabama
29	
30	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
31 32	Glenn Constant
3∠ 33	Dave Donaldson
34	Leo DanaherUSCG
35	STAFF
36	Steven Atran
37	Assane Diagne
38	Matt FreemanEconomist
39	John FroeschkeFishery Biologist - Statistician
1 0	Douglas GregoryExecutive Director
41	Morgan KilgourFishery Biologist
42	Ava LasseterAnthropologist
43	Mara LevyNOAA General Counsel
44	Jessica MatosAdministrative Assistant
45	Ryan RindoneFishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
46	Claire RobertsEFH Specialist
47	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
48	Charlotte SchiaffoResearch and Human Resource Librarian

1 2	Carrie Simmons	Deputy Director
3	OTHER PARTICIPANTS	
4		Panama City, FL
5	Pam Anderson	Panama City, FL
6	Randy Boggs	Orange Beach, AL
7	Susan Boggs	Orange Beach, AL
8	Steve Bosarge	Pascagoula, MS
9	Eric Brazer	.Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance
10		Fort Morgan, AL
11		Panama City Beach, FL
12		
13	-	Clearwater, FL
14	<u>=</u>	HMS
15		Fairhope, AL
16	-	HMS
17		Destin, FL
18	-	LA
19		LA
20		Orange Beach, AL
21		
22		NMFS
23		
24		Destin, FL
25		ASA
26		
27	-	Destin, FL
28	_	Freeport, TX
29		MDMR
30		Oceana
31 32	=	FKCFA
3 <i>2</i> 33		Orange Beach, AL
34		Destin, FLOrange Beach, AL
3 1	-	NMFS
36		Fort Morgan, AL
37		
38	_	
39		Orange Beach, AL
40		Lynn Haven, FL
41		Lynn Haven, FL
42	-	Aransas Pass, TX
43	_	
44		MDMR
45		SEFSC
46		
47		TX
48		

1	Clarence SeymourOcean Springs, M
2	Michael Short
3	Bill StaffOrange Beach, A
4	Tom SteberOrange Beach, A
5	Albert StinsonOrange Beach, A
6	Mike ThierryDauphin Island, A
7	Steve TomenyPort Fourchon, L
8	Jay TrochessetBiloxi, M
9	Tom WheatleyPew Charitable Trust
LO	Johnny WilliamsGalveston, T
L1	Dale WoodruffOrange Beach, A
L2	
L3	
L4	
5	

mah]	le of Contents
Tabl	e or contents
Tabl	Le of Motions
1001	COL MOCIONE
Call	to Order, Announcements, and Introductions
Revi	lew and Adoption of Proposed 2016-2017 Council Committee
Rost	ter
<u>Ador</u>	otion of Agenda and Approval of Minutes
Pres	sentations
	Draft Highly Migratory Species Amendments 5b and 10
	Climate Vulnerability Analysis for Gulf-Managed Stocks
	Mississippi Law Enforcement Presentation
	NMFS-SERO Landings Summaries
Supp	porting Agencies Update
	U.S. Coast Guard
D1-1	lin Commont
Publ	lic Comment
Comp	
	vittoo Boporta
	nittee Reports
<u> </u>	Shrimp Committee Report
	Shrimp Committee Report
	Shrimp Committee Report
<u> </u>	Shrimp Committee Report
<u></u>	Shrimp Committee Report
	Shrimp Committee Report

TABLE OF MOTIONS

3 4

<u>PAGE 11</u>: Motion to adopt the proposed council committee roster for 2016-2017. The motion carried on page 11.

5 6 7

<u>PAGE 102</u>: Motion to move Action 3, Alternative 6, and Action 5 to Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 103.

8 9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Motion in Action 6 to change Alternative 2 to read as PAGE 103: follows and remove Alternative 4. Alternative 2 is a vessel possessing shrimp may transit Gulf federal waters without a federal vessel permit if fishing gear is appropriately stowed. Transit means non-stop progression through the area. gear appropriately stowed means trawl doors and nets must be out of the water and the bag straps must be removed from the net. Alternative 4 is a vessel possessing shrimp may transit Gulf federal waters without a federal vessel permit if fishing gear is appropriately stowed. Transit means non-stop progression through the area. Fishing gear appropriately stowed means a trawl net may remain on deck, but the bag straps must be removed The motion carried on page 104. from the net.

222324

<u>PAGE 104</u>: Motion to change the wording in Action 6, Alternative 3. The motion carried on page 107.

252627

28

29

<u>PAGE 110</u>: Motion to forward the white paper with the suggested changes to the proposed fishing regulations for the proposed Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary expansion. <u>The motion carried on page 111</u>.

303132

PAGE 112: Motion to move Action 3 to Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 112.

333435

<u>PAGE 112</u>: Motion in Action 4 to move Alternatives 2 and 4 to Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 112.

36 37

38 PAGE 112: Motion in Action 5 to include in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 an option to exclude 2015. The motion carried on page 40 113.

41

42 <u>PAGE 113</u>: Motion to adopt Alternative 2, Option b, as the preferred alternative. The motion failed on page 118.

44

45 <u>PAGE 130</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 4 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 131.

47

48 PAGE 131: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 1 the

```
1 preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 131.
```

3 <u>PAGE 131</u>: Motion in Action 4 that the commercial trip limits be expressed in numbers of fish. The motion carried on page 132.

5 6

<u>PAGE 132</u>: Motion in Action 4 to add an alternative to increase the commercial trip limit to sixteen fish. <u>The motion carried</u> on page 132.

8

7

10 PAGE 133: Motion in Action 3.1 to make Alternative 4 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 133.

12

13 <u>PAGE 133</u>: Motion in Action 3.2 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 135.

15

16 <u>PAGE 135</u>: Motion in Action 3.3 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 137.

18

19 <u>PAGE 139</u>: Motion in Action 1 to modify the alternatives to 20 reflect that landings occur at a preapproved site. <u>The motion</u> 21 carried on page 140.

22 23

23 <u>PAGE 140</u>: Motion in Action 2.2 to move Alternative 4 to 24 Considered but Rejected. The motion carried on page 140.

25

26 <u>PAGE 141</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 143.

28

29 <u>PAGE 143</u>: Motion in Action 2.1 to make Alternative 2, Option 30 2a, and Alternative 3, Option 3a, the preferred alternatives. 31 <u>The motion carried on page 145</u>.

32

33 <u>PAGE 145</u>: Motion in Action 2.2 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 147.

35

36 <u>PAGE 147</u>: Motion to move Action 4 to Considered but Rejected. 37 The motion failed on page 150.

38

39 PAGE 150: Motion in Action 4 to make Alternative 1 the 40 preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 150.

41

42 <u>PAGE 150</u>: Motion in Action 3 to make Alternative 2a the 43 preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 152.

44

45 <u>PAGE 155</u>: Motion in Action 4 to make Alternative 2, Options a 46 and b, the Preferred Alternative. <u>The motion carried on page</u> 47 161.

<u>PAGE 167</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 167.

PAGE 167: Motion to approve CMP Amendment 30 and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review implementation and deem the codified text as necessary staff editorial appropriate, giving license to make necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 169.

<u>PAGE 169</u>: Motion to approve CMP Framework Amendment 5 and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 171.

<u>PAGE 171</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 2, Option 2b and Option 2g the preferred alternative. <u>The motion carried on page 178</u>.

<u>PAGE 184</u>: Motion in Action 2 to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 185.

<u>PAGE 185</u>: Motion to develop an allocation exchange or sharing discussion paper for presentation at the spring 2017 council meeting that includes, but is not limited to, the following: the types or method of allocation exchange or sharing benefits and detriments, difficulties in implementation, and then other issues and considerations. The motion carried on page 186.

 <u>PAGE 188</u>: Motion to provide recommendations to the council on private recreational red snapper management measures which would provide more quality access to the resource in federal waters, reduce discards, and improve fisheries data collection. <u>The motion carried on page 195</u>.

 <u>PAGE 199</u>: Motion that beginning December 31, 2017, accrued annual leave in excess of 480 hours at the end of each calendar year will be converted to sick leave. <u>The motion carried on page 199</u>.

PAGE 199: Motion that upon separation of employment or upon retirement, leave can be paid out either as a lump sum or as a payment every two weeks, at the employee's discretion. Upon separation of employment due to cause, leave will be paid as a lump sum payment only. When leave is paid out as a payment every two weeks, due to separation from employment, accrual of further leave will not be allowed during the pay-out period. Any person hired after December 31, 2016, upon separation of employment, will be paid any applicable unused leave in a lump sum payment. The motion carried on page 200.

<u>PAGE 200</u>: Motion that the council approve the 2017-2018 Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Operations Plan and the 2017-2020 Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Strategic Plan. The motion carried on page 201.

<u>PAGE 202</u>: Motion to forward the five-year EFH Review to NMFS by the end of 2016 and give editorial license to staff to modify the document as needed with approval of the Chair. <u>The motion carried on page 202</u>.

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the IP Casino & Resort, Biloxi, Mississippi, Monday morning, October 17, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE: I would like to welcome you to the 261st meeting of the Gulf Council. You have me, Leann Bosarge, at the helm as your chairwoman, I guess, for this meeting, and so bear with me. I wanted to introduce a couple of people before we get started, and don't forget that we're doing things a little differently at this meeting, because we are going to go into Full Council first thing, in order to look over the committee assignments and assign people to those committees, so that they can participate during this meeting.

I want to introduce a couple of people. We have Mr. Corky Perret and Mr. Bob Gill in the audience, both former council members, and hello. We're glad to have you. I'm sure that Mr. Perret will speak out at any moment and he will keep us on track.

One other introduction is we have a new member on staff. We have Jessica Matos, and we're glad to have you, and I understand that you have some background in elementary education, as a teacher. That may come in handy with us, and so that will be great. All right.

 The first thing on our agenda today is the Review and Adoption of the Proposed 2016-2017 Council Committee Roster. That's going to be Tab A-2(b) in your briefing book, and there were -- I will give you a synopsis of a couple of things. If you will remember, at our last council meeting -- Dale.

MR. DALE DIAZ: Can I interrupt you before you start that?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Certainly.

MR. DIAZ: I just wanted to mention, for the agenda, that we have a closed session, and we recently were served with a lawsuit by the Matagorda Bay Foundation, just in the last couple of days, and I was hoping that legal counsel could give us some information related to that lawsuit during the closed session. I don't know if the agenda needs to be adopted or not, but I wanted to bring that up on the record. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We will definitely make that notion to

- 1 the agenda, and, since we're going into Full Council right now
- 2 and then right back out, we better go ahead and go around the
- 3 table and state your name, for the record. We will start on my 4 left.

6 MR. JOHNNY GREENE: Johnny Greene, Alabama.

7

8 MR. DAVID WALKER: David Walker, Alabama.

9

10 MR. CHRIS BLANKENSHIP: Chris Blankenship, Alabama.

11

12 MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine 13 Fisheries Commission.

14

15 MR. PATRICK BANKS: Patrick Banks, Louisiana.

16

17 MR. ED SWINDELL: Ed Swindell, Louisiana.

18

19 MR. CAMPO MATENS: Camp Matens, Louisiana.

20

21 DR. TOM FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.

22

23 MR. JOHN SANCHEZ: John Sanchez, Florida.

24

25 MS. MARTHA GUYAS: Martha Guyas, Florida.

26

27 DR. PAMELA DANA: Pam Dana, Florida.

28

29 MR. CHARLIE PHILLIPS: Charlie Phillips, South Atlantic Council.

30

31 DR. JACK MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.

32

33 MS. SUSAN GERHART: Susan Gerhart, NOAA Fisheries.

34

35 DR. BONNIE PONWITH: Bonnie Ponwith, NOAA Fisheries.

36

37 MR. ROBIN RIECHERS: Robin Riechers, Texas.

38

39 DR. GREG STUNZ: Greg Stunz, Texas.

40

41 MR. DOUG BOYD: Doug Boyd, Texas.

42

43 DR. KELLY LUCAS: Kelly Lucas, Mississippi.

44

45 MR. DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.

- 47 LCDR LEO DANAHER: Lieutenant Commander Leo Danaher, U.S. Coast
- 48 Guard.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUGLAS GREGORY: Doug Gregory, council staff.

REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF PROPOSED 2016-2017 COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROSTER

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. For the committees this year, if you will remember, at our last meeting, we did pass a motion to split certain committees and then join other committees, and there was in one particular that I think three went into one, and so some of the numbers, as far as membership numbers on some of these committees, did change a little bit. Part of it was due to that, and then there were a couple of committees that were extremely popular.

Obviously Reef Fish always is, but there were others that were in the top one, two, or three for a number of people, and so I adjusted and tweaked things for that, to try and make an accommodation there. Reef Fish will be a committee of the whole again this year. I think that worked quite well last year. I thought we got good input, and it made the committee report a much more streamlined process. We did the bulk of the heavy lifting during the actual committee, and so I kept that the same. Were there any questions or comments on the committee roster as it stands? All right. If not, I will entertain a motion to accept the committee roster.

MR. MATENS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's so moved by Camp and seconded by Johnny. We have a motion on the board to adopt the proposed council committee roster, and that's obviously for the 2016-2017 committee roster. Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing no objection, the motion carries. Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We will immediately redo the committee agendas with the new committee rosters and put them on the website. We're not going to have time to get them on the FTP site, but they will be on the website with the new committee roster within a couple of hours, if not sooner.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It may be a good idea, and we had this discussion with the staff before we set all of this up, and we thought, should we go ahead and print everything with the new committee chairs and the new membership, but then that kind of assumed that the council would be okay with the committees as they were assigned, and so we did not do that, and so it may be

helpful if the chair of each committee could just read the membership of your committee before we get started for each of the committees. If there is nothing else under that, then we will go back into committee sessions, and I will turn it over to Dr. Greg Stunz, if he's ready, for Data Collection.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on October 17, 2016.)

October 19, 2016

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

.5 - - -

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the IP Casino & Resort, Biloxi, Mississippi, Wednesday afternoon, October 19, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Good afternoon, and welcome to the $261^{\rm st}$ meeting of the Gulf Council. My name is Leann Bosarge, Chair of the Council. If you have a cell phone, pager, or similar device, we ask that you keep them on silent or vibrating mode during the meeting.

The Gulf Council is one of eight regional councils established in 1976 by the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, known today as the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The council's purpose is to serve as a deliberative body to advise the Secretary of Commerce on fishery management measures in the federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico. These measures help ensure that fishery resources in the Gulf are sustained, while providing the best overall benefit to the nation.

 The council has seventeen voting members, eleven of whom are appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and include individuals from a range of geographical areas in the Gulf of Mexico and with experience in various aspects of fisheries.

The membership also includes five state fishery managers from each Gulf state and the Regional Administrator from NOAA's Southeast Fisheries Service, as well as several non-voting members.

Public input is a vital part of the council's deliberative process, and comments, both oral and written, are accepted and

- 1 considered by the council throughout the process. Anyone
- 2 wishing to speak during public comment should sign in at the
- 3 registration kiosk located at the entrance to the meeting room.
- 4 We accept only one registration per person. A digital recording
- 5 is used for the public record. Therefore, for the purpose of
- 6 voice identification, each person at the table is requested to
- 7 identify him or herself, starting on my left.
- 8
- 9 MR. GREENE: Johnny Greene, Alabama.
- 10
- 11 MR. WALKER: David Walker, Alabama.
- 12
- 13 MR. DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine Fisheries
- 14 Commission.
- 15
- 16 MR. BANKS: Patrick Banks, Louisiana.
- 17
- 18 MR. SWINDELL: Ed Swindell, Louisiana.
- 19
- 20 MR. MATENS: Camp Matens, Louisiana.
- 21
- 22 DR. FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.
- 23
- 24 MR. GLENN CONSTANT: Glenn Constant, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
- 25 Service.
- 26
- 27 MS. GUYAS: Martha Guyas, Florida.
- 28
- 29 DR. DANA: Pam Dana, Florida.
- 30
- 31 MR. PHILLIPS: Charlie Phillips, South Atlantic liaison.
- 32
- 33 MS. MARA LEVY: Mara Levy, NOAA Office of General Counsel.
- 34
- 35 DR. ROY CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.
- 36
- 37 DR. MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.
- 38
- 39 DR. BONNIE PONWITH: Bonnie Ponwith, NOAA Fisheries.
- 40
- 41 MR. RIECHERS: Robin Riechers, Texas.
- 42
- 43 DR. STUNZ: Greg Stunz, Texas.
- 44
- 45 DR. LUCAS: Kelly Lucas, Mississippi.
- 46
- 47 MR. DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.
- 48

1 LCDR DANAHER: Lieutenant Commander Leo Danaher, U.S. Coast 2 Guard.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Douglas Gregory, council staff.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Our agenda can be found on Tab A, Number 3. Are there any additions or revisions to the agenda as presented? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

MR. RIECHERS: Move to adopt the agenda.

16 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's so moved by Robin.

18 MR. GREENE: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Seconded by Johnny. From our last meeting, the minutes are located at Tab A, Number 4. Were there any revisions or additions to the minutes that needed to be made? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to adopt the minutes.

DR. LUCAS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So moved by Dr. Lucas and seconded by Mr. Greene. Any opposition to that motion? Seeing none, the motion carries, and we didn't actually approve the motion for the agenda. Was there any opposition to approving the motion for the agenda? Seeing none, that is approved. All right. Next on our agenda is Review of Any Exempted Fishing Permit Applications. Dr. Crabtree, do we have any of those for this meeting?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: No, we do not.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: No, we do not. All right. That will bring us right into our Presentations, and I believe our first presentation is going to be our Draft Highly Migratory Species Amendments 5b and 10, which is found under Tab A, Number 7 in our briefing book. We're going to have a tag-team, I think, for this presentation of Ms. Jennifer Cudney and Guy Dubeck, and I hope I pronounced that correctly.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Before we get started, I want to 47 make an announcement and again at the beginning of public testimony. If anybody has lost anything in the audience in the

back of the room, come see me, and if you hear of anybody talking about having lost something, tell them to come see me. If they can identify what it is, we will give it to them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. I think we have your presentation on the screen, whenever you're ready, sir.

PRESENTATIONS

DRAFT HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES AMENDMENTS 5B AND 10

MR. GUY DUBECK: Hello, everyone. My name is Guy Dubeck. I am here to talk about Amendment 5b, which is dusky shark management measures. The first slide here is just a quick outline of the presentation. Here is a management history of dusky sharks. As you can see, we've been working on Amendment 5b for quite a while, since 2011. I just want to point out that the most recent thing is that, in May of 2016, we had a settlement agreement to have the proposed rule out by October 14, and we have to have the final rule out by the end of March, and so that kind of gives you a sense of our timeline and how we're moving forward here.

Here is the SEDAR 21 update, and the addendum shows that dusky sharks are still overfished with overfishing, but we only need to reduce mortality by 35 percent to get the rebuilding by 2107, as you see here on the graph there what the assessment determined.

Right now, here are the preferred alternatives. Like I mentioned, we're looking for the reduced mortality by 35 percent and ensure rebuilding of dusky sharks, and so I will start with the preferred recreational alternatives. The first one is we're going to require all HMS recreational permit holders that want to fish for, retain, land, or possess sharks to get a shark endorsement along with the HMS permit. That would then an entail an extra kind of quiz for shark identification and some regulatory training that would be involved with the permit.

The second alternative, Alternative 6a, would be to require circle hooks in the recreational fishery for sharks. For our reference, somebody who is targeting sharks is usually someone who is using natural bait and using greater than 200-pound test line.

For the preferred alternatives for the commercial fishery, we're looking for safety release of sharks. We're trying to get fishermen to safely dehook or cut the gangions about three feet from the shark, to minimize post-release mortality. Another

alternative, Alternative 5b, would be to require shark identification and fishery regulation training to go along with the safe handling and release workshops. All of our fishermen are required to do the safe handling and release workshops every three years, and this would just be an added part to the training at the end, where we do the shark identification and regulatory training and safe release of sharks.

The other measure is to increase dusky shark outreach awareness and also implement a fleet relocation protocol, where, fishermen that interact with dusky sharks, we would like them to get on the radio and advise other fishermen in the area to avoid the area because of dusky sharks and also for that fisherman to pull up their gear and move one nautical mile away from where the interaction with dusky sharks is. The last preferred alternative is to require circle hooks in the bottom longline shark fishery.

We had many other alternatives considered in this amendment. Some of the recreational alternatives that were considered, but not preferred at this time, were to require recreational fishermen to always have a shark ID placard aboard and to prohibit the retention of all ridgeback sharks, increase the recreational size limit, and also allow catch-and-release only for the shark fishery recreationally.

 Some of the commercial alternatives that we considered were to restrict the number of hooks that pelagic longline fishermen could use and to implement dusky shark time/area closures, to close the pelagic longline fishery, and also to implement individual dusky shark bycatch quotas. Again, these were ones that we considered, but are not preferred at this time.

Also, in Amendment 5b, we're clarifying the annual catch limits and accountability measures for the nineteen prohibited shark species we have. We are establishing an ACL of zero, but a small amount of bycatch is permissible, as long as it does not lead to overfishing, and a majority of the small levels of bycatch and the legal landings of prohibited species do not lead to the overfishing of these species. However, for dusky sharks, the small levels of bycatch are causing overfishing, and so we are implementing -- Measures proposed in Amendment 5b are the AMs for dusky sharks.

 Along with all the comments and questions we have in the entire rulemaking, we had some specific comments we would like the council and the public to give us feedback on. They are the mortality reduction and rebuilding objectives, based on the

SEDAR update. Is our approach for the ACLs and AMs for prohibited species appropriate? Then Alternative 2a was the shark endorsement and how should we effectively implement this? What is the appropriate date that it should be implemented and potentially the implementation strategy of how to do this.

The other one was for the circle hooks for the recreational fishery. Will the circle hook approach ensure the measure applies to the shark fishery? Should the different indications of what a recreational shark fishery is, would that be appropriate? Should we look for something greater than 200-pound test as kind of a directed shark trip?

One of the alternatives that wasn't preferred was to look at the hook size. Is that a good indication of what a recreational fisherman that is targeting sharks looks like? The other thing was the Paperwork Reduction Act and collecting different information, especially for the endorsement, if we have any specific comments on that.

I kind of went through everything fast, but we have public comment through December 22. You can submit comments at regulations.gov, or you can submit them to us here right now, and I will gladly accept any comments or questions you all have.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Any comments or feedback? Patrick.

MR. BANKS: Just one comment, and you had it twice in the presentation, and so I'm assuming it's accurate, but the rebuilding plan is ninety years from now?

MR. DUBECK: Yes, and it's an update from a hundred years from the last assessment, but --

MR. BANKS: Okay. Well, we're doing better then. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: On the recreational circle hook requirement, you may want to consider requiring that also when anglers are using stainless steel cable rigs, or cable rigs, because I don't know that if they would consider that wire or -- It certainly wouldn't be monofilament, and so that's just another idea there, but that's a common rig for shark fishing.

MR. DUBECK: Yes, and another thing that I forgot to mention is, with this requirement, the use of circle hooks would also apply

to fishermen fishing in recreational tournaments that have shark as a category prize or something like that. They would be required to get the endorsement and use circle hooks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: What kind of outreach and education do you have planned on the recreational side for some of these new requirements?

 MR. DUBECK: We are trying to put together different placards for fishermen as more ID guides, because there is a lot of -The main thing for dusky sharks is misidentification, and so a lot of the recreational landings or observer information is probably misidentification of some of the look-alike species, like silky and sandbar. We're trying to put together ID guides just for those species, for fishermen to have.

We are also looking to outreach to the states, because there is a lot of state-water fishermen, where they are interacting with dusky sharks, and we feel that's a good avenue to get the states involved with outreach. Not so much, I think, in the Gulf, but in the Atlantic, there is a lot more beach fishermen, and they're interacting with dusky sharks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ed.

MR. SWINDELL: So this is an issue with the Atlantic and the Gulf as a combined system, or are you proposing this also for the Atlantic?

MR. DUBECK: This is the entire HMS here, yes, because dusky sharks are in the Gulf and the Atlantic. This is entirely for both regions, and it's not specified. There is no specific regional implementation here, but it's for the entire HMS fisheries.

MR. SWINDELL: Where is the biggest problem with overfishing? Is it in the Gulf or the Atlantic, may I ask?

 MR. DUBECK: Well, historically, dusky sharks were pretty prevalent in the Gulf of Mexico, and they're not right now. Historically, there used to be a huge population in the Gulf, but now, with the population of dusky, you're seeing a lot more interactions in the Atlantic than you would in the Gulf.

I think some of the management measures we've put in place in the past few years, especially with Amendment 2, where we removed sandbar from the commercial fishery, and sandbar and dusky are caught in similar areas and along the same time, that most of the interactions with dusky sharks are mostly occurring in the research fishery now, but, to answer your question, a lot of the recreational and commercial interactions with dusky sharks do happen more in the Atlantic than they would the Gulf.

MR. SWINDELL: Is the dusky shark a closer-to-shore shark or a deepwater shark?

MR. DUBECK: That's a tough one. They're highly migratory, and so you see them kind of all over. Historically, they're probably more in deeper water, and you see them with sandbar, but some fishermen have said, because of some of the changes we've put in the shark fishery, you're seeing them more closer to shore in sixty feet of water. It kind of varies where they're at, but yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Thank you for your presentation. It was very informative. In the commercial shark fishery, you were talking about 750 hooks, and no more than 800 of them rigged. What type of landings is the shark fishery having in the Gulf? Is it a sustainable fishery, or is there a lot of fishing, longline, specific to the Gulf? Is it highly regulated, more so than just the hooks? What all is involved there?

 MR. DUBECK: The pelagic longline fishery, we recently implemented Amendment 7, and so it's the individual bluefin tuna quota, kind of a catch share, and so the effort has kind of decreased for the pelagic longline fleet because of that, the first year it was implemented, because people are just trying to figure it out. They're separate quotas for the Gulf and the Atlantic, and you can't move Atlantic quota into the Gulf, but you can move Gulf quota out, because the Gulf is a breeding ground for bluefin tuna.

The hook restriction there was something that was proposed to us during our many years of doing this dusky amendment on different alternatives to look at and compare to doing large time/area closures. They're looking at hook restrictions, where the shark would be only -- For mortality purposes, it wouldn't be soaking for such a long time, but the hook restriction didn't impact many of the fisheries.

Most of the fisheries use less than 750 hooks. There is only a few that do more than that, based on our analysis, and so it's not a preferred alternative, but we're looking at it wasn't going to have much impact anyway.

 MR. GREENE: Thank you. I can certainly tell you, from my fishing experience off the northern Gulf coast, off of Alabama and Florida and Mississippi, the shark population has come back extremely, extremely well. Now, I am no shark identifier. There is big ones and little ones, and they've all got lots of teeth, but I can assure you that there is plenty of them there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Greene. Any other comments or questions? Lieutenant Commander Danaher.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Good presentation. Just LCDR DANAHER: For your Alternative A3 on the recreational an observation. alternatives, the identification placard I think is a great idea, and my suggestion would be to add that as some kind of supplement to whatever alternative you choose, for recreational aids and commercial. Anything that in identification of the species to help out will certainly, think, make a difference on the scene when they're trying to figure out what kind of a shark it is.

MR. DUBECK: Thank you, and we do have, right now, a shark placard, but it goes through the steps on trying to identify the species. Dusky shark is not on that, but there are more commonly-occurring species on there, so that fishermen can determine whether they can retain it or not, based on the fin location and the teeth and the look of the body. We have those available now, and anyone that would like them can have them, but we're looking at some more stuff to help with identification purposes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Guy. Why isn't dusky on that identification card?

MR. DUBECK: It's more the laying of certain characteristics. When you first come upon a shark, it's like, well, where is the fin location and how many fins does it have at the top. It's very similar to some of the other species, and so it just happened to not be on there, but we just didn't realize it. We just kind of went through the placard, and dusky sharks is not more of an interactive species, compared to like sandbar and silky, that fishermen might come across.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I will just mention that the states have been compiling very extensive databases on a lot of their

recreational fishermen of late, and so you may want to reach out to them and see if maybe you could get an email sent out, by an avenue of that manner. Some of those fishermen may be more inshore or near-shore fishermen, but it never hurts. Fishermen talk, and so that may be another outreach and education avenue for you. Anything else? Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Just a follow-on with that. HMS does have an HMS news, and I know at the last HMS Advisory Council meeting that we did discuss how better to get that news out to the fishermen on all sorts of issues, and they were contemplating, they being the Sustainable Fisheries Office, on having an opt-out HMS -- You would automatically get the HMS news sent to you on just updating you, unless you opted out. Anyway, they're trying.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dale.

MR. DIAZ: Good presentation. I noticed that, under your alternatives considered, you had oceanic whitetip mentioned for recreational, and then, later in the presentation, you've got annual catch limits and accountability measures, and Draft Amendment 5b clarifications, but that species is not listed there, the oceanic whitetip, and am I missing something?

MR. DUBECK: Oceanic whitetip is just prohibited in ICCAT fisheries, and so if you're fishing with pelagic longline gear or if you're recreational fishing and you land a swordfish or a tuna, you're not allowed to retain oceanic whitetip, but they can be retained in the other fisheries and, recreationally, you are able to retain them, but we mentioned them too because they do have ridgeback, and some of the species that it would be prohibiting would be these that recreational fishermen can normally retain, but, under these alternatives, they would not be able to.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any other questions from the council? Thank you, sir. That was a very interesting presentation. Next on our agenda, we are going to have a presentation on climate vulnerability analysis for Gulf-managed stocks.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: There is another part of the 43 presentation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am cutting you short, and I apologize. 46 Come on up.

MS. JENNIFER CUDNEY: Thank you very much. I will be talking

very briefly about Amendment 10, which is the other FMP amendment that we currently have out for public comment right now with HMS. This is our essential fish habitat revision and update amendment.

I don't think that I need to get too far into what HMS is with everybody here, but I do want to point out that, for Atlantic HMS, we do designate HMS in state waters, and, of course, we cannot designate it in international waters.

This is a timeline of recent HMS EFH actions, and what I would like to focus your attention on is the last three items that are on this list. Starting in 2014, we have our HMS EFH five-year review. We finished that up in 2015, and, based on the outcome of that five-year review, we initiated Draft Amendment 10 this past fall.

The purpose and need, of course, as we went through that review, we have identified new information that warranted updates to EFH boundaries, and we also identified information that was pertinent to our HAPCs, and so we decided that we needed to initiate this amendment, and we are also doing this to be consistent with the best available information provisions under National Standard 2 Guidelines.

I am going to quickly bounce through our Amendment 10 alternatives, and I am going to focus specifically on the things that are pertinent to the Gulf of Mexico, and so you'll see a couple of slides in here that I am not going to talk about. These are related to HAPC alternatives that are in the Atlantic. If you have questions or you would like me to go through them with you, I would be happy to do so, either in the question-and-answer or offline.

The first alternative that we preferred in this amendment is the actual delineation process, which is to basically use Kernal Density Estimation and a 95 percent volume contour method, which I will explain in the next few slides. We would first go out and collect data from internal and external data sources through the five-year review process and the solicitation associated with Draft Amendment 10.

We identified over forty datasets that we then formatted together and put them into GIS, and so this map, the larger map on this slide, is showing you point data associated with bluefin tuna, spawning eggs, and larval life stage, and so this is just an example. There is no confidential information in here. This is all agency data, and so we included it as an example in our

amendment.

 Once we got that data together, we would run the Kernal Density Estimation tool that is in Geospatial Modeling Environment, which is an extension tool that you can download for ArcGIS. It would produce something that looks like this, which is a raw shapefile that we would then edit based on biological information.

These fish aren't going to be showing up on land. Certain species are going to be located at certain distances offshore or with specific habitat, and so this involved a consultation process with our scientists, but also part of this is consultation with the public, and so we have released these maps, sort of putting our best foot forward on what we think the updated EFH is, but we are asking the public to go in and look at the maps that we've produced and provide comment on them.

Our HAPC alternatives, we have two different types of HAPC alternatives, one that looks at our current HAPCs for bluefin tuna and sandbar shark and the other HAPC alternatives are looking at the creation of new HAPCs. The one alternative that is relevant to the Gulf of Mexico management area is Alternative 3b.

This is modifying a current HAPC for bluefin tuna, basically an extension of the HAPC eastward into the eastern part of the Gulf of Mexico, and so it's basically covering more areas where larval bluefin tuna have been found, and it has a higher probability of occurrence, based on some recent literature that came out. This is our sandbar HAPC. We have the other two alternatives creating HAPCs for lemon sharks on the east coast of Florida and sand tiger sharks in the Mid-Atlantic and off of Massachusetts.

Some important reminders. These are not time/area closures, and I do want to point out that, at this point in time, there are no implementing regulations, such as restrictions on fishing or non-fishing activities in this draft amendment.

Our public comment period closes on December 22. There is some information on the slide here that shows you how to submit public comment, and the questions that we are bringing to the council are whether the proposed EFH boundaries are reflecting of EFH for these species, and did we miss anything or are we right on the nose?

Are the proposed updates to HAPC boundaries and the boundaries

of the new HAPCs appropriate? Are there other species for which we should have considered HAPCs? Are there any additional fishing or non-fishing impacts that should be evaluated in the EA? I didn't really get into that here, because we don't have any implementing regulations, but we do provide a discussion of these in the amendment, and we encourage feedback on that. That is it for me.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions or comments from our group? Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Jennifer. Now, the expansion of the HAPC in the Gulf is being proposed based on the probability of the larvae as you're seeing it, more towards central Florida, and, or but, NOAA researchers have seen that there is also a spawning ground in the North Atlantic, over by the Slope Sea, and is your office also looking to make a HAPC out of that area, based on that research?

MS. CUDNEY: At this time, we are looking at including that area as EFH, but not specifically as a HAPC yet. We're waiting for more information to come out from the Science Centers. It's something that we would probably consider in a future revision and update to EFH, in the next five-year review. It's definitely something that we will take a look at.

DR. DANA: But if it's a spawning area and you know it to be a spawning area, and this HAPC expansion in the Gulf is based on new research, why wouldn't there be more emphasis with the Slope Sea and doing the same as what you're proposing in the Gulf?

CUDNEY: this time, the primary spawning area MS. Αt considered to be the Gulf of Mexico, and so the HAPC is really focused on protecting spawning habitat in the Gulf of Mexico, as it is recognized as the primary spawning grounds for western Atlantic bluefin tuna, but I do get where you're coming from. It is something that we are aware of and keeping an eye on, and it's going to be kind of a stay-tuned thing and see what the new literature brings up. This is based on, I believe, one year of data, and so I think, before we can consider a HAPC up in that particular region, we're going to want to see more sampling, more data, that kind of suggests the same thing. That's going to really boost the merit of expanding a HAPC up into that region.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have a question. The HAPC for bluefin tuna, you say it has no regulations associated with it, and is that correct? Is that what you said?

MS. CUDNEY: We are just considering expanding it eastward, and so the teeth with this is going to come from any consultations that are happening through the habitat consultation process, and so that's not really us. That's the Office of Habitat Conservation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and that was my question. I wondered - Obviously I knew there was a purpose, and, if it wasn't the fishing regulations side, I wondered where it was, but it's the consultation process that would go on mainly with the oil and gas industry or what?

MS. CUDNEY: Various mineral and energy fields of oil and gas and maybe liquid natural gas. It's basically any sort of fishing or non-fishing activities or development in those areas that undergo consultation. They would basically be looking at what is EFH in that area, and the fact that there's a HAPC there really focuses the question on whether or not those activities would affect spawning bluefin.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Thank you. That was a very interesting presentation, and I apologize for not remembering that you all were a tag-team. Any other questions or feedback for our presenters? Okay. I think that wraps up our HMS Amendment 5b and HMS Amendment 10 presentation. Now, we will move on to our Climate Vulnerability Analysis for Gulf-Managed Stocks, and that is under Tab A, Number 8 in our briefing book, and we're going to have the SEFSC, and is that going to be you, Dr. Ponwith? Okay.

CLIMATE VULNERABILITY ANALYSIS FOR GULF-MANAGED STOCKS

DR. PONWITH: That is going to be me, and that is an excellent opportunity for me to acknowledge that the the person in the Southeast Fisheries Science Center who has been leading this effort on behalf of us is Dr. John Quinlan, and I want to acknowledge his work in preparing us for this very next step in our work on climate.

Today, we're going to be talking about the Climate Vulnerability Assessment, which we are going to kick off in 2017. This is related to the National Climate Science Strategy that NOAA Fisheries put out last fall, and the other thing that we have been working on throughout 2016 is the Gulf of Mexico's Climate Science Regional Action Plan, and that will ring a bell with you, because many of you came to the workshop that was held in November of last year to kick off this effort, and many of you

contributed to the comments that came from the Gulf Council on our Draft Regional Action Plan when we put it out for public comment.

I just want to pause for a second acknowledgement, and that is to thank the Gulf Council for the thoughtful input that was provided that really helped us strengthen this regional action plan, and I think that's particularly important, because we view the Gulf Council as one of our primary clients of this regional action plan, one of the groups that I think will really benefit from the fact that that plan will be implemented beginning this year.

The purpose behind the climate vulnerability assessment is to determine what stocks in the Gulf of Mexico are susceptible to changes in a changing climate, and that could be shifts in abundance or shifts in productivity or densities and things like that.

Today, we're going to talk a little bit about what that process looks like, and this is kind of a schematic of what that process We will begin by looking at the vulnerability looks like. assessment framework, and, essentially, what we're looking at is examples of sensitivity attributes, which might complexities in the reproduction of these animals or habitat specificity, and, adding to that, examples of climate factors, like sea surface temperature or changes in salinity or changes ocean acidification, and looking at those things combination.

We use existing information that we have in hand right now to create species profiles and then build on those species profiles using, again, existing information plus expert opinion to score each of these stocks in the Gulf of Mexico relative to how vulnerable they are to some of these climate factors.

 Then the next step is to look at multi-stock vulnerability scores and rankings of those scores within the Gulf of Mexico. Then we will use that input and those analyses to generate a vulnerability report for each of the species relative to these key attributes, and that is just kind of an overview of how that process is going to work.

The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council has a key role to play in this, and, again, you've been very collaborative in our work thus far. We look forward to that continuing, going into the future, and we think it's going to be really valuable to get your help to prioritize the species and the stocks to assess.

 We're not going to be able to do all of these. We really want to focus on the ones that we think are ecologically or economically important in the Gulf of Mexico and are worthy of looking at relative to some of these climate drivers. We also want to understand your take on regional climate processes. What kind of climate impacts do you anticipate, in your views, to be the ones we should be focusing on?

Again, we have a lot of people with fantastic data holdings, in terms of the fishing industry themselves, as well as our state and interstate partners, to help us with life history data, which are going to be crucial tools for helping with these evaluations. Suggesting tangible products that we could be generating that would help you as decision makers in the Gulf of Mexico make climate-informed decisions, which is ultimately what this is all about.

What kind of materials or decision support tools would best support management, ecological impacts, biological opinions, and then also your input on the best way to communicate some of these results.

Again, the purpose that we're focusing on for doing these climate vulnerability analyses is to understand climate model projections within the region and what kind of gaps in ecological knowledge we have to understand what those climate impacts in the Gulf would be on the species that we're managing here, to help establish how stocks might respond, a decline or, in some cases, potentially even expand in response to these climate drivers, and then to identify communities dependent on vulnerable stocks, once we know which stocks are indeed vulnerable, to build a greater economic resilience to climate change going forward.

 Before we go to questions and comments, just how are we going to go about doing this vulnerability analysis? It's kind of a two-way matrix. The things that we're looking at are exposure to some of these climate signals, like sea surface temperature and currents and precipitation, and then look at that in combination with the sensitivity of these different organisms throughout their life history to those exposures, and that, in combination, gives us the ability to score these individual species in terms of their own vulnerability.

This is just kind of an example of how we would walk through a species or relative to some of the questions we would have about their vulnerability to climate impacts, and so that is the

presentation, and I guess what I would do is open it up to questions.

We are designing the process right now. The Northeast led this, and they have completed their climate vulnerability analysis. We will go to school on things they did that were particularly successful and be carrying these out throughout the year, and one of the questions we're doing right now is looking at whether we should do this in conjunction with the South Atlantic or whether we should do these separately, and we're willing to entertain your input on that as well. At this point, any questions or comments?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Dr. Ponwith. That was very interesting. Are there any questions or comments from the group? I have a comment. I have listened to a few presentations on the same general topic, on different coastlines though and things that they're seeing, more directed at the Atlantic, and now they're seeing some shifts in different populations, either northward or southward, and I believe most of it was relative to maybe some changes in temperature, water temperature, but the Gulf is a little different, kind of, in a lot of ways.

 That Atlantic coastline, for the most part, is all U.S. coastline, until you get very far north, whereas, here in the Gulf, we think of it as the Gulf and we have our five states, but it does continue on southward, that coastline does, and it leaves things -- It leaves our jurisdiction, for sure, and we go down into Mexico and curve back around, and its not a closed system, obviously, but, if you look at the coastline, it does loop in and just about come back together.

 I would like to see how these impacts are going to be different for our system versus a system that's managed just about from one end to the other, as a north-south line that's all U.S. coastline, as I said, until you get to the very -- It has different management implications and things that we can control and things that are going to be outside of our control, but, if we could know a little bit better what to expect and where we can see certain shifts possibly coming or movements, that would be very interesting, I think, to see that comparison.

 DR. PONWITH: That's excellent, because that is almost like I bribed you to ask the question. I am actually really interested in that kind of comparison as well, and our ability to complete this climate vulnerability analysis with respect to the context that we're functioning in in the Gulf of Mexico. Once we finish

that, it will be a fascinating comparison of how things are similar and how things are different in these very different ecosystems, comparing the Atlantic seaboard to the Gulf of Mexico.

4 5 6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

1

2

3

You bring up an interesting component, and that is the fact that we do have a system that borders international interests as and we're aware of that and are raising international fora, through the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem Program, through our bilateral with the NOAA Fisheries counterpart in Mexico, which is INAPESCA, and making sure that aware that we're doing this and looking opportunities to collaborate, to understand, could we be seeing northward movements of species that are thermally challenged from increased sea surface temperatures, or I think one of the more interesting signals that we could see is changes, subtle in sea surface temperature influencing current changes, patterns.

18 19 20

2122

23

2425

26

There, a subtle change in temperature can have profound changes in current patterns, which can really influence recruitment processes in the Gulf of Mexico, and I think that's going to be one of the more interesting areas that we should be on the lookout for, and so I agree with you, and I think that comparison will be very interesting. I will be looking forward to completing the vulnerability analysis so we can more directly answer questions like that.

272829

30 31

32

33

34

35

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It may increase our collaboration with the Caribbean Council, and that would make for a very nice joint meeting. You've always got to think about the positives. All right. Thank you, Dr. Ponwith, for that presentation. Next, if he's ready, we're going to have Mr. Rusty Pittman come up and give his Mississippi Law Enforcement Presentation. You can find this in your briefing book under Tab A, Number 9, and we are very excited to have you, sir.

363738

MISSISSIPPI LAW ENFORCEMENT PRESENTATION

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

MR. RUSTY PITTMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair, and good afternoon. I am Rusty Pittman, Assistant Chief of the Marine Patrol for the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources. As you can see on our first slide, this is our mission statement with the cooperative law enforcement through the Gulf states. The last two sentences are to enhance, protect, and conserve, and that's what we're all about.

46 47 48

This is last year, which our contract ended in August, some of

our achievements and our accomplishments that we did. We had 2,044 man hours dedicated to enforcement of federal fishery regulations and 894 vessel hours dedicated to inshore, midrange, and offshore patrols. These patrols resulted in 191 commercial contacts and 797 recreational contacts.

Some of the fishery violations that we came across were, for state violations, we had forty-two, and they were issued for various offenses. There was red snapper during the closed season, undersized red snapper, and the possession of gray triggerfish during the closed season.

Three of our cases that we referred to the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement were possession of a prohibited species, the dusky shark. Now, I did this presentation before the presentation on the dusky shark, and so we didn't talk about this. There was also illegal turtle excluder devices and no federal shrimping permit. The first two cases, one was the officer with NOAA, the law enforcement with NOAA, James Kejonen, is here today, and he is handling those two cases for us for the federal.

That is your dusky shark. This was brought in by a fisherman to a tournament to be entered as a bull shark. It just so happened that the weigh master at the tournament was one of our retired biologists, Buck Buchannan, and he notified us, and we sent an officer over there to handle the case.

This is the turtle excluder device. In talking to James and other federal law enforcement officers and state officers, we have never come across anything like this with a chain that was sewn into the second flap and tied down. This captain also, two weeks later, was stopped again, this time by NOAA, and cited for an illegal TED violation.

My picture didn't turn out that good. The bow does go a little further than what it's showing, but this is one of our inshore, midrange, and offshore patrol vessels. This was a Silver Ship that was built back in the 1990s that we had refurbished a few years ago with funds through NOAA and the joint enforcement.

 Our dedicated offshore patrol vessel is the forty-eight-foot Mississippi. It was built by Silver Ships, too. The one that we're fixing to really be proud of, that you all haven't seen, that hardly anybody has seen, is the new vessel here, built by Silver Ships, again, and they won the bid. This is a forty-one foot, and it will be powered by three 350 horsepower Mercury motors. It was purchased through NOAA, with our funds through the joint enforcement agreement. It should be delivered this

week. We are expecting delivery on Friday. We were hoping that delivery would have been here today, and we were going to bring it around so we could show the council our vessel, but it's not going to be here until Friday. It's outfitted with up-to-date electronics, and it will handle a crew of up to six officers.

This is the picture of it as it's being built in Silver Ships, in the hangar, and that's the inside of the cabin there with all of the electronics in it. Then there's the triple 350s. It will do a speed of seventy miles per hour, but we were told the fuel range is amount per gallon, and so, with 475 gallons of fuel, we'll be able to go far offshore, which this boat will be specifically used for offshore patrols in the EEZ, as far as we can go and come back.

Marine Patrol's continued success means continued enforcement through the joint enforcement agreement. It means continued patrols in the EEZ for federal fishery compliance, and it means with our continued strong partnerships federal and Ιt means continuing our mission of protecting, and conserving marine resources in federal and state If there is any questions about the two cases, the federal cases that are pending, two of three, James, Officer Kejonen, is here, and he will be glad to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Excellent presentation, and I just want to personally say thank you for everything that you do for us out there. We appreciate it. Were there any other questions or comments for Mr. Pittman? Dale and then Chris.

MR. DIAZ: Rusty, I want to thank you also. I've known Rusty since 1990, and Rusty has been a very effective leader for our Marine Patrol since 1990. He has been a mentor and trained a lot of young officers, and I think one of the best compliments I can give you is you enforce the law and use a whole lot of common sense, and I think that's what has made you so successful for the State of Mississippi.

 I do notice that you've got highlighted in here, Rusty, the joint enforcement agreements, and, since I have known you, these joint enforcement agreements have went from a very small amount of money that used to be transferred to the state, \$25,000 or \$30,000, or maybe \$50,000 at one time, but now it's morphed into where it's enough where we actually can pay people to put hours into doing some of this offshore enforcement, and I think the Coast Guard does a very good job, but the Coast Guard alone, I don't think, could give us the level of enforcement that we're getting now. What's your thoughts about how things are going

with the joint enforcement agreement and any other needs that you might have from that agreement?

MR. PITTMAN: It would always be nice to get more money, but we're happy with what we get, and we use -- We are very conservative with what we spend. Of course, with our equipment, half of that from this year's contract, or last year's contract, went for that boat. The other goes for, as you said, time-and-a-half for officers on their days off to patrol the federal EEZ.

Also, the Coast Guard, we do joint patrols with the Coast Guard, where we will have officers board and go on their boats with them and go off together, and so that's worked out great, and the same thing with NOAA, with the law enforcement officers with NOAA and James. We have all done joint patrols. Alabama and Louisiana, we've done patrols with both states.

As a matter of a fact, we're going to be doing a detail tomorrow with Louisiana and Alabama, and so it's really worked out great, and hopefully we can keep the joint enforcement agreement, keep the funding for it, and, like you said, Dale, we started out with very little. I think it was like \$10,000, maybe, or \$20,000, the first year, and I appreciate all the kind words you said about me, but remember now that you were my lieutenant at one time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I just wanted to thank Rusty for the presentation and tell you that I have always enjoyed working with you, for the past twenty years or more, and I think you do a good job over here in Mississippi, and I've enjoyed partnering with you, and I'm so glad that, as we continue that state partnership, that we can continue to build you boats in Alabama for you all to patrol out of.

MR. PITTMAN: I appreciate that, Director. I will tell you this. Scott approached me yesterday and said he's going to hit you up, because he went over and saw the boat the other day.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Lieutenant Commander.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Officer Pittman, great presentation. I wanted to ask you, but how often -- It doesn't necessarily have to be your agency, but any observations that you have had. You briefed some good compliance measurements today, from your agency specifically, and how often do you see that happening at either council meetings or other types of

functions, where you're producing that compliance measurement?

MR. PITTMAN: You're talking about the compliance rates and how we were checking people in the federal EEZ? Is that what you're talking about?

LCDR DANAHER: Correct, because you have the numbers of how many boardings you conducted and then how many violations you discovered from those boardings.

MR. PITTMAN: Right, and the compliance rate is really -- You have a lot of fishermen. You have probably a lot more recreational fishermen than you do commercial fishermen, and, with the checks that we do, the compliance rate is really good. You have a few that always violate, but, compared to the last several years, compliance is going up. It really is.

LCDR DANAHER: Another question I have, sir, is do you ever work with partner agencies, either from your state or other states or even the Coast Guard? Have you ever sat down to like compare the numbers before?

MR. PITTMAN: We haven't, and that's a good question. I think we ought to sit down and see where we're going and where we've come from and check it that way on compliance. That could lead into a better partnership with the neighboring states and the Coast Guard and NOAA.

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, sir, and thank you again.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate it.

MR. PITTMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Next on our agenda, we're going to go through the Landings Summaries. Ms. Gerhart, I think you're going to help us with that.

NMFS-SERO LANDINGS SUMMARIES

 MS. GERHART: This is Tab A-10 in your briefing book. We have already seen this tab a little bit earlier today, or I guess it was yesterday, when we were talking about gray triggerfish. This is both going to be reef fish and coastal migratory pelagic species. On the first page, we have reef fish.

Starting with commercial, there's just the two species that we do regular dealer monitoring with. Remember that the rest of

the species are either in the IFQ program, and so they aren't through this type of monitoring, or they are part of a stock complex.

Just as a point, the stock groups, we don't have updates to in this report, and the reason is we were a little late on getting all the data, and we really just didn't have time for those, and so we will show you those next time, but, if you would like to look at them, they are on our website, the Southeast Region website, and that shows those stocks. Again, those are ones where there is no commercial and recreational allocation. There is a single ACL.

That leaves just the two commercial species, gray triggerfish and greater amberjack. As you can see, gray triggerfish is at around 67 percent of the quota at this point, and these landings -- It says August 5 there, but that's not correct. It's through October 11, and so this up until last week, and so they're the most recent landings that we have.

Greater amberjack did reach the ACL, or the ACT rather, and it actually exceeded the ACT, but it did not exceed the ACL. It was shut down on October 4 of this year, and so that remains shut for the rest of this fishing year, which is through December 31. Gray triggerfish is still open at this time.

For the recreational landings, you can see there the two where we have exceeded the ACLs. Our triggerfish, again, we talked about that earlier, and these landings are through Wave 3, and you can see that there is still some time in there. We did not open either gray triggerfish or greater amberjack after the spawning season closure, which was June and July, and so, on August 1, that normally reopens. We did not reopen either of those, because the quota had been caught by that time.

The other species, you can see are below their ACTs and ACLs at this time, and we did talk about red snapper again yesterday, and these numbers are the same as in the table that you saw there, but it's just for this particular year that's shown.

This is then the coastal migratory pelagics. What you see is actually all king mackerel. Spanish mackerel and cobia are both stock ACLs, and so, again, no allocation between the commercial and recreational sectors. Those aren't shown here, but they are well below their ACLs, and you can see those exact numbers on our website, if you would like.

For commercial, again, the data dates, it says August dates

there. Again, this actually should be October 11, our most recent, and so it's the most recent final week that we had those landings reports. Starting with the Western Zone, you can see 95 percent. We actually closed the Western Zone this past Friday, which is the $14^{\rm th}$, at noon, and so the Western Zone is closed now.

One thing to note about all of these quotas is these are the quotas without the increase that was approved by this council through Amendment 26. That is still in the process of going through secretarial review, and it will be implemented, hopefully, within the next few months. If that does happen, we would do a reopening of any of the closed zones to utilize the rest of that additional quota that is coming out.

Another thing that is part of Amendment 26 was moving the boundary between the Gulf and South Atlantic groups and making it a permanent boundary that doesn't shift over the course of the year from winter to summer.

Because Amendment 26 isn't in place yet, that shift will still take place on November 1, so that the east coast Florida subzone for the Gulf will come into existence on November 1, under that quota that it's under the old system. However, our expectation is that we will get the implementation of 26 in place before the end of the fishing year and then we will readjust, so that any of those landings in that zone will then be counted against the Atlantic quota instead of this east coast quota, which will no longer exist for the Gulf. Again, that's a little bit complicated, if you all remember from Amendment 26, but I can explain that further later if you would like.

Then the Northern Zone just opened up on October 1, and so they have less than two weeks of landings, but they're at 23 percent right now, and so we're watching that zone closely to see when that may need to close, and, again, if we do close them, we would likely reopen them if Amendment 26 is approved and implemented.

 The Southern Zone is open. It's been open since July 1. However, the fish are not down there yet. I imagine that they will start coming down there fairly soon. We see, towards the end of the year, that we start to see landings from that zone, but, right now, we don't have any landings. Then the gillnet season is closed until the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day, and that's January 17 this year, and so that remains closed and will be open at that time.

Finally, the recreational, this is actually the 2015/2016 landings, which have just become complete, and so the Wave 3 that we saw for the other species is the last wave of this fishing year, and so that May/June you see is the Wave 3 for 2016, and so this is mostly complete. We are still missing Texas data for the high season, and so part of May and all of June are missing from Texas, but, other than that, these are fairly complete numbers for that last fishing season, and so only about 36 percent of the quota was taken. I will take any questions, if you have them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Sue. Martha.

MS. GUYAS: Sue, it looks like you guys have Wave 4 for some species, but not others. When do you think we could see Wave 4 for some of these other species?

MS. GERHART: As we talked about with the red snapper landings that we did yesterday, those are very preliminary. Those are just out of MRIP. They are MRIP only, and so they don't include Texas, LA Creel, and I don't think they even include the headboat data, and so they are very preliminary.

Also, even the MRIP data goes to the Science Center for some adjustments that are due to some things that are specific to the Southeast Region, and so my expectation of when that will be available would be probably, I am guessing, another month, maybe, from now, but they will be posted on our website when it's ready.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dale.

MR. DIAZ: Ms. Gerhart, thank you all for getting those red snapper numbers to us for that discussion yesterday. I know they are very preliminary, but that was very helpful, and so I appreciate you all working extra hard to get those.

 I just want to make sure that, for greater amberjack, your table shows that, for the percent ACL, we're at 112 percent, and so we're -- If that's correct, we're in a situation where there is going to be a small payback for next year with greater amberjack? Is that correct?

MS. GERHART: Yes, and, once we finalize those numbers. Again, these are preliminary, but, if that remains, then any amount over the ACL does go as a payback the next year.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Gerhart, you said it, but I just missed

it. You said with the pending Amendment 26 and finalizing all of that that, if there's anything there, that you may be reopening some of those commercial seasons, and did you say weeks or months on those openings, if they come to fruition?

MS. GERHART: As to how long the opening would be? We would have to look at how much quota there actually is and look at catch rates and try to calculate that. It will be one of those things that is maybe a little difficult, because we, particularly with the Western and Northern Zone, we almost always are closed in the fall, and there is no fishing in the spring.

If we do spring fishing, we would have to do some estimates of what fishing rates might be then, and so we don't have -- We haven't done that yet, because, again, we haven't gotten -- We don't know how much was actually caught through this season to know how much they will have, but the increase for the Northern Zone in particular is a quite substantial amount of quota increase, and so we would imagine that it would be open for a while.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. I appreciate that update. Any other questions? Yes, Mr. Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I am concerned when I look at the landings, particularly for red snapper, even for the for-hire during that January, February, March, and April timeframe. I guess most of those are going to be from discards? Most of that is where that would come from?

MS. GERHART: No, these would be landings. One of the things we did look into, if you're comparing to previous years, is that some of the states, at least, were open January 1. Plus, on top of that, remember that we had the nine-mile extension off of the northern states, and so that's why we believe those early waves are a little bit higher than what we've seen in previous years.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: For the for-hire vessels as well?

MS. GERHART: The for-hire, I think Jessica tried to explain this a little earlier. The for-hire landings outside of the season come from the headboat survey, and the headboat survey has mostly federally-permitted vessels, but there is at least one, and maybe more, vessels that are not federally-permitted and therefore could have been fishing in state waters outside of the federal season. That would be where those landings came from.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: That vessel did well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Any other questions? All right. We are slightly ahead of schedule. We are scheduled for a short break before public comment. We're scheduled for a break in about fifteen minutes from now, and so what I would like to do, while we have just a second, is I checked with all of our different counterparts around the room that would give some liaison reports to us.

 Charlie told me that he has one in our briefing book, and he referred us to that, if we would like to take a look at some of the things the South Atlantic is doing, but I believe Lieutenant Commander Danaher has a couple of slides that you would like to show us, and we'll go ahead and entertain that, if you're ready.

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Go ahead.

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATE U.S. COAST GUARD

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm just going to knock out the update today. The intent for this meeting was to conduct more of a thorough update on the illegal fishing and the lancha interdictions on the U.S.-Mexico border, but we're going to wait and do a more comprehensive and thorough briefing in January. There were just two slides that I created real quickly here that I wanted to show you.

Something that we try and obtain as often as possible is larger cutter support in the Gulf. District 8, which is headquartered out of New Orleans, normally only has access to air stations and patrol boats, which can get the bulk of the work done, but, when we're trying to maintain a more enduring presence in certain areas, it's helpful when we can get larger cutter support from the boss's boss up there in the Atlantic area and Norfolk.

Cutter Resolute is going to be supporting us this fall. I am not at liberty to discuss the details of the patrol schedule, but the two primary areas that we will be focusing on and applying this cutter support is the maritime boundary line and also the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary. They will be performing law enforcement missions in those areas.

The associated pictures that are there just represent some of

the other capabilities the cutter will have. It will be taking on a helicopter, an MH-65 Dolphin, and not the entire time, but during some of the more focused operations, and then also the Mark III, over the horizon, cutter boat, which increases the pursuit capability for the cutter.

Just the other item that I wanted to make note of is that Commander Carmen DeGeorge who is, if I'm not mistaken, was formerly in this chair years ago, is the Commanding Officer of this cutter, and so he's got a distinct passion for helping us out here in the Gulf this fall.

Just another little event to capture is it was an interagency event that occurred just last week. On the morning of October 13, the U.S. Coast Guard duty section at Station South Padre Island was monitoring the maritime boundary line with a newly-installed long-range infrared camera. It can see usually about fifteen nautical miles out.

Northbound high-speed contact was spotted with the camera, and the duty personnel alerted local law enforcement and Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine regarding the vessel. The air and marine resources, there were some that were on patrol that early morning, and those vessels were vectored to intercept the contact of interest that was northbound.

Local and state law enforcement also coordinated intercept on the beach, and they observed a contraband transfer between the lancha and a pickup truck. 730 pounds of marijuana was seized, and several suspects were arrested on the beach. The lancha fled the scene, but then was quickly interdicted by the CBP Air and Marine speedboat, who apprehended the four-person crew.

 The reason I bring this up is it just further defines the diverse criminal element that we're facing on the southern border, aside from the illegal fisheries, and the drug smuggling and the human trafficking are other components that we're trying to counter in addition to the illegal lancha fishing, which we'll talk more about in a few months. This was a great example, a textbook case, of agencies working together, and they achieved a successful endgame, and that's all I have, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. That was a very interesting presentation. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Quick question, Madam Chairman. Just speaking of the lancha fleet that you were discussing a couple of months

ago, we will get an update? I was just curious about where we are with that, or we'll hear an update soon, you mentioned?

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, Dr. Stunz. We did establish a record for lancha interdictions in Fiscal Year 2016. It was forty-five interdictions. Now, that doesn't include how many times we either intercepted a contact that was successfully able to flee back into Mexican waters before we could apprehend them or a detection via like an aircraft detection, where we didn't have a surface asset on scene to make an interdiction, but it was forty-five lanchas for Fiscal Year 2016, which is pretty good. I believe it was thirty-nine the year before.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: If I could, I just want to thank you and your efforts. Obviously our folks were involved as well, and we certainly appreciate the cooperation down there, especially when you see these kinds of efforts that happen routinely, unfortunately, probably too routinely, but where it really takes all of those enforcement efforts working together, and so I appreciate that.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: You said the camera had the visibility for fifteen miles? It was fifteen miles east or fifteen miles west, and so you have a coverage of thirty miles?

LCDR DANAHER: No, that's fifteen miles total, Mr. Walker. It's on top of a tower, but we're trying to increase the detection capabilities on the border in as many different ways as we can. Mr. Walker, if you cross the border and go south into Mexican territorial seas, I can't help you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. It sounds like there's a lot of anticipation for your next presentation as well in January, and so thank you, sir. All right. We're going to take a short break now. We are scheduled for public testimony at 2:45. Let's take a break and be back at 2:40, since we tend to run a little late. Let's shoot for 2:40 at the table. Thank you, guys.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

48 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Good afternoon, everyone. Public input is a

vital part of the council's deliberative process. Comments, both oral and written, are accepted and considered by the council throughout the process. The Sustainable Fisheries Act requires that all statements include a brief description of the background and interest of the person in the subject of the statement. All written information shall include a statement of the source and date of such information.

Oral or written communications provided to the council, its members, or its staff, that relate to matters within the council's purview are public in nature. Please give any written comments to the staff, as well as all written comments will also be posted on the council's website for viewing by council members and the public, and it will be maintained by the council as part of the permanent record.

Knowingly and willfully submitting false information to the council is a violation of federal law. If you plan to speak and haven't already done so, please sign in at the iPad registration station located at the entrance to the meeting room. We accept only one registration per person.

 Each speaker is allowed three minutes for their testimony. Please note the timer lights on the podium, as they will be green for the first two minutes and yellow for the final minute of testimony. After the three minutes is up, the red light will blink, and a buzzer may sound. Additional time is allowed to dignitaries providing testimony, at the discretion of the Chair. First up this afternoon for public testimony, we will have Mr. Bill Kelly, followed by Mr. Gary Bryant.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. BILL KELLY: Madam Chair and members of the council, Bill Kelly representing the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's Association. I would like to thank the council again for moving forward with the circle hook exemption for commercial fishermen on yellowtail snapper in the Gulf. I appreciate that.

I also wanted to talk to you with regard to CMP Amendment 29, and I want to thank you again for moving forward with that as well. That concept first put forward by Madam Chair Bosarge and translated into science speak by council staff member Ryan Rindone was a very positive step to move forward here.

I am dismayed, and I had to scratch my head, which is probably the reason I've lost so much hair, but to listen to SSC comments regarding data inefficiencies in managing kingfish, that we're

going to have to reduce the ACL over the next couple of years.

Here is a stock of fish that's been under one of the most successful rebuilding processes in the history of the fishery, thirty years worth, and more than thirty-million pounds left on the table over the last ten years by the recreational sector, and we still have concerns about whether or not we should move forward.

As Mr. Sanchez pointed out, we're essentially fishing about four or five tiers down from OY, MSY. You throw in scientific uncertainty and management uncertainty and you take a risk-averse approach, and then you have to wonder what on earth is going on here that we don't have positive signals that we can move forward in allocations with this fishery, and that's another important point here.

Reallocation and allocation aren't dirty words, and they need to be addressed by the council. With the SSC and what they've done with kingfish here, it's now obvious that underfishing is just as detrimental to the users as overfishing is to the stocks, and then they turn around and tell us that we've got too many old fish out there, and it's incumbent on the councils to allocate appropriately so that we can harvest the numbers that they set forth.

Anyway, this is a very positive step in the right direction, and I want to salute all of you on taking that action, and I hope that those preferreds will carry through the Full Council meeting this week so that they can be forwarded to the South Atlantic Council for additional positive action. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Gary Bryant, followed by Walter McNeil.

MR. GARY BRYANT: I'm Gary Bryant, owner and operator of Red Eye Charters from Fort Morgan, Alabama. I'm also one of the members of the AP panel for charter/for-hire. Most of my comments today will be about 41 and 42. On 42, I like what they have. They have multiple species, and they have a landings history. That gives them a leg up on what they're going to get. If it moves forward, they will get the opportunity to catch what they have historically caught. As a member of 41, that's what I want.

The problem is to get there. I please encourage you all to move the ELBs forward, so we can start building some history. To move away from the derby, we need to have a product that's better. To have that, we need some landing histories. We have been under our target, our catch target, the last two years, and so that means there is no reason why I should have less fish under the new program than I am actually catching. We have not gone over our target, and so there's no reason that everyone participating in the fishery should have less fish.

The problem is the plan doesn't look at who is participating. It tries to divide fish equally, or in some fashion, among everybody, and we need to identify the people that are fishing. We need to identify how much they are actually fishing. There are areas of the Gulf that the fish are closer in than others.

I happen to be in an area where I can run multiple trips a day, because the fish are twelve to fifteen miles out. Under the derby last year, I gave seventy-six groups access to our fish. Under the plans we're looking at now, I'm looking at maybe eight trips that I can give access to the fish. Like I said, the main thing is we are under our target. If we do this right, everybody should be able to catch what they've been catching. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Walter McNeil, followed by Troy Frady.

MR. WALTER MCNEIL: I am Walter McNeil. I'm a charter captain Nicole Fishing Charters out of and owner of Fort I am also a reef fish shareholder in the commercial sector. The biggest thing for me right now is I think we need to -- On the Amendment 42 and the 41, the charter sector separation and fish allocation and everything, we've got -- The main thing is logbooks. We've got to get some up-to-date logbooks, and we've got VMS on our vessels right now, and we've had some -- This past year, everything worked smooth, and we should have some catch history, but we need to have an official catch history.

The people that are fishing and making a living at it are the ones that need to have this allocation when it does come out, and, on the kingfish, you all are talking about doing three fish per person and going up from two, and I would like to see the size limit go down, because sometimes we'll go out there and I will catch eight or ten kingfish that are twenty-three inches and I have to throw them back and my customers can't keep anything, whereas, if we're going -- Like the guy said earlier, we're leaving fish on the table, and there is no sense in not dropping the size limit and letting some customers keep some fish. That's all I've got. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Troy Frady, followed by Bart Niquet.

MR. TROY FRADY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Troy Frady. I'm a charter boat captain from Orange Beach, Alabama. I've been in business for fourteen years, and I really enjoy making 100 percent of my income charter fishing. I am here on my own, and I am speaking only for myself.

I feel like we need to expedite data collection, so we can identify the charter/for-hire industry and the participants who are fishing. I support every participating vessel having a permanently-affixed electronic logbook and have a backup plan, just in case of mechanical failure.

 I think Amendment 41 and 42 should continue moving forward, but I want to make sure that you've thought everything through before implementation, because, if you do something wrong now, it will be difficult to change it later.

I know 40 and 41 and 42 are all about red snapper. Well, 41 has a couple of other species in there, but I am tired of talking about ARS, and if American red snapper is the problem with everybody in here, why don't you consider, just for the time being, to remove red snapper from the document and add a multispecies component to it and let it run for a while? Let 41 and 42 run.

That way, it will give you an opportunity to work out and fix any unintended problems that you have with the program. As a model, start with everyone gets an equal share and allow transfers. After three years, or however many years we deem possible, let's say 50 percent get -- After three years, let's take a portion of those fish that everyone was allocated back. Say if you take 50 percent back from everybody and you redistribute it to those participants who are left in the industry after you have identified who is using the shares, and it will also allow for new entrants coming into the program.

By only taking back a portion, it means the vessel owners can plan for the future, with a set amount of fish, and the redistributed portion goes to those who are actively landing the species. Redistribution could also include an additional bump in the quota to those who have multi-passenger boats who have been paying their dues for three years. It would also help those, like I said, for new entrants.

We can do this on like a continuous rolling cycle every three

years or every four years. By doing so, this will identify the latent permits and allow new entrants and end up with an allocation with all who actually fish it. God bless you, and let's make fishing great again.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Bart Niquet, followed by Dale Woodruff.

MR. BART NIQUET: Good afternoon. I am glad to be here. Thank you for letting me talk. I have a few minor things. On the Flower Gardens, I think to leave it status quo and perhaps put a few permanent anchor buoys down so that people can tie up to it. That won't help much, but it will be there.

On the minimum size on gag grouper, the only ones small like that that I see being caught are on TV in Tampa Bay and Biscayne Bay, and they go in there with iceboxes, and I never see them release one, and so maybe that's part of your problem.

The hailing proposals are redundant and confusing. you leave well enough alone on that? On the inactive permits, right now, they act as a built-in buffer and promote more rapid If the council decides to redistribute growth of the stock. them, the rules you set up at the beginning of the IFQ program mandate that they be split evenly between the shareholders, regardless of them having a reef fish permit or not. fish rescinded that reef permit at the qualification period, after the last review, and remember that? It's already in your minutes. Read them.

It seems odd to me that our dockside people report that the average size of headboat red snapper and commercial boat red snapper are between four and six pounds, and the average size of a charter and private boat fish are between twelve and fifteen pounds, and some of them are up to twenty. It might be two separate Gulfs, but let's be realists. Most of your rules don't do much more than confuse the issue. You know the private boat anglers are going to bring in the biggest fish they can, and you have too many people fishing with no control over them.

The triggerfish program, how could the SSC and the rest of the council miss the size of this species and how, with all the resources of the U.S. government left to you, you could set up a program with no way to modify it or get out of it? That's poor, poor planning.

47 Leasing allocation seems to be a problem with the committee, 48 but, if you remember when they came up with this, deciding the goals of the IFQ program, I was on the Reef Fish Panel at that time, and we were led by a member of your staff, big Dave McKinney. As one of the major parts of that, he said that we would be able to lease or sell fish inside the shareholders stock. That was one of the main parts that they had, so that boats coming with an overload of fish could reach out. You had twenty days, at that time, before he would be fined, so that he could find poundage.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Niquet, I need you to wrap it up, please, 11 sir.

MR. B. NIQUET: I will be through in just a moment. Yes, ma'am. Maybe either somebody in the council was lying then or they're being lied to now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Dale Woodruff, followed by Joe Nash.

MR. DALE WOODRUFF: My name is Dale Woodruff. I've got two boats out of Orange Beach, one dually-permitted six-pack with a commercial permit and one that's a multi-passenger vessel with up to twenty passengers. Guys, we need electronic logbooks. We've been up here at this podium too many times, too many years, and said the same things over and over and over again, and we're still asking for electronic logbooks.

Two-thirds of the fishery has some type of data reporting, and we're still trying to fix the other third, and it's getting tiresome. It's simple. I'm sorry if somebody don't want one on their boat. I don't believe they're fully invested if they don't. I don't believe they want to be in this business if they don't want to report their fish. Maybe they are trying to do cash sales and not reporting to the IRS. I don't want to have to deal with them every year, but I do.

 We've got to admit that we don't know who is fishing. We really don't. We've got all these permits in the Gulf up on the shelf, Idaho or wherever, Ohio, and we don't know what's being used, but you can tell where there is 600 permits, possibly, being used right now, but we don't know what's being caught. We've got have electronic logbooks.

The charter/for-hire catch, we've come up with 83 percent. We only caught 83 percent, and Texas hasn't fully reported. Amendment 40 is working, and so what we've done, we've done good. We were under last year with the charter/for-hire and we're under this year for the charter/for-hire. It's working.

Due to possible state non-compliance, since triggerfish was shut down for the rest of the year, we went over and we know we're not going to have something next year, but we've got to prevent the states from going non-compliant, and you know it's going to happen if you say you can't catch any trigger next year in federal waters.

One of these five states will probably go non-compliant, and I think there needs to be separation, again, for the triggerfish and maybe even for the amberjack, because you know it's going to happen. There's going to be some non-compliance going on, because they believe that they feel like they should catch those fish in state waters. That is going to prohibit us from catching triggerfish for the next two or three or maybe even four years, because those triggerfish are in state waters now, and they are thick.

41 and 42, they need to be implemented at the same time. We can work on them. We can get it all nice and get it in its package, but 41 can't go without 42, and 42 can't go without 41. You don't know what I am catching. I have got to have the electronic logbooks, and I've got to have the proof. I've got to be able to show you. You can't limit me and then give me an electronic logbook and then give me the data where I can't show you what I am catching with the minimum amount of fish. It just can't be done. You're going to restrict me and then give me an electronic logbook. I see that I'm over, and I guess that's about it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question for you, Mr. Woodruff, from Chris.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Dale, thanks for speaking. Did you participate in the voluntary logbook program in Alabama this year?

MR. WOODRUFF: Yes, sir, I did. The State of Alabama knows exactly how many trips I ran. CLS America knows exactly how many trips that I was out on the water. I reported all of my fish, and so the State of Alabama knows exactly how many fish I caught on my big boat and on my little boat and how many days, if it was twice a day or all day.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Thanks.

47 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell has a question for you.

MR. SWINDELL: What about the ease of use? Do you find it difficult to use the logbook or do you think it's easy enough to get done?

MR. WOODRUFF: It's very simple, it really is. We're at the technology that we have now these days, where the smartphones, where you've got a smartphone now that teaches you how to use your own smartphone. The electronic logbooks, they're simple. They really are. What we do need on the electronic logbooks now, with the program that we were in, we may need a few more fish, but we're in a study. We're in a growing process, and we have asked CLS America for a few more fish to be added on there.

That's the only complaint I have, that there wasn't enough species of fish for me to report on that electronic logbook. I want to report everything that I catch on my boat. I want it reported, because it can be used eventually, one way or the other, when NMFS decides to start using it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Patrick.

MR. BANKS: What type of boat are you running, did you say?

MR. WOODRUFF: I have one boat that's got twenty passengers, and it's a fifty-two-foot Miller, and my other boat is a thirty-one-foot six-pack boat, six passengers, and so I'm in both categories.

MR. BANKS: So the six-pack is a center console?

MR. WOODRUFF: No, the six-pack boat does have a cabin. I understand the center console situation, but we're packing on \$40,000 and \$50,000 and \$60,000 worth of electronics on a center console to go fishing, with 300 gallons of fuel and four motors, 150 to 200 miles in the Gulf of Mexico, running rig to rig, and you're telling me that another little piece of equipment, a little bit bigger than this, is going to be something that's going to inhibit you? I just can't buy that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Joe Nash, followed by Billy Neff.

MR. JOE NASH: I'm Joe Nash, and I own and operate Cool Change Charters in Orange Beach, Alabama. You're going to hear it a lot today, but we would like to implement the electronic logbooks. We've asked for them for years, and I know some people are on the program and some aren't, but we are on the program. We have reported everything that we caught and

everything we released for every trip we ran, and so they do work.

Just like Dale was saying with the center console, I know a lot of these people don't want to have them on their boats, but it's only a little bit bigger than a cellphone. I mean, we've got thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of electronics onboard any boat you're on. Some of the center-console boats are worth three or four or five or six times what our boats are worth, and so they have room for them, but they just don't want to use them, but we need that. We need the information, and we want to give the information. We've been saying that for years.

We finally have the opportunity, and I believe, if they look at what we're doing, you will see a trend, even with the small amount of boats that are on it. We're releasing a lot of fish and the mortality is not as bad. We were talking about triggerfish earlier, and, some trips, we're releasing thirty or forty or fifty triggerfish, and I've had some trips that were up to eighty and ninety triggerfish, and so the stock assessments should be able to see this, and maybe the numbers might be a little bit off.

41 and 42 need to go in together. With the Beaufort study, they are on their own study, but we didn't have the opportunity to be on that study, and so we would like to be together on this, so everybody knows what to go with. With the electronic logbooks, one of the things you may want to look at, as far as delete some of the vessels that aren't interested in red snapper, is, if they do not want to participate, if it does become a share program of fish, they would be opting out of the share program, because then, that way, you would know that that boat is not fishing for red snapper. We just want the fish to go where they're supposed to go, where we're catching them. I know everybody wants a piece of the action, but you've got to look at it.

If we go into grouper and hogfish and everything else, I guess we're going to get those, and we don't really see very many of them where we're at, and so that will be taken away from the people that do harvest those kind of fish, and we just want to work together and do what's fair. We really have to sit down and work together. Let's make something easy, something that everybody can live with.

We just want to make a living and have a good time and enjoy fishing. We like taking people fishing. We want to all enjoy it, and we can't do that if we just keep trying to figure out who is getting what and where and when, and you don't want one guy walking away with half of the quota and then somebody else get absolutely nothing that is in that particular fishery. Other than that, I just wanted to thank you for having us here today and that we can speak, and just think of fairness. We just want everything to work for everybody, if we can. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Billy Neff, followed by Mike Colby.

MR. BILLY NEFF: How are you doing? I'm Billy Neff with Class Act Charters in Orange Beach, Alabama. I am going to make this short. We need electronic logbooks. We want to see electronic logbooks on all boats, on all charter boats, in the Gulf of Mexico. That way, we can get the accurate data that we need. The people that don't want to provide the data, I don't really understand that.

We've been doing it voluntarily on the Class Act and on the Baby Blue since it was available, and it's giving the data. It's giving the correct data that we need. It's showing everyone what we're catching and what we're not catching, and so I think it's very important that we get the electronic logbooks on all boats. As far as 41 and 42, I think they need to go in together at the same time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Neff, I believe we have a question for you from Mr. Swindell.

31 MR. SWINDELL: Thank you being here today. What size boat do 32 you have?

MR. NEFF: I'm with the Class Act, and the Class Act is a fifty-two-foot Miller, and the Baby Blue is a thirty-one-foot Johnny Morgan.

MR. SWINDELL: Okay. Are you able to work with the logbook on the way in or as you're catching fish? When do you use it?

MR. NEFF: We usually do it on the way in, before we get back to the dock. We will log in and log everything down on both boats, and it's simple enough to use. We do it on the way in, before we get back.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have one more question 47 from Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Billy. I was just going to ask, are you witnessing a lot of triggerfish offshore also?

MR. NEFF: Yes, the triggerfish are everywhere. I have been doing this for almost fourteen years, and this is probably getting up there with the most triggerfish that I've ever seen. The amount of them that we're throwing back is just insane. When we go commercial fishing, it's the same thing. On a commercial trip, we're only allowed to keep twelve triggerfish, and we're catching -- If we're out there for three or four days, we're catching hundreds and hundreds of them and just throwing them back, trying to catch vermilion snapper and other species that we can keep.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mike Colby, followed by Randy Boggs.

MR. MIKE COLBY: Thank you, council members. I'm Mike Colby from the Clearwater Marine Association. I'm a headboat and charter operator out of Clearwater, Florida. I didn't arrive until yesterday, and I was listening to Monday on the webinar at home. With Bob Gill's presentation to you all, I was hopeful that my comments would be informational to the Data Collection Committee, in response to some of the things that Bob said and some of the feedback that I'm getting out of our east Gulf area.

I can preface all of that by saying that I know that this is a really, really important framework action. This redoes the way we think about fishery-dependent information, particularly what we're asking operators to do, to provide not only effort data, but catch data. I also queried some of the guys on my email list in the eastern Gulf, and I am relying on their feedback for what I'm telling you, and that's four or five people, and they're talking to some of their fleet guys.

 After we signed people up for the project, that was kind of the part where the fishermen said I know we need to improve how we collect data and the timeliness of how we deliver the data and maybe even, to an extent, how we evaluate that data, and, after you go through that, we signed these people up.

Then, what I'm getting now is the challenges to making that work can be wrapped in one or one-and-a-half things. The biggest challenge is getting the fishermen to incorporate doing this in their everyday activity. I fish for a living, and I know you're almost robotic when you get to the dock. I am checking my

engine room and I am checking my fuel. Is the ice machine full? Where are my customers? Get the bait on the boat and do this, and you're going through these motions.

It's not impossible -- I mean, I've got some guys in this project that are still using flip-phones, but they can do this, and so the challenge is just getting the fishermen to incorporate this in their daily activities, and the other challenge is then when you're out on the water, and I know there was a lot of discussion, and there can be a lot of discussion in the committee, about how does a fisherman report.

Some people have said, well, I can't do it and I fish alone or this and that and the other and there is a safety at sea issue, and the feedback I'm getting is, and I will preface that by saying that we've got a lot of boats in the eastern Gulf that are very similar to those that fish in Louisiana.

They are thirty-four-foot Contenders with three egg-beaters on the back, and they're forty-knot boats, and I've got an old forty-foot Stapleton with twin-jimmies in it, and I'm fourteen knots, but I can go down in my cabin and put my deckhand on the wheel, and I interact with my customers.

By the time I've got that tablet on, I've got every customer on that boat that's going, wow, this is cool, and they are actually helping me enter the data, but the way our fishermen are getting around this on the thirty-four Contenders is, and they've told my port guys about it, but, man, the last stop of the day, put them in neutral and everybody is getting their beer and their Coke. I enter it and hit "submit", and then we motor home. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Colby, we have a question for you from Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Thank you for coming today. Since your comments about talking to others, are some fishermen just absolutely reluctant to provide the information, or they just don't want to spend the time? I am getting the feeling sometimes that some people just don't want to provide information to anybody. Thank you.

MR. COLBY: Sir, there might be a little of both, but I can't speak for 1,247 permit operators. My gut reaction is that --When I was signing people up for this project, starting in October of last year, I mean I phoned more people than I can care to remember and, yes, I had people just hang up on me and

say I ain't going to do it and you can't force to me to do it, click.

Now, I can't describe that operator. I don't know if they're a part-time operator or a full-time operator or what size vessel they have or how they perceive the business, but the people that we did sign up were the people that perceived the benefits to their business from this. Anytime you improve the data inputs going into a fishery, that's going to improve your fish.

If it improves your fish, that's going to improve your business, and so those people made that hurdle, and I think -- In thinking about the people that just pound the table and say I'm not going to do this, and they can't make me do it and I'm not going to do it, they haven't made that hurdle yet in their mind. They haven't reached that far yet, and I think that's where industry needs to take a bigger role in this, where we need to step up to the plate and go to ports and talk to fishermen and make them see the advantages of an ELB reporting platform.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz, did you have a question?

DR. STUNZ: Yes, and I had a quick question for you. I hear what you're saying, and several before you came up and testified that you guys really want this. Obviously I've heard that many times, but, when Mr. Gill gave his presentation, there is still units available that I guess weren't distributed, and so I'm trying to reconcile -- If you guys are not getting the units when they're available, and it's really just the cost of the service, I am wondering how that's going to be when individuals have to go out and purchase them on their own, and so I am trying to reconcile where is the disconnect of, if the fleet wants to report, why aren't they -- It seems like there would have been a waiting line to get more VMS units, and that doesn't seem to be the case.

MR. COLBY: I can't answer to all of that, but I can tell you that, as a fisherman, I know cost is always on my mind, and that certainly could be one of the motivations for not doing a voluntary project, and even less of a motivation if it's mandatory, but I also know what a lot of the other fishermen don't know, is that there are many, many funding opportunities out there that I am investigating and others will be investigating to offset costs to the industry.

 Now, having said that, there will be costs to government, and, in terms of ramping up for validation and certification of the data and the data being calibrated, I get all of that, but I

think the more we make it known to fishermen that they're not going to be left out there alone and we're going to find ways to offset many of these costs to industry. Will there be one monthly cost for a satellite service, just like your cellphone? Probably, but, in the initial rollout, I am very hopeful that we're going to find ways to offset that cost and get the fleet outfitted and move on down the road with this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Randy Boggs, followed by Ricky McDuffie.

MR. RANDY BOGGS: Hi, guys. Randy Boggs. Please ask me that same question before I leave the podium, because I've got a lot to cover. Guys, you all know who I am and what I do, but I want to talk to you about something different today. I sent you an email that you're all going to hate me for. It's a hundred-and-something pages. I also have headboats, and you all know that, but I also have a charter boat, and I've been listening to a lot about what's been going on about the allocation issues in 41 and how to do this.

I sat down and tried to think of a commonsense approach to this, and I've showed it to a lot of the guys, and I've asked the council to post it on their website. I took the total number of people available on all the charter boats from south Florida north, and I cut it off where we felt like we were pretty confident that there were no snapper caught south of there.

 I took that number of anglers, and I don't have the numbers in front of me, because it would slow me down, but I took that number of anglers and I took the fish that we were allocated under the sector separation and I divided it by -- I used a seven-pound weight. I divided the number of anglers into the number of fish, and then we divvied them out to the boats.

It comes up with a number, and it's fair and equitable for everybody. It doesn't matter if you're a six-pack boat or a multi-passenger boat, but this comes down to access to the American public's fish. It's not about the charter boat captains, and it's not about what we do. The American public has access to these fish, and it should be equitable on each boat, and I don't know exactly what the number came up with, twenty-one, twenty-five, thirty, but it came up to X number of spaces per boat, and it's in the email. It's seven pounds per person. We did it in pounds, and then we transferred it over.

If you did that, and you allocated the fish that way and you did a reporting system and a use-it-or-lose-it, if you did it for

two years and you allocated the fish, it's going to be terrible on the charter/for-hire captains for two years, because we're probably not going to, any of us, get nearly what we normally catch, but, at the end of two years, if you go back and look at the harvest, and then you redistribute the fish based on what they harvested -- If a boat got 3,000 fish and he caught 1,500 fish, then the other 1,500 would roll back into the pool and get re-equitably distributed.

If you did that twice or three times, then the fish are going to end up where they need to be and the boats that don't need them -- I would love to tell you -- In the headboat program, I am going to give you a fictitious number.

Let's say I've got 1,500 fish in the headboat program. I can't ramp up and catch 3,000 fish in a year. I just can't increase my customer base. If I gave trips away, I couldn't catch that many fish. I mean there's just not that much business there for me to garner, but this is a fair and equitable way to separate the fish. You roll them back in over four years, and then, at the end of the fifth year, if they want intersector trading or if they want to be able to trade the fish or sell the fish or move them, at the fifth year, you could do that and tie this into a VMS system and you would do really well.

You asked the question, and I've got a little bit of time, and so I'm going to hit on the VMS. The reason that the VMS are not popular, and I didn't know this when I started this program. I called every headboat along the entire Gulf coast. I have spoke to most of them in person.

One of the reasons that people don't like reporting on these, number one, is they believe the VMS system can be hacked into, and they feel like that somebody will be able to go in and steal their fishing spots. I am out of time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead, Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I was just saying Captain Boggs had a lot of ground to cover, and I will re-ask the question, or if you want to finish your answer.

MR. BOGGS: A lot of people believe that the VMS system can be hacked into and that people can steal the places that they're fishing, and they don't trust that. There is an inherent fear of that, and that is one of the things. The other thing is that a lot of these boats are older boats, and the older boats have been paid for for years, and this is a cash-cow for a lot of

these guys.

A lot of these guys run cash trips. They fish for cash, and they feel like if they put this VMS on the boat, and I don't believe that there's any truth in it, that the IRS is going to look at their VMS records and go back and see how many days they fished and how many fish they caught and they're going to lose out on that. That's the two main reasons that people don't want to cooperate with a VMS program, and that is the two biggest reasons that I've heard all the way through. Guys, I am sorry about the long email, but take a look at it. Maybe it will help with the allocation issues in 41. Thank you, guys, a bunch.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Mr. Boggs, we've got a question from Mr. Swindell over here.

MR. SWINDELL: Are you aware of any one -- You have a VMS on your boat?

MR. BOGGS: During the headboat EFP, we had a VMS on the boat. We reported via the VMS, and all three of my boats have them on there and have them on there.

MR. SWINDELL: Are you aware of anyone with any kind of system that they can get into your VMS information? Have you ever heard of one having that problem?

MR. BOGGS: No, and, as far as I know, and I talked to law enforcement about this, but, as far as I know, nobody has ever hacked into the VMS system. Nobody is able to track it. I mean, it's very private.

The commercial fishermen, you've got David sitting here, David Krebs and David Walker, and all the guys that commercial fish. I am not saying it's a realistic fear, but it's one of the things that has been voiced to me over and over and over again. You know, people build their lives on their ability to catch fish, and a lot of these guys don't want to take a chance on compromising a thing, and that's the biggest drawback that I've heard.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: One more, Mr. Boggs, from Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Mr. Boggs, have you ever had a situation where you were getting ready to go on a trip and the VMS, for some reason, didn't work and you couldn't go on the trip and you had customers standing there and you couldn't go out on the trip? What's the reliability of the units that you were using?

MR. BOGGS: We have had many, many issues. When the Headboat Collaborative was -- When the EFP came into effect, we had ninety days to get that thing up and running. We had, the first year, about sixteen boats. In ninety days, we got sixteen VMS on the boat and got the system up and operational. The National Marine Fisheries Service got us piggybacked into the commercial fishery system, and we set up accounts. We set up accounts for everybody and we did all of this in ninety days.

Yes, there were several days that we couldn't go out, but all you have to do is call. There is a 1-800 number that you call and tell them that you're hailing-out. Then you call it when you're hailing back in. I could call my wife and she could send them an email. It doesn't stop you from going fishing. I mean, there is people there that monitor it, or you can leave a message, and they know what you're doing.

As a safety measure, during the collaborative, which is what I can speak for -- Just to tell you a quick story, I walked in one night and I saw Chris and a couple of the other policemen, and they said, we see you had a bad day of fishing today. I said, how did you know that? They said, well, we got an email and you had thirty-six people on the boat and you only caught fifty-something fish. The news of what I had on the boat beat me to the law enforcement and beat me to the dock. They knew what I had before I got there. It never slowed me down. It never stopped me from fishing one day.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: One more question from Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Randy, how difficult do you find it to hail-in and hail-out?

MR. BOGGS: The CLS America thing, it's a swap screen. You swap it and tap it and swap it and tap it. The guys on my boats, I have one guy who is more computer literate than I am, which is really bad, and the guy, within three days, he had it figured out. You just slide it and tap it and slide it and tap it and it's very, very easy.

The only thing negative that I will say about the VMS is you have to crank your boat on a regular basis, because they do have a tendency to pull your batteries down. That's one of the negatives to it, and then the other problem with it is, with the units that we had, the screens are small. If you're in the Gulf and you're beating and banging and bouncing around and you're trying to enter the number of fish when you get ready to come

home, sometimes you would mis-enter the fish. Once you hit send, then you had to call the reporter, Dave Borty in our area, and you had to call him and let him know that you had made a mistake on the entry.

In the EFP, we had some discrepancies, about eight or ten discrepancies, and, most of the time, and I'm not going to tell you a lie, it was me that made the mistake, and it's usually because I've got great big fingers and the boat would be rocking, and I would hit a "3" instead of a "2", and so I would report thirty-three fish instead of twenty-three fish, but just a phone call solved that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have one more question from Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: All right, Randy. You covered a lot of ground there quick, and you're too big to carry out of here, and so are you feeling okay?

MR. BOGGS: We're doing good, man.

MR. GREENE: All right. Attached to those big fingers is a big guy. You sent us an email, and I'm kind of looking down the screen, and I know that you have a headboat and you've been pretty involved or you were the Headboat Collaborative, and you sent us this email. Is this specific to 42 or is this --

MR. BOGGS: It could be 41 or 42 or 57. It doesn't matter. This is just a -- This is the fairest way that I could think of to -- I have showed it to about twenty-five different people out here in the audience. If everybody gets the exact same thing in here initially to start with, if every permit gets funded the same, nobody can complain. It's not tiered and it's not based on anything.

 You know, going in -- I stood right here and told you that the first year is going to be terrible, because you're not going to get what you have historically caught, but boats that get funded at a bigger rate, the fish are going to roll back in, either in one or two years, and you're going to get more fish each year, and it's going to get better. If you do that use-it-or-lose-it provision, it's going to roll back in.

Is it the number of fish you need? No. If it gives you the freedom to go when the weather is good, and you know all about that, going when the weather is good and being able to harvest these fish and get maximum dollars for your fish, imagine being on one of your trips when the tuna don't bite and you need a few

snapper.

If you had twenty-five or thirty snapper to catch forty miles southwest, you could put a few hundreds of fish in the box and satisfy your customers. It's just the way that I felt like was really fair, because it gives the public, the American public, the access on an equal basis, on a six-pack boat, a multipassenger.

Wayne Werner told me that, when you do this allocation, it said that you have to make it hurt equally across the board. I wouldn't be opposed -- To be honest with you, when I did the numbers, it came in very close to the number of fish that I actually harvested on my boat. It came in within a few hundred fish. Would it hurt to lose a few hundred fish? Yes, but it came in close enough that if I knew that I was going to get a few more fish the second year or the third year or the fourth year, that I could probably live with it.

MR. GREENE: Okay, and you're going to be here the rest of today and maybe tomorrow if we have some questions about this?

MR. BOGGS: I am probably going to duck out a little bit this afternoon. I've got a pair of John Deere up there that I haven't laid eyes on yet, and I would like to go see my new John Deere that I am putting in the boat, but I will be here all day tomorrow.

MR. GREENE: Thank you.

MR. BOGGS: Thank you, guys.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Mr. Ricky McDuffie, followed by Chris Niquet.

MR. RICKY MCDUFFIE: I am Ricky McDuffie. Sea Hunter Charters is my business, and I have a multi-passenger boat and a headboat also, and so I'm kind of in between on 41 and 42, but I just think we need to keep moving forward with them and tweak them a little bit.

 I know some people are wanting them to go in at the same time, but, if we have to go with 42 and get it going and have it be the precedent for getting 41 -- If we need to give it a model to go by, I'm in favor of that, but we've got to get the logbooks operable. We have to have them. We've got to be accountable, and that's -- We need to speed that up. We need to get it where, this summer, we can be using it, that it could be used

and logged. We've got to get it moving faster.

We're moving at a snail's pace, it seems like, and, as far as triggerfish, you go try to catch vermilion and you sit on a spot for twenty or thirty minutes and burn up a flat of squid trying to throw back twenty or thirty or forty trigger and get vermilion. Then, if they don't pan out, then you've got move to the next hole and start the process all over again. We are releasing, like some of the other guys were saying, crazy numbers of triggerfish. They're coming back strong, and I think, with some moderate regulations, we should be able to catch a few of them and still maintain a population.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Chris Niquet, followed by Susan Boggs.

 MR. CHRIS NIQUET: Chris Niquet, Panama City, Florida. On the subject of 41 and 42, I think you need to either pass them both at the same time or combine them, and, for electronic logbooks on these same vessels, you need to have a carrot-and-stick approach.

They agree to put the logbooks on their vessels and report like they're supposed to or else, when the allocation time comes, they don't get no allocation. It's real simple. Driving is a privilege and not a right. If you can't pass the test, you don't get to drive. That's just the way it works. That will put the onus on the people. If you don't want a logbook, you ain't going to participate in this fishery. You will see some of them hard-liners come around.

Now, on another subject, if this council is going to implement rules and regulations on 41 and 42 going forward that is going to create a pinch point, I call it, in the transferability of poundage or permits or allocation or shares, at some point you're going to have somebody like me step in and buy up vast amounts of these things and create another situation just like you've got in the commercial sector. You're going to be faced with more lawsuits, and you're going to be here fifteen years hence, just like you are in the commercial sector.

I don't know what rules and regulations you've got to put in place, but something has got to happen. You've got to figure it out. You're going to have to either distribute them equally amongst all the participants and then, after three or four years, figure out who is catching what. They ain't catching them in Key West, these red snapper. Distribute them equally amongst those going forward and let the free market decide from

then, but you're going to have to restrict ownership somehow to the people in the industry.

On the triggerfish, I talked to a fellow the other day fishing for vermilion snapper and white snapper. He fishes out of Apalachicola. He fished for four days and he had 4,800 pounds. After the first day, he had to quit fishing in the daytime. The triggerfish were so thick that he couldn't get a gear to the bottom. He had to start fishing at night. Most of the time, the triggerfish don't bite at night. There is plenty of triggerfish. Please correct the problem and get the limit up to twelve per day instead of twelve per trip or something to give these fellows a chance to catch them. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Susan Boggs, followed by Ken Haddad.

MS. SUSAN BOGGS: Good afternoon. My name is Susan Boggs from Reel Surprise Charters in Orange Beach, Alabama. I would like to call your attention to one thing on that spreadsheet real quick. There are two tabs on that spreadsheet. One of them is just for the charter/for-hire vessels and one we went in and included if you grouped the headboats, and so I just wanted to call that to your attention.

What I would like to speak to today is, of course, the electronic logbooks. I believe they're essential to the charter fleet, and I support all of the preferred alternatives to the modifications to charter vessel and headboat reporting requirements. I would like to see the council take final action on this modification in January.

This is a modification that has little to no opposition from the fleet. With electronic logbooks, this will assist with moving Amendment 41 forward. I support include multispecies in Amendment 41. I urge the council to please support the final action of the referendum requirements for Amendment 42 tomorrow.

As the charter/for-hire vessels continue to move forward with Amendment 41, please do not push back on Amendment 42, as the headboats have landings history and the success of the plan, the EFP, which was proven -- Amendment 42 was proven within the Gulf Headboat Collaborative EFP, and I thank you for your time today.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Ken Haddad, followed by Mr. Tom Wheatley.

 MR. KEN HADDAD: Thank you, Madam Chairman and council members. My name is Ken Haddad with American Sportfishing Association. I am going to speak kind of around Amendment 29, mackerel, a bit, for a little bigger picture, maybe, but we've given you detailed comments.

Those, in quick summary, are take into account the three-fish effect and be very conservative and don't put anything in place that holds the recreational sector accountable for going over a temporary ACL.

 Now, with that said, I want to talk about OY for a minute and how that plays into some thinking we have. Right now, when you think of OY, and we heard it this morning, it tries to be the ABC or the MSY. If you go to the Magnuson-Stevens, it says it should be developed on the greatest overall benefits, including economic, social, and biological consideration, and we would argue that there is no analysis for many of these species that we believe takes in the interests of the recreational fishing arena into developing OY. It's much more of a capture as much of the ABC as you can get into OY.

It's possible that a lower OY is better for the socioeconomics of the recreational mackerel, and so why do we think this is important? There is a difference in how the commercial and recreational fishers fish for a given species. Commercial fisheries typically attempt to catch its entire allocation, while the recreational fishers typically fish by encounter and don't have as a goal to fish its entire allocation, and you see that in red snapper and mackerel. In one, we're definitely fishing the entire allocation, but we would argue that's because of encounter. The other, we're not, and that may be due to encounter also.

Right now, the recreational sector is happy with the current fishing situation for mackerel, based on encounter and allocation. This is one species where you are not hearing a whole lot of banter by the recreational side, and we suggest this may be due to encounter rates. We don't understand it, and it may not be, but it's not being looked at, and that's kind of our point, is that, instead of just looking at what's being underfished, you need to be asking why are they being underfished, and we are busting at the seams for most species and why not mackerel? We don't know.

 This morning, the Reef Fish AP brought up the intent to look at the recreational and commercial allocation exchange, and we think this is important, for a number of reasons. We think it's important for mackerel. We, the recreational community, don't understand where this is going to go, and, if you don't talk about it and let us know what your plan is, we are concerned. The same thing is going to be happening with dolphin, as you know, and so we would like you to take it up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Ken. We have a question.

DR. CRABTREE: Ken, I wondered if you could give us an update on what's going on with the focus group and when we might see a report.

MR. HADDAD: It's going great. We just had a meeting Monday, a meeting with some of the commercial, for-hire, and environmental groups. We had a good interchange, and we produced -- I will call it a brainstorm of options papers that have come out of the other meetings. We got good feedback on all of that, with some ideas on viability of some of the options that we're looking at.

We have one more meeting scheduled at the end of November with the Planning Committee, and perhaps some others, to look at the production of the final product, which would be -- Our list of -- We don't know if we're going to do them in priority order, or we don't know if we're going to give any priorities. What we're finding, honestly, is that many of the options we're looking at, without further analysis that we're not capable of doing, it's hard to make a judgment on whether it's a viable management option or not, but there is some pretty interesting options in there.

We will have a product that at least takes things quite a way down the road on what are possible options to look at for different management approaches, for red snapper, specifically. We have kind of narrowed ourselves to red snapper right now, because of the Red Snapper AP. We're on target to have a product at the beginning of the new year.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Haddad, we have one more question for you from Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Thank you for being here. In your membership, I assume you have many boat owners and not just individual fishermen. Would they be willing -- Have you had any talks about using electronic logbooks and VMS on their boats?

MR. HADDAD: We haven't talked VMS. That might be a little extreme. We have talked about the smartphones and various things like that as options for better data collection. Data

is, frankly, a limiting factor for almost everything we're 1 talking about and pretty much the universe of the fishermen. know so little, but, yes, that is part of the discussions, for sure.

4 5 6

2

3

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Tom Wheatley, followed by Bill Staff.

7 8 9

10

11 12

13

Good afternoon, council. My name is Tom MR. TOM WHEATLEY: Wheatley. I represent the Pew Charitable Trusts. I live, work, and fish out of Tampa, Florida. I'm going to touch on two issues today for deep-sea corals. First, we would like to thank the council, and also staff, for bringing the scoping document to this meeting to safeguard deep-sea coral communities.

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

Scientists think they have discovered only a fraction of the potential value of deep-sea corals. For instance, octocorals possess properties that might be useful in treating cancer. skeletons of black corals actually contain growth rings, similar to trees, that provide clues to changes in ocean temperature over time and water chemistry. Bamboo corals have use in bone grafting, and several species of deep-sea sponges that share deep-sea coral communities have anti-inflammatory, antiviral, and also anti-tumor properties.

24 25 26

27

28 29

30 31

Then there is the significant contribution these corals actually make to providing shelter, feeding grounds, and nurseries to things like cat sharks, crustaceans, eels, and, of course, fish, including species such as deepwater groupers. Over the coming months, we look forward to working with stakeholders, and, of course, this council on finding sensible and realistic ways to safeguard these coral communities.

32 33 34

35 36

37

38 39

40

41

42

Second, on electronic logbooks, the charter/for-hire electronic logbook amendment is nearing completion, and we urge the council to finalize this amendment in January of 2017. We believe the technical data committee has provided a really good list of data elements that can be used with this program, and we agree with the current approach of keeping this list as an appendix in the It does two things. It provides transparency to the charter fishing community of what data is going to be collected, but it also leaves the agency enough flexibility to make changes, if needed, working with this council.

43 44 45

46

47 48 With that said, there is one data element that is slightly confusing to me. I don't really understand why the requirement to report the disposition of fish discarded, whether it's a live discard or a dead discard, is limited to just highly-migratory species. It does seem like that data would be important in the stock assessment process for all species, and so I would urge you to think about that and potentially add that as we move forward, and that's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Bill Staff, followed by Casey Price.

MR. BILL STAFF: I'm Bill Staff from the Charter Boat Sea Spray, thirty-five years of charter fishing. I am proud to be in the 75th percentile of the accountable fishery of snapper. Amendment 41 needs to be tweaked a little. I think we need to have multispecies, mainly so we can have something to fish for. Trigger is closed and amberjack is closed and, of course, snapper is closed. It doesn't leave us much to sell this time of year.

Roy, you said it best a few years ago. Find something that everybody can live with, that everybody won't be happy. I can't live with 3,000 pounds of snapper, sorry. I am in the top tier of the charter boats, and it is a hard pill to swallow that some headboats may get eleven or twelve times the fish that I'm going to get if 42 goes through it its present form. I like the program that Randy Boggs talked of, and, with some tweaking, I think it would work well.

Also, if that couldn't be used, we will do a derby. I've already got my logbook installed, and I've been using it. It charges with a phone charger, and so I don't have a dead battery issue, and I hope we can use it to get some timely data that would help us in the future. Let's use them as a qualifier, just like a commercial fisherman said, but let's use them as a qualifier.

Gray triggerfish, they have rebounded, and I fish offshore a lot, and I stopped in there back before it closed in May, just to see, and these guys aren't lying to you. They're there. I had May 30 and 31, the last two days, twelve people, and I caught forty-eight triggerfish in the first four stops I made, not having knowing they were there, and that's not a lie. That's the truth. I appreciate your time, and hopefully we can keep moving forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Casey Price, followed by Eric Brazer.

UNIDENTIFIED: Casey is not here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Eric Brazer, followed by Gary Jarvis.

MR. ERIC BRAZER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. That has a nice ring to it, doesn't it? I am Eric Brazer, Deputy Director of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance. Thank you for the chance to speak.

For my first point, I would like to talk about Amendment 36A. We support the AP's preferred alternatives. All of the votes that the AP made were overwhelmingly in support of their preferred alternatives. In fact, I think there was only one vote where there were greater than zero members in opposition, if that makes sense, and I think that was the method of redistribution of those inactivated shares. To that point specifically, we still think there is a use -- There is a need to put those shares to use addressing discards, addressing the next generation of fishermen, and, if that can't happen through 36A, we're just going to continue to make that happen through the reef fish quota bank.

On gag and mutton, we support Martha's committee motion to move Action 3 to Considered but Rejected, for the reasons she mentioned yesterday, and we support Action 5, Alternative 2, increasing the size limit to twenty-four inches, because of the biological gains and to create some parity with the recreational sector.

I am going to lump my coral and Flower Garden Banks comments into one. This is a controversial issue, it's pretty clear, but it's an important one, given that I don't think there is a commercial fisherman out there that wouldn't say that healthy corals and complex habitats don't add value to commercial fisheries.

We believe that habitat protection and responsible fishing can coexist, that they should coexist, and that's going to require taking a hard look at the data and also having a little bit of trust in the system and trust in the people involved in the system.

We are glad there is going to be more rationale in the corals document, and we're happy to work with council staff and members to help disseminate that and distribute that information to the industry. We hope the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary gives you guys more time to deliberate and discuss the sanctuary expansion, and we ask you to support the proposal in the document. We think the tiered system is a creative solution

and the development of the endorsement program is key to making sure that fishermen continue to have access to these areas in a way that supports healthy coral systems. Again, those two things can coexist.

If you create the space for that endorsement program, we will work with you and staff and the National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council, the industry council, to flesh that out and to identify program standards and requirements and things like that.

I am going to take a right-turn here and talk about amberjack. The trip limit went from 2,000 pounds to 1,500 pounds on the commercial side. The season closed even earlier, and I would like you to consider dropping that trip limit down to 500 pounds on the commercial side. I don't think it's possible by January 1, but, if you ask staff to look at it, we can start to figure out a way to really extend that season and, ultimately, have a real, legitimate conversation about whether Amendment 33, an IFQ system, can solve some of these problems that we're seeing in amberjack, and I support the logbooks. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Gary Jarvis, followed by Bobby Kelly.

MR. GARY JARVIS: You guys know who I am. I'm Captain Gary Jarvis, President of the Destin Charter Boat Association. It's good to see you all once more. Folks, it's time to take the ELB amendment to a final vote and to send it to National Marine Fisheries for implementation. Since 2008, in New Orleans, it's been workshops and webinars and pilots and presentations and scientifically evaluated, and, to cap it all off, probably 10,000 public testimonies from the members of our industry over that eight-year period in favor of electronic logbooks.

The irony of this is there's been a charter/for-hire fishery-dependent data reporting system in place in the Gulf of Mexico since 1986, and now, since 2013, it's become the very electronic logbook that we've been asking for for over a decade. Our community of fishers in Destin, with different passenger-carrying capabilities, need equal opportunity to ELBs.

It makes you wonder why we spend so much time telling stories and making excuses not to move forward when the product and technology necessary to improve data collection in fisheries management is right here, just a fingertip away.

I respectfully ask that you bring this to fruition, as this

amendment is on the agenda for final action in January. Delay of this action again serves no purpose, other than to fail twenty-first century needs of better management of our entire fishery resources in the charter/for-hire sector.

My last comment is concerning Amendment 41 and 42. We have a couple of important issues in these two amendments that need to be addressed, and I apologize to this council for not recognizing these months earlier and bringing this up at this time. The first, and the most important, is the disparity in the charge of the two amendments. One is for multispecies and the other is not.

Both of these must have the same charge, whether to both either be single species or both be multispecies, and these are the reasons why. For over eighty years, the charter/for-hire community has provided access to the public recreational anglers together as a whole. Most management protocols addressing the charter/for-hire industry, including the moratorium permits, included charter boats and headboats.

It's very important, as we move forward with these amendments, that the spirit of the historical daily and yearly operation of providing access to the EEZ fisheries remain along those same realities. This issue, and a few others, we have recognized, and all of them can be resolved with continued discussion within the industry and with help and guidance from the National Marine Fisheries Service and this council.

It's my personal mission, as president of the largest charter fishing fleet in the Gulf of Mexico, to make sure that we develop an exceptional FMP that ensures the generational continuance of the charter/for-hire sector and to ensure the preservation of the historical significance of that industry to communities like Destin and all the others along the coast.

 We're getting close to accomplishing this improvement in the management of our resources and the security of the industry as a constant provider of public access, but the present product before this council needs some revision. It needs some thought and refinement and evaluation, to ensure that there are no unintended consequences that will adversely impact the lives, the legacy, and the heritage of the charter/for-hire industry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Jarvis, we have a question for you.

 MR. BLANKENSHIP: Thanks, Gary. Did you participate in the voluntary ELB program this year?

MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir. This is the third ELB logbook volunteer participation that I have been involved with.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Bobby Kelly, followed by Mr. Clarence Seymour.

MR. BOBBY KELLY: Good afternoon, council. I'm Bobby Kelly from Orange Beach, Alabama. Thanks for having me today. Director Blankenship, it's so nice to see your lovely face on the council. I hope we see more of this, and I don't know what you did with Kevin, but I'm sure he would be willing to let you have it for a few more days.

The first thing is I'm a dual-permitted boat. I just came in off of a commercial fishing trip, and I want to speak to Mr. Walker's Amendment 46 on triggerfish, to raise the commercial TAC. He says sixteen would give us four extra fish, and that is not nearly enough fish to compensate the amount of squid that those guys ate me out of house and home on a little two-day trip. Those guys are ravenous and ferocious, and I think there's a much healthier stock that we can harvest out there, and so I would ask to raise the limit on triggerfish and go a little faster in your stock assessments, to do what you can. The fishery is vibrant and it's healthy out there. They are mean and ferocious, and they taste great.

As far as the electronic logbooks, I'm in favor of it. I have been in favor of it. Any of your proponents are good, healthy businesses that pay their taxes and they want to report. They want good data.

I find that most of the pushback comes from people when they mention ELB that they're antiquated, and, quite simply, I feel like they're hiding income. That's the only reason to it. With today's technology, what some of the people said, that they're going to hide my fishing spot, and, with today's technology, there is no such thing as a secret fishing spot anymore.

Everybody out there can have a radar and can keep track of you for twenty miles. It doesn't matter anymore, and so I say move forward with it. We're sixteen years into the twenty-first century, and every fisherman out there is for electronic monitoring. I myself participated in the CLS voluntary program this year. It was a nice little tablet. When we got done fishing at the end of the day, we walked downstairs and put the

deckhand on the wheel and walked with my customers and showed them what I was doing and why we were doing it, and everybody loved it. It's a great deal, these little VMS. It's easy, peasy, Japanesey. I hope we can find a way to use that and take final action on it.

As far as Amendment 41 and 42 goes, I am for a rights-based management system. There is great benefits to it out there. I get it. The way 41 and 42 are designed right now, you're going to create a big system of the have and the have-nots when you start talking 41 and 42. I don't really see that this council would want to make another class of sea lords out there. I just don't do it.

 We're headed in the right direction. The fact that we can all sit down at this table and agree that we want this idea is great. We have got a great unity in the charter/for-hire fleet, the headboats and private charter boats. We can work this out. We will work this out, but just give us time. We ask you to put the ELBs on the boats and figure out who is catching what and then let's divide the fish. Right now, we don't know who is catching what. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Clarence Seymour, followed by Mr. Mike Nugent.

MR. CLARENCE SEYMOUR: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can we go back to the list, the names, Ms. Bosarge, please? Now we can go to the chart. I'm Captain Clarence Seymour from Biloxi, Mississippi. I'm federal-permitted for hire, and I have made a little chart for you guys today. It's kind of to show the area of demographics of what makes Biloxi and Gulfport, Mississippi special to the industry, which it's kind of hard, but I'm going to go ahead and explain it real quick.

There is thirty-two permits showing on the list of Mississippi. There is ten that's active in Biloxi, and I've got one in the Back Bay right over here, and there is four in Gulfport, Mississippi. My three-mile line is showing, and that's the EEZ past that, which everybody knows that. The nine-mile line, it runs through the boundaries here, and so our reporting area is only for red snapper and triggerfish would be out, and then amberjack is about seventy nautical miles south of Biloxi.

In the forty-six-day season, we stayed in this area that you see of FH1, 2, and 5. The four oil rigs that is left, that is pretty well a reality to that, and so there is no more structure out than what's out there in our state waters, but the guys

asked me, and I want to be on record to make sure that my fleet -- They put me up here and asked me for reporting issues.

Being that we are a special area here and we have quite a journey to get to the federal EEZ, and everybody knows that, but I wanted to let you know that we are all about reporting, but I think the guys might have a problem with getting slapped with a seventy-dollar-a-month fee. I just want to make sure that's on the record that I stated that from Mississippi.

We will do -- I will do whatever it takes to be reportable and accountable for our industry, but the main point would be some of our fellows are -- The VMS system is what they're afraid of, and I don't know why. I've got it on my boat, and I didn't -- I was in the pilot program, and I didn't turn it on. I tried to get CLS to get down there. I had a little issue with my light that came on, and so, anyway, but, Roy, permits with home port would be pretty helpful too, because there are some permits being listed in the State of Mississippi that are in Louisiana, because I found them, and I -- Maybe we could add that to the thing, but I guess I'm out of time. Triggerfish, make sure you take care of these guys on triggerfish. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate you coming. Next, we have Mr. Mike Nugent, followed by Mr. Tom Steber.

 MR. MIKE NUGENT: My name is Mike Nugent, and I'm a charter boat owner and operator from Aransas Pass, Texas, and I'm also a member of the Ad Hoc Red Snapper AP. The first thing that I wanted to talk about is the electronic logbooks, and, to reiterate a lot of what's been said, you can go back ten years and start looking at when we're saying we need it and it's a needed thing and then, it was in Biloxi, as a matter of a fact, and time gets away from me, but I bet it was six or seven years ago when Harlon Pearce was sitting over there in the Louisiana section that we were going to have electronic logbooks and we were going to fast-track it.

Well, one man's fast-track is another man's turtle, but the point is that we don't agree, all of us, on the kind of electronic logbook maybe, and there are things we don't agree on, but, with all the disagreements we have in our industry, it's hard to find anybody that doesn't support the electronic logbooks, and that seems to be the very thing that we can't get put in. Maybe if we had used psychology and everybody told you that, hell, no, we don't want one that we would have had one ten years ago. I don't know, but it just bears thinking about, I quess.

It's got to be done, and, again, you know, when you're getting ready in 41 and you're trying to figure out how to divvy up these fish by the methods we're looking at, if we had a couple or three years or two years or one year of electronic logbooks, to find out who is fishing and how many times they're fishing and go from there, it would make a whole lot of sense.

 Then, after criticizing and berating for taking too long to put something into effect, I am going to turn around and, when it comes to 41 and 42, I am going to caution you about passing something too quickly. I am nothing if not hypocritical, I quess.

When you think about how important 41 and 42 is, I would just urge you not to get the feeling that you've got to do something and you've got to get 42 passed, because there is things in it that need looking at. For example, the number of boats in there that don't have catch history, they passed the definition of a headboat, and so they must be a headboat, but, since they don't have a catch history, you're going to put them into the charter boat fleet to get some red snapper allocation.

The minute they drop into the charter boat fleet, that's going to be the largest capacity vessels in the charter boat fleet taking the lion's share of the amount of fish that's already being argued about to be divvied up, and so I would just urge caution and try to get it right, because they are important. I guess I'm about out. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Tom Steber, followed by Mr. Steve Tomeny.

MR. TOM STEBER: I am Tom Steber, and most of you know me. I have been at a lot of council meetings, and I'm President of the Alabama Charter Fishing Association and a member of both 41 and two APs. I want to thank you again for setting up Amendment 40 that is allowing us to try to build a management plan to help you manage. I had a whole bunch of other things to say, but I could not say it any better than Gary Jarvis did, and so I want to second his speech, and I will leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Steve Tomeny, followed by B.J. Burkett.

MR. STEVE TOMENY: How are you doing? I am Steve Tomeny. I run a couple of headboats down in Port Fourchon, Louisiana. I've been at it for a long time. I've been up here at the podium a

lot of times asking for logbooks or VMS or whatever it takes to count our fish.

Also, I've been asking for a rights-based fishery management plan. I've been involved in 42 and 41 and as many conversations as I can get in on, and so I'm for these things, and I'm still for them, and I can't wait to see it get on the water. We've just got to get it right and make sure that we don't make any big mistakes and we will move on, but I definitely want to see the electronic logbooks get moving along and get the final action done. If you don't do it at this meeting, do it at the next one, and that's mostly what I've got. It's nothing too much today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. B.J. Burkett, followed by Mr. Johnny Williams.

MR. B.J. BURKETT: My name is B.J. Burkett, and I own and operate Hook'em-Up Charters in Panama City Beach. It's an eighteen-passenger boat, and I also do dual-permitted. I also own a commercial fishing vessel, the Lady Y. I reef fish and king mackerel fish on it.

Just to change gears from what everybody else has been talking about up here a little bit, just real quick, red grouper. The red grouper is a struggling fishery right now. If you look at the catch landings on the IFQ site, you will see that. The increase in the quota by two-million pounds was a huge mistake for the fishery and for the shareholders in that fishery. The fishermen aren't coming close to catching the existing quota, and so why add more? If anything, it needs to go the other way.

Triggerfish, they haven't just rebounded, but they're a nuisance. They're one of the most aggressive species in the Gulf. If you all don't let us start catching them, they're going to eat everything and everybody. It's getting very bad. I really hope you all can take your blinders off on that and do something about it.

Amendment 41 and 42, I agree with several others that have already commented on it. We need to slow down on it and get them put together. If not, you're going to cause a huge feud between both groups, and so those need to be put together.

Electronic logbooks, while I'm up here, can I make a motion to just go ahead and put them in place? I mean, we need the electronic logbooks, please. How many times have you all got to hear it? That's all I've got. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Burkett, we have a question.

 MR. GREENE: Thanks for coming. In your area of the Gulf, I know you guys have caught a lot of gags in the past. Do you have any issue with going to twenty-four inches on a gag grouper, and what are you seeing over there for gags, as far as this year and last year goes?

 MR. BURKETT: Directly off of Panama City, it's definitely slower than it was last year. Now, if you get a little bit south of us, that's a whole different deal. My commercial boat fishes out of Apalachicola, and there is a lot better amount of gags in that area, but Panama City is still very slow on gags.

16 MR. GREENE: Going to twenty-four inches in size, would that be 17 a problem?

19 MR. BURKETT: No, and, I mean, we're not seeing very many small 20 ones. Twenty-four inches, for me, does not make a big difference.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, sir.

25 MR. BURKETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Johnny Williams, followed by Mr. Mike Eller.

MR. JOHNNY WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. I'm Johnny Williams from Williams Partyboats Incorporated in Galveston, Texas. I'm a third-generation partyboat operator out of Galveston. I am here to speak about Amendment 41 and 42. I think we should go forward with Amendments 41 and 42.

When I was involved with the first ad hoc committee meeting for the for-hire sector, a gentleman that is in the charter boat industry, Bob Zales, put forth a motion that we divide the for-hire sector into the partyboats and the charter boats, and I think the motion passed pretty much unanimously. We all saw, at that meeting, at that time, that we needed to divide the two groups, because they basically weren't the same. They had some differences.

For one thing, we had catch records in the partyboat industry, in my case, back into the 1980s, before it was even mandatory, mandated by Amendment 1 for the partyboats to report, and so I don't really see any need to hold 42 back because 41 is not

ready yet. I think we should try to proceed with both and implement both as quickly as possible, but there is no reason that the people that are in 42 should have to languish for a few years while we get 41 prepared, and, as I said, at the first for-hire sector ad hoc committee, we saw that difference, and that's why we divided up into two groups, and that's why we have 41 and 42.

It seems unnecessary to hold 42 up because 41 is not ready. What a solution may be -- I mean, if 42 is going to be easily done and 41 is going to be a challenge, we could go ahead and do the electronic logbooks and let all the charter boats get data for a couple of years. I wouldn't want to do it for one year, because there may be a situation where someone lost an engine in the middle of the year and couldn't participate in the fishery or something during the derby, but I have been in the partyboat business for a long time, and we had this pilot program for two years.

I participated in it both years, and it was a wonderful process. The thing has been completed vetted, and it's been examined top to bottom. As far as I know, all the participants that were in the first year were also in the second year. It was such a wonderful program, and I urge you to go forward with 42 and 41 as quickly as you can and also make 41 multispecies. Thank you very much, and I hope you all have a great day.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mike Eller, followed by Mr. Jim Green.

MR. MIKE ELLER: Mike Eller, hailing from the great state of Florida, Destin, Florida, the world's luckiest fishing village. It's my thirty-fourth year, consecutive, as a charter boat fisherman. We need electronic logbooks, once again. I've been up here for fifteen or sixteen years, since 1995, talking about them, and so we need them. The truth needs to come out. No matter who is catching what, the truth needs to come out. It's not hard. I did participate in the pilot program, and it takes me about a minute, maybe a minute-and-a-half, to fill out my logbook. It is very, very, very simple.

Anybody that says they can't do it, but yet they post pictures on their Facebook page and they post videos on their Facebook page from their boat, that shows you. Technology has finally caught up with what we want to do, and there is no reason to delay any longer.

If it takes two years to implement it, then let's do it. If we

would have done it ten years ago, we would already be there right now, and so it's ridiculous, the fact that we keep coming up here and asking for it and asking for it and asking for it.

Everybody wants to know the truth. Everybody wants to know what's being caught, but yet, for some reason, the powers that be won't move forward, and so let's move forward with electronic logbooks.

Triggerfish, what you've been hearing about it, it's incredible. I have been charter fishing my entire life, since I was fifteen years, my adult life, and I've never seen anything like it. It's unbelievable. It's like the days of old, two at a time, great big ones. I just saw a picture on Facebook from Gary Jarvis's boat, and they caught two triggers on one hook. I mean, it's incredible. It's really a success story, and so the closures that we had have really -- They're there, and it's incredible. I think if you fell into the water that they might eat you.

Amendment 41 and 42, we've got to get them right. We can't do like Obamacare and let's pass it and then tweak it. Let's get it right from the very beginning. If we're got to slow 42 down to get it all right, then that's what we need to do. We need to make it fair and equitable. Today, I propose to the fishermen that I know here that why don't we take this winter and why don't we put together -- Let's find every one of those permitted boats.

Let's find out what boat it's on and are they fishing or are they not fishing and where they're at and what's going on. They won't do it for us, and so we're going to do it. We're going to find out every single boat. Are they in the red snapper fishery? Is it a latent permit? We're going to have it done this winter. We're going to put a file on every one of them, and we're going to show who is fishing and who is not fishing, and I bet you we are about 90 percent accurate.

 We need your help. We need electronic logbooks. Let's quit talking about it and let's do it. If it takes two years to implement it, let's do it. In two years from now, we'll be glad we did. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question for you, sir. Just a moment.

MR. SWINDELL: Electronic logbooks, are you able to use the data for yourself? Are you keeping records as it goes along with

your electronic logbook?

 MR. ELLER: The record is in the electronic logbook, and so I can go back and pull any of it up that I want, and I have a VMS, and I wanted to tell you something about the VMS, real quick. People worry about looking at your fishing spots, but I went to log on to look at my boat on the VMS, on the computer, because I had an incident and I wanted to see my course and my track line. It's not very accurate. It showed me driving my boat across land to get into the pass. It only shows a dot every fifteen or twenty minutes, and so, unless you sat in one place all day long, nobody is going to be able to tell what -- They can see the area that you went fishing in, but they're not going to steal your fishing spot. The electronic logbook, through CLS, needs a little tweaking, but it's very, very good. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Jim Green, followed by Mr. Scott Hickman.

MR. JIM GREEN: Hello. I'm Captain Jim Green, Vice President of the Destin Charter Boat Association and CFA. For over a decade, our industry has asked for the accountability tool of logbooks. We have begged to give this council and the agency a resource, and this isn't a contentious topic or idea, but it's the right thing to do.

As a headboat operator, I fill out a report every trip, and it takes about a minute. This data is validated and used as a platform to manage our fisheries. Our industry is burdened by inconsistent state seasons and payback provisions. That looms over not just the angler's head, but the crew and the businesses.

 We want to account for every fish harvested, and we no longer want to be part of an equation that extrapolates. It is extremely important to our industry that we develop an electronic logbook to help identify who is participating, which would be used for effort, and also, by requiring data to be submitted before a landing, it will keep the reports accurate and aid validators, and, of course, provide real-time data.

It will also make closures far more palatable, if we can see real numbers showing what we caught instead of we have estimated you have caught the quota. They will go a long way with our fleet as a whole, and so please move forward with this amendment and accommodate our industry with this tool.

Under Amendment 41 and 42, with the recent triggerfish and

amberjack closures, it's become glowingly apparently that these species are following the same troubled path as we've had with red snappers. In this, we urge the council to allow the 41 AP to continue exploring the amendment with a multispecies alternative. We have made some good progress in both 41 and 42, and though we have found some issues, we are working those out.

No matter how these amendments develop, it is important to our industry that they hit the water at the same time. Whether separate plans or combined, we need to ensure that we have developed the best plan for our industry as a whole. Thank you for allowing us to work so diligently on these amendments, and please reconvene the APs at the earliest convenience.

When it comes to triggerfish, the DCBA would like to state that they want a March opening with a two-fish bag limit and a new stock assessment. As you have heard, all of it is true. It's unbelievable the amount of triggers we're seeing, and it's unfathomable that we possibly might not have a 2017 season, and this is another example where logbooks would make this not such a bitter pill to swallow. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Captain Green, we have a question for you.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Captain Green. Doug Gregory, you're going to love this. When you say convene the AP, do you think you should convene them together, the headboat AP and the forhire AP, so you could work out some of these differences that we have been alluding to today?

MR. GREEN: I would say that wouldn't such a bad idea. That's a lot of Type A personalities in a room at one time, but either separate or together. We have some -- More problems and issues come up as we continue this dialogue with each other, and we have things that need to be addressed, and so, whether separate or together, I am up for the challenge. I'm on both, and so I would be there anyway. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Scott Hickman, followed by Mr. Michael Short.

MR. SCOTT HICKMAN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Gulf Council. Thanks for listening to us today. First off, I am Captain Scott Hickman from Galveston, Texas. I am both a commercial shareholder and a long-term charter/for-hire operator. I was glad to see HMS come give the presentation today on sharks, and I would hope that the council would write a letter in support of the alternative, the preferred alternative,

for recreational and charter/for-hire HMS permits to include the endorsement where they can do the education aspect and get the endorsement to continue to harvest blacktip sharks in the EEZ.

Sharks are a huge recreational fish. In fact, there's probably more people catching sharks near-shore and offshore than even snapper fish, and I know we hear a lot about red snappers. Shane Cantrell and I both worked real hard with the HMS people for years, trying to come up with this, because we knew eventually that the dusky problem was going to be a real issue, and so if you all could send a letter along saying that would be great fishermen, to let people do this educational process to get that endorsement to continue to harvest blacktip sharks in the EEZ.

Also, I sit on the Flower Garden Banks. I hold the recreational seat, and I have for quite some time. Corals are something I am very passionate about. I can't imagine my children living in a world without coral. Corals are very important for habitat, and that's all corals, deepwater corals and shallow-water corals. That's an essential part of the habitat in the ocean.

I would like this council to move forward with protecting these corals in this coral amendment. We are having alarming rates of coral dying off and coral bleaching events worldwide, and so anything this council can do to help protect these vital ecosystems would be really great.

As far as the CLS America program, I am the regional guy for that in Texas. I was asked last spring, and we signed up about forty captains, and I had another ten on the list or more that wanted units. We ran out of units. I know Dr. Stunz alluded that there were extra units. There were some units they held out for replacements, so if they had issues with parts in such a short two-year pilot that they could provide those.

We're getting great feedback from the captains. They like the units. Probably the only negative I had is I had a captain that his wife had figured out how to go on the computer and track his boats. He said he was going tuna fishing one night, and he was actually up at a bar in Clear Lake, and he got in a little trouble, but that's one of the good things. You can track those boats, and it's a safety aspect.

As far as Amendment 41 and 42, I will say it once again. If we're going to do multispecies in 42, we need to do multispecies in 41. We need to take our time on these amendments and they need to be done correctly. They need to be done fairly. You

can't just have a bunch of people getting a really great program and the other guy is maybe not getting such a great program. It needs to be well thought out.

I totally agree with reconvening the APs, just like Captain Boggs said today, and he had some good ideas on some allocation concepts. Some folks in the agency had run some new ideas by us here at this meeting, and so let's roll up our sleeves and make sure we do this thing right on 41 and 42. There is a lot of --Americans' access to this fishery that don't own a boat do it on charter boats, and so we want to be fair to all the folks that get on a charter boat and go fishing, and so that's about it, and I thank you all for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question.

MR. BANKS: Scott, how many of those forty that you signed up are center console, or are they all captain boats?

MR. HICKMAN: I would say, out of forty, I would say thirty-five are center console boats that are less than thirty feet, twinengine, twenty-seven to thirty-foot boats. A few of them are triple-engine boats, like mine, go-fast type boats, and I think they're just a very small handful.

Most of the Texas fleet is exactly like the Louisiana fleet. It's outboard-powered and go-fast with a T-top and a radio box. The units are very nonintrusive. They've got a little box, a junction box. It's got a little antenna about the size of a Nerf football, and you've got a little tablet about the size of a big cellphone.

MR. BANKS: Were any of those guys -- Did it take almost putting somebody's arm behind their back to get them to be convinced to try it? Then were they relieved that it wasn't as bad or as intrusive as they thought?

 MR. HICKMAN: No, sir, and I actually called about ten people and just put the word out and said, hey, they want to do something in Texas. If you all want to be part of this program, send me all your information, and word spread, like it always does, within the charter boat fleet, and we were overwhelmed with response of people wanting to do it, to volunteer, knowing that this would be important and something they wanted to get involved in. They desperately wanted an ELB program.

I haven't heard any bad feedback as trying to use it or an issue with the technology. These people all have multiple layers of

electronics on their vessels, and so it's not a big step to use this compared to using a radar or a chart plotter or any of that, and so it was well received.

I've got a couple of guys from Galveston that participated that are here at this meeting that can -- You can ask them. They have told me that they really enjoyed it, and so they want to see the program move forward. This year, in fact, I've got about another ten or fifteen on a list driving me crazy wanting to participate, and I think that CLS is going to be able to increase the program next year, and so that will be good.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Michael Short, followed by Mr. Zack Franey.

MR. MICHAEL SHORT: How are you all doing? My name is Michael Short from Galveston, Texas. First off, I just want to thank Scott for airing my dirty laundry out there, but that thing works great.

First off, 41 and 42, we need to slow those down a little bit and get multispecies added to both of them, and we've got some work to do on that one. The VMS electronic logbook, I like it. It's great. I own six boats, two of them federally-permitted boats, and both of them are center console. One is a thirty-six Contender and one is a thirty-foot Pro-Line, and I have no idea where they even put it in the Pro-Line. You can't even see it anywhere. The only thing you've got is the little tablet. In my boat, it's inside the console, out of the way. It stays dry. The only time you see it is when you open the door, and so that's about all I've got.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question for you, sir.

MR. SWINDELL: With the VMS, can you access the VMS yourself on a computer, or does it just go to the --

38 MR. SHORT: I cannot hear you, sir.

40 MR. SWINDELL: On the VMS system, can you access the information on it yourself?

43 MR. SHORT: Yes.

45 MR. SWINDELL: From what, from a computer?

47 MR. SHORT: Are you talking about from my wife looking at it? 48 Yes, she had no problem figuring that out. MR. SWINDELL: From your wife or anyone else looking at it?

MR. SHORT: No, there's a code that only you know about that you go in and put in it.

MR. SWINDELL: If someone else should get your code, they could easily use it, and is that right?

10 MR. SHORT: I have no idea. I am not computer savvy.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have Mr. Zack Franey, 13 followed by Mr. David Krebs.

MR. ZACK FRANEY: How are you guys today? I am Captain Zack Franey from Galveston, Texas. I have a federally-permitted boat. I am currently on the list waiting for a VMS. I agree with Mike and Scott that we need to get 42 and 41 right with multispecies and electronic logbooks to keep track of the fish that we're catching and that we're releasing and get accurate numbers, so we can have accurate catch allotment. That's all I've got.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we have a question for you, Zack.

MR. SWINDELL: One quick question. What size vessel do you have?

MR. FRANEY: It's a thirty-three-foot Scorpion, twin outboard.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. David 32 Krebs, followed by Ms. Pam Anderson.

 MR. DAVID KREBS: Madam Chairman and council, my name is David Krebs, and I own Ariel Seafoods in Destin, Florida and Sebastian, Florida, and I have been invested in the commercial fishing industry for over forty-five years now. I sit on your APs, Reef Fish and Mackerel, and I participate in the SEDAR process, and I actually drove over today from Destin just to thank you for allowing me that privilege, to be involved, and also to thank you for all the work that you have to do to do your jobs effectively.

- I haven't been coming to many council meetings in a while, and, all of a sudden, I am here, and I figured out why. I thought it was going to be just a simple thank-you and I was gone, and yet
- 47 I hear some things that are probably near and dear to my heart
- 48 that have changed.

 King mackerel, I'm on the AP, and we talked about this reallocation on the AP, and, although it sounds simple, our concern is, from the AP's perspective, that reallocation of this stock, until the recreational community settles down, could be negative, and I say that because, from a dealer standpoint, the size of fish that we've been harvesting the last two years are getting progressively smaller.

Now, I need big fish. If he's over ten pounds, I'm a happy camper. If he's six pounds, he's a big Spanish mackerel. That's the way the market sees it. The Naples run was small and the Jupiter run was small. The Gulf run, we don't know, because, when the fish are due to get big in late October and November and into January in the western Gulf, the season is closed these days. We're going to have this quota increase and the shifting of the boundary lines, and, when we get to 400,000 pounds plus in the northern subzone, that's going to be a big barometer for us, to see what the stock is really doing.

We know we have until December 20 to catch our fish in the northern subzone. December 20, they're gone, and they have been for twenty-five years. When the water gets cool, they leave Apalachicola and they head to the Keys, where they can have sun and fun.

I have a little bit of concern there. The gag issue, I heard we want to go twenty-four to be with the recreational industry, and we talked about this at the Reef Fish AP. Twenty-two, we're finally close to catching our gag. They're sexually mature at twenty-two. Most fishermen that were there that gave testimony said that twenty-three inches was -- They weren't catching a twenty-two, and they were catching a twenty-three. It all of a sudden put the commercial industry in a box, because we don't have parity with the recreational industry. I think that's the wrong approach.

 They want to mention there for second length by having a bigger size limit. The recreational industry is not concerned with how well the stock is doing, per se, and I'm being a little foolish there, but they need season length more than they need -- They use the size limit to get there.

 The last thing is the triggerfish. They are crawling on the water, and I know Councilman Walker has addressed that, and we addressed it in the AP. Twelve triggerfish on a commercial boat was 102 pounds last week, and so a five-pound one used to be a banjo. I don't know what we're going to call an eight-pound

one, and so that winds me up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a couple of questions from Mr. Walker and then Dr. Dana.

MR. WALKER: Hi, David. I had a couple of questions. Was triggerfish -- Were you happy with the numbers? Then what are your thoughts on the amberjack 500-pound trip limit that was mentioned earlier?

MR. KREBS: Thank you for that. The triggerfish, the reason that we went to these headcounts was we said that discarding them doesn't hurt the animal. If that's the fact, we have really struggled with supplying the restaurants that want to eat these fish commercially during the seasonal months, which is May to October.

A twelve-fish trip limit on a commercial boat really isn't accomplishing anything. We would be better off going with an open season, like it's always been, because I don't know anybody that is just purposely targeting them. That's for you guys, in other testimony, to separate.

The twelve fish hasn't been healthy for anybody, and I heard Mr. Brazer talk earlier about reducing the amberjack trip limit, and that's the same thing. For us, we need amberjack commercially for our summer-month seasons, when the tourists want to eat them, when the American public wants to show up and eat them. It's not something we're putting in grocery stores or anywhere around, as far as our coast is concerned. Texas could be different, and South Florida could be different, but I would think that you would really hurt the commercial ability to prosecute that fishery in our area if you went below a 1,500-pound trip limit.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, David. I don't believe there is anyone that understands the king mackerel fishery as well as you do, particularly the commercial aspects of it. In the CMP Committee, we are looking at Amendment 29, which does a conditional lease going from the recreational to the commercial. We had talked about it a little bit, but can you talk to the council about your feelings on that?

MR. KREBS: Again, we talked about it at length on the Mackerel

AP, and the concern was I did hear -- We hear several charter operators saying if we don't have triggers and if we don't have jacks -- When I was a kid growing up in Destin, we didn't bottom fish on charter boats. All we did was troll for kingfish. The headboats did the bottom fishing and the charter boats did the trolling.

It is a fishery that, at any given time, the recreational industry may want back, and so, the way we've been operating and prosecuting this fishery for all these years, it's almost like Myron says that we've got a buffer out there.

That fish that the recreational hasn't been catching has in fact acted as this great big buffer, and so I just -- My concern is always, if you want to increase something, increase the testing, the biology of the fish, because, to my knowledge, since the 1970s or the 1980s, we haven't had a really ongoing tagging checking of the fish.

The fish in Jupiter, which the May run in Jupiter is always a spawning stock. When I first started buying fish in Jupiter in 2006, I think we had a thirty-pound average on a king mackerel. They were huge females. We haven't had a run of fish in the last four years anything like that, and, even talking to Mr. Hartig from the east coast -- Ben is on the South Atlantic Council, and I said, this is a spawning stock and why aren't we trying to protect it? The opinion has always been there is plenty and plenty and plenty.

Well, I don't know if it's water temperature or salinity or what's changing how the harvest rate is, but, for us, and we're not in the Keys. It's the only place that I am not there, and I trust what Mr. Kelly says to be the gospel for them, but, from everywhere else that we're participating the fishery, they're getting smaller and a little bit more difficult to catch, with the exception of Naples. Last year, Naples, the stock showed up there and they worked on those fish in February. It was a great fishery for them.

I think once we cycle through -- I wish we were going to get the bump this year to go to 400,000 in the Northern Subzone, because that will carry over to -- Well, even if it comes late, we'll have a spring fishery in Destin, and it will reset next October, and that's going to really solve our Panhandle problems, I think, going forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: One more question for you from Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Do you handle any of the fish in the Keys caught, the overwinter fish?

MR. KREBS: No, I don't. I see the freezer fish come through the pipeline, and some of the fish make it up to Miami, and we may get a couple of vats of big fish that we'll send out west or something from them, but, as far as actually going out there—I probably need to, but I've left Seafood Atlantic and Fish Busters. That's been their territory, and you've got to mind your own business sometimes. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Ms. Pam Anderson, followed by Mr. Albert Stinson.

MS. PAM ANDERSON: Thank you. Madam Chair, Dr. Crabtree, and council members, I am Pam Anderson with Captain Anderson's Marina in Panama City Beach, and I'm the fishery rep on the Bay County Chamber of Commerce.

In response to the stated need for better harvest data, our industry has asked the council for years to not just insist that we have electronic logbooks, but tell us the particular data needs and why. The technical committee review has done that, and we thank the Data Collection Committee for following through with that request. We believe the specifics here go a long way to explain the need and how to accomplish that need.

Two issues we still have with some of our boat operators are requiring the expense burden of the VMS system and having the report completed before docking. If VMS is required, we believe, just like in the commercial sector, that NOAA or NMFS should bear the initial expense. This council did set a precedent when they financed the commercial sector's VMS, and it should be the same for for-hire.

For modifications to headboat reporting, for 2.2, Action 2, Alternative 3 is our preferred. We have no issue with hail-in and hail-out. It is similar to a radio check. For 2.4, Action 4, Alternative 4 is our preferred. That gives the captain enough time to collect data from the deckhands and check it for accuracy and then report it.

The GPS capabilities are not an issue as long as the captains' proprietary information is kept confidential. A fair referendum is one permit, one vote. Once that is decided, the division of allocation should go according to catch history. This is the most fair way.

 One thing we're hearing about the headboats and charter boats wanting to go together, going side-by-side, I think it has to do with one group deciding that they weren't going to get enough fish and this is all that happens with sector separation and all of these other things, and this should not be a surprise for these folks.

As we have stated in the past, Magnuson's 407(d) will prevent subsectors from being made responsible for excess harvest or beneficiaries of any quota carryover. This was one of the reasons that we opposed sector separation in the first place.

A new term is surfacing of recreational and commercial exchange. For those not aware of the efforts to push this, it is just another term for intersector trading, the way I see it. In Amendment 42, we still believe 2.2, Action 1, that no action is best for our industry. We needed an improved data collection system and a way to confirm the number of trips and passengers as well as fishing harvest data. That is all attained with the modifications for reporting requirements. All the rest is to give an avenue to accomplish intersector trading.

In 2.2, Action 2, Alternative 1, if any species is selected besides red snapper, it will not tie us back to Amendment 40, and so we will not have access to the sunset that may happen. I will submit other comments on that in writing. Am I over my time?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay. I had a couple of other things to say, but I will hold those and send them in written comment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. We appreciate it. Mr. Albert Stinson, followed by Mr. Mike Thierry.

MR. ALBERT STINSON: Thank you for letting me be here today and giving my opinion on this. We have had a lot of my coworkers and co-charter boat guys. I have a thirty-four-foot charter boat, federally-permitted, out of Orange Beach. I reflect the sentiments that Randy Boggs and Troy Frady and Bill Staff and all of them have hit on, and there's no reason for me to keep going on about that.

There was one thing, the subject about the electronic logbooks. Early on, I signed up for the logbooks, and, by no fault of anyone, I missed the appointment with the gentleman to get the equipment on my boat. I did get the receiver, and I did get

some of the equipment installed, the antenna and this and that and the other, but, as I went to going ahead and getting the tablet and this and that and the other, I started getting information and feedback from other people, some of it good and some of it bad, and so there was a lot of being unsure about it. I was not sure exactly what about the location of the VMS and if it was going to be something that somebody could access, and so misinformation and stuff. I will take responsibility for that.

I will go ahead and say that I am in favor of it. I think it's something I should have gone ahead and done, and I will do it. I have everything but the tablet, and so I don't see a problem with reporting. We need that for our industry. It's been going on, and I'm a second-generation charter boat captain. I've been doing it all my life. There's more triggerfish out there than you can say grace over. It's kind of tough when you're on a six-pack boat and you can go through a flat of squid trying to catch a b-liner and you're feeding it to triggerfish. There's plenty of them out there, guys, and you all have got to do something to allow us to access that fishery.

 I like the idea that Randy had. I think there can be something done there, and I'm in favor of 41 and 42 not being stalled. We need to tweak them out and get them where they need to be. You all have got a lot of smart heads up here, and I am real impressed by the comments I've heard today, and I would like to see 41 and 42 worked on. I do think they need to hit the floor running at the same time, and, other than that, I think that our industry needs the electronic logbooks and data to move us forward. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mike Thierry, followed by Mr. Michael Miglini.

MR. MIKE THIERRY: Thank you, all. I'm Captain Mike Thierry from Dauphin Island, Alabama. I've been charter/headboat fishing for over fifty years, and I probably spend approximately 150 days a year in that Gulf.

I support Amendments 41 and 42. I feel they will greatly help our industry, but I also feel like 41 should mirror 42 with multiple species in both and implementation of these amendments at the same time, to eliminate any inequities that could occur.

Mandatory reporting with electronic logbooks is way overdue. We have asked for this for years. It needs to be put into place as quickly as possible, please. It is very important to know who is catching these fish and who is depending on these fish for

our livelihoods.

I am part of the CLS pilot program, and I was surprised how easy it was to use. It takes me about five minutes to enter my data or less than five minutes to enter my data for a day. There's been no inconvenience, and it's worked great. My equipment has worked great.

 I would like to see a size limit on our king mackerel eliminated. I feel like the discards are dying, and I hate to waste fish. Triggerfish, everybody has sat up here and said it, but there's plenty of them. In all my years of fishing, it's as good as it has ever been. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Michael Miglini, followed by Ms. Patricia Davis.

MR. MICHAEL MIGLINI: Hi there. I am Michael Miglini from Corpus Christi, Texas. When I kind of started with all this charter boat and getting involved with the council, I seriously thought we would be done by now, but it's been a really long road, working with the charter/for-hire and getting sector separation allocation, and it's been a long road. There's a lot of work left to do, and I think you see Amendment 41 and 42 and, the way they're written, I think they need some more work, but that's part of the process.

We always said that if you put all the charter boat operators and headboat operators together and give them an allocation that you've got a pretty good chance of being able to figure something out. I think what you're seeing and hearing right now is just part of the process of getting that done.

I think that it's worth taking the time to do it right, and I think everybody in the industry looks forward to developing a product that shows how much work went into it and sets an example for the rest of the regional fishery management councils and others to follow.

I think that anytime you make a fishery management plan, especially for charter/for-hire, you need to look at really the goal of what you're trying to accomplish, and I think that when you look at charter boats and charter boat operators in the for-hire sector, you need to realize that the value is what you leave the dock with, the people that are on the boat and providing that public access to fishing for people that don't own a boat.

 That's going to require small boats and big boats and old operations and allowing for new entrants. I don't think we should manage the charter/for-hire sector like a commercial fishing sector, because while one is valued on what you come to the dock with in pounds, and certain efficiencies are great for commercial fishing, but they're not necessarily going to meet the qoals long-term of charter/for-hire sector, and I think it's important to realize that.

I think that on logbooks, and it's been said a million times, but I've just kind of got to say it again, but it's really -- There is an effort to divide things up, but there is not a denominator of common quality among the permitted vessels. You have got a somewhat data-rich group and an extraordinarily data-poor group, and so it's going to be tough, and I think the logbooks and the data needs to move forward, of course. I think that's it. I think we're left with a lot of questions, and I think that's a good thing. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have one question for you, sir, from Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Do you have a VMS and an electronic logbook?

 MR. MIGLINI: I have dealt with VMS for a long time. I was actually one of the first ones in my port, in Port Aransas, to have one when I had a commercial reef fish vessel. I also own a business that has sold dozens and dozens of VMS to people and dealt with them, a lot of the issues and everything. I think it's a very powerful tool, and I believe that, given a fishery management plan that justifies it and warrants it, that most of your charter boat operators are going to say, hey, that's worth what we're getting, that the extra work is worth what we're getting.

I think it's a very scary thing. I think one of the major concerns that I've got with VMS is, first of all, having a fishery management plan that makes it worth it, and, two, having a provision in any VMS-required system that if you have the real value of this whole thing, which is those people that want to go fishing on a day, and they show up and that piece of electronic equipment is broken, that there is a back-up system in place where those people can still get to go fishing.

If it were a commercial boat, it's a big deal to have to wait a day or two on a commercial boat, but you're going to be able to make a trip, where a couple of hours for a charter is a big

deal. It can be a deal-breaker, and those people plan their vacations and everything else like that to come down. They don't want to leave two days from now because your VMS is broken. They want to go fishing today, because they need to go back, because the kids need to go back to school.

I would say anything with VMS needs to have a fail-safe. I don't think that fail-safe should become a way of life or an operating thing. It may be something where they can use it for up to five business days and then you put it in the design requirement of the VMS service provider that the VMS service provider has two business days to get a replacement to the operator. Something like that would alleviate a lot of the concerns, I think, with VMS.

MR. SWINDELL: How about the electronic logbook?

MR. MIGLINI: I look at a lot of different fisheries and the way they're managed and the fact that, arguably, the charter/for-hire sector left close to half of its allocation on the table this year, and I see electronic logbooks as an awesome opportunity to be able to harvest that allocation.

There is lots of things the council could do. They could maybe allocate days or time to catch reef fish and then, if you have real-time logbooks, you have twenty-four-hour wave data as far as landings. You could shut it down before you go over.

If you're doing an allocation-based system, to be able to harvest all of the allocation, you can look at those landings and allocate more so that the landings get done.

 You know, I just don't see any way that the charter/for-hire sector is going to be able to have a flexible catch model or harvest model without providing better data, and I think electronic logbooks are going to be necessary to do that, and hopefully, once again, just like if VMS are required, I hope that the fishery management plan, the result, is something that the operators say, yes, this is more work, but, wow, look what I'm getting from doing that work. I think that it needs to be justified, and I think that everybody around in the industry kind of sees the value of the data now and getting it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Patricia 46 Davis, followed by Ms. Alison Johnson.

MS. PATRICIA DAVIS: Hi. I'm Patricia Davis. I'm not a boat

captain. I'm actually a business consultant. A lot of people in Fairhope, Alabama know me as a real estate appraiser and a real estate broker. I've been around all of the United States doing consulting for Mel Graham, the Boot Ranch in Texas, and I spent about a year in Galveston, Texas lately.

I have noticed that the multispecies is crucial, because there is so many different types of fish, and it's different in every area I fish. I'm a recreational fisherwoman, and I went charter boat fishing with Mike Thierry, and I go headboat fishing with Johnny Williams. I am a little partial to passing it very quickly, so he will retire and give that company to Captain Jillian, but, in the meantime, 42 could be passed. 41, you could add the multispecies, and we could all be happily ever after, and we commend all the hard work that you've done on all of this, and you guys have been wonderful. We've enjoyed our time here, and thank you very much. Do you have any questions at all?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, ma'am. We appreciate it. Next, we have Ms. Alison Johnson, followed by Mr. Richard Fischer.

MS. ALISON JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Gulf Council members. I'm Alison Johnson, and I'm the Responsible Fisheries Campaign Manager for Oceana for the Southeast and Gulf of Mexico. I would like to say a few words about Amendment 7, the scoping guide for proposed coral protection in the Gulf of Mexico.

Although that we think that the scoping guide is a step in the right direction, we feel it is lacking information and does not fully employ all the authority available to protect deep-sea coral under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. For example, the scoping guide discusses using habitat areas of particular concern as the primary mechanism to manage deep-sea coral in the Gulf. HAPCs are a subset of essential fish habitat, which is considered ecologically important or rare.

HAPCs may be appropriate for some coral areas, but those that did not provide essential fish habitat cannot be protected under this mechanism. We feel that the scoping guide should discuss the discretionary provisions of the amended MSA to protect deepsea coral. These measures would prevent expansion of fisheries using bottom-tending gear in areas with deep-sea coral and prevent damage to deep-sea coral in areas where they have been observed.

We also think that the scoping guide should discuss Section 408,

the deep-sea coral research and technology program, which would add background information and improve the development of Amendment 7.

We think it's premature to send this document out for scoping without soliciting additional input from scientists, NGOs, and the Fisheries Service about the size, location, and number of areas for consideration.

Lastly, we feel that the scoping guide should discuss a pathway to add additional areas when new science becomes available and also a mechanism to remove areas when deep-sea coral is confirmed not to be present. I would like to thank the council for allowing me to provide public testimony today, and we look forward to working with you on this important amendment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Richard Fischer, followed by Mr. Mike Jennings.

MR. RICHARD FISCHER: Hello, everyone. Madam Chair and members of the council, thanks for having me here today to speak. I am going to talk about Amendment 41 as well as the electronic logbooks. Starting with 41, it looks like we're kind of between PFQ and IFQ, and what we would like to say is the Louisiana Charter Boat Association, as we represent many of the charter boats in the State of Louisiana, both inshore and offshore in our saltwater regions, that we would be in favor of PFQ instead of IFO.

Many of our captains, they have kind of been crunching the numbers over the course of the last few months, and I think they're kind of starting to realize that if we go to either one of those systems that they're really only going to get fourteen to eighteen days per year to go ahead and catch snapper and so, whenever you put it to them like that, that way, maybe the current forty-five-day season on a set time period sounds a little bit better, and so they're still kind of split about trying to decide where they want to go, but I think, for the most part, there's a consensus that the current forty-five-day season might be a better alternative for them.

We would like the council to enter a discussion on having a split season, because a lot of our member captains have told us that, look, we can book trips in the middle of the summer and we don't necessarily need to have snapper as a fish that we can catch in the middle of the summer.

 If you look at other parts of the year, maybe they could kind of dangle that as some kind of business opportunity there, to tell customers that, look, other parts of the year you can catch snapper, and we do want to say that we oppose allocation sharing among permits. We kind of thought that that was the separation between IFQ and PFQ, and we would like to keep it to where, if it's a permit, you've got have it on your permit, and the only way to lose that snapper allocation is to lose your permit.

Moving on to logbooks now, we have heard a lot of support for logbooks so far today, but I can tell you, in talking to our Louisiana charter fishermen, a lot of them are not in favor of having logbooks.

We have had LA Creel in the State of Louisiana for the last few years, and LA Creel has really shown us that it's possible to get very precise data, and, even though our captains are opposing logbooks, I think they are kind of reaching that acceptance stage, to where they're kind of realizing that, look, logbooks are going to happen, but we do absolutely, positively need for there to be some kind of call-in, to where, if your logbook is broken, you can have a number that you can call so that you're not losing that business.

As for VMS, we don't want real-time GMS. We don't want VMS. We are also opposed to having something that's fixed to the boat, and we did want to thank Dr. Ponwith for going with some suggestions the other day that were not necessarily items that were fixed to the boat and that could be mobile-type devices. It looks like I'm out of time, and so thank you, all, for letting me speak here today.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I think we have a question for you.

MR. SWINDELL: Why are you against the VMS?

 MR. R. FISCHER: They don't want to be tracked real-time. They don't want something fixed to the boat. They would much rather have something like a cell phone or any other kind of less-cumbersome device. They just don't want the trouble of that. It's going to cost money to install, and it's going to cost money to service. They would much rather a less-cumbersome device than something that's going to get fixed to a console.

In Louisiana, we're talking about a lot of center-console boats.
The vast majority are like that. There's not very many closed hulls, and so they're in the rain, they're in the weather,

they're in the wind. They're in all the conditions, and so we just want to make it as easy for them as possible.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Richard, how many federally-permitted members do you have?

MR. R. FISCHER: In our membership, we have, I want to say, between thirty and forty, and I haven't looked at that in that past few weeks. Our membership is growing quickly. We have doubled our membership in the past year, and we're hoping to be able to double it again in the next year. I think there's about seventy or eighty charter fishermen offshore that we're talking about that actually fish in Louisiana, and we represent I think between thirty and forty, and we're looking to up that here pretty quickly. Anything else?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think that's it, sir. Thank you. Mr. Mike Jennings, followed by Mr. Shane Cantrell.

MR. MIKE JENNINGS: Hello. I'm Captain Mike Jennings from Freeport, Texas. I own two federally-permitted charter boats, and I am the current President of the Charter Fishermen's Association. I am going to speak mainly to 41 and 42, and I will keep it brief, rather than sound like a broken record. I think you all have heard a lot of the concerns that everybody has had today, and it's been kind of a whirlwind two or three weeks leading up to this meeting.

From an association standpoint on 42, we see that, between 41 and 42, we see that the charge, in our opinion, is unequal, and the makeup is unequal. We take issue with some of the time series that are being used, especially 2014, while the headboats were in the pilot, and there's been a lot of discussion over the last couple of days on that issue.

There has been also some thoughts and some dislikes on how the boats from 41 that don't get allocation can be rolled into 42 and some thoughts and discussion on one side taking a haircut that the other wouldn't take that may or may not have been unfounded, compared to some of the stuff that we've seen since we've got here the last few days.

With all this, it comes down, I think, to some issues where we've had some problems with some misunderstanding of the language in the amendments and some lack of clarity in some language in the amendments and, at this current time, from an

association standpoint, we do not support 41 and 42 as they currently are written, and I will repeat that, as they are currently written.

We are fully committed to working towards a rights-based FMP and continuing to work with this council on that issue, and I am hoping that we do so in a nature that we can start to move forward and address some of these situations, and especially one of the big heartaches or heartburn has been the multispecies issue that this council had the opportunity to pass at the last council meeting and voted down.

That is causing some of the turmoil that's within this, and whether that was by design or not is neither here nor there, but I would like to see the council bring that back up and readdress that, because that's one of the big issues.

As far as ELBs, we fully support the ELBs, and I may be a little bit unique in my situation, but, as I've grown older, my boats have grown bigger, but I have spent about twenty years of my life running fast in a center console, and I have now moved up to something with air conditioning and a bridge, but it's the same concept of worrying about using that technology in rough seas and things along those lines.

I can tell you, from experience, that I can sit on a console in rough seas with an autopilot running, or steering with my feet, and, as soon as my phone comes on, start texting and answering the texts that are rolling through on my phone while zooming my GPS out and moving and dragging my radar in so I can see the jetties as I approach it. It's not that difficult.

The technology is easy to use, and I currently have it on my boats. It's something we need to look at. If it's not a VMS, then give us an alternative that fits what the Science Center needs, and let's move forward with these ELBs and get this done. Let's take that thing to final action and start a design that we can put on the water and start narrowing some of this information down that we know that we need. I appreciate it. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Shane Cantrell, followed by Mr. Jay Trochesset.

45 MR. SHANE CANTRELL: Hello. I am Shane Cantrell, Executive 46 Director of the Charter Fishermen's Association. I'm a charter 47 boat permit holder and a commercial catch share fisherman out of 48 Galveston, Texas. First, off the top, I didn't see this one necessarily coming up, but supporting this HMS amendment as it moves forward is something that I've been involved with for the last four or five years, since they wanted to move the blacktip shark up to ninety-six inches. We started digging into that. The north coast of Africa is the only place that they have those fish, and we were able to get around that the first time. When you come out of a lawsuit, you kind of take a little bit more action with overfished and undergoing overfishing, and having that settled out of court is a big deal.

 It's the requirement, and we need to have a mandatory shark identification course with the charter/for-hire endorsement to be able to responsibly harvest these and continue to catch them, continue to do the right thing for the fishery and not harm these dusky sharks and not harm these sandbar sharks. These are things we need in the water, and we need to be able to get that data. We can get a lot more data off of that, especially pairing it with the electronic reporting that we're already going to do, and it would be all species.

You can put those in there just like you can put in anything else. It would be a good thing to do. The electronic logbook needs to be finalized and implemented as soon as we can. This has started before I started coming to these council meetings, and we need to get it done. January is a perfect time. I was a little discouraged that it wasn't in October and we weren't being able to do that now, but we can do it the next meeting.

I understand the concerns out of Louisiana on some of this stuff. I fully support this going with Action 4, Alternative 2. The technical data committee, or the technical review committee, said we can do this and this will be okay. If Dr. Crabtree and his people have some other ideas, let them know and let's see what we've got in January. Let's get this thing passed. Get us the information that we need to be able to execute this fishery and get that extra 17 percent of those fish that we're leaving in the water right now, to be able to fully use that.

Amendment 41 and 42, working through their respective issues, we need to keep moving down this road and keep developing these things, work it out and get something that everybody is happy with and everybody is on an equal playing field in terms of species. We need each one to be multispecies. It's critical to have some of these fish available for different fishermen in different regions, having a gag grouper available in the Panhandle during snapper season instead of watching it float

off. That was huge this year, for me to be able to have red snapper and amberjack on the table and go out and charter boat fish for those.

The last thing I want to touch on is this carryover provision. The beginning of this discussion is coming up, and it's very concerning to me, as I look at this and kind of see how it's going out. When we implemented the buffers and accountability measures, we did not do it as a sector-specific scenario or subsector-specific. We did it for the total deal, and so the 17 percent that's underharvested would go back into the total recreational and fall out, and it would be covering overages from a sub-sector that I'm not a part of, and that's very concerning to me, that that's how we want to move forward in that, and I would be happy to take any questions that you all might have.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Captain Greene.

MR. GREENE: You've been involved with HMS for about five years? Did I understand that correctly?

MR. CANTRELL: Yes, sir.

MR. GREENE: In our area of the Gulf, from the mouth of the Mississippi River, to off of Apalachicola, where I fish a fair bit, if we hook a grouper, red grouper, scamp, or gag grouper, very rarely do we get them off the bottom without a shark eating him. Now, we may catch one while somebody is fighting that shark on that one, but that's about the extent of it.

How can we as a council move forward and help HMS do something that would potentially open up some fishing around the dusky situation, to where some of those guys can go back to fishing?

 MR. CANTRELL: As I understand it, the council can weigh in and provide a letter of support or a letter of advice towards HMS, Highly Migratory Species, as they move forward. This council doesn't directly manage those, but we do have, in the shark fishery, the directed shark fishery, an in-person shark dealer identification course.

If you're a shark dealer, and you're buying sharks, you're mandated to go through this course. It's a one-day, four-to-six-hour course. I've gone through it, and it's put together through the agency, and you can identify these sharks with no fins and no guts and no head and no tail. You can do it really

well. It's not that difficult to be able to do, but you've got to see them. You've got to put them next to each other and be able to do that.

You go through that, and you can get a very similar course and adapt that to the charter boats. You can do it online or you can do it in-person, whatever it needs to do to make sure we're meeting those deals, because, if you can correctly identify that shark and it's legal to harvest, you should be able to put it in the boat, if that's what your customers want to do, and I personally don't want to keep a lot of them, but I've got customers that do, and they want to do that, and we've got to be able to responsibly execute these fisheries, be able to go catch them and know what we're taking and know what we cannot take.

If that fish comes up and it's a dusky or a sandbar, it's going to be a prohibited species, and I can't justify keeping it, but, if it's not, we've got to be able to do that, and this council could put together a letter of support for that and be able to move that forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Jay Trochesset, followed by Mr. Dan Green.

MR. JAY TROCHESSET: I'm Jay Trochesset from Silver Dollar Charters in Biloxi, Mississippi. My family is four generations, and I started running my own boat in 1973. I know it's late, and I have two quick things.

I have a little problem with the VMS, in that Captain Seymour had a chart, a map, up here earlier, and we have a unique situation here in Mississippi. We don't get out in the EEZ much, and this VMS, I have to a month-and-a-half pay for it, but you've got to pay the whole year. Being in business all this time, that's a problem for me, having to pay twelve months when I don't use it but a month-and-a-half.

The other thing is the split season. Our people in Mississippi would love to see a split snapper season, because we can run every day in June and July, but we would like to run in September or October or early November. I would like for you all to think about that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Dan Green.

46 MR. DAN GREEN: How's it going? I'm Dan Green from Galveston, 47 Texas. I have been a charter boat and permit owner for the last 48 ten years, and, recently, this year, I decided to get into the commercial fishery. I went out and bought my permit and leased some allocation of fish, and I even became an IFQ shareholder.

It's working out great for me, but I fish on a twenty-six-foot boat, and so I don't have a huge fish capacity like a lot of the commercial fishermen. I can probably hold about 1,000 pounds, and so having seasons for fish, like amberjack, that are longer are more important to me, because I can go out and catch 500 pounds of snapper and then catch bycatch and stuff like that, and so I would be for maybe a smaller trip limit on amberjack, like 1,000 pounds, if it would extend the season out for a longer period of time.

Also, I do like the idea of a sixteen-fish triggerfish limit, and also, on the charter side, with the amberjack as well, we need to find a way that we can access these amberjack in August and September, because, in Texas, that's one of our main fish that we take our customers out to catch that time of year, and, without them, like this year, it's pretty hard to have a nice box of fish for them to take home without the amberjack.

In regards to the electronic logbooks being a burden on the operators of the small center consoles, like I said, I fish on a twenty-six-foot catamaran boat, and I have the VMS that the guys on the charter boats have, and it's very small. It's just basically all you have accessible to the elements is a tablet, and I just sit it on my center console all day, and it's fine. It's pretty easy to use.

It's my first year to use it, and I haven't had any issues with it yet, not one, and so I don't think there is any reason not to have them, especially from a scientific standpoint. You guys need better data, and why would you guys not make that mandatory? That is one of the real uses for it. It's perfect for that.

 With Amendment 41, I would like to see the multispecies concept with tradability within the sector, and also I really like the idea that Randy talked about with the distribution of the allocation, and that's all. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We had one individual that wasn't present when their name was called, Casey Price. Did he make it back to the room? If not, that completes everyone that was on the list for public testimony. We appreciate everybody taking the time out of their day and their lives to come and speak to us. It is very meaningful, and it helps to guide us in our deliberations. Thank you very much. We are adjourned for

the day, and we will start back up tomorrow morning at eight o'clock.

2 3 4

1

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on October 19, 2016.)

5 6

_ _ _

7

October 20, 2016

8 9 10

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

11

12 - - -

13 14

15

16

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the IP Casino & Resort, Biloxi, Mississippi, Thursday morning, October 20, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

17 18 19

20

2122

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a couple of schedules that we're going to try and accommodate, and so we may shift some of these reports around a little bit. Obviously Reef Fish is always the heavy lift, and so I think what we will do -- There is two main reports that we're trying to accommodate. Dale, are you ready? I will let you lead off with Shrimp, and then we'll follow that up by Reef Fish. Then I think, after that, we can go back to the normal agenda. Will that work for you, Dale?

262728

MR. DIAZ: Yes, ma'am.

29 30

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Then that's what we'll do. I am going to turn it over to you, Mr. Diaz.

313233

COMMITTEE REPORTS SHRIMP COMMITTEE REPORT

343536

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

MR. DIAZ: Good morning, everyone. This is the Shrimp Committee Update on National Marine Fisheries Service Turtle Report. Device Rule, Mr. Hoffman presented Excluder the current compliance rate and a status update on the TED Rule. alternatives for the rulemaking include the status quo, required use of modified TEDs in skimmer trawls, required use of modified shrimp trawl vessels, and other by all potential alternatives. The DEIS on the proposed rule is expected by the end of the year.

44 45 46

47

48

Mr. Hoffman also presented the compliance policy and compliance threshold. Mr. Hoffman stressed that the closure of the shrimp fishery due to poor TED compliance is a last-resort action that would occur only after education and outreach and enforcement activities failed to remedy poor compliance.

Risk Assessment for Threshold Permit Numbers Relative to Sea Turtle Incidental Take Restraints, Dr. Hart presented the information provided in the risk assessment for threshold permit numbers relative to sea turtle incidental take restraints. The committee was also presented with the SSC report on this document.

It was noted that the relative risk table available in the document was a risk relative to the other alternatives and that the SSC highlighted the caveats identified in this analysis. The caveats include the following: 1)not all latent effort can be realized; 2)economic and biological factors drive effort in the shrimp fishery rather than the number of federal permits; 3)federal and state effort cannot be partitioned; and 4)moratorium permits only limit effort in the EEZ and, thus, only federal effort is limited.

Revised Options Paper for Shrimp Amendment 17B, the committee was presented with the revised draft options paper of Shrimp Amendment 17B. The document now includes data from 2014, and, thus, some of the values have changed slightly for Actions 1, 2, and 3.

The committee discussed the threshold values for Action 3. With the information from the risk assessment, the committee discussed eliminating Alternative 6 in Action 3, which is the only alternative that has a threshold greater than the current number of valid permits.

There was concern about eliminating the only alternative that is based on the number of valid permits and not based on the number of active permits. It was noted that with the current rate of attrition of permits through non-renewal, the threshold values would not be reached for five to ten years. Thus, it was discussed that it would be inappropriate to recommend reserve pool permit requirements at this time.

The committee made the following motion. The committee recommends, and I so move, to move Action 3, Alternative 6 and Action 5 to Considered but Rejected. Action 3 is Minimum Threshold Number of Gulf Shrimp Vessel Permits. Alternative 6 is set a threshold number of valid or renewable Gulf shrimp vessel permits equal to the number of valid permits at the end of 2013, 2014, or at the end of the initial moratorium on October 26, 2016. Action 5 is the Issuance and Maintenance of

Reserved Gulf Shrimp Vessel Permits. The motion carried seven to two.

Madam Chair, before I turn it back over to you, I did not read the entire Action 5, but it's on the board if anybody wants to discuss it, or, if anybody wants me to read it, I would be glad to read it, but it's quite lengthy.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Diaz.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: All the council members were emailed a copy of the committee report, and everybody should have copies of all the committee reports, plus they're on our website.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. We have it on the board in front of us. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Chairman Diaz, would you like to carry on?

MR. DIAZ: Yes, ma'am. The committee then discussed Action 6, Transit Provisions for Shrimp Vessels Without a Federal Shrimp Permit. The committee felt that Alternatives 2 and 4 could be combined for clarity. It was noted that this would be changing the AP's Preferred Alternative, and staff informed the committee that the AP was not presented with Alternative 4, but would likely be amenable to the change. The committee discussed that Alternative 3 would be cumbersome to fishermen and could be a safety issue.

committee made the following motion. The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 6, to change Alternative 2 to read as follows and remove Alternative 4. Alternative 2 is a vessel possessing shrimp may transit Gulf federal waters without a federal vessel permit if fishing gear is appropriately stowed. Transit means non-stop progression through the area. gear appropriately stowed means trawl doors and nets must be out of the water and the bag straps must be removed from the net. Alternative 4 is vessel possessing shrimp may transit Gulf federal waters without a federal vessel permit if fishing gear is appropriately stowed. Transit means non-stop progression through the area. Fishing gear appropriately stowed means a trawl net may remain on deck, but the bag straps must be removed from the net. The motion carried with no opposition. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to

the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. DIAZ: Under Other Business, Dr. Hart presented the 2015 Gulf of Mexico commercial shrimp fishing effort estimate. In 2015, the fishing effort was equal to a 71.1 percent reduction from the baseline effort, which is more than the 67 percent reduction required for juvenile red snapper bycatch mortality. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Mr. 11 Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I do have a motion. I just emailed it to the staff. The motion is in Action 6, Alternative 3. We talked at the meeting about unshackling the net and the difficulty that that would be for the crew and what we're really trying to accomplish.

In talking with Mr. Diaz, I think this motion would still give us the same effect, which would be that they have the doors on the deck, but they wouldn't have to unshackle the nets and be a burden to the fishermen, but it would still, from an enforcement standpoint, ensure that they're not shrimping when they go through the EEZ without a permit. I would make a motion on Action 6, Alternative 3, that this be the new language for that alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Will you double check what is on the board there and make sure that's your alternative, once we finish editing it? Then I will read it into the record.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Yes, ma'am.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Let me read this. In Action 6, to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. A vessel possessing shrimp may transit Gulf federal waters without a federal vessel permit if fishing gear is appropriately stowed. Transit means non-stop progression through the area. Fishing gear appropriately stowed means a trawl net and trawl doors shall remain on deck, but trawl doors. Is that your motion?

42 MR. BLANKENSHIP: Yes, ma'am.

44 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

46 MS. LEVY: Maybe I missed it, but did you just want to change 47 the language to Alternative 3, or did you want to change it and 48 make it a preferred? MR. BLANKENSHIP: I just wanted to change the language.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Do we have a second to this motion? It's seconded by Mr. Walker. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Leann, I guess I need to ask for your shrimping expertise. If you're in rough seas, and so you've pulled your nets up and you've got the doors hoisted up to the outriggers, now this requires that you've got to put them on the deck, and how dangerous is that to do?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: If it's rough, then that can get to be a hairy situation, for sure. I thought though that we had that in the document. Is that what we just removed from the document earlier? Let's flip to the document real quick. Mr. Diaz, you may have to straighten us out on this, but I thought we had an alternative that would have you deck your doors and disconnect, and then this will amend that so that you don't disconnect? Is that essentially what we're doing?

MR. DIAZ: Right, and, I guess to Dr. Crabtree's point, right now, to disconnect the nets from the doors, the doors are going to have to be on the deck anyway for this alternative, and so it's not changing the fact that they would have to put the nets and the doors on the deck, but it's just taking the burden of them having to unshackle the net from the doors, which are already on the deck away from the fishermen, and I do agree that, in rough seas, Dr. Crabtree, there are times when making the fishermen have to put everything on the deck might be something that would be quite dangerous. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: We still have Alternative 4 in here, right, that doesn't require them to put the doors on the deck.

MS. LEVY: It's Alternative 2 that got changed.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, but we made that Alternative 2 at this 41 point, I guess, and, since we're not making this the preferred, 42 then I'm good with changing the language the way that Chris 43 wants to.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: We started down this road yesterday in the 48 committee, and I think this was similar to what I was trying to

do, and then I believe our Coast Guard representative had read it a different way, and so is you all's language different than this?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Lieutenant Commander?

 LCDR DANAHER: Yes, Madam Chair. The language that I was specifying, and I was going to bring this up regardless, but the language in our manual, per the law, says what is the definition of stowed? A trawl net may remain on deck, but trawl doors must be disconnected from the trawl gear and must be secured. The point I want to make for clarity's sake though here is that these are for closed areas.

If you're just concerned about transiting through federal waters and not having a federal permit, from a safety aspect, I could see why you would maybe change the regulations a little bit, but, for closed areas, we take a more strict approach on the equipment stowage.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree and then Mr. Banks.

DR. CRABTREE: One thing I think we need to be clear in the document is, if we were to choose this as the preferred, and so the trawl net would remain on the deck and the doors would be on the deck, if they happen to have the doors stowed below deck, which is even more restrictive, because they're on the way back from the Tortugas Banks or something like that, that would be okay? I think, as we write this, we need to make sure that if they have everything stowed below or something like that that we aren't making it illegal. I don't know if that's likely to happen or not, but --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: The question I have I think maybe is for Chris. At what point -- I think you were saying the purpose is to try to make sure that they couldn't shrimp illegally, and so at what point would you be able to write a citation to this vessel? Is it only if his net was actively fishing? Is that the point at which you would be able to write a citation to the vessel for fishing in closed waters?

 MR. BLANKENSHIP: Well, for this, it would be without a permit, and so it depends on what alternative we choose as to when you would be able to write them a ticket. If we say that we only have to have the net on deck and the back strap out which is very easy for them to do, quick to do if they see a patrol boat

coming, that would make them where they would not be in violation when the boat got there, but it would be easy for them, if they didn't see a patrol boat, just to put the nets over and shrimp. This would -- We have a suite of alternatives, and this alternative would ensure that, as they're transiting through those waters without a permit, that they couldn't easily just drop the nets over and shrimp and get away with it without the permit.

MR. BANKS: But in the absence of this is what I'm asking. If a non-permitted vessel is transiting through the area, a closed area, at what point -- If you were watching him from afar and he had his trawl boards up on his booms and his net on the deck, and he is transiting through a closed area, at what point could you rush up to him and write him a ticket? Is it once he dropped those trawl boards in the water?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I don't really know what the current law says, if it's they possess shrimp that they have the shrimp permit or they have to actually be shrimping in the EEZ to have to have the federal permit. It's been a while since I did that, but, if it says that they have to be shrimping, then when those doors hit the water, that would be enough for us.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Just to recap, the motion that was put forth by Mr. Blankenship, it takes that essentially most onerous transit provision and makes it slightly less onerous, is essentially what it does. You are still going to have to deck your doors, but you're not going to have to disconnect your gear. The decking the doors is the more hairy part. That's the more strenuous part of this whole process.

 It's just, when you disconnect your gear, that's a slight art. There's a little tweaking there when you have to go and put it back, and so this will actually make it a little less onerous, I'm assuming, in case enforcement and some members of the council want to go a little more strenuous on the requirement, but not quite as strenuous as what we had it written before, and so I think that's where you're headed with that, and is that right?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So we have a motion on the board. Is there any further discussion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Do any council members have anything else before we move on to the Reef Fish Report? All right. Next on our agenda, we are going to bump up the Reef

Fish Committee Report, and so, Chairman Greene, I am going to turn it over to you, sir.

REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Madam Chair, and good morning. I just want to take a second and thank the staff. This was a long committee report, and they've done a very good job of consolidating it and still being able to get most of in there, and so it is not as short as I would like it. About one page would be good for me, but it's as small as it can be, and so thank you to the staff for your hard work on this.

The Reef Fish Management Committee Report from October 18 and 19, Review of Proposed Regulations on the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary, Tab B, Number 4, the committee was presented with the proposed regulations for the expansion of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary.

The proposed regulations are based on a tiered approach. Staff also presented the Reef Fish AP comments and motions on this document. In the proposed document, the first tier coincides with existing Bureau of Ocean Energy Management no-activity zones, and the document proposes to make these areas into no-bottom-tending-gear zones. Traditional hook-and-line fishing, including bandit rigs, would be allowable in these zones.

The second tier would be the area outside the BOEM no-activity zones, but inside the boundaries of the proposed Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary expansion. This tier would allow bottom tending gear and anchoring, but would exclude bottom trawling, traps and dredges.

The third tier would be outside the boundaries of the proposed expansion and would not have any Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary imposed regulations. The document also includes recommendations for an endorsement, anchor restrictions, and mooring buoys.

 Staff presented the committee with specific recommendations for each of the proposed expansion areas in the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary Preferred Alternative 3. Mr. Schmahl, Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary Superintendent, answered questions regarding current regulations, oil and gas exploration, and exemptions in the sanctuary.

He also provided input on the current recommended regulations document. Mr. Schmahl stated that there could be further

discussion with the council regarding the proposed regulations submitted to the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary on the expansion areas.

The committee discussed different types of endorsements and also discussed anchor types and regulations. Staff was instructed to make recommendations consistent for each area, a three-tiered approach for all sanctuary areas.

Staff has revised the language in the document to reflect two different types of endorsements and anchor regulations, and this is provided in track changes for the council's review. The council is requested with making a motion about forwarding the white paper along with a letter to the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary regarding the proposed regulations by the December 2016 deadline.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. We did put this into the briefing book, Morgan, the track changes document, correct, so that you could see it. As you know, this is our last meeting. We only had two meetings to get this done, and so it is in there, and I think Morgan did a very good job of trying to capture some of the conversation and the questions that we had around the table and build that into the document.

 She elaborated a little bit more on the endorsement, to try and address the questions that Camp had. You were wondering if it would be for commercial and recreational, and she tried to --What she did is the more in-depth endorsement, where you will probably have to go and sit through a course of some sort that would be very lengthy, that would be for a commercial fishing endorsement only. The recreational endorsement would simply be -- She has it listed out as an online certification program, if that's okay. All right.

 Then she did streamline the document and try and make each of the banks consistent with the tiered approach. She did that, and then we had a lot of verbiage in that executive summary about the anchors. Once we had the conversation around the table, it sounded as if maybe we shouldn't be quite as prescriptive in the language here, but rather say that it will need to be equipped with weak link, an environmental weak link, and then essentially leave the rest of it in the education portion, on how to use that, up to the endorsement program and going through that class.

Those are the major changes that I see with the three pages she printed out for me, so that I could go through it fairly

quickly, but does anybody want to bring the document up on the screen? We're more than happy to do that, or go through it further, because we will have to have a motion from the council to forward this on as our recommendations to the Flower Gardens Sanctuary. Lieutenant Commander.

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, Madam Chair. I kind of wanted to revisit this, because I felt like I was taking maybe a controversial stance with some of the no-activity zone boundaries the other day, and I know that you have to make a decision, and so I'm not trying to hold you up.

I think, having spoken a little bit further with G.P. Schmahl on the side, if anyone is going to be close to those no-activity zones that they will have already essentially been through some kind of a preparatory course in order to be within the proximity there, and I think from hitting that from two sides.

One is with the National Marine Sanctuary staff educating the mariners before they go out there and then, from an enforcement standpoint, I think we'll be able to see enough success so that you can move forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. We appreciate those comments. Any other comments? If there are none, then I will entertain a motion to forward this on as our recommendations to the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary.

MR. DIAZ: I would like to make that motion. The motion is to forward the -- Is it a letter or a white paper, Morgan?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Morgan, will you help us out a little bit, maybe?

MR. DIAZ: The motion to forward the proposed regulations to the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion on the board. Do we have a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Greene. The motion is to forward the white paper on the proposed regulations for the proposed Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary expansion. Is there any discussion on the motion?

MR. GREENE: To forward the white paper along with a letter to them? Do we need a letter to go to them as well, Morgan?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Yes, we'll have a cover letter with the Chairman's signature with that, and you may want to be a

little more explicit than just white paper, because the white paper are suggested regulations or suggested changes to the regulations.

MR. DIAZ: Okay. Forward the white paper regarding the suggested changes to the proposed -- Forward the white paper with the suggested changes to the proposed fishing regulations.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I think we have it crafted. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

We have sent them a letter prior asking them if a council member or a member of our staff could be involved in some of their deliberations going forward with some of their working groups, and I am hoping that they will take heed to that letter, especially once they get this, where they can see the value maybe of having our involvement on those committees, and maybe we'll be able to have someone from staff attend some of those meetings. I think it would probably streamline the process a little bit. I will turn it back over to you, Chairman Greene.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Madam Chair. SEDAR 47, Goliath Grouper Benchmark Assessment, Mr. Joe O'Hop from Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute gave a brief presentation via webinar summarizing the main points of the goliath grouper assessment and the reasons why it was not accepted by the SEDAR Review Panel.

The assessment used two methods to model the stock, a catch-free model and an age-structured surplus production model. However, neither analysis was accepted for management purposes. The review panel made recommendations for a designed fishery-independent survey which would provide more acceptable data to examine changes in population abundance and distribution for this species.

The SSC representative, Dr. Joe Powers, summarized the SSC's comments, noting that the SSC concurred with the review panel report. Staff reviewed the Reef Fish AP comments. A committee member suggested that some take of goliath grouper be allowed in order to obtain data needed to conduct an assessment. A slot limit was suggested to avoid the mercury concerns. No motions were made by the committee.

 Draft Framework Action, Mutton Snapper ACL and Management Measures and Gag Commercial Size Limit, the committee reviewed the draft framework action that would revise mutton snapper and gag management measures. The committee reviewed Action 3, which considers changes to commercial trip limits. The committee discussed that trip limits may not be an effective management measure to reduce harvest when using bottom longline gear and that imposing commercial trip limits would result in unnecessary regulatory discards. With no opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to move Action 3 to Considered but Rejected.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: The committee also reviewed Action 4, which considers changes to the minimum size limit for mutton snapper. The committee discussed the necessity of Alternatives 2 and 4, as the other alternatives capture a reasonable range. With no opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, that in Action 4 to move Alternatives 2 and 4 to Considered but Rejected.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Draft Amendment 42, Reef Fish Management for Headboat Survey Vessels, Review of Draft Amendment, staff reviewed management actions and issues requiring further consideration by the council.

The committee discussed bag limits and indicated that recreational bag limits would continue to be in effect under the fishing quota program for landings history vessels. Staff noted that inclusion in the Southeast Headboat Survey beyond the December 31, 2015 control date is not required to participate in the fishing quota program under development.

Staff also noted that, for the species included in the amendment, the possession of a landings history vessel permit or endorsement to the reef fish for-hire permit would not allow the harvest of these species outside of the fishing quota program.

The committee discussed an alternative time series for the ACL allocations to the fishing quota program. The committee noted that, for allocation of gag and red snapper, the reef fish species included in the headboat EFP, the time series should exclude 2014 and 2015. The committee made the following motion. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in

Action 5, to include in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 an option to exclude 2015.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: The committee noted that, instead of separate options excluding 2014 or 2015, an option excluding both years would be added.

 Final Action, Referendum Eligibility Requirements, staff discussed the proposed eligibility criteria for participation in the referendum that must be conducted prior to the council's decision to submit Amendment 42 for secretarial review. Committee members reviewed the criteria proposed and made the following motion. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to adopt Alternative 2, Option b as the Preferred Alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I think we need to talk a minute about where we are on Amendments 42 and 41 and how that relates to the timeline. It was clear to me, from the public testimony, that there remain a lot of concerns among the for-hire folks about how these two amendments fit together and what the timing of them should be and about the initial allocations.

I suspect that the general view on the council is that we're going to need to slow down a little bit and do a little more work on it, and I think we ought to decide what we want to do there, because, if that's what you all want to do, then we may not want to go forward with the voting procedures until we're clear.

 We saw, for example, something that Mr. Boggs sent out, which was -- I haven't time to really look at it, but I think it was another alternative way of doing the initial allocation, but I think it included headboats and charter boats, and, if we wanted to do something like that, that would change how the voting procedures would need to be set up, and so I think we ought to have some discussion about timing and where we want to go with all of this before we vote on this motion, probably.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, I would echo that, in that we heard from a good cross-section of both sides of the for-hire industry yesterday saying that they're trying to iron out some differences that have been brought to light, and there are some items that they can agree on as they're working towards the middle ground, which they kind of voiced their intention to do that, and I would even suggest that we have them convene as per some of the discussion at the podium yesterday, the respective APs, so they can meet that task of trying to flesh out that middle ground in doing something.

In doing so, that might completely change the direction of this referendum document. I don't know what the final product will be once these two subgroups of the for-hire work out their differences, and so I would agree that we should hold off on this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Madam Chair, Roy and I had a little sidebar down here, and obviously this is selecting the preferred alternative and determining who would be in the referendum, at least the motion that we had on the board. The other question then that John just spoke to is whether you move this forward to the Secretary, and it sounds like at least there may be consensus that we not move it forward to the Secretary.

I think the question at hand is whether or not we think we should select a preferred as they continue to work on 41 and 42 and we see what that looks like. I don't know that it's going to change our thoughts about what constitutes a reasonable activity in the fishery, but that's the question, I think, at hand, is do we change -- As Dr. Crabtree was suggesting here, do we not go forward with selecting a preferred and wait to hear more about what those conclusions are?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think that's right, and I tend to agree with Mr. Sanchez that we need to reconvene these two panels and have them try to work on -- The initial allocation and the way that the headboat program and the charter program fit together seems to be the big issue here, and so my suggestion to you -- Because, if we change the structure of these amendments, it's likely to change the voting procedures, and so we probably ought to vote -- If that's where we all are, we probably ought to vote the committee motion down and then reconvene the panels and have whatever other discussion folks want to have on 41 and 42 and

guide the staff, and then come back at the next meeting and see where we are.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Diaz and then Mr. Greene.

 MR. DIAZ: I just want to make a correction to the report. It says without opposition, and I did vote in opposition to that. I think it was fifteen-to-one, and I just had some concerns that I would like to know the answer to about the seven people that we would be excluding. What would happen to the value of their vessels? I would just like to know that before I vote in favor of that motion, but it's not material to our discussion now. I was just correcting the record. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 MR. GREENE: I think we're on the right path here to vote this down, because Mr. Diaz has a valid concern. Where those seven vessels go is important in the whole shake of things. We heard public testimony yesterday about if the seven vessels are not in the headboat program and they revert back to Amendment 41. Based on passenger capacity, it would be one of those concerns.

I think I am going to be not in support of passing this motion at this time, because I think we've got a lot of work to do within the industry to iron out some things. It's just, as we all know, it takes time, as fast as we want to move things and all, but, at this point, I think we need to vote this down and regroup a touch before we move forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy and then Mr. Boyd.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify, and it's nothing to do with whether you vote this up or down, but any vessel that is excluded from voting in the referendum is not excluded from the program that would ultimately get approved and developed. There is a difference between who substantially fished the species and therefore is able to have a vote in the referendum. It doesn't mean that they would be excluded from the program, and so I just wanted to make that clear.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Just a comment. Yesterday, in public testimony, we heard several people very pointedly, and some people kind of vaguely, say that there were inequities in what these documents do, 41 and 42, and I even heard a couple of people say unfair.

I don't understand why all of a sudden these documents that have been in development for months and months and months with the

driving force of the charter/for-hire and the headboat people behind them all of a sudden we go from push, push, push to, whoa, wait a minute, this is unfair. They have been a part of these documents, and I am not sure that we should slow down. That's just my comment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

 DR. CRABTREE: To that point, we somewhere in the last month or so put out a decision tool that enabled the charter boats to go in and see what their allocations might be. I think that was the first time they really were able to see what they might actually get. I think there was new information presented to them that they haven't had before.

Nonetheless, I remain committed. I think the approach in 41 and 42 is worth pursuing, and I think it's probably a better way to manage this fishery in the long run, but I think we need to get more buy-in from these guys to move forward with it, and that means we're going to have to invest some more time working on the initial allocation, and we're going to have to address these concerns so that at least the majority of the stakeholders affected feel like the initial allocation is fair and equitable, and I'm not sure we're there with them yet.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Just one additional comment. Around this table for the last year, we have done the math on napkins and have all said that this doesn't look like it's going to be fair and equitable, and the fishermen kept pushing and kept pushing. I think that if they had done the math that they would have already seen this, and we've all said, I think we've all said, or some of us have said, that the only way this is really going to work is with a considerable consolidation of the fleet, and I think that's still what they're looking at. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Roy, you brought up a point that was brought up in committee, but I want to put it on the record. When we have the chance to share that decision tool with all the council members -- I realize that we saw a little bit of it, but it was said that it was still being worked on, and we certainly would like that shipped to all of the council members as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We will make a note of that, and I think Dr. Stephen said they were hoping to have it ready by our next

council meeting, and so hopefully we'll have it in a briefing book sometime before then. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I think we lose sight in the haste to do something, some monumentally important to the entire industry as a whole. What I heard from them is they are wanting to sort some things out and have some pause in this. This has been a long, arduous process. I never viewed this as a sprint to the finish line. This has always been a marathon, and I think it's far more important to try to do the right thing for the entire industry than just hurry up and do something for some arbitrary motives.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz and then Mr. Gregory.

MR. DIAZ: I just want us to -- Three times this week, three separate people have told me that forty-six days might not be looking so bad. I know there is some charter boat fishermen that are reconsidering what their options were, and I just want to say on the record that, at the June meeting, if they want to go back and look through the briefing book, we had staff give us some presentations on what potentially could be done with traditional management options. I think, in June, Dr. Froeschke looked at bag limits and size limits, and that's on the record. He might have even looked at hook sizes and some other things, but that's on the record.

 Then, at the August meeting, we looked at what could be done with split seasons, and so, if folks are out there and they're looking and they're trying to consider what might be best for them and their business, there is some stuff in our briefing books where they could go through and they could review and see what those traditional management measures could provide, if that's something that they would like to consider as a different option. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Just a question, and maybe it's for staff, but I can respect that the guys, that the industry, want to slow this down, but what I'm concerned about is if they get together -- They've gotten together, and they've sort of changed their minds on some of this. If they get together some more and they change their mind back and want to stay split up, then we're not -- If we don't at least get the referendum ready to go, we're not in a position to go anywhere, and we've got to come back and debate it some more.

It seems like, to me, we should have this ready to go, to be able to pull the trigger, but make sure that we make it clear that we're not moving forward yet with it. Is that even a possibility, to make sure that we have the voting referendum details ready to go, but be clear that we're not ready to move to a referendum? Is that possible?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I mean, it's possible, but we could go through the whole voting procedures rulemaking between now and the next council meeting and then realize that we've got to do it all over again, because we have changed the structure of the amendment, but I guess you're right that if they get back together and decide, never mind, we want to go forward with these, but I am looking at it, given where we are now, that we're not going to get either one of these programs implemented by 2018, and I think it's unlikely we would come back in January and have all of these issues all resolved. Surely there will be some changes that will require more work on the documents and things, but I understand your point.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We've had some good discussion on the motion. Is everyone ready to vote? All of those opposed to the motion on the board, please raise your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We have fourteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those in favor, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Two. It's fourteen who are opposed and two are for it. Is that right? This is kind of backwards, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, you do have a woman at the helm.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One abstention.

39 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. All right. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: In terms of where that leaves us, Doug, we would pull these two APs back together at some point between now and the next council meeting and try to continue working on different ways to look at the initial allocations and things?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: That was going to be my next question, and if Carrie or Assane want to help me with this, that's fine, but do you just want to convene the two APs again

and just see what happens?

Obviously there's been some suggestions that are upsetting the apple cart here, and does the council have specific options that you want us to analyze in the meantime and come back or just convene -- We've got a Reef Fish AP that has headboat and charter boat people and the two ad hoc APs, and one is a charter boat and one is a headboat, and they have both groups in each of them, too. Do you just want us to convene the two ad hoc, try to convene them between now and January? We do have trouble, at times, getting a quorum of these groups, and we just convened one of them recently, and so what do you want us to do?

We can analyze a particular option that somebody wants to entertain, or we can just convene the two groups and see what they recommend from there. I don't know how practical it would be to try to convene them together. We could do one on one day and one the next day or something like that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Assane, did you have your hand raised?

DR. ASSANE DIAGNE: Yes, Madam Chair, and thank you. Along the lines of the point that Mr. Gregory is making, essentially, before we even consider convening these APs separately or jointly, perhaps the council needs to discuss some of the issues that we agreed upon initially.

Initially, the council decided to create two separate APs because it recognized perhaps the difference between the two subcomponents, but now we are beginning, some people, to think that perhaps we have to put it together. Then maybe the council needs to have some discussion to see whether what we are looking for as a final product would be a single amendment that is going to combine the both of them or whether we are still on the two amendment tracks.

 Another issue perhaps to consider is a question of scope. For the charter guys, up to right now, it is a single species document. The headboat folks are looking at the multispecies approach, five reef fish species, and perhaps the council would like to consider that and maybe even make both amendments as multispecies amendments, so they will have something to talk about, because, if you put them together today, they can talk about red snapper, perhaps, and, after that, some will have to leave the room while the discussion continues and that sort of thing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

1 2

DR. CRABTREE: My feeling, and what I heard in the comment, was the desire to make both amendments multispecies, and so we've got five species that are now in Amendment 42, and what I have heard is the charter boat guys want both programs to be multispecies and deal with those five species, and that's my preference as to how we go.

I think one of the options that needs to be discussed is potentially pulling them all together into one program. I think if you look at what Mr. Boggs suggested as an initial allocation scheme, that's what it would do, and that would pull this into one amendment.

I don't know for sure if that's what we want to do, but I think that is an option on the table, and I am going to ask my staff, when I get back in the office, to work with Doug's folks to try and come up with some alternative initial allocation schemes that may address some of the concern that have been raised, and hopefully we could come up with some alternative ways to look at them that could then be put in front of the APs when they come together.

Now, whether we ought to convene the APs jointly or have one on one day and one the next day or something like that, I'm not sure what the best way is to go with that. I know if we pull them all together in one room that that's a lot of people, but I definitely think what's on the table ought to be a multispecies approach and how do we get at the initial allocation, and certainly one thing that ought to be on the table is the possibility of pulling this all into one program.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

 MR. RIECHERS: I heard some of those same comments at the podium yesterday, but I think it goes back to a more central discussion, which is basically now that people are coming to grips, because we don't have catch share history in the charter/for-hire industry the same as we do in the headboats, and people are looking at what they are going to receive, there is more concern about that, and they're looking for some fair and equitable way to think through that, both for them as well as for their counterparts in the headboat industry who it also impact them, if they were to move forward before them.

I don't think, at this point, that the decision has to be made whether we merge the documents. You've got two separate documents, and you've got a lot of options in each. I think

that's premature to decide that today. I think what we need to do is send them back working and see if there is a solution, because there may not be a solution to this.

Dale has offered some other solutions, and certainly what this was contemplated for was red snapper, and so I am certainly not going to complicate it, since we've already -- We are being told, up until this meeting, to move, move, move fast, move fast, and then now, all of a sudden, we have slowed down. I am not going to complicate it further with other species at this point, or at least I don't want to. I want to see if we can conceptually come up with a framework where people think there is a better way to have an equitable path forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Believe it or not, fishermen are pretty hard-headed animals, and I am probably the most hard-headed one of all, because I really have to kind of see something for myself to kind of see where I'm at on it.

This is something that I have really wrestled for a long time, and I did push as hard as I could for a while to move things along, because we were working underneath a sunset, and that was something new to me that I had never seen done in fishery management, and I felt like we had to go, go, go, go.

When we backed the sunset up some, it kind of gives a little bit of room to stop and breathe for a second, and what I saw at the roundtable, the day before, it seemed like these guys were ready to kill one another and that they didn't ever want to talk about it again. As we were in committees, I would go to the bathroom, and these guys were out in the hallways and they were talking about it, and it was headboats and charter boats and everybody together.

I saw people talking in the hallway that wouldn't talk to each other on a radio to save their lives, and so there is some things coming along, and I think people have finally kind of grasped the concept, and so, when you have an individual who has a catch history, and there is seventy boats and 30 percent of the catch history that they're looking at, that is a pretty considerable, considering that there is another 1,130 boats that are going to get 70 percent of that.

When I saw the headboats willing to give up that catch history to make it more fair to do something, that spoke volumes to me. I mean, that was a big deal. That proved to me that these guys

are willing to sit down and come up with something, and I think it's a tribute to these guys, because they really do want to genuinely do something, and it may not be something that they all like.

There may be some black eyes and bloody noses before it's over with, and I would imagine that there probably would need to be, but it's one of those things that we've got a little bit more time now, because we have a little extension on the sunset to move forward.

I don't know that all of the people who have participated in what's gone on at this meeting have had a chance to really catch up with some of the guys that have not been here, because obviously not all 1,000 of them are not here, and so these guys are going to have to go back to their respective ports and kind of explain what went on at this meeting and why this and why that, and they're going to have to talk amongst themselves and come together.

It's been a challenge, and the multispecies thing. You know, we talked about it at the last meeting, and I had never really thought about anything more than red snapper for Amendment 41, because it was kind of red snapper driven. However, where I have kind of changed my mind on that is when I see the triggerfish landings and I look at the short season that we had on amberjack.

You have state compliance and state non-compliance, and it doesn't matter which side of the fence you fall or where you're at on it, but we're trying to decide, is this the right thing to do? I kind of think that perhaps maybe we should back up and look at multispecies and at least explore that option, but it may complicate the document. I am not going to argue that point at all, but, just like the private recreational group that has asked for some time to sit back and explore some new ideas, I don't see that what the charter boat guys are doing is much different than that.

I think they have got to the point where they needed some more data to make some decisions, and I think -- I don't have any idea what that recreational AP focus group is doing or where they're at. I have not had any updates, and I have not attended any of the meetings. I haven't had any personal updates or anything other than what's been brought before us at the council.

At some point, it doesn't matter what the AP is. You're going

to get to a point where you need data before you can make a collective decision to move forward, and I think that maybe there was some information that was new that these guys have come up with, and they're like, well, wait a minute, man, maybe that's not the best way to go, and I would imagine that that would be a big topic, because these guys are going to have to go back and talk to their fellow charter guys and kind of see where they're at.

There is going to be some tempers there and everything else, and I think that, at some point, we're going to need to get these APs together, because they're going to have to talk about it, and I think it's going to be -- To put both of those APs in the same room with all of those Type A personalities, it's going to be a WWE-type of scenario before it's over with, I imagine, but I think that's what it's going to take.

As I started out this discussion or talking to you guys, we're pretty hard-headed, and we almost have to just burn our hand to realize that that stove is hot, and so that's where I'm at on it. I tried hard in committee not to weigh in on some of these items, and I am just trying to lay it out in front of you now, as to where I am at and what I think.

The industry is kind of -- What I think they're looking for, and I am certainly not speaking for 100 percent of them, but I am just trying to lay some things out there to continue this discussion around the council.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Johnny, I guess this is some follow-up on what you said, and you may have some insight, in that these guys are talking to you. The decision tool that they put out was clearly red snapper centric, because they had the red snapper information, because we've gone through sector separation and we've divvied all that up, and so you were able to see the 30 percent to the headboats and the 70 percent to the charter/for-hire folks, because those numbers were there.

The numbers aren't necessarily there on any of the other species, because we haven't gone through the same process. Would they consider just going with one species and getting it right between the headboats and the charter/for-hire and working that route and leaving the multispecies alone, until they can figure it out for one species and then maybe incorporate it for the others?

I don't know that one is faster than the other. I would think one would be faster than the other, but I am not sure, but I know one person mentioned it, and it was Randy who mentioned it, because he was giving his presentation, but I mean they have the numbers for those, and currently there are no numbers for any of the other species, other than for the headboats, because we haven't gone through that whole process of separating that out. Do you have any thoughts on that?

MR. GREENE: I don't know. I've thought about it both ways. I have thought about, well, maybe it should be multispecies and we leave red snapper out of it until they get their allocation together, and that's why I am thinking that maybe we need a little bit of time to digest this, because I don't know if they have thought about just doing one species for 42, because, based on the success of the Headboat Collaborative with being able to swap snappers and groupers -- Some of the guys in the western Gulf were able to swap groupers for snappers, and it worked back and forth.

I think that some of that utility is why they're wanting to look at being able to swap fish for areas that may not have had fish, because what you have to realize is that we have looked at -- As you and I know, we have looked at geographic distributions. When you look at it that way, you think, well, we need to be able to swap fish. When you look at it on a passenger capacity type of situation, that's a whole different ballgame.

 The whole dynamic has changed, and I think that all of us are going to need a little bit of time to kind of digest it. They may say, you know, it might be best that we just do one species, because once they realize that we have to do all of this to get at multispecies, they may not want to -- It may take too long, or it may not be worth the fight at that point, but I think that needs to be a topic of discussion for them.

I don't really have a good sense, to be honest with you, on where they're at on that. I am a little more trying to look at the big-picture item, because of the triggerfish situation that we're in and amberjack and these other species, and that's where I'm coming from on it, but, honestly, Kelly, I don't know if I have a good answer for you or not. I hate to dance around the answer, but I'm just going to look you in the eye and tell you that I don't know, because I don't.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: A lot of the comments that were made at public

testimony yesterday and then the way we keep saying, well, what if we just make it a multispecies for 41, I just don't think it's that simple.

There was a lot of weeping and gnashing of teeth when we did it with the single species of red snapper. It went over several years to get to that point, and is it going to be any different with gray triggerfish, amberjack, gag, and red grouper? I just don't -- I think that's going to really -- If you try and make it a multispecies for the charter guys, it's going to be just as long and just as difficult as it was with red snapper for the other four or five species.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I happen to agree strongly with Chris, but also, just about convening the APs, I just think that they probably need a little bit of time, as we've been discussing, to even get them to meet before our next meeting, the end of the year, but to go back and do their thing. There is a lot of things to mull over.

I would almost recommend that we let them do that until the end of the year and then have them meet for our next meeting. I know that's even further delaying things, but there's just a lot of things that they are going to have to discuss, and we want as productive of an AP meeting as possible.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I am not saying for sure if we want to do multispecies or not, but I just think it ought to be on the table. I think, if you can come to an understanding of fundamentally what's the best way to do the initial allocation, then it's a pretty simple matter to apply it to one species or apply it to five species.

I think the fundamental thing is how to do the initial allocation, and that's what we're looking at, is this disparity between the headboat program and the charter boat programs and the fish. I think, if we can work through that, I don't think it would be that big of a task to do multispecies versus one species. It's that one hump that you've got to get over that I think is the big challenge, but I think that's what we really need to focus on now, but I think we ought to leave the door open to considering multispecies for the whole program.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

 MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have always been one of the proponents that was trying to rush this, but, again, it's not my plan. It's their plan, and they have reached this point where they want to slow down and reevaluate all of these things.

Last night, I heard headboat operators that may not agree on some allocation issues, but, at the podium, they said, you know, it is kind of unfair that there's multispecies in ours and not in the other. We can hardly have this discussion without bouncing around from 41 to 42 and then a little bit of underlying tone of logbook issues and stuff.

So, I mean, there's a lot of moving parts in this, but they're not mutually exclusive. They're all interrelated, and I think that's where this may be going, and to have an option to have it as multispecies as a potential item, then it's in the document and you vote it up or you vote it down, but at least there's more of a semblance of fairness in this, and I have heard people from across the aisle asking for that, and so I don't know. It seems like you can't talk about one without the other and so on and so forth, and so it's kind of all together, whether we have it in separate amendments or not, the whole industry is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I will just say one thing on this. I am good with getting APs together and all of that and having them think about this and figuring out where they want to go. I am good with that. With the multispecies, the concern that I have, the way that we're talking about this and the way that it has been discussed, is we're hearing from headboats and we're hearing from charter boats.

 There is a large segment of the recreational fishery, and I don't know what the breakdown is for all these different species, what it is between private rec and charter/for-hire, but I think my concern, depending on how we proceed forward with this, is that we leave those voices out of the conversation, and I do not want to do that. I think it's going to be very important that they stay in the conversation if we want to keep the public trust, and so I will just leave it with that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I do kind of echo what Martha is saying, but that is not originally why I asked to talk, but I do echo those comments. I would also -- I am going to steal a page out of

Patrick's playbook over here and say that, if you do have to convene these two, you may wish to do a facilitator-type of meeting as well on that, to get things together. That's just a thought.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I think we've had a lot of good discussion on this. Ι agree most certainly with facilitator. From what Johnny said, maybe an armed facilitator, but I think that it sounds like -- I mean, we're not going to come to any kind of conclusion around this table today of whether this is going to be multispecies or single species or two documents or one document or all one allocation and split it that way or bust it down into two.

Honestly, I think that the best way for us to figure out how we're going to move forward is to have the two groups that are trying to work this out on the ground come together, and let's let them duke it out and figure out where the pain level needs to be on each side to have some comfort that everybody is taking a little bit of pain in order to have something go forward that they feel is a sustainable fishery for their future.

My personal preference would be to, when those two groups meet, to have them meet together, which will give Mr. Gregory heart failure, but I think they all need to be in the same room. If you want to do it in the central Gulf, that would probably be best, so that not everybody has to travel to Florida. I think that probably worked well when you did it that way with that other meeting, and so that's my preference, if the council will agree. Mr. Gregory, are you okay with that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Just a couple of things. One of the problems we've been having is now, with the internet, we do a doodle poll and we see who can come. Then we've started doing doodle polls in private, because we have found that people start shifting their dates in doing that.

 In the old days, we used to set a date for a meeting and we would have the meeting, and whoever showed up showed up. We have kind of been going on a trajectory that if we don't have a quorum than the advice is not warranted or something like that, and so we don't have a meeting.

 I would like to just tell the council that my attitude is, if eleven people is a quorum and ten can show up, that is good enough to have a meeting and provide advice to the council, and you take it in consideration. Clearly, if only three or four people can show up, that's not really a meeting, but what's the

council's thought on is a quorum necessary to have a meeting, because that has been our biggest problem.

That's one of the concern that I have about large meetings, large participants, is, the bigger the committee, the harder it is to get everybody available the same date, and so the harder it is to get a quorum, and so that's one thing.

The other thing is we'll look into trying to do this. I was just looking to see when the Reef Fish AP was going to be reappointed, and it's 2018, which is not good, because I was going to say, well, why don't we just -- We could even go so far as abolish the two ad hoc and reappoint the appropriate people on our AP and let the AP work it out, the Reef Fish AP, which is the purpose of advisory panels, but we can look at trying to convene them back-to-back or together and see how that works, but getting a quorum is probably going to be our biggest challenge, particularly going between now and January. We've got all of these holidays coming up. We may not be able to do that until after the January meeting even.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: To that point, Doug, being that we're going into fall, I would say a quorum is a quorum. If those charter boat guys don't care enough to show up, then we'll just move on without them, and I don't think you're going to have that problem. I think you're going to need a fairly large room, because I personally think, if we're going to do this, this is the time of year to do it. I cannot imagine that there would not be a guorum there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I agree with the way you laid it out, Leann. I am with you on that. I think a quorum is desirable, but not essential. I think Johnny is right that they will come to this one, but they're giving us advice, and so, if we can get a good cross-section of them, so be it.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: For the record, my opinion on the quorum, I think it's important if you have a very small group. I mean, if you only have five or ten people, then, at that point, having a quorum is pretty important. You don't want three people deciding on an issue, but, if it's a large group, if you're looking at thirty or forty people, to me, the most important part of having them give us advice is that we're getting a fairly broad perspective, and I think, once you have a larger

and larger group, then, at that point, you're going to get that broader perspective. The quorum, to me, is extremely important if you have a very small AP. At that point, you definitely need to have a quorum, to make sure you're getting that broad perspective.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: If I may, I think, for this body to make a decision, you have to have a quorum, and I am asking Mara. For the advisory panels and the SSC, it's not a legal requirement, and we can use common sense in this, as to whether we convene a meeting or not. If we've got fourteen people on the Headboat Ad Hoc and we've got nineteen people on the Charter/For-Hire Ad Hoc, and so it's thirty-three people all together.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: I have been sitting here listening to all of this, and I go back and remember everything that's gone on with things like triggerfish. Triggerfish is almost not an issue in Louisiana and Texas, and you've got such a difference in the groups in the charter boat industry for certain things, as to the kind of operation that they conduct.

I still want to believe that we should take another good look at an east/west separation. This whole thing, and I think you could come much quicker to a decision to help the group in each area than we're trying to do across the board. I think we have a big problem, because of the differences between the groups, almost east/west. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I think we've had a lot of discussion on this. Mr. Green, do you want to continue on with your report?

MR. GREENE: Yes, ma'am. Preliminary 2016 Red Snapper For-Hire Landings Relative to ACT, Mr. Dale Diaz reviewed the preliminary federal for-hire and private vessel red snapper landings for 2016 through Wave 4. Although the landings exclude Texas data and are incomplete, the for-hire component appears to be harvesting less fish to date than it did in 2015 and is on track to finish the year under both its ACL and ACT.

This suggests that the for-hire ACT buffer might be reduced. However, the private component has already exceeded its ACL, and the season remains open in several states. As a result, if the ACT buffer is reduced for the for-hire component, it may need to be increased for the private component. If the combined catches

from both components exceeds the recreational ACL, payback provisions will be triggered.

Committee members noted that there will be more information about the 2016 catch levels at the next council meeting and suggested that this be put back on the Reef Fish Committee agenda for January.

 Draft Amendment 46, Gray Triggerfish Rebuilding Plan, Dr. Powers reviewed the SSC recommendations and motion on the recreational and commercial decision tools. Staff provided an overview of the action and alternatives in Amendment 46 and briefed the committee on the status of the document. The IPT has currently drafted Sections 1 through 3, and the staff plans to bring a public hearing draft to the council in January.

Staff also reviewed the Reef Fish AP recommendations on gray triggerfish action-by-action. For Action 1, establish a rebuilding time period for gray triggerfish, a motion was made to make Alternative 5, establish a ten-year rebuilding time period, the preferred alternative. Dr. Crabtree did not feel the agency could support a rebuilding time period of ten years, since it is the maximum time frame the council is allowed and the stock was not adequately rebuilding.

After discussion, the committee passed the following substitute motion. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 4 the Preferred Alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Not so much on the motion, but I would like to know an update on when is the next triggerfish assessment. We have heard so much testimony yesterday, and I would like to know when that's going to available, because there's a lot of people -- Everyone heard the testimony yesterday on triggerfish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Rindone, can you give us that update?

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Yes, ma'am. You guys had tried to have the triggerfish assessment moved to 2017. In talking with the SEDAR Steering Committee, logistically, that was just not going to be feasible, but we have put it in during 2018, on the tail-end, to be able to use 2017 data, or at least increase the odds of being able to use 2017 data, and we've also been assured that the larval indices that were not updated the last time around are

going to be updated this time, along with updated age and growth and everything else that we wanted, and so 2018.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Any other discussion on this motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

 MR. GREENE: Staff explained that that Action 1 alternatives dictate the options that can be used in Action 2. The committee questioned when the 2017 season information would be released for gray triggerfish, given that the preliminary landings indicate that 239 percent of the ACT and 210 percent of ACL are estimated to have been landed by the recreational sector in 2016.

The committee noted that the no action alternative was a valid alternative, because it was within the range of ABC recommendations for catch levels made by the SSC and meets the nine-year rebuilding plan. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2, to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Staff reviewed the three recreational management actions of fixed closed season, bag limit, and minimum size limits. Staff also review the LETC and Reef Fish AP recommendations regarding each of these sub-actions. Staff reminded the committee that the recreational decision tool allows the council to consider an effort shifting percentages from zero to 100 percent for each mode of charter vessels, private anglers, and headboats. The committee did not make any motions on the recreational management measures.

Staff reviewed Action 4, modifications to the commercial trip limit, and explained there were alternatives to increase and decrease the commercial trip limits. Since the implementation of twelve gray triggerfish trip limit and fixed closed season of June 1 through July 31, the commercial sector was 31 percent and 23 percent below the quota, the ACT, in 2014 and 2015, respectively.

Staff reviewed the LETC recommendations on the proposed trip limit alternatives. They stated that it is easier for law enforcement to count a number of fish than to assess a weight of less than 100 pounds. Without opposition, the committee

recommends, and I so move, in Action 4, that the commercial trip limits be expressed in numbers of fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Yes, sir, Lieutenant Commander.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to let you know that it is easier for us to actually measure the fish or count the fish than to weigh them. When you're underway, it's just very complicated, at least from the Coast Guard's perspective. We don't have the ability to weigh the fish out there on the ocean, and so sticking to counting and measuring is a lot easier, especially from our perspective. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Any other discussion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Staff reminded the committee that the Reef Fish AP had also requested the consideration of a sixteen-fish trip limit which is not currently in the document. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 4, to add an alternative to increase the commercial trip limit to sixteen fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Staff reminded the committee that a public hearing draft will be brought to the council in January and requested the council select public hearing locations. Staff reminded the committee of the locations and participation for Amendment 37 in 2012.

 The committee selected the following public hearing locations. In Alabama, it will be Spanish Fort Five Rivers Facility. In Florida, it will be Destin and the St. Pete area. Louisiana and Mississippi will both be via webinar only. In Texas, it will be Galveston and Corpus Christi.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's not a motion, but is okay everybody okay with those public hearing locations? I think we had some pretty good discussion on it. Johnny says we can take a very short restroom break, because I know nobody leaves the table during the Reef Fish Committee, and I'm looking around, and I think we're about to float off, and so let's take about a five-minute bathroom break and come right back.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We will go ahead and pick back up. I believe we left off and we had just blessed the public hearing locations for triggerfish.

 MR. GREENE: Okay. Before we leave triggerfish, I am going to make a couple of motions here, and it's all relative to Action 3, which is going to be recreational management measures to modify the fixed closed season, the size limit, and the bag limit. I am going to take them one at a time, just because I don't like to blanket things through. It seems like we do better if we just do things one at a time.

Staff, I'm sorry, but I did not give these to you ahead of time, and so I will go as best I can, and you all can help me as we make it work out. My motion would be, in Action 3.1, to move Alternative 4 as the preferred.

While they're getting that up on the board, I know a lot of you may not have the document in front of you, and I'm going to read it to you. Alternative 4 is to modify the closed season from January 1 through the end of February. Then it would open back up and then it would close again June 1 and remain closed until July 31.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so we have a motion in Action 3.1 to make Alternative 4 the preferred alternative. Do we have a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Walker. Is there any discussion on the motion? I am going to give staff just a minute. I think they're going to put that complete verbiage on the screen before we vote on it.

MR. GREENE: It's at the bottom of page 5 and onto page 6.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have the complete motion on the board. In Action 3.1, to make Alternative 4 the preferred alternative. Alternative 4 is January 1 through February and June 1 through July 31. All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand; all those opposed, same sign. The motion carries. All right, Mr. Greene, continue on.

MR. GREENE: I have two more motions, just so you're aware of what I'm doing, and this will be in Action 3.2, and this is on page 6, in Action 3.2, to modify the recreational bag limit. My motion would be, in Action 3.2, to move Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative. Just for the council members at the

table, that would reduce the daily bag limit to one gray triggerfish per angler within the twenty-fish reef fish aggregate bag limit.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We will give staff just a second to get it on the board. We have a motion on the board in Action 3.2 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 is to reduce the recreational daily bag limit to one gray triggerfish per angler per day within the twenty reef fish aggregate bag limit. Do we have a second to the motion? It's seconded by Dr. Crabtree. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Banks.

12
13 MR. BANKS: Johnny, can you just give me a little bit of your
14 rationale here, please? I would love to hear it. Thank you.

MR. GREENE: Absolutely. One of the things in fisheries, whether it's charter boat or private recreational, that I believe is that you should have access to fish for as many days as you possibly can.

If we can simply reduce from two to one and equal more access and more opportunities for anglers of any type, then I believe that we should. At this point, we're simply picking a preferred, and I think that this will probably get some comments on it and people will let us know how we decide to go ultimately, either way.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

 DR. DANA: In 2017, the recreational fishery doesn't have a triggerfish season, because of payback, correct? Why would we be looking to reduce the number of fish from two to one when we wouldn't even be able to fish recreationally until 2018? Isn't that premature?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Mr. Greene?

MR. GREENE: Well, Dr. Dana, obviously we caught those fish in massive quantities in a hurry this past year, which gave us this huge overage. I think that, by reducing it to one, we could potentially slow it down quick enough that maybe it would be picked up where we could have closed the fishery sooner and not had such a big overrun.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: This is one where we've heard -- I feel like people on both sides, some that want to keep it at two and some one,

and I'm okay with putting it at one, at least for public hearings. I am kind of poking the bear to see who comes out to speak about this. There's a lot of angst about triggerfish as it is, and so let's see what kind of comments we get about it and go from there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion on the board. All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fifteen.

12 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

14 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One opposed.

16 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The motion carries. Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Just following Pam's line of discussion here, I mean I certainly kind of agree, in some respects, but I think we just need to make it real clear as we go to public hearings, because people are going to be seeing this change and thinking that's impacting their fishing year, and, in reality, their fishing year next year is not going to -- That doesn't impact next year at all. It would be a full year after that, if then, and certainly there would be time to make a change, Pam, if we needed to into that next year.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas and then Dr. Crabtree.

DR. LUCAS: I think Dr. Crabtree maybe can address this, because I just wanted to clarify this. On the payback, regardless of whatever percentage you went over, the payback is only in effect for one year and then you would reopen? Is that correct?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and remember too that I don't think we vote this amendment up until probably April, and so this amendment won't even be implemented until potentially about this time next year anyhow.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I just want to make one more point on the record. We just heard from Ryan a few minutes ago that the next stock assessment for triggerfish is not going to occur until 2018. Likely, we won't get any results from that until 2019. We're probably going to be in the same annual catch limit range that we are now for several more years, and so the chance of having some type of increase from a future stock assessment that shows

more of what we're hearing people say at the podium is actually happening on the water is quite some time in the future. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I have another motion to come before you. In Alternative 3.3, I would like to move Alternative 2 as the preferred. Alternative 2 would increase the size limit for gray triggerfish to fifteen inches fork length.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion on the board in Action 3.3 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 is to increase the recreational minimum size limit for gray triggerfish to fifteen inches fork length. Do we have a second for this motion? It's seconded by Mr. Blankenship. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I will wait on Dr. Lucas. I was going to give a little more rationale.

DR. LUCAS: Go ahead.

 MR. GREENE: Okay. My rationale on this is, again, is a bigger triggerfish I think might slow the harvest down some, but I don't know that. I am trying to set a preferred alternative to get feedback from the public. I don't know that, when it comes time to do full implementation on this, that I would go with fifteen inches, because sometimes -- I just don't know, but, as big as those triggerfish are going to be in 2020 when we get to catch one, we might be looking at twenty inches, but I think that's kind of where I'm at on it, just in all honesty.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Mr. Greene just said it all, but I was curious if anybody, maybe Dr. Crabtree, could help, or one of the biologists, but how does this affect discard mortality? Are these things vulnerable to discard mortality or not?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

43 MR. WALKER: I would just say, from my personal observation, 44 that triggerfish probably has the lowest discard mortality rate, 45 from what I have witnessed. Maybe when you're in some really 46 deep water and you catch some big trigger, but I think the one 47 fish will help address some of that, and I'm not opposed to 48 raising that size limit, because the discard mortality rate is 1 so low.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion on the board.

All those in favor of the motion, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We have sixteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One abstention.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The motion carries. Anything else on triggerfish before Johnny carries on with the committee report? All right. Carry on, sir.

MR. GREENE: Okay. Thank you. Draft Amendment 41, Red Snapper Management for Federally-Permitted Charter Vessels, staff reviewed the revised actions in Draft Amendment 41 alongside the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Red Snapper Charter AP.

For Action 3, Alternative 4, the committee clarified that passenger capacity should be based on each vessel and not tiers of passenger capacity.

Dr. Jessica Stephen presented a preliminary decision tool for the various charter vessel allocations that could result from the alternatives and options in Action 3. She will also incorporate the AP recommendations into the tool for informational purposes.

For the metric of historical landings by region, staff requested clarification on the council's motion from the last meeting to combine Mississippi and Alabama as a single region. The committee requested an analysis of Mississippi and Alabama as separate regions and for the two states as a single region. Staff will add a sub-action to provide this analysis.

Madam Chair, I just have one question. In regard to the preliminary decision tool, I know that Dr. Stephen had indicated that it would be ready before the next council meeting, and do we feel like it would be ready before an AP meeting, if we had an AP meeting before the next council meeting?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stephen, can we put you on the spot for that? How soon do you think that decision tool will be QC'd and ready?

DR. JESSICA STEPHEN: The QA/QC of it shouldn't take much longer for what it is, as it was shown to you. We're just double-checking that. Adding the additional few elements, I think we can do it definitely before the January meeting, and probably in time for the AP meeting. Do we have a timeframe for when we think an AP meeting would be? I would say by the mid to end of November that it should be ready, as a ballpark.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. I appreciate that. Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I have a question for clarity, because we've had some discussion on it, and I know I've had some of my guys in Mississippi ask this. When we discuss it by region and we talk about the regions, we are talking about the address that the permit goes to or are we talking about the home port of where that boat is located?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Well, I'm glad you asked that question, and, Lieutenant Commander, I should have asked you this beforehand, just to get you ready, and I don't want to put you on the spot, and so, if you don't want to answer this, don't. The Coast Guard, when you're dealing with vessels, you guys work off of the home port of the vessel whenever -- For enforcement purposes and all, I know, through the Coast Guard COI, I have to declare a home port on it.

If that is different than a mailing address, which one would you all work with, the home port of the vessel or how we would go? We have some permits and they are off away from the coast, or potentially in other areas, and there seems to be a little bit of a misinterpretation with that. If you don't have answer for that, perhaps you could look into it and maybe get back with us down the road, and that might be the best thing, because I certainly don't want to put you on the cuff with that, but I know there's some Coast Guard regulations and it's specific to home port of the vessel.

LCDR DANAHER: That's a good question, and I'm going to have to get back to you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: When we do the charter boat and the MRIP landings estimates, that's done by the location of the vessel, and so I think you would want it to be apples to apples here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I am noticing that we may need to -- I don't know if that is the way it is currently in the document, and so we just may want to look into that, because I know, in looking at the way that Mississippi is structured -- Like I see the number of permits that we have listed or whatever, but I know that not all these people are registered in Tails and Scales, because they may not be physically -- Their boat may not be in the State of Mississippi, although their address is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted, and I don't think Dr. Lasseter is here today, and so we will have staff look into that and give us an update when we come back in January, if not before. Dr. Simmons, did you have some --

DR. CARRIE SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would just say that you're referring to Amendment 41, correct, and Table 1.1.1? That's by home port state, currently. Ava is on the webinar if you want her to speak.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think that answers our question. Thank you. Is there anything else for that subject before Chairman Greene moves on? Are we okay with that and all of our questions are answered? Okay.

MR. GREENE: Moving on to Draft Amendment 36A, Commercial IFQ Program Modifications, staff reviewed the actions in Draft Amendment 36A alongside recommendations from the Reef Fish AP and the Law Enforcement Technical Committee.

Discussing the expansion of the hail-in requirement to reef fish vessels landing non-IFQ species, the committee noted that, to improve enforcement, it would be necessary for law enforcement to be able to access where landings are made. Dr. Jessica Stephen noted that National Marine Fisheries Service is working with the VMS vendors to modify how fishermen enter their landing location. This will allow for the addition of many more approved landing locations in the system.

The committee then made the following motion. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to modify the alternatives to reflect that landings occur at a preapproved site.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: I was going to say this in committee, but I didn't. Do we have any -- Have we estimated in any way, when we look at the landings of those other species -- I mean, I've got to believe there is a few number of dealers who aren't landing red snapper, but would land those other species. I just don't think this is a big issue, but I'm trying to see if we have any numeric suggestion of whether it will be or will not be.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had kind of wondered the same thing, what kind of increase would that look like, and so maybe staff can do a little bit of research on that between now and the next meeting, and I don't know that that's something that they could probably give us a hard number on, per se, but we could get some general estimates and get a feeling for what kind of increase that might be.

MR. RIECHERS: Yes, because it may change through time, but I would think we certainly know where the red snapper landings sites are now and we can look to see where those other species are landed, to get some notion of whether those are the same people now or whether we expect an increase of ten dealers or fifteen or a hundred or whatever it may be.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion on the motion on the board? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: In Action 2, staff noted that the amount of shares held in inactivated accounts has continued to decline. Across all IFQ share categories, there are currently less than 32,000 pounds of quota held in the inactivated accounts. Noting the relatively small amount of quota and complicated method for distributing inactivated shares as proposed in Alternative 4, the committee passed the following motion. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2.2, to move Alternative 4 to Considered but Rejected.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: The committee discussed Action 3, to retain annual allocation before an anticipated quota reduction. Dr. Crabtree noted that it is possible to reduce a quota after the beginning of the year in the recreational sector, but this is not possible for commercial IFQ species, as allocation is distributed at the beginning of the year.

Some committee members were concerned about the impacts of quota released late in the year. Dr. Crabtree noted that it would not be likely to release withheld quota. The council would have already approved an action to reduce the quota, and it would be unlikely for the action not to be implemented. informational purposes, staff will add distribution of IFQ landings by month to the document.

The committee discussed Action 4, which would require dealers to notify National Marine Fisheries Service of the time offloading would begin. Dr. Crabtree noted that this could be difficult to do and that law enforcement is not in support. Mr. Walker suggested gathering additional public comment.

Discussing public hearings, the committee agreed that staff would use a direct mailing to commercial reef fish permit holders and shareholders to solicit public comment. Staff will also hold one public hearing by webinar.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I apologize to the staff for not sending these, but I do want to make some motions for preferred alternatives on this amendment, after the discussion we had on Tuesday and then in talking to some of the fishermen between then and now.

In Action 1, I would move to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. That's the one where anybody landing commercially-caught reef fish would have to hail-in and hail-out or hail-in.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We will give staff just a second to get that on the board. Do you want to repeat it one more time for staff, if you don't mind?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: In Amendment 36A, to make Action 1, Alternative 2 the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Your motion reads, in Action 1, to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Do we have a second for the motion? It's seconded by Ms. Guyas. Now, do we have any discussion on the motion? Would you like to provide some rationale, Chris?

 MR. BLANKENSHIP: After talking with the fishermen and then the enforcement guys, this is what fits better under what we're trying to do in this amendment, is to ensure that all the vessels with IFQ are reporting those fish adequately and by

having anybody that has commercial reef fish they are coming to the dealer to provide the three-hour notification, it just felt like this would help ensure the enforcement, but it would not overly burden the enforcement officers by receiving the threehour notifications for every commercial vessel in the Gulf as they come to unload.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I think the AP had picked Alternative 3, and I would just like to get some input from Roy on what he feels about Alternative 2 and 3.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that's probably my preference, and I tend to agree with Chris to go ahead with Alternative 2. I am a little concerned about overloading everyone, and we've heard some concerns about number of notifications, and so I would like to go with Alternative 2 for now, and then let's get that smoothed out and working, and then we can come back down the road, if we wanted to expand it further.

MR. WALKER: I would like to hear some public comment on that as well when it gets out. It's definitely better than what we have now, Alternative 2.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I speak in support of Alternative 2 as the preferred motion. Alternative 3 is any federally-managed species, and so we would be including all of the shrimp vessels in there. The number of notifications would go up substantially, and, at this point, I think it would just be too much, and so I support the motion.

MR. WALKER: I was just going to add that I think that it would just include the shrimp vessels that had a reef fish permit, I think.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Which, strangely enough, was eleven in the Gulf. I found that kind of interesting. They're two very different types of boats. Maybe somebody is just parking a permit.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I don't know if Mr. Walker just 47 said this, but Alternative 3 is limited to commercial reef-fish-48 permitted vessels. It wouldn't include king mackerel and shrimp vessels.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Alternative 3 or 2?

explicit in the alternative itself, but, if you go down to the top of page 16, where it starts to describe Alternative 3, it says that Alternative 3 would extend the hail-in requirement beyond Alternative 2 by including all trips by commercial reeffish-permitted vessels landing any federally-managed commercially-caught species from the Gulf, and so if a reeffish-permitted vessel caught shrimp, they would have to hail it in, but it's limited to just the reef-fish-permitted vessels.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion? I will read this into the record. The motion is, in Action 1, to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 is the owner or operator of a commercial reef-fish-permitted vessel landing commercially-caught reef fish from the Gulf is responsible for ensuring that National Marine Fisheries Service is contacted at least three hours, but no more than twenty-four hours, in advance of landing.

If IFQ species are to be landed, all IFQ advance notice of landings regulations must be followed. If no IFQ species are to be landed, information required with the advance notice of landings will include date, time, location of landing, and vessel identification number, Coast Guard certificate of documentation, or state registration number. All those in favor this motion, signify by raising your hand, please.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fifteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One no. It's fifteen to one. **The motion passes.**

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Did you have another motion, Mr. Blankenship?

 MR. BLANKENSHIP: I would also make a motion that in Action 2 that Alternative 2, Option 2a and Alternative 3, Option 3a be the preferred alternatives. That's the alternatives that any unused share -- On the effective date of the implementation of this amendment, any unused shares would go back to NMFS.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Do we have a second for the motion that we're working on getting on the board here? It's seconded

by Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I think you're talking about Action 2.1

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Yes, Action 2.1.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The motion reads that, in Action 2.1, to make Alternative 2, Option 2a, and Alternative 3, Option 3a, be the preferred alternatives. Alternative 2 is for shares in red snapper IFQ program accounts that have never been activated in the current system, return the shares to NMFS on the effective date of the final rule implementing this amendment. Alternative 3 is for shares in grouper/tilefish IFQ program accounts that have never been activated in the current system, return the shares to NMFS on the effective date of the final rule implementing this amendment. Is there discussion on the motion?

MR. WALKER: I remember from Roy's discussion that he would like to -- I think he said the other day that he would like to have either both a or both b, and, with the discussion that I hear from the AP, it was sort of the grouper guys were three years behind in implementing their program, and they felt they needed a little longer, and so I don't know if we wanted to go with b on both of these or a on both of these, but I would like to hear Dr. Crabtree's input on this as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't really have strong feelings one way or another. I am inclined to go with Chris's motion and just do it on the effective date and get these fish -- If we wait another year, then that's another year those fish don't get to anyone and nobody catches them, and so I think I'm inclined to go along with Chris's motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Chris.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: That was my rationale on this. The snapper program has been in place a long time. The grouper/tilefish program has been in place for several years, and it will be at least another year before this ever takes place, and so there's a lot of fish that have not been able to make the market because of them not being available. If people want to participate in the fishery, they have plenty of time between now and then to do that, to get started.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Any further discussion? All right. All those in favor of the motion of the board, please signify by

raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fifteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All opposed, same sign. The motion carries.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It was fifteen to zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship, do you have another motion 10 for us?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Again, I apologize to the staff. It's my first time sitting at the adult table. I should have sent these to you already, and I apologize, but, in Action 2.2, method of redistributing shares, I would move to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. That was the AP's recommendation, and that's the one that redistributes the shares from each account according to the proportion of shares held by the shareholder.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion in Action 2.2 to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. Alternative 3 is redistribute the shares from each share category according to the proportion of shares held by shareholders of that share category at the time the shares are redistributed by NMFS. Do we have a second for the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Riechers. Is there discussion on the motion? Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: One possibility here is, if anyone is at the share cap, then they won't be able to get any of these. Aside from that though, I think I am going to make a substitute motion to go with Alternative 2 as the preferred, which would redistribute the shares equally among the shareholders.

Chris's motion kind of gives the bulk of this to the people who already have the most, and I think I would rather see it just divvied up equally, although I will live with it either way, but I am more inclined to go with equally, and so I will try that motion and see if it floats.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a substitute motion on the board in Action 2.2 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 reads: Redistribute the shares from each share category equally among all shareholders of that share category. Do we have a second for the substitute? It's seconded by Mr. Swindell. Is there discussion? Dr. Crabtree and then Mr. Boyd.

DR. CRABTREE: It just seems to me, in this case, that I would rather see some of the smaller shareholders get a little bit

more, and this is not many fish. I don't think it's a big deal, but this would go a little bit towards that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: I support this substitute motion, and my comment is that we've talked about what a small amount this is. In the report, it says 32,000 pounds. Let's talk for a second about the value of that that the American people are going to redistribute. That's somewhere in the neighborhood of \$800,000 worth of value in today's market. It's a lot of money, and, if we're redistributing America's wealth, we need to do it across the board and not to those who are already wealthy. That's my point. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I was torn between 2 and 3, and I had both of them circled on my paper, and so I'm okay with 2, if that's where the committee wants to go.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: That's right. It's not a lot of fish. I just want to back up to when this first began, and it was the ad hoc panel that helped develop the profiles for this, and we had an appeals process for the people who came and said that I didn't get what I caught. They could bring their records, and they could bring their landings, or they could bring some receipts and prove that.

We went through that, but the discussion at the time was it would be -- It was divided, the appeals process. The fish that were left over, were not claimed, were divided proportionately, and that's what the AP has asked for. It's not a lot of fish, but that was the discussion, that we take them proportionately as this came back, as the fishery came back, that we would be proportionately would gain from making sacrifices.

We took a 50 percent cut at the beginning of this program. Of course, the recreational took a 50 percent cut too, beside their overages, but we all make sacrifices to rebuild this program. The industry voted as stewards to do this, and I'm not going to fall on the sword for this small amount of fish that we're talking about here, because it's already shrunk. It's not 32,000 anymore, but I'm just saying that's what the original ad hoc panel had voted in support of that, with the thought that if any fish were unused -- That's when we asked for the use-it-or-

lose-it, because we wanted those fish to be distributed amongst the fishermen who were substantially dependent on it, but I mean it's -- Like I said, I'm not going to fall on this small amount of fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

 MR. RIECHERS: Just to put a little finer point on the numbers here in the record, at least as I am reading the discussion here, at the end of 2014, that would have been seventy-six pounds of allocation per shareholder on red snapper. Oddly enough, we don't have the grouper/tilefish poundage in there, and I don't really know why we wouldn't have that explained in there, but it's probably less than that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We've had some good discussion. Let's take a vote on the substitute. All in favor of the substitute motion, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen.

22 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: No nays. It passes sixteen to zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: One more, Mr. Blankenship. Go ahead.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I would move, in Action 4, that all of Action 4 be moved to the Considered but Rejected section.

MR. RIECHERS: I will second.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion to move Action 4 to Considered but Rejected. Action 4 is dealer notification requirement for beginning to offload IFQ species, and you can see the three alternatives there below it. I can read it if Mara would like. I had a second, first by Ms. Guyas over here and then followed by Mr. Riechers, and so it's definitely seconded. Do we have any discussion on this motion?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: My rationale on this is that, in talking with the enforcement officers, that this is a limited problem and that it wasn't necessary to create this where they were getting two email notifications for every offload, one when they landed and once when they offloaded, and it just wasn't necessary to do for the dealers, in order to enforce this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz and then Mr. Riechers.

MR. DIAZ: Yes, ma'am. This document is going to go out for public hearing. It's already in the document now. If we made Alternative 1 the preferred alternative at this time, at least it would go out and people can comment on it.

I believe we've had some discussion in the past that this is something that industry has asked for. At the end of the day, I might be more inclined to agree with Chris. I don't know that Alternative 2 or 3 is the way to go, but, from where we're at right now, and it's going out for public comment, I think I would be in favor of just leaving it in the document, and so I'm going to speak against the motion. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Dale brought this in sidebar, Chris, after you made the motion, and I will just ask if we think there is value in leaving it in, since the analysis has already been done, and just choosing the no action, so that people can see we considered it.

I had some of those same conversations with folks after the committee meeting, and while I don't think this is the solution, if we leave it in, people may get creative about a better solution and be thinking about it, as opposed to putting it in Considered but Rejected, and maybe we could still have a placeholder for the notion of is there a way to tighten this up where these things are happening. I can go either way on this, Chris, but I am kind of wondering and just pose the question of is it valuable to leave in, so that people can see that we considered it?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I would like to leave it in or go with no action. I heard the discussion that the law enforcement said it was burdensome, and I also spoke with a dealer that said it would be burdensome on him as well, and so leave it in and maybe hear some more public comment on it. Maybe not take it out right now, but there is some dealers who are really adamant about wanting this in the document, and there is others who don't think it's necessary. I could go -- I would prefer no action at this time, or something to at least leave it in the document.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: At least the alternatives that we have in front of us for this one, it sounds like the Law Enforcement AP had some issues and the Reef Fish AP had some issues, and I get that this was an industry request, but it seems like what we have now at least isn't going to work, and this is going to go out to public hearing after this council meeting, and is that right, or does this come back to us in January? I would much rather have something workable to put in front of the public, rather than take out something that we kind of know is not going to work. That's not that I am saying that we need to delay this, but I'm just trying to understand where we are.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we're going to do a mail-out to all the permit holders, followed by a webinar, and is that correct? Dr. Simmons.

DR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. We will bring back a public hearing draft to you in January for you to approve before we do that mail-out. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I guess, with that, if we're going to see this again, maybe, between now and then, we can put our heads together and industry can put their heads together and figure out if there's a workable solution. If not, then I would say let's take it out, but we've got a little bit of time, it sounds like.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

 MR. SWINDELL: I attended the Reef Fish Advisory Panel, and the dealer, or a couple of dealers, that were there were not -- They said this is going to be a real problem in trying to get anything for enforcement to come do anything about it, which I can appreciate. If this is the only reason we're using it, I don't think it's really workable. We even heard, I thought, from the enforcement, saying that where they want to inspect the fish is aboard the vessel and not as it's being offloaded off the vessel. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We've had some good discussion. This motion, if we pass it, will remove this action from the document. If not, it will stay in, and we will see it one more time at our next meeting before it goes out to the public. All those in favor of the motion to remove Action 4 from the document to the Considered but Rejected section, signify by raising your hand.

```
1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Seven.
```

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

5 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Seven. I get seven to seven.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So that's me. All right.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Are you for or opposed?

11 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I say leave it in the document right now.

13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: So the motion fails seven to eight.

15 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

17 DR. CRABTREE: I would like to make a motion that in Action 4 that the preferred alternative be Alternative 1, no action.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a second by Johnny Greene for that. In Action 4, to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative, and obviously Alternative 1 is no action. We have a motion on the board, and we have a second. Do we have any discussion on the motion? I think we've had good discussion on it prior to this. All those in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.

28 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen. The motion passes sixteen 29 to zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Did you have any other motions 32 for us, Mr. Blankenship?

34 MR. BLANKENSHIP: I am done.

36 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: You are done, but Dr. Crabtree may.

38 DR. CRABTREE: While we're on a roll with this amendment, I would like to make a motion that in Action 3 that Alternative 2a be the preferred.

42 MR. BLANKENSHIP: Second.

44 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: There is a second from Mr. Blankenship.

DR. CRABTREE: This is the action about retaining the quota in 47 case the council has a pending action, and this would provide 48 the Fisheries Service the authority to do that. Should the

action not go forward, then they would release it in June, which I think gives the industry a fair amount of time to do it. I think this is something we need. It's come up in the past.

3 4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

1

2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am going to read it into the record. motion is, in Action 3, to make Alternative 2a the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 is to provide the Administrator the authority to withhold the amount or grouper/tilefish annual allocation before distribution at the beginning of a year in which a commercial quota reduction is expected to occur. Withheld red snapper and grouper/tilefish annual allocation will be distributed shareholders if the effective date the final of implementing the quota reduction has not occurred by, Option a, Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Riechers.

15 16 17

18

19

20

2122

2324

25

MR. RIECHERS: I would like for Doug to walk us through, and probably Mara, the rulemaking process, because I'm assuming this would typically occur if we pass something in the October or November meeting and then we were trying to work our way through the final publication of that in the first part of the next year, and so all I want to do is make sure we, on the record, put what we believe the timing of all of that would take. It typically takes us X days to get it forwarded to you guys, and you guys have to do a certain amount to it. It has to publish, and just walk us through that.

262728

29

30

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: This is pretty straightforward. It wouldn't take long to have a document ready to be transmitted to NMFS after the council approves it, and so it would be the NMFS rulemaking process that would be the predominant amount of time.

313233

MR. RIECHERS: But two weeks? I mean, rarely do we send it out the next day, I know, and so --

343536

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It would be less than a month, for sure.

373839

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree, do you want to --

40 41

42

43

44

45

DR. CRABTREE: For example, if we had a framework action that was to reduce the quota and we vote it up at the October meeting, it would be sent over to us usually in November sometime. We get a proposed rule out the first of the year, maybe February or March, and there's a thirty-day comment period and the final rule. We would get it done by June.

46 47 48

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene, did you have a comment?

MR. GREENE: Dr. Crabtree, in absence of Option a or b, if you just took them completely out, then they would not be able to receive that quota until the following year? Is that correct?

DR. CRABTREE: I think, if you don't put anything in there, then, if we disapprove the action, we would just redistribute the quota at that point, and you would be leaving the timing of it at the discretion of the agency, I guess.

MR. GREENE: The reason that I ask is that it seems like we're trying to withhold some and we're going to give it to you later, and the industry is concerned about, well, if we get it later, it's going to upset my business model. If we don't get it to them then, and we wait until the following year, that's the other alternative, and that's not really written in here, but am I correct?

DR. CRABTREE: I think what you're doing here is telling the agency if you can't get your decision made by then that you have to give it back to them anyway, and so you're sort of putting the heat on the agency to get it done by June 1.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any further discussion? All those in favor of the motion on the board, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fifteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

31 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One no. The motion carries fifteen 32 to one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Are there any other motions before we leave this section? Okay, Chairman Greene, I am going to turn it back over to you.

MR. GREENE: Standing and Reef Fish SSC Report, Dr. Powers reviewed the summary of items that have not been reviewed under other agenda items. This included a discussion on limit and target reference points and MSY proxies for reef fish, a review of ABC control rule alternatives, and a discussion on carryover of red snapper quota underharvest.

The SSC considered the formation of an ad hoc working group on MSY proxies, but felt they should wait until the data-poor stock assessment review is done. In the interim, several of the social scientists and economists on the SSC agreed to put

together a discussion on risk and uncertainty associated with choosing MSY proxies from a socioeconomic viewpoint.

In the future, expanded use of management strategy evaluation techniques should help to better identify sources of scientific variability. Dr. Ponwith noted that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is in the process of hiring a MSE specialist.

Regarding carryover of unharvested ACL to the following year, SSC members felt that the totality of data and analysis needed to consider an ABC adjustment to allow a carryover to occur would require the equivalent of an update assessment.

However, the SSC was aware that the council is looking for a simpler solution. Two alternative approaches were suggested. One method would be to allow the unharvested amount minus natural deaths to be carried over, such as one minus M times underharvest. Another method would be to conduct simulations to determine what level of carryover could be allowed without affecting rebuilding.

Both of these methods would require further evaluation to determine if they are feasible. Council members felt that the issues associated with carryovers could be addressed in a plan amendment, and they would like to proceed with a plan amendment. Staff noted that the amendment is on the action schedule, and a document will be presented to the council in January.

Reef Fish AP Summary, staff reviewed the following remaining Reef Fish AP agenda items that were not covered: vermillion snapper assessment and draft options; discussion on carryover of unharvested red snapper ACL; and other business of recreational and commercial allocation exchange.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I believe the concludes the Reef Fish Management Committee Report. We will go back up to our normal agenda now and pick back up with Data Collection, if Dr. Stunz is ready.

DR. STUNZ: I am ready when you are, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead.

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. STUNZ: The Data Collection Committee met on October 17, 2016. First was the NFWF For-Hire Pilot Program. Mr. Gill gave a presentation, which is Tab F, Number 4, summarizing the

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation For-Hire Pilot Program.

The objective of this program is to use electronic logbooks to report catch and effort information of for-hire vessels in the Gulf of Mexico. The program uses CLS America reporting software developed for this project. To date, 234 vessels have voluntarily participated in the program.

 The program has been effective and several methods to improve software, including ease of use and data quality, have resulted from this pilot program. Mr. Gill stated that the intent is for this program to serve as building block to implement electronic reporting for the federally-permitted for-hire fleet.

Next was the Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendment. Staff provided a summary of the Technical Committee meeting, which is Tab F, Number 5(a), recommendations about data elements that should be considered in the proposed for-hire electronic reporting program.

Staff explained that the list of recommended elements were identified as essential elements and the timing of anticipated reporting, i.e., during hail-out or hail-in, was included for each variable. The committee was in agreement with this list. However, it requested that the number of passengers be added to the list of essential elements.

Staff reviewed the Generic Charter Vessel and Headboat Reporting Requirements document, which is Tab F, Number 5, including the actions and preferred alternatives. Staff reviewed comments and recommendations from the Ad-Hoc Red Snapper Charter For-Hire, Tab B, Number 10(b), and Reef Fish AP, Tab B, Number 13.

The Ad-Hoc Charter For-Hire supported the current preferred alternatives for Actions 1 and 3, but recommended Alternative 2 for Action 4. That would require vessel operators to submit fishing records via NMFS-approved hardware/software with minimum archived GPS capabilities that provides vessel position.

The Reef Fish AP supported the current preferred alternatives in all four actions. They requested that a backup option be available, in the event of VMS/hardware failure, and that options for VMS funding be explored.

Staff reviewed public comments received during the September 28, 2016 webinar as well as written comments submitted through our website. Staff also reviewed the comments from the Law Enforcement Committee. The committee recognized the benefits of

hail-in requirements for the purpose of data collection, but did not recommend the hail-in requirement for law enforcement purposes. The committee supports the council's Preferred Alternative 4 in Action 4 that requires VMS that is permanently affixed to the vessel.

The committee recommended that staff expand the discussion in the document to clarify the need for a backup system, in the event of VMS/hardware failure, and clarify the role of the council in reviewing the final plan before implementation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

 MS. GUYAS: Before we leave this amendment, I wanted to have a little more discussion about the hardware requirements. It seems like we've gotten some feedback from that on from our APs, and so, to do that, I will put up a motion. The motion would be, in Action 4, to select Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion in Action 4 to select Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 is to require vessel operators to submit fishing records via NMFS-approved hardware/software with minimum archived GPS capabilities that provides vessel position. That was the technical committee recommendation. Do we have a second for the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Banks. Is there discussion on the motion? Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Let me start by saying that our commission discussed this issue and this amendment at their meeting, and they were supportive of this option, because it does provide the flexibility to use a VMS or any of these other platforms, smartphones or tablets or so on and so forth. This was the recommendation that came from our technical committee. This is what we need to get the job done. It was also the preference of I think the for-hire AP, if I have that right, when they discussed this, or maybe the charter/for-hire AP.

I have also gotten a lot of input from people in the industry that are supportive of this option because they are concerned about the costs of potentially having to buy the VMS unit and keep that up, just the overall cost of the program with VMS. Also, this seems like it would be a little bit more flexible and convenient for maybe some of the part-time and seasonal operators that are out there that we did hear from as well, and so I would support this instead of the VMS-only option.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Martha, I don't disagree with you at all, from the Preferred Alternative 4, which we currently have. The little bit of concern that I would have, and I am probably going to support this, but I just want to get on the record that, should we change the way we're going with this to a rights-based type of method of management, I think that would warrant that it needs VMS.

Now, I know this alternative currently doesn't preclude VMS, and so it's fine, and I suppose that we could do that and make those specifications in other amendments, but I just want to make sure that that's on the record, that this might be preferred for where we're at currently, but it would be hard pressed, if someone has an individual fishing quota, that we don't go down a VMS-type route, and so I want to make sure that that's clear, that it's dependent upon management.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I agree. If we go down that road, then let's cross that bridge when we get there. I heard a lot of people in public testimony yesterday that said we're ready to go with this amendment and let's get it done, and it seems to me that the way to do that is to choose this alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: In the VMS, the current preferred, it has the provision that the system has to be permanently affixed to the vessel, and so one of my concerns with this alternative is it's not clear to me that anything is actually affixed to the vessel, and so it's not clear to me that we could use this to actually determine if the vessel went out or didn't go out, because they could potentially leave the unit at the dock and go out and come back and then the unit would show that they never left the dock.

I don't know if there's anything in the document, and can staff tell me, that addresses that or some of these units have an antenna that's permanently affixed to the vessel, and I don't know if that's in here as a requirement or not. I am not completely wed to VMS, but I think the system has to be able to hail-in and hail-out and it has to be able to send the report in before they hit the dock. If something else can do that, I'm okay with that, but I am a little worried if the unit can be taken off the boat and moved around and we don't have any way of knowing that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: John.

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: We have talked about that, both at the IPT and in the various technical committees and things, and there is currently nothing in there. One solution that we have talked about is adding some language such that the reporting device has to be in your possession while on a trip at all times or something, and we talked about this. You could transfer your reporting device to another vessel that was in state waters or all kind of scenarios, but it's not in there now.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Dr. Crabtree brings up a really good point, and there are two aspects, and we've spent a lot of time talking about the notion of reporting before they get back to the dock, and the whole purpose of that timing is to improve the quality of the catch reporting, because the captain wouldn't know before they got back to the dock whether they were going to be sampled or not, and that sampling is the validation step, to see how close the at-sea report is to the validated dockside intercept, in the event that that happened.

That deals with catch. I think the point that Dr. Crabtree is making is that having a device permanently affixed to the vessel helps us also validate effort, and that is, of course, a crucial component of understanding what the total landings are.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: The effort side of this is going to be dealt with on the survey and the questions that you're asking them, and so I don't see that as a huge a hurdle as we might think. I certainly support the motion. We've heard a lot of testimony. We've heard a lot of people wanting to move forward, and the way to move forward at this point, because we don't have a system that's going to outfit everyone with a VMS -- We do not. It's not available. It's not there. If we want to move forward, this is the system at this point in time that would allow us to use -- Each state has different systems ongoing that will feed right into this, and so I think this is a reasonable approach at this time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Maybe I am reading this wrong, but it says -- I don't know if you can scroll back up, but doesn't it say minimum

archived GPS vessel position or something? Isn't that what's written in the document, in that thing?

To me, it implies -- I mean, if you left that at the dock, that would not be supplying the archived minimum vessel information, and so that would defeat the entire -- I mean, you would already be in violation of this, because, in order for that to be applied, that whatever device has to be with you, so that when you come back and you submit it that it does indeed transmit that information, which is your vessel location. It was just archived data instead of real-time data, and so it seems to me that it's actually already in this document.

Now, if we need to write it into the report, so that there is clarity, so that if people understand that you can't leave it at the dock, because it violates this amendment, but, to me, it seems like it's already there, and I am in support of this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: The problem I see is the enforcement of that, because, if they did leave it at the dock and went out, unless we board the vessel at sea and find out they don't have it, we would have no way of knowing that they ever left the dock, and the odds that the Coast Guard or NOAA Law Enforcement or anybody is going to board one of these vessels is pretty low, because we don't have that many enforcement agents out there, and so it's just a matter of, with the permanently-affixed VMS unit, if that boat leaves the dock, we're going to know that the guy went out and he is supposed to have reported a hail-in and hail-out and what he's doing, but, with this, we lose that safeguard.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I just realized that I forgot to include the options underneath the alternative. Can you flip back to the motion? My motion would be to make Alternative 2, Options a and b the preferred alternative. That includes headboats and charterboats. I should have clarified that. This is one of those ones where you have to pick and choose which one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell, I think you had a comment next?

MR. SWINDELL: Not to this particular point. Kelly, do you want to add anything to this point?

DR. LUCAS: The addition? No.

MR. SWINDELL: What happens if the person leaving the dock to go fishing was not intending to go beyond the three or nine-mile limits and he's just out there fishing for whatever the customer wants to catch and catch red snapper or whatever within state waters. Does he need a vessel monitoring system or anything at that time?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and so federally-permitted vessels will have to have this system aboard, and they're going to have to report the trip and everything they catch and discard, regardless of whether they are in state waters or federal waters.

MR. SWINDELL: So it will apply specifically to the federally-permitted? You've got a federal permit that you're going to go out sometime or another and you need to have this system at all times?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and, if you're a state guideboat and don't have a federal permit, then you don't have to comply with this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Roy, there is a hail-in and a hail-out associated with this, in this document as it is, and so if somebody hails out and they left the GPS, then I mean clearly you're going to know, right? Then they have the hail-in, but I don't know that just because it's affixed that it means anything, because those who are going to try to get around the system are going to get around the system, but, from what I'm hearing, these people don't want to get around the system.

They are out there begging for us to give them something that works, and so I think that they're all pretty much willing participants, because those who are trying to get around it are going to get around it whether you have something affixed to their boat or not. That's just kind of my thought on it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Dr. Crabtree?

 DR. CRABTREE: I hope you're right about that, and I agree, if they hail-out, I don't think they're going to leave it at the dock then. My concern is more about if they don't hail-out and they leave it at the dock and then we would never know they went. I hope you're right and that everybody is going to comply. If that's the case, then that's one situation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

 DR. STUNZ: This is a point -- Roy is making some key points here, and we may need to get some clarification from the technical committee. Roy, what you're saying is if we go with Alternative 2, even if it's affixed to the vessel, unlike a VMS, it's off and it's not telling you where this is all the time, is at least my understanding. That technology is not there.

In other words, what we're talking about here is two fundamentally different things, obviously, with 2 and 4, and so I just wanted to make it clear that it's not -- If we go with 2, even though, as it says in there, it has archiving GPS capabilities, it is not necessarily running all the time and telling you where that vessel is, and so we wouldn't have some of that information that I think Roy is potentially getting at.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene, and then we will take a vote.

MR. GREENE: Well, I speak in opposition to Alternative 2. There's just a million things going and everything else, and I kind of view this as a blanket document, and we're picking -- We have got these available systems before us.

The one thing that strikes me with Alternative 4 is that it's permanently affixed to the boat. You have to have a federally-permitted boat, and it has to be affixed to that boat. Now, there might be some folks that have two boats with permits and he may want to jump back and forth, and I'm not saying that that's not a possibility, but it's not a real possibility. I can't imagine having more than one boat, but that's just me personally.

Where I'm hung up on this is I think law enforcement was in preference of the VMS alternative, and so am I. Number one, it's based on the permanently affixed to the vessel, and, if we do something down the road that we see that we don't need Alternative 4, then we can come back and change it at a later point.

Now, the technology may change such that, twelve months from now, Alternative 2 may be able to have a way to be permanently affixed to the vessel, and I wouldn't have an issue with that, but, at this point, with it being affixed to the vessel, and the VMS is the only system I know of that does that, that's why I am going to be in support of it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We've had some good discussion on the motion.

All of those in favor of making Alternative 2, Options and b, the preferred alternative, please signify by raising your hand.

2 3 4

1

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Nine yeas.

5 6

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All opposed, same sign.

7

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Seven no. It passes nine to seven.

9

10 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. I'm going to turn it back over to 11 Dr. Stunz, if there is no more business on that part of the 12 report. Mr. Greene.

13 14

15

16 17 MR. GREENE: It was my understanding, through committee discussion, that there was really not anything else we could do to this alternative, and so it would be my intent that we are going to go to final action at the next meeting. Is that correct?

18 19 20

DR. STUNZ: That was what we had discussed during the committee meetings, and the staff was preparing for that.

212223

24

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We will take the necessary steps to notice it for final action. All right. Would you like to carry on with your committee report, Dr. Stunz?

252627

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

Yes, please. Next was the Cost Analysis and STUNZ: Reporting Requirements of Commercial Electronic Reporting Ponwith gave a presentation summarizing a Dr. commercial e-logbook pilot program. Dr. Ponwith stated that this is a voluntarily program that aims to transition the fleet from paper-based to electronic logbooks. She stated that preliminary feedback has been positive and that the council may want to consider developing an amendment to implement mandatory electronic reporting for commercial vessels. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

363738

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is there any other discussion before we leave Data Collection? Mr. Greene.

39 40 41

42

43

44

MR. GREENE: Just reading in the last sentence of the report, it seems that we need to consider developing an amendment to implement mandatory electronic reporting for commercial vessels. I think I will go ahead and make that motion. You can copy it right out of the last sentence there of the report.

45 46 47

48

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board to develop an amendment to implement mandatory electronic reporting

for commercial vessels. Do we have a second to the motion?

DR. STUNZ: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's seconded by Dr. Stunz. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: I think I brought this up in committee, and I will look to Dave or Bonnie or someone else to help explain, because we already have trip ticket reporting that basically is providing this information trip-by-trip, and each state does that in coordination through Gulf States now.

It just so happened that I received a note from my Gulf States representative, right after our discussion about this, that we took a 12 to 13 percent cut in this program over the course of the last week. As we think about this and we're asking to do I, first of all, wonder about the yet another program, really gaining redundancy of that and are we information, number one, and, number two, if we have the money to do this, then maybe it should help us support our current programs back to the level that they were at before. just a thought, and I will look to Dave or someone else to weigh in here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Right now, we have an electronic dealer reporting system. That system is what we use for monitoring progress towards commercial ACLs, and so we take those data that are reported on a mandatory basis no less than weekly and use those weekly reports to create projections of when we anticipate a commercial season is going to hit their ACL.

That advancement has been almost revolutionary in terms of our ability to manage these commercial fisheries and their ACLs more crisply, to avoid more frequently going over ACLs and, equally as disruptive, undershooting those ACLs. The commercial vessels have been submitting their data on a vessel basis using paper logbooks for a long, long time. Those data are invaluable.

 The thing that the vessel logbooks give us is better information on discards, and so we're using the actual business transactions, the commercial dealer reports, for monitoring the ACL. The vessel information gives us better information on bycatch data and other aspects of actual trip-by-trip information.

The electronic reporting would be able to refine those data. It gives us the flexibility to keep more detailed information by depth. Instead of having one trip that has one depth field for what we know are more complicated trips than that, it gives us the ability to keep data at a higher resolution for their activities by depth, and I guess for the whole trip.

The pilot project worked on vessels that were trawling and that were dropping traps and that were longlining, and it gave us the ability to keep data at a resolution that was set-by-set and drop-by-drop and trawl-by-trawl, which is really valuable. How often are we asking questions of the data, and do we improve our bycatch levels and do we improve our decisions on reducing bycatch by managing spatially, and our ability to answer those questions now are really, really limited by the granularity of the data that we have in the logbooks.

These data coming in electronically, again, we have been asked by industry of can you make it so that we can submit our data electronically on a voluntary basis rather than on the logbook, because we're over-submitting this on paper, and we're trying to prepare ourselves to be able to answer that question with a, yes, we think in about six months we'll be at that point.

There are some distinct advantages in having those data for everybody. If the council opts to do this as a mandatory program, it gives us data at a higher resolution, and temporally more quickly, to be able to generate those bycatch estimates faster, with a shorter turnaround, and make those data available more readily for things like stock assessments or future council decisions.

 MR. DONALDSON: Bonnie, I appreciate that, and upgrading antiquated systems is certainly important. As we talk about, and you've been involved in the discussions at our state and federal meeting, with limited resources, I think we need to look to see where we get the biggest bang for the buck, and I think that was the point that Robin was making with trip tickets and -- I just hope that we can weigh the benefits, the pros and cons, doing this versus augmenting trip tickets, and something that your office has talked to us about during state and federal, and so I would like to engage in those types of conversations with your programs as well, because, with limited resources, we need to make sure that we're getting the most out of those limited funds.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Certainly, Bonnie, as you discussed and described how you could use that data, I don't think anyone around this table doesn't believe that there may be some additional benefit associated with the types of data that you may receive and with that granularity, but I think Dave hit the nail on the head, which is, at some point, if we can't fund the current programs we've got, how do we continue to add and split up that pie amongst those other programs?

It's real easy for many of us to say we have cellphone technology and we can pull an app down and we can do that, but we all know that there's truly a cost behind the scenes to managing that data and to developing that data framework, et cetera, and so, while I will support the motion to go to a scoping document and to have that conversation and continue that conversation, I think, until we can really start prioritizing, we're just making a bunch of motions and creating a bunch of scoping documents.

Unless we can see where we're going to fund them, I am just -At some point, I am going to probably reach, at the point when
we start doing alternatives, that I'm probably not going to
support the document, because, at some point, if we can't fund
it, I don't know really why we're having the discussions and
wasting many of our hours around the table doing that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: I just want to mention that the South Atlantic Council is moving in this direction as well, to do an amendment to make mandatory electronic reporting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Bonnie, I have a question, but let me let David go. He's had his hand up for a while.

MR. WALKER: I was just going to say the commercial industry has the best data collection system in the Gulf, as far as I know, and they welcome this. They want to give better data and to be accountable and to be good stewards of the resource.

We've done this. We have worked hard. We had problems in our fishery, and we worked on it, and we want to keep tweaking it and keep giving superior data. That's what we're all after, and everyone is after data. I don't see any objection. Probably some people could advocate from the audience. The council can't, but maybe to Congress.

Everyone testifies that we need better data and we need faster

data and we need more accurate data, and so I think that's something we agree on. I just would like to see more funding for the resources that maybe you could use in Texas and other states to get data quicker, and I'm just in support of this motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Bonnie, specific to the shrimp fleet, we already have ELBs on the boats, and they upload that data automatically, but I have had some requests from some shrimpers, actually in Louisiana, wondering if we would ever get to the point where the federal form that we have to submit at the end of the year each year, if we could ever do that electronically, and so would an amendment like this be able to implement something like that, to give us that ability?

DR. PONWITH: The ELBs are exclusively for monitoring effort by depth, and we instrument a subset of the federally-permitted shrimp vessels to acquire that information to help us determine that very report that we had in the shrimp report, and that is, was the total effort for the year in those specific depth ranges below the threshold, and that effort is a proxy for red snapper bycatch.

 That is what is being submitted on the shrimp vessel ELBs. It's essentially how much of the time were you out on the water actively fishing versus in the port or running from one place to another. That's what that is for. If your question is, is something like this -- Would it have utility for submitting the actual commercial logbook, that is what it is designed for. It's for submitting that required commercial logbook data.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I don't know if this will get to what some of Robin spoke of, and I know he had to leave the table, but, in the data amendment, we had a lot of cost-associated things put into it, where we followed the kind of cost if you go with this route or if you go with that route or whatever, and I was at the state and federal meeting, and so I understand a lot of the discussion we had on we're reducing federal funds and states are trying to fill this in, while at the same time reducing their budget, to make sure we get the information, but there may be some -- Like Dave said, commercial wants this, and so there may be some way for the commercial that want this to chip in to some of it, to help offset some of the costs. Maybe not all of it, but to help offset some of the costs as it goes along to meet this, which is what we're doing with programs now and trying to explore that.

1 Maybe in some of these documents, when we get along that and we

- 2 start having that discussion, Bonnie, we can look at some of
- 3 those avenues as a way of kind of cost sharing across all the

4 programs, to see if it works. That's just a thought.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion on the board to develop an amendment to implement mandatory electronic reporting for commercial vessels. All those in favor, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We have sixteen yeas.

13 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: There are zero no, and so the 16 motion carries sixteen to zero.

18 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Yes, sir, Dr. McGovern.

DR. MCGOVERN: One thing I think we might want to add to the 21 motion is to say mandatory electronic logbook reporting, just to 22 clarify it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted. We've already voted on the motion, 25 but we will note that to staff. Thank you. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: In reading back through this, I want to ask Bonnie a question. In this motion, is this specific to reef fish vessels or all commercial vessels?

DR. MCGOVERN: It's the commercial logbook, and so that includes dolphin wahoo and coastal migratory pelagics and reef fish and snapper grouper.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Good to know. Thank you. We appreciate the clarification. Is there any other business to come before us on Data Collection before we officially conclude that discussion? All right. Next on our scheduled agenda is Mackerel. Dr. Dana, would you like a five-minute break before you go into that, or do you want to move right along?

42 DR. DANA: It's at the pleasure of the Chairwoman.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Can I get another five-minute break, just 45 real quick?

47 DR. DANA: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MACKEREL COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. DANA: The Mackerel Committee met on October 17, and we started off with the CMP Amendment 30. Staff reviewed the purpose and need of CMP 30, which is to change the recreational fishing season for Atlantic cobia north of the Florida/Georgia state line. CMP 30 does not affect the Gulf migratory group of cobia.

The recreational ACL for Atlantic cobia was exceeded in 2015, and the South Atlantic Council is considering several measures to ensure that the fishing season remains open during the most popular time of year, which for them is May through September. The South Atlantic Council has selected Alternative 2 as their preferred alternative and has recommended that the document be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce for implementation. The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board. It's a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

DR. DANA: The committee recommends, and I so move, to approve CMP Amendment 30 and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board, and this will be a roll call vote for this motion. Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Diaz.

42 MR. DIAZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.

```
1
    MR. BANKS: Yes.
 2
 3
 4
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker. Mr. Sanchez. Mr.
 5
    Swindell.
 6
 7
    MR. SWINDELL: Yes.
 8
9
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Captain Greene.
10
11
    MR. GREENE: Yes.
12
13
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Lucas.
14
15
    DR. LUCAS: Yes.
16
17
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. McGovern.
18
19
    DR. MCGOVERN: Yes.
20
21
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.
22
23
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
24
25
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.
26
27
    MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
28
29
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.
30
31
    MR. WALKER: Yes.
32
33
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd.
34
35
    MR. BOYD: Yes.
36
37
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Robinson.
38
39
    MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
40
41
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Dana.
42
43
    DR. DANA: Yes.
44
45
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.
46
47
    MR. MATENS: Yes.
```

1 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Dr. Stunz.

2

DR. STUNZ: Yes.

4

5 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Blankenship.

6 7

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Yes.

8 9

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.

10

11 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

12

13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Seventeen yes and zero no. It's 14 unanimous.

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

The committee continued on with CMP Framework DANA: Amendment 5. Staff reviewed the purpose and need of CMP modify restrictions Framework Amendment 5, which is to applicable to federal commercial permits for king and Spanish This amendment will allow commercial fishermen to recreationally fish for king and Spanish mackerel on their commercially-permitted vessels when the commercial season closed, and it would apply in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic. The councils have selected the same preferred alternatives, and the South Atlantic Council has recommended that the document be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce for implementation.

272829

30 31

32

33

34

The committee recommends, and I so move, to approve CMP Framework Amendment 5 and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate.

35 36

37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** We have a committee motion on the board, and this again will be a roll call vote.

39

40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Swindell.

41

42 MR. SWINDELL: Yes.

43

44 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.

45 46

MR. WALKER: Yes.

47

48 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Diaz.

```
1
 2
    MR. DIAZ: Yes.
 3
 4
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. McGovern.
 5
 6
    DR. MCGOVERN: Yes.
 7
 8
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Captain Greene.
 9
10
    MR. GREENE: Yes.
11
12
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd.
13
14
    MR. BOYD: Yes.
15
16
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Dana.
17
18
    DR. DANA: Yes.
19
20
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.
21
22
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
23
24
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.
25
26
    MR. MATENS: Yes.
27
28
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.
29
30
    MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
31
32
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Robinson.
33
34
    MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
35
36
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.
37
38
    DR. STUNZ: Yes.
39
40
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.
41
42
    MS. GUYAS: Yes.
43
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Lucas.
44
45
46
    DR. LUCAS: Yes.
47
```

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Blankenship.

```
1 2 MR. BLANKENSHIP: Yes.
```

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.

10 MS. BOSARGE: Yes.

12 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Again, it's unanimous, seventeen to 22 zero.

DR. DANA: Staff then reviewed the purpose and need for CMP 29, which addresses Gulf king mackerel allocation sharing and a recreational accountability measure. Staff reviewed Action 1, which examines options for allocation sharing strategies between the recreational and commercial sectors for Gulf king mackerel.

Committee members asked why two-year old data would be used in Alternative 2 if the following year, which constitutes preliminary data, would also determine whether a conditional transfer would occur. Staff replied that the use of two-year old data would result in the consideration of both validated and preliminary landings data prior to any allocation sharing, thereby providing more confidence in any resulting decision.

From a timeliness perspective, Alternative 2 is predicted to move more quickly than Alternative 3. Staff noted that transfers are only for one year, and are therefore not cumulative across fishing years. A committee member was concerned about the risk of removing fish that have historically acted as a buffer. Another committee member replied that there were already buffers in place to protect the stock. The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 2, Options 2b and 2g the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there discussion on the motion? Mr. Boyd.

 MR. BOYD: We heard quite a few people yesterday in public testimony talk, and we heard Dr. Powers tell us that the SSC was not comfortable with the data that they had, and, in fact, they had sent back a request for additional data and confirmation from the Science Center about the stock and about what's happening in the stock.

It appears to me, from conversation around this table and public testimony, that there is listening to uncertainty about what's happening in the stock. We know that the commercial fishermen are over their allocation, and I think that we ought to first look at how to get them within their allocation, but I won't address that right now. it's premature to go ahead and select a alternative until we know more about what the stock is doing and how it's reacting to the increase in our bag limit for the recreational fishermen, and so I would speak against this motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I noted too during public testimony that there was one individual that said that the average size of the fish that they're landing commercially had gone down, and that, I think, from an eight-pound average to I think he said a six-pound average. That gave me a little bit of hesitation. It made me -- I was at that SSC meeting, and there were a lot of questions when they presented that data, and the questions couldn't be -- Unfortunately, the man that had done the presentation wasn't there to give it. He was on leave, I think. Anyway, they were going to go back and try and answer those questions.

The questions centered around the fact that why are your OFLs --Why are you showing decreasing OFLs when the recreational sector is not landing what you put in the assessments that it would actually land? They are not even coming up to that point, and yet you're saying that our OFLs and ABCs should go down, and so I am all ears when that discussion comes back up, because I think you're right.

We certainly don't want to do something that -- If this is something that we haven't tried before and we're trying to go down this road of sharing, the last thing that we want to do is to implement it and then have everything crash and burn. That's not going to bode well for ever trying to do it again in the other direction.

I definitely want to take a step back and look at this and listen to what the SSC has to say, and when are we taking this out to the public? When is this scheduled to go to the -- Is it between this meeting and January, or is it after the January meeting?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: It would clearly be next year, but I think it might be after the April meeting. Carrie.

DR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. We had planned to take this out to public hearings, if you approved this draft, after this meeting, before the January council meeting, and I think the idea was to try to get some preferreds on the table so that we could take those out to public hearings and we could get that information back to the council in January for final action and it would go to the South Atlantic Council for their December meeting. It was a tight timeline, and that's what we were planning to do, but if the document is not ready to go out to public hearings, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I stand corrected on that, but my understanding of the problem the SSC had with the analysis is the new projections were not done in a comparable way to the original projections, and there was some -- It was just not clear exactly how it was done, and so we sent it back and said, you know, let's do it in a comparable way.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: If this is scheduled to go out to the public, then I will probably vote in favor of having this preferred alternative, because I want them to see what we're thinking about, and I want to get -- If there is some negative feedback out there, I want to hear it.

I want them to know that this is what we're considering and get that feedback, for sure, and so, if that's our schedule and that's what we have slated, I am okay with making this the preferred, with the understanding that we may need to slow down and look at this a little bit harder and make sure that we've considered everything that could possibly go wrong, because we certainly don't want to do something that will go wrong. I had Ms. Guyas, and then we'll come back over here.

MS. GUYAS: We couldn't hear very well over here. Did I hear April for final action for this and public hearings before January? Is that right? Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: To the points that you were making, David Krebs, who is intimately involved in the kingfish fishery throughout the Gulf and up the east coast, made a comment yesterday, and then I confirmed it with him after we finished, that he is seeing smaller and smaller kingfish all the way around Florida, and he says, I can't tell you why, but he said there is something going on in this stock, and so we have an issue with the SSC, we have

an issue with the people who fish this fishery and who sell those fish, and so I think we've got something going on here in the stock that we're not sure of. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Also, during yesterday's meeting, I made a point to ask Mr. Krebs, because the Florida Keys, the commercial fishermen in the Keys, have been heavy historical participants in this fishery, for as long as there has been this fishery, and their representative came forth and he was advocating this, as you've all heard Bill Kelly speak, and Mr. Krebs does not buy the fish in the Keys, and I don't know if that has something to do with it or not, but certainly, if there is any division of fish, it goes to all the respective regions that we divided, and every commercial fisher, throughout the whole range of this fish, is going to benefit from this.

I don't see this having any biological impact whatsoever to the stock. I understand we have a difference of opinion on this, but this is benign, and it will just benefit the use of this resource without any impacts biologically at all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Rindone.

 MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to clarify when you guys could take final action on this, if you guys picked preferred alternatives here for both actions, then the South Atlantic Council could be in a position in December to take final action after reviewing the public hearing summary, which would be available to them at their December meeting, and then you guys could subsequently take final action on it in January. Then we could submit it to NMFS thereafter, and so it wouldn't have to wait until April, unless you decided to change preferred alternatives.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I too share your concerns with this variability in the fisheries, and I don't have a problem voting for this, in terms of preferred for public hearings, so they know what our intent is, but, from the larger perspective of this amendment, I would disagree with Mr. Sanchez. I do think there could be some biological impacts.

Is it broadly going to affect the fishery as a whole? Maybe not, but you heard the testimony that Doug referred to about the smaller size, but it sort of gets at this fundamental issue we

have between recreational and commercial fishing. People around this table said, oh, it's sort of crazy or whatever, silly, to leave fish in the water, and I would argue that it's not.

I mean, there is high value in recreational fisheries to have high catch per unit effort and big fish to go out and catch and have this enjoyable experience, and I would be very concerned that there might be some of these unintended consequences, and whether it's biological biomass or not, I don't know, but you can imagine a situation where, if the fishery was depressed some and the recreational guys couldn't get their quota to push it up, and so you would never trigger those benchmarks or whatever you want to call it, or those triggers, that we have in place, because the fishery is going down from being where it is today.

You could have this unintended consequence of it kind of working against the recreational anglers, and so, for a variety of reasons, including those, and we still don't know the full implications of these bag limits and that kind of thing, I am not real in favor of this amendment as it is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I tend to agree with a lot that's been said. I've been a proponent of trying to do this for this fishery, because, historically, the fishery, the recreational side of the fishery, has left around four-million pounds out there every year, and I think we've worked real hard to try to be conservative with the way we've approached this.

 I would like to send it out to the public with the preferreds that we have now, so they could know what direction at least we're thinking, if this is indeed what the council wants to do. The option that we currently have as the preferred here is to conditionally transfer 10 percent, and so, originally, I think the first motion we talked about was 15 percent, and we backed off of that a little bit, and I think we're -- I have been thinking about this, trying to do this, and doing it in a conservative manner and not try to move too many fish, but to try to eliminate any potential problems that could occur.

If something happens between now and the January meeting or the April meeting, if we want to slow this document down, I would be fine with that, but, as of today, I speak in favor of the motion on the board. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas and then Mr. Matens.

MS. GUYAS: It seems like there is at least some interest in taking this out to the public but also some hesitancy in really pushing this forward and taking a final action before we get a little bit more information. Is it possible to, assuming that we vote this up, to take this out to public hearing, but don't put this on the South Atlantic agenda maybe for December? We can chew on what the public tells us and maybe get a little bit more information about what's going on and look at it again in January and then send it to the South Atlantic and then potentially vote it up in April. When does the SSC meet again?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The SSC was going to come back with some more information at their next meeting, and so when is that?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We typically have the SSC meeting three weeks before our council meeting, and I would ask Steven if we have it on the agenda, if we're going to have the revised analyses for the SSC to consider in January.

MR. STEVEN ATRAN: The next SSC meeting is currently scheduled the week of January 10. Has an analysis request been made to the Science Center? I don't normally get involved with the mackerel items.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Not that I know of, and so we need to do that right away if it hasn't been done.

MR. ATRAN: So we would have to coordinate with Bonnie to see when we could get any analysis done.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The gentleman that gave that presentation at the meeting, that said he would get back with us, he was from the Science Center, and then Shannon Cass-Calay, she's from the Science Center, and so those were the two individuals that were there that said that they were going to go back and dig a little deeper and try and come back with an update at the next meeting, and so I'm assuming that's the Science Center.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We will definitely follow up on that, because that was my assumption too, and so we haven't formally requested it, but maybe we should.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Mr. Matens and then we will go to Mr. Sanchez.

46 MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have enjoyed listening 47 to the discussion here. From a philosophical standpoint, I am 48 in favor of moving fish either way. If some sector is not using them, then I'm okay with the concept of moving them to the sector that is not using their allocation.

I was disturbed by Mr. Krebs's comments, and I know that's anecdotal and I know it's just one person, but one of the things that he told me was that the fish that he's buying, the smaller fish, are not well received by his customers, and they are not receiving the same price, and the economic considerations of that is starting to bother me.

If these fish were a little bigger and he gets more money, that's good for everybody, and so I really haven't decided how to vote on this thing, quite frankly. I like the concept, and I know that Mr. Krebs is just one voice crying in the wilderness, but I just don't know what to do here. I think this is a really confusing issue.

This is not the biggest fishery that we have. There is some other parts of this fishery that are of concern to me. One of them has been voiced here before, and it has nothing to do with this issue that's on the table, and that's the fact that some of the Louisiana shrimpers aren't prosecuting this fishery because the fish get caught before they stop shrimping, and, of course, I'm from Louisiana, and I'm in favor of that. Forgive me for rambling here, but I am just conflicted here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't like talking about Mr. Krebs. He is not here. Clearly he buys fish from both coasts. I don't know if some of this is motivated from not wanting to disrupt markets at certain times, but, to me, if there is a concern about small fish, small fish might mean strong recruitment. Maybe we should have the Science Center look at that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Excellent recommendation, and, in fact, we are on tap for a stock assessment to be conducted in 2018, and that stock assessment is going to be unique, in that we are doing it in collaboration with the Mexican government. For the first time ever, we're going to be including data and age composition information, landings information, from the Mexican government, and so we'll be able to take a look at patterns that we're seeing.

Seeing small fish can mean that there is a drop in the number of

large fish. Seeing small fish can be a leading indicator that there is a large year class coming in. The thing that answers the question of which is happening of those two possible scenarios would be that stock assessment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Also, the other day, we were talking about the effects of climate on species, and we will probably see this first in the pelagics. For us, king mackerel will be it.

We know, from the way the migratory patterns have changed since the 1970s, when it was cold, to now, when it was warmer, that these fish are very influenced by temperature changes, and so that could be going on today and we just don't realize it yet, because it's in transition.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are slated to go out to the public with this, and I do think that it is important that we have a preferred alternative, whether you want this one or you want another one, and that's your option, but I do think we should have a preferred.

We have a motion on the board to make our Preferred Alternative 2, Option 2b and Option 2g in Action 1, and I'm going to read this into the record. Alternative 2 would conditionally transfer a certain percentage of the allocation to the commercial sector in the next fishing year, if the minimum recreational landings threshold is not met. If the commercial sector does not land at least 90 percent of its annual catch limit, this transfer will not occur. Landings data from two years prior will be used to determine allocation transfers.

Conditional Quota Transfer, Option 2b, conditionally transfer 10 percent from the stock allocation to the commercial allocation. Recreational ACL Minimum Threshold, if the recreational sector landings are, Option 2g, less than 75 percent of the recreational ACL. All those in favor of this motion, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We have fourteen yeas.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: $\ensuremath{\text{Two}}$. The motion passes fourteen to two with one abstention.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: I didn't get my question in before we voted, but what I am interested in would be is this a one year, each year, provision?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Rindone can speak to it, but, yes, this would be reviewed annually. Mr. Rindone, do you want to clarify? Okay. Dr. Dana, we have one more question from Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: I have a motion I would like to make, if staff could put it up, please, and I think this might be the right place to do it. I was kind of waiting to find out where. I will go ahead and talk about what it is as they're putting it up.

We have heard that there are several species that are underfished by the different sectors, and we've started talking about how to share those or reallocate them. I call it reallocation, but we're calling it sharing. I think we need to step back for a minute and not rush into this on a fish-by-fish basis.

 I think we need to start to develop some global parameters on how we want to approach underfishing in a particular sector versus sharing, and so I have a motion that I would like to put forth, and the motion is to develop an allocation exchange or sharing discussion paper for presentation at the spring 2017 council meeting that includes, but is not limited to, the following: the types or method of allocation exchange or sharing benefits and detriments, difficulties in implementation, and then other issues and considerations.

I am asking for us to look at that and let's get a white paper on it that talks about what are some of the issues and alternatives and positives and negatives.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Do we have a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr. Matens, and I think you gave some pretty good rationale on what you were hoping to see in that paper and why we should be taking a look at this.

MR. BOYD: Yes, and I would just like to say that I am not against the sharing. I think it needs to be done in a prudent, organized, structured manner and not willy-nilly when we feel like it or if some sector says, well, I don't want to share, we need to have some way that we want to look at doing that, and so

this is a way to start it, I think, is just to get some information.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Do you envision we will work on this, but also keep moving forward with our mackerel amendment as we're working out some parameters?

MR. BOYD: Yes, I would. Now, a caveat to that is I am where Greg is. I think that there is some serious issues that we need to deal with in the mackerel stock itself. I think there is a lot of issues that we don't understand that are going on here, the size of the fish and the abundance of the fish and not catching fish, a lot of issues, and so I don't -- Globally, I don't know if I can support the whole amendment, but I understand the concept.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Just a point of order. Is this motion germane to CMP 20 Amendment 29, or would it fall outside of this?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara, would it be best to put this under our Other Business or --

MS. LEVY: Maybe. It's up to you. I think we're still talking about Amendment 29. I think we had another motion with respect to the actions in Amendment 29, and so you could talk about it here if you want to, but, if you want to hold off and finish talking about Amendment 29, then you could do that. It also wasn't clear to me whether we were talking about not just CMP, right, but we're talking about -- In that context, you're in the CMP Committee, and so it might be better to do it when you're done with the committee.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: I don't have a problem with the motion, but I just want to make sure that it's in the right place.

40 MR. BOYD: Madam Chair, I am okay with that. I was looking for 41 the right place to do it, and, if you feel it would be better at 42 the end of the report, I am fine with that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Would that be okay, if you withdraw it now, 45 but staff keep it handy and, once we finish our discussion on 46 mackerel, then we will move into that. Don't let me pass it up.

MR. BOYD: I will withdraw the motion until a further time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Dr. Dana, I will turn it back over to you.

DR. DANA: Thank you. Continuing with CMP Amendment 29, in Action 2, staff reviewed the proposed modifications to the recreational accountability measures for king mackerel. Because of the council's desire to keep the recreational sector open year-round, the council is considering changing the current inseason AM to a post-season AM.

The change to a post-season AM allows for the safeguards built into Action 1 in CMP 29 to return any shared allocation to the recreational sector before the AM is applied, thereby safeguarding the current year-round recreational season from any risks related to an allocation-sharing strategy.

A committee member thought that the recreational sector would be penalized for exceeding their sector ACL in a fishing year under the proposed alternatives. Another committee member clarified that no such penalty would occur. By delaying the AM until the following season, the recreational ACL would return to its preallocation sharing level. Staff were directed to provide examples of how the AMs would work, and I believe Ryan has an attachment that he is going to put up and walk us through on those examples.

MR. RINDONE: This is a rudimentary --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ryan, did you find a warm spot?

MR. RINDONE: Exactly. This is uncalled for cold. I am ready to go home. This is a very rudimentary PowerPoint, but hopefully it will help kind of explain how things are going to work.

The current allocations that I used in this example are based on Amendment 26, which has been submitted for secretarial review, but it hasn't been implemented yet, and NMFS has told us that they think that will be late January when that goes through. Using the current allocations that we have for the recreational and commercial sectors, the recreational sector's ACL would be 6.263 million pounds, and the commercial would be 2.947. That's based on our current 68/32 split.

These are the recreational landings trends by MRIP wave, and the 2015/2016 wave, Ms. Gerhart gave us the actual numbers for that, yesterday, I think, and so that Wave 3 number, at the tail-end

for the dark-blue line, should be ticked up, obviously, to where she said it should be, but you can see that our main times for landing kingfish are definitely Waves 3 and 4.

With the exception of Wave 2 in 2014/2015, Wave 2 tends to be a lower time, and that gives a little bit of a question as to the landings data for that particular wave, but hopefully the next stock assessment will tease that out.

How the accountability measures are going to work with allocation sharing, some assumptions that I've used for the examples are that we're using the 9.21-million-pound stock quota for 2016/2017 from Amendment 26, and we're assuming that you guys are going to conditionally transfer 10 percent to the commercial sector with a recreational minimum landings threshold of 75 percent, and so, with that 10 percent transfer, that makes the recreational ACL 5.342 million pounds and the commercial ACL 3.8 and change.

That 75 percent recreational threshold would set the threshold at about four-million pounds on the nose for the recreational sector, and so, if they were to land over four-million pounds in a fishing year, then no transfer would occur.

In the first example, we say the recreational sector landed six-million pounds. That's more than their 5.342 and the threshold. Under our current accountability measure, the recreational season would be closed early, because the ACL would have been exceeded. Under the proposed accountability measures, either Alternative 2 or 3, the next year's season would be based on the full recreational ACL, the 68 percent of 6.263, and, because the previous year's landings were less than the ACL, six-million compared to 6.263, there wouldn't be a need to shorten the following season, and so there would be no penalty assessed to the recreational sector at either time under the proposed accountability measures. Does everyone understand this example?

 This is your doomsday scenario, if you will. The recreational landings equal 6.5 million pounds, which exceeds both the threshold, the recreational sector's adjusted ACL, and their ACL if no allocation sharing were to occur. Under both circumstances, the following fishing season -- Under the current AMs, the fishing season would have been closed early, because the landings would have been exceeded.

 Under the proposed accountability measures, fishing in the following year would be abbreviated based on the landing six-and-a-half million pounds against the ACL of 6.263. Maybe that

means that the recreational sector would close say the first week of December or something like that, but they would have exceeded their original ACL if no allocation sharing had occurred, which means that there probably needs to be some investigation into effort. This is typically what we would do anyway without allocation sharing.

The third example here shows the recreational sector just going through the threshold, but not the ACL. We assume the recreational sector lands four-and-a-half million pounds, which exceeds that 75 percent threshold, but not the sector ACL. Well, in this circumstance, the transfer is cancelled for the following year for the commercial sector, and so the allocations still go back to the 68/32. No conditional transfer occurs. Under the current AM, nothing would happen. Under the proposed AMs, nothing would happen for the recreational sector. Does everybody see how this works?

The take-away, generally speaking, is that, under the proposed AMs, during an allocation-sharing year, if the recreational sector exceeds its ACL during that fishing year, nothing happens. Then, in the following year, they get all the fish they shared back.

Now, if their landings in the previous year were so high that they would have exceeded the following year's total 68 percent allocation that they get, then NMFS would need to investigate to what degree the fishing season should be shortened, to make sure that the ACL isn't exceeded again. Does everybody get that? That's it, folks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have some questions.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I have a question. Assuming we go through a 10 percent allocation transfer and the commercial exceeds their quota with that 10 percent share, what happens then? What happens to the commercial side?

MR. RINDONE: Right now, the commercial season, when it's closed, is governed by when NMFS gets the landings through the electronic reporting and issues a closure notice, and where we're at right now is the stock ACL has to be exceeded for there to be a -- Excuse me. There is no like following season payback or anything for the commercial sector. It's just that, if their ACL is met or projected to be met, they're closed. That's the current accountability measure, just like it is for the recreational sector.

The alternatives that we're proposing for changing the recreational sector's accountability measures actually make it more lenient than what the commercial sector has, and so they close during the year when their landings are met or projected to be met. What's being proposed for the recreational sector is, if they exceeded their ACL in a year where there is allocation sharing or period, nothing happens until the following year.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Just a comment. I think this is where Doug's request really comes in and could be helpful to us in trying to -- I understand what you are outlining here, but maybe what some of the impacts of these accountability measures could be and what circumstances do we want to look at something different, at like payback or whatever, and so that's just a comment and a nod to what Mr. Boyd is looking at doing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Any other questions for Ryan or comments? Thank you. That helped me really visualize how this was going to function, and I really wanted to see that worst-case scenario and see how that played out, and so, Mara, do you have a comment?

MS. LEVY: Just to the extent that I think Amendment 29, as it stands, has an analysis of the alternatives and actions that are in there, and so you do have an effects analysis, to the extent that it's analyzing what the current actions and alternatives are in there. If you're looking at other alternatives, when you talk about this white paper, that's fine, but I just wanted to make sure that people knew that there is an effects analysis in there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, and that's fine. Just when you put those hard numbers and give me a little example, it really helps me, and so I appreciate that, Ryan, doing it on the fly, especially. Dr. Dana, I am going to turn it over to you, because I don't think we actually have a motion on the board yet.

DR. DANA: Okay, and so I'm going to go into a motion then. The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2, to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. Alternative 3 is to replace the current in-season AM with a post-season AM. If both the recreational ACL and the stock ACL are exceeded in a fishing year, the length of the following recreational fishing season will be reduced by the amount necessary to ensure the landings

do not exceed the recreational ACL.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a committee motion on the board. Is there discussion on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fifteen yea.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Zero may, and so the motion passes fourteen to zero.

DR. DANA: Staff recommended that the committee reconsider going to Brownsville, Texas during public hearings for CMP 29. The committee directed staff to remove Brownsville, Texas from the list of public hearing locations for this amendment.

We then moved into King Mackerel Projections Update. Dr. Joe Powers summarized the presentation reviewed by the SSC for updating the yield projections for Gulf king mackerel. The SSC had many specific questions regarding the update, especially with respect to which data were used, what was updated, and whether the condition of the surplus biomass had changed.

 The SSC was ultimately not willing to consider modifying the Gulf king mackerel ABC until it received clarification on the noted issues with the projections. They also noted that changing the ABC midway through a projection is always going to be problematic, especially when using preliminary data. The SSC expects to discuss the projections again at their next meeting. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Thank you. Is there anything specific to mackerel that we want to discuss? If not, then, Mr. Boyd, would you like to put your motion back on the board?

MR. BOYD: Sure, if staff would repost my motion. I will be happy to reread it, but I think everybody understands it, pretty much, at this point. To save time, I will not reread it, but that is the motion on the board. If there is something additional that the committee would like, I would be happy to modify my motion in some way, but I'm just trying to get us in a proactive mode instead of a reactive mode.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Did we already have a second? We better second it again. Do we have a second to this motion?

1 MR. BOYD: Yes, but I withdrew it, and so we would have to have another one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Matens seconds. Is there any discussion on the motion? All right. All those in favor, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen yea.

10 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Zero nay. **The motion passes** 13 **sixteen to zero.**

15 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Swindell.

17 MR. SWINDELL: Now that we've passed this, I just -- How is that going to work with the staff? Are you going to have time to put this together?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We haven't had a chance to discuss it, but we will certainly do our best to bring it to our March/April meeting, to bring something to you. I think we can. I don't know in-depth it will be, but we'll at least get it started.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think the South Atlantic has an amendment that maybe we could use some of that information, just as a basis, because they were exploring something like this, similar to what you're talking about, where it was a more general concept. Now, that amendment had a lot of different general concepts in it, but this was one of them, and so that may be something where maybe we don't have to recreate the wheel and we can look at it. If certain things apply to the Gulf, we could try and get some --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Well, I'm glad we hired a second economist recently.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We are past our scheduled lunch break at the moment. We are scheduled to go to lunch from 12:00 to 1:30, and we do still have several things on our agenda, and so I think we better go ahead and take our scheduled lunch break. Then we will come back and finish up our agenda. We still have our Closed Session Report, Law Enforcement, the Joint Coral/Habitat, the Administrative/Budget Committee Report, and then anything under Other Business that there is, and so is the council okay with going to lunch, or would you rather just

proceed through this? It could take a little bit. Mr. Boyd.

 MR. BOYD: Yes, ma'am. I have a request. Several people have asked me if we would earlier rather than later talk about the recreational AP membership that we did in closed session, because a lot of people in the audience are going to try to leave early this afternoon, and so, if you could put that next on the agenda, I think it would be appreciated.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, we can definitely do that. I mean is it something that we need to take up before lunch? Is that what you're saying, or just take it up right after lunch?

MR. BOYD: It's totally up to you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: As a policy that we've had, we don't post any of this information until it's actually announced in the council meeting, and so it's not on the website. It hasn't been distributed to anybody outside the council.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Then we will move that up to the first thing right after lunch, if that will work for you. All right. Let's go ahead and be back at our regular scheduled time, which is 1:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on October 20, 2016.)

October 20, 2016

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the IP Casino & Resort, Biloxi, Mississippi, Thursday afternoon, October 20, 2016, and was

called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CLOSED SESSION REPORT: AD HOC PRIVATE RECREATIONAL ANGLER AP
MEMBERSHIP AND DISCUSS THE CHARGE OF THE AP

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We decided that we would bump up our closed session report on the Ad Hoc Private Recreational Angler AP membership and the discussion of the charge of the AP, that we

would do that next, and that report falls to me. It's pretty short and sweet.

The council met in closed session and decided to populate the Ad Hoc Private Recreational AP with five representatives from each Gulf state. The membership is as follows: Bryan Anderson, Hughes Andry, William B. Blankenship, Ray Box, James "Jim" Allen Brown, Charlie Caplinger, Kenneth D. Creel, Chris Duca, Jonathan "JD" Dugas, Nathanial Duvall, Marcus R. Kenney, John Kimbrough, Ed Landgraf, Mark Randal Luitjen, John T. Marquez, Jr., Michael Bolton McDermott, Jr., Charles McVea, Jr., Bradford J. Miller, Ronald Jay Moser, Benjamin Ross Payton, Kellie Rebello Ralston, Charles Wendell Taylor, Mark Turner, Rodolfo C. Valenciano, Troy Bello Williamson, II. Those are our five members from each Gulf state.

 The next item on our agenda under this committee report is a discussion of the charge for this AP. I would like some feedback from the council if anybody has a charge. Patrick, I am assuming that might be your charge on the board. Maybe you provided that. Go ahead.

MR. BANKS: I had a sent a motion to the staff, if we could put it up, and hopefully I can get a second, so that we can at least discuss it. I would like to provide some fairly clear guidance to the AP.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Patrick, is that your charge, or your motion with the charge in it? I will just read it. The motion is to provide recommendations to the council on private recreational red snapper management measures which would provide more quality access to the resource in federal waters, reduce discards, and improve fisheries data collection. Management measures to be considered are, but not limited to, regional management, harvest tags, days at sea, and seasonal framework adjustments. Is that your motion?

MR. BANKS: That's it, Madam Chairman. I hope to get a second, so we can discuss it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Do we have a second to the motion? John Sanchez seconds. Would you like to discuss, sir?

MR. BANKS: Only that I think you all know that I'm very interested in making sure that the AP works diligently on this issue and that they try to give us some good input, so that we can move the private recreational red snapper amendment forward and bring some better quality access to that sector. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Other discussion? Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Patrick, I support your motion. I am little uncomfortable with the last sentence, and the only reason I say that is kind of the way I view this is, for this AP, everything is on the table. Your last sentence mentions a couple of things there, like harvest tags and day at sea and seasonal framework adjustments, and I just -- I almost feel like maybe we're trying to steer them a little bit, and my initial thought is just everything is on the table. I am not saying that I'm voting against your motion, but that's the only thing that gives me pause. Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I would tend to agree with that. I think we need this group to really think outside of the box and just let it go and see what they can come up with, and we will have that report, I guess, at some point that they can look at too that will analyze a bunch of different options, and so, yes, I support the idea, but I don't like that second sentence there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship.

MR. BLANKENSHIP: I was just going to say that I just didn't want to limit it to red snapper, but to provide recommendations to the council on private recreational management measures, because I think the same issues we're having with red snapper we're having with triggerfish and we're going to have with amberjack and some other things, and so just to make it more broad, which I think it's not the red snapper private recreational AP. It's the Ad Hoc Private Recreational AP.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I've got the motion from the June meeting, and it specifies red snapper in it. It says the motion is that the council assemble an ad hoc advisory panel of private boat recreational fishermen and charge them to develop fair and effective ways to mitigate the red snapper derby and populate this committee and convene them for their first meeting after hearing results from the recreational angler focus group by January of 2017. That was the motion in June, and so it specified red snapper. I will leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Patrick, I too have the same concerns as Martha and Dale, and I'm wondering if you would be willing to accept a friendly amendment that deleted the last sentence.

MR. BANKS: I would prefer to leave that in there. I agree with you guys. I think all of it needs to be on the table, which is precisely the reason I used the words "but not limited to".

I just wanted to make sure that some of these things, mainly regional management, would be considered by the AP, and I just didn't want to end up with something that came out where some of these ideas that we've all talked about at length were not considered by them. That was really my fear, was that they -- I am fine if they come up with a recommendation that's outside the box. I think that would be great, but I just don't want them to not consider some of these things that we've all talked about for so long, and so I would prefer to leave that in there at this time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. I just was wondering, what do you mean by seasonal framework adjustments, just to be clear exactly what you're getting at there?

26 MR. BANKS: To consider whether the first week of June is the 27 best time to prosecute it.

29 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

31 MR. BOYD: Patrick, what you're saying there is seasons and bag 32 limits?

34 MR. BANKS: Certainly.

36 MR. BOYD: So the same things that are on the table now, including size limits and catch limits and seasons?

MR. BANKS: Absolutely. I think what Dale and Martha had talked about, and Kelly too, was we want to look at all of those. I just hated for them not to consider those particular things that we've all talked about.

44 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Clearly I understand that, but I am still concerned, and so I'm going to offer a substitute motion. The motion would basically be the same motion, but just deleting the last sentence, and, if I get a second, we can talk about that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a substitute motion on the board to provide recommendations to the council on private recreational red snapper management measures which would provide more quality access to the resource in federal waters, reduce discards, and improve fisheries data collection. Is there a second to this motion? It's seconded by Ms. Guyas. Is there discussion on this motion? Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: In the charge that Mr. Gregory read, it talked about the derby. Since that was in the motion before, should we also include a derby? The only reason I say that is because it was in the original council motion. Otherwise, I don't --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It is in the original. To me, the derby is the current private recreational red snapper management. I mean, essentially, that's what they have right now, and so I don't know that we need to spell it out as a derby, if that's okay. I think that kind of puts a negative connotation to it. Yes, sir, Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: The other thought I would say is if -- I don't know how Doug plans to start the meeting with these folks, but I assume that you're going to share the charge and maybe the motion that created them. If you did do that, they get the flavor of that as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: I think the item that Mr. Boyd is referring to with the derby is covered in Item Number 1 there with providing more quality access.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any other discussion? Mr. Banks.

 MR. BANKS: That was covered by the seasonal framework adjustment, just as a point of clarity. I do want to ask Kelly though about her motion. Are you saying that you're okay with them not discussing regional management?

DR. LUCAS: I think that will come up. I don't want to direct them what to discuss. I would really like for them to tell us what they want.

MR. SWINDELL: So what are we going to -- What kind of instructions are we going to give them for things that we really want them to discuss? I mean, all Patrick was trying to do was

say, hey, let's start somewhere. You are not giving them anywhere to start here, I don't see. You need to give them some good ideas, some items or something, to definitely go through. During their discussions, they're going to come up with everything, hopefully. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: I speak in opposition to the last couple of comments. I think these people need to be able to free-range. That's what we want. That's what we asked for. I don't think we can direct them or we should direct them into or out of anything. I might change some words here, but the intent is clear. They may think of things that we have not thought of, and they need to put them out there, but we should not say that you guys need to consider reduce discards, for example. That's a whole different ballgame, and so I speak in support of this motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Just for the record, when I was thinking about bringing this group together and kind of having the grassroots effort that we talked about before, it will be different, because we won't have an amendment that we're putting before them, which is fine.

 I think that's perfectly fine, and the way I envisioned it possibly working, and I would like the council's feedback on this, is I thought probably where we should start, since I am assuming that a lot of the individuals that we populated this AP with maybe have not been extremely engaged in our process before, is to just take a step back and familiarize them with that process, which our process is governed by the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

I thought that might be probably a starting point on the agenda, is we're probably going to need to let them know what parameters this body has to function within and what the law says we can do or can't do, and that's the only box, really, that we have to work within. Then we could give them a brief snapshot of the history of the fishery, both commercial and recreational, just generally speaking.

That's not getting into management measures that of, well, we went through regional management and this or that, but just a long-term history of this is how it was, and it was open access everywhere, and then we kind of came to a point where we got to a turning point in the fishery and we needed to do something, and these were some of the actions that we took, and we're

starting to turn around and get into a better trajectory with this fishery and its health, but just, generally speaking, where we're at and where we came from and where we are and then let them tell us where to go. That was, generally speaking, how I thought we might kind of lay it out, but I am open to suggestions. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I like that approach, and I think this charge that we have here will be helpful for that, and so we have some basic goals up here. Again, with those goals in mind that we have, what do they want out of this fishery?

Then, from there, they can kind of work to look at maybe thinking about some of these different management systems or how the regulations could work, and so I know that, in Mississippi, you all did some red snapper -- I don't know how you want to describe them, but I guess they were visioning kind of public meetings. We did some similar in Florida, based on what you all did, and we opened our workshops.

We did breakout groups, and we had some very broad like what do you want out of this fishery kind of questions, and to kind of get people thinking about that first before moving into management options, and I thought that worked fairly well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Blankenship.

 MR. BLANKENSHIP: Kind of along those same lines, I appreciate, Patrick, for your motion, what you were trying to do. I think that all of those things are good, but we've all been on these panels and committees before where, if you have something like that that you're looking at, people tend to get focused on those things and they exhaust all of their conversation about that before they move on to something else.

I just think, on this particular thing, since you have so many people on this panel that are involved that have not really been in the process before, that it would be good just to go into it and just let them take almost a shotgun approach to begin with and then maybe refine it down, and so I guess I will speak in favor of the substitute motion. I am not disparaging you, because I think what you were trying to do is good, but I just think this is a better way to get that free-flow of information.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Atran, did you have a comment?

MR. ATRAN: I just wanted to remind you that this group will be meeting after we get the report from the Gulf Angler Focus

Group, and it's my understanding that that report is going to contain some recommendations on how to proceed, and so they're already going to have some initial input as to how they might want to proceed with possible options.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have been waiting on that report, but I guess I never thought about it actually like as an agenda in that meeting and guiding. It definitely is something that we're going to want them to review. I think it will just be kind of critical where we put it at on the agenda. We may want to have some open discussion and try and get that grassroots feedback, and I would imagine that a lot of those things are going to overlap, but then bring that document in. Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Since Patrick suggested using a facilitator, which I think is a great idea, this facilitator is going to kind of have this kind of laid out, and having that document, I think, will be pretty beneficial on how to structure that meeting and how to go about capturing the information that you want to capture, and so, in addition to the great things you outlined, I guess they will have that, and they can formulate how to structure the meeting and where to do what you're trying to accomplish and making sure that there's a structured manner in which to get there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: For the audience, maybe those listening in via webinar or here in the room, we also discussed, during closed session, the idea of having a facilitator actually be part of this group. We have also discussed that for other groups throughout the day today that we may have meeting, but we did specifically discuss it for this as well, and there were several groups thrown out that are independent groups government groups that have facilitators available that we could call upon, and I think that's definitely a good idea to have. The other group that's meeting outside the council, they have a facilitator, and so I think we're seeing a trend that that can be helpful. Any further discussion on the motion on the board? Yes, sir, Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: If we're going to get rid of some of the stuff that Patrick already had in there, why are we keeping to reduce discards? Is this such an important item that you're going to leave it in there? That makes sense, when you're taking out some of this other stuff that we really are more interested in than even reducing discards. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I think that needs to be in there. Discards are a big issue for this fishery, and it's one of the major points of frustration for I would say a lot of recreational anglers, and so I think we've got -- It's also part of like our objectives for the Reef Fish FMP, and so I think it fits in here.

7 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Last call. Any further 8 discussion on the motion on the board? All right. All those in 9 favor of the substitute motion, please signify by raising your 10 hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fourteen yeas.

14 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One nay. It's fourteen to one, and 17 the motion passes.

19 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: This probably goes without saying, but this report that we're talking about from that other group, I would assume that's going to be presented to the council in January also? Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, I would assume that the council would need to see it. It would be kind of strange to put a document in front of our advisory groups before we see it. It's usually the other way around. Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Well, we seem to have decision tools that are doing that, and so I do agree that it's a little strange, but just as a point of order there, we have had decision tools that have gone out prior to us seeing them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

38 MR. BANKS: Do we need an official motion to request that Mr. 39 Haddad provide us a formal presentation at the January meeting, 40 Doug?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: No, and I don't know if he's here, 43 but I think he would appreciate that opportunity, if the report 44 is completed by then.

46 MR. BANKS: I definitely would like to see that, and keep in 47 mind that it's pretty clear that we took out some of our 48 guidance on what we wanted this group to do, but yet we're

deferring that guidance to this group. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Just something on the timing. I don't know when the ad hoc committee planned to meet, but is it possible that they will meet before we have a council meeting?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: No, because the other report is not going to be available until after January, and so the logistics are that we couldn't have them meet until after the January council meeting anyway. We will just see. We will do it as quickly as we can, but it definitely won't be before the January council meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we probably should write a nice, formal letter to Mr. Haddad, to let him know that we do have interest and we would like him to present. That way, he is not unsure, because I know he's kind of talked to us about giving a presentation, and so I am pretty sure everybody around this table is pretty interested in what is going to be in that report, right? Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: He and I have communicated quite a bit by email. Do you want a formal letter?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: No, an email is fine, as long as we formally invite him. Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I was just going to point out, since we will be meeting in January and you will have the report and all of that, if there was something that you felt needed to be changed in the charge, based on the report that you saw or whatever, if it didn't cover something, you would then have the opportunity to do something at that time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I would also like to know how many of the people that we've appointed to this AP have been involved either as part of the focus group and who they are.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Maybe that's something that we could request from Mr. Haddad when you send him the email, because I'm not sure how else we would actually come to get that information, because it's a private group.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Yes, I will talk to him. He's had

a number of meetings. He has had two this week here in Biloxi with a bunch of people that I don't think were part of that original focus group, but they've been doing a lot and communicating with a lot of different people to try to come up with their plan or ideas.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I will just say, before we see this report, and I would rather that this be a comment that's viewed in an unbiased manner, because that's how I intend it, but I do have some hesitation about -- If we're not going to give them any of our documents beforehand and we really want out-of-the-box --

In other words, if we don't want to guide them at all, if we really want them to give us the first ideas that pop into your head and start fleshing out details, I don't know about showing them a report that has specific recommendations before -- I want to show them them report, but I guess what I'm getting at is, when we get in that room, I really want to get some feedback from them before we hand them the report, and then maybe the report can stem further feedback and new ideas that might be in the report that they didn't give us, but I definitely want to try and get some feedback before we influence them in any way, even though it's not our document. Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I was just going to say, if I'm not mistaken, I think the intent of that group was to make that document public when they sent everything, and so, just like all of our documents through the council, that would be public for any of these people to review, and I have a feeling that, unless somebody made a special request, that that document would also be public.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sure, and that's fine, and ours are too, but we're not going to wave ours in front of them before we ask for their ideas and try and steer them in any direction. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Also, Leann, I agree with you. In a perfect world, that would be great, but I think at least the group from Texas, these are people that are well-informed of the fishery in a way, and I can't imagine that they wouldn't already know that this group is happening. In other words, I don't know that we could necessarily keep it from them or whatever, even if we wanted to, and so I think it's just sort of a foregone conclusion that they're going to be aware of that, even if we do or don't tell them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Maybe January is the best time to have this discussion, or continue this discussion, after we see what the focus group has come up with. I haven't had time, but I was going to go back to the June meeting, where this was discussed, and staff was explicitly told not to produce anything, either until we got that formal report or until we had the AP meeting, and so we can resurrect that discussion, because we're not going to have any meeting immediately after the January meeting.

It's going to take time to schedule a facilitator and do that, but the intent certainly is to have the meeting before the April council meeting, if we can. I think there is further time to talk about how you want to approach this. We also have, online, an orientation video for AP members, and we have a process for getting people up to speed about how the council operates and what their role is as AP members, and so we already have that in place.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I think that's a good suggestion. I think we have done some heavy lifting here today, and we came up with, I think, an excellent charge. That was good work by everybody, because I know a lot of times we just sit around and look at each other when we try and come up with a charge, and so thank you to everybody participating and getting something good to start the ball rolling in that meeting. That concludes my report for the closed session, and so now we will get back to our regular agenda, and next is going to be Dr. Lucas with the Administrative and Budget Committee Report.

ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. LUCAS: Thank you. The committee adopted the agenda and minutes of the August 2016 Administrative/Budget Committee meeting as written. Staff presented the items for approval under Tab G, Number 4(a) and provided background data on annual leave policies of the Gulf States, councils, and National Marine Fisheries Service in Tab G, Number 4(b).

There was quite a bit of discussion about how to handle future accrued leave and grandfathering current leave levels. It was noted that the committee's guiding principle was to do no harm. It was noted that moving from a leave policy of allowing unlimited accumulation of annual leave to a cap of 480 hours, while allowing staff to be grandfathered in at their current leave levels, would be the fairest way to minimize future potential financial obligations.

It was noted that the past policy of unlimited leave was historically allowed at a time when the council benefits were much less. However, a recent Markley analysis of staff retirement benefits indicated that council staff are now on par with the federal retirement system. The following motions were passed by the committee without opposition.

The committee recommends, and I so move, beginning December 31, 2017, accrued annual leave in excess of 480 hours at the end of each calendar year will be converted to sick leave.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? We did have a lot of discussion during committee on this. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

DR. LUCAS: Thanks. The leave cap of 480 hours begins on January 1, 2017 forward. Accrued annual leave as of December 31, 2016 will be grandfathered. Staff was asked to research possible avenues for converting accumulated annual leave to an annuity or depositing it into the council's retirement plan.

The committee recommends, and I so move, upon separation of employment or upon retirement, leave can be paid out either as a lump sum or as a payment every two weeks, at the employee's discretion. Upon separation of employment due to cause leave will be paid as a lump sum payment only. When leave is paid out as a payment every two weeks, due to separation from employment, accrual of further leave will not be allowed during the payout period. Any person hired after December 31, 2016, upon separation of employment, will be paid any applicable unused leave in a lump sum payment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Any discussion on the motion? Yes, sir, Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I am sorry, but I didn't hear the discussion in this committee. The leave was whatever leave was on the books and there was no minimum? It could have been 1,000 hours? I just want to make sure that I'm clear.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Right. From our research, it's similar to what Mississippi and Louisiana has, as far as what you can accrue. It's unlimited.

MR. BANKS: I realize that, but I'm talking about what you're paid for upon separation.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We've been paying for the entire amount of accrued leave.

MR. BANKS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any other questions or comments? We have a motion on the board. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

DR. LUCAS: Bonus Program Review, staff also reviewed the history of the bonus program since it was implemented in 2010, which is Tab G, Number 5. Mr. Gregory stated that he had limited the performance bonuses this past two years, and it was noted that the council agreed to streamline the bonus program at its August meeting by removing the performance bonus while maintaining the merit bonus. There was no other business to come before the committee. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Dr. Lucas. Is there any other comments or questions or motions or anything else on this topic before we move on to our next committee report? All right. Next, we will move to the Law Enforcement Committee Report and, Mr. Boyd, I will turn it over to you.

LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Law Enforcement Committee met on October 19 with Doug Boyd as Chair. Steve VanderKooy with the Gulf Stated Marine Fisheries Commission summarized the proposed changes to the 2017 and 2018 Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Operations Plan, and the 2017 through 2020 Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Strategic Plan.

These changes were developed by the LEC and LETC over a series of webinar and conference calls. The changes included the addition of a seventh goal to address short-term response and long-term recovery from manmade and natural disasters. In addition, several objectives in the Operations Plan were reorganized to fit under goals that were more appropriate.

By a unanimous vote, the committee recommends, and I so move, that the council approve the 2017 and 2018 Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Operations Plan and the 2017 through 2020 Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Strategic Plan. Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. BOYD: Continuing, the staff noted that the LEC and LETC currently has two Chairs and two Vice Chairs, one each for the Gulf States Marine Fishery Commission's LEC and the council's LETC. The membership of the two committees is the same, except for the U.S. Coast Guard representative, who is a member of the LEC, but not the LETC, because he is also a council member. To improve efficiency and reduce confusion, the LEC and LETC is considering having one Chair and Vice Chair for the combined committee, starting with the next election.

The LEC and LETC was advised that the council will be soliciting nominees for the next (2016) Officer of the Year Award. Committee members agreed to submit nominees to the council by December 1, 2016. Lieutenant Commander Danaher asked if federal agencies could submit nominations. Staff responded affirmatively, noting that both Coast Guard Districts and NOAA Enforcement could submit nominations.

Newly-elected LEC Chair Rusty Pittman from Mississippi DMR thanked Steve VanderKooy and Steven Atran for their efforts in guiding the efforts to revise the Strategic and Operations Plan. Madam Chairman, that concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Anything else on that particular topic before we move on? Lieutenant Commander.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just other item of note that we kind of refined in both the operational and the strategic plans is the topic that I brought up with Officer Pittman yesterday during his presentation, and we're really trying to pioneer some new methods of collaborative assessments on compliance measurement of the laws, and so he provided some great data, but we need to start getting agencies to work together and start sharing some of those numbers.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. We appreciate it. Next on our agenda is the Joint Coral and Habitat Protection Committee Report and, Mr. Diaz, are you going to take us through that one?

JOINT CORAL/HABITAT PROTECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

 MR. DIAZ: Yes, ma'am. The Joint Coral/Habitat Protection Committee Report, Final Draft of the Five-Year EFH Review, the committee was presented with the final draft of the five-year

EFH review.

Staff highlighted new portions of the document that were added since the August 2016 council meeting, emphasizing the EFH maps by species and life stage, the EFH web application, and EFH recommendations.

The committee briefly discussed the importance of determining whether or not to include habitat data collected from studies conducted outside of the Gulf Council's jurisdiction. Moving forward, staff may want to work with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to solve this problem. It was requested that "proxy", as used throughout the habitat association tables in Appendix A, be defined in the document.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to forward this five-year EFH Review to the National Marine Fisheries Service by the end of 2016 and give editorial license to the staff to modify the document as needed, with approval of the Chair. Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? All right. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Mara.

MS. LEVY: I just wanted to ask whether there is interest in having us have staff start looking at whether you want to actually update or look at updating your essential fish habitat designations, because you voted to submit this report once it's finished, but then I wanted you to think about what the next step is. I didn't want to just leave this and then we forget about the fact that we had a review.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I anticipated that we probably would have at least one more presentation on this, to give us some more feedback and another update, because we did instruct staff to work with the Science Center to take a look at some of the new available science that was outside the Gulf that was noted, but I believe -- Didn't you get with Bonnie and you all said you were going to talk about it and see if it could be incorporated into our document? That was one thing that I know they're still going to be working on that we would get another update on. Dr. Ponwith, did you --

DR. PONWITH: Yes, and that specifically was to help create criteria for when it's appropriate to incorporate considerations that came from outside that have applicability to inside the

region.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: John.

DR. FROESCHKE: One idea to think about, after we do this, is, in the document, there is a section of recommendations, and Claire went through this in some haste, but there are many of them, and perhaps what we could do is prepare a presentation with some clear-cut examples of issues that we identified, and it might make it a little easier for you to determine if there is sufficient new problems identified or new information to warrant an update or start an amendment at that time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Indeed that is our plan, and I was talking with Claire, but to see which of those issues warrant amending the Generic FMP, and it's been ten years since it was amended, and so that in itself might warrant a look at it. We will do that, and we will come back in January, but none of that slows us down in submitting this to National Marine Fisheries Service, but the question is now what do we do next, and do we need to develop an amendment to the Generic EFH Plan.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, and so I think we have guidance on that. I am going to turn it back over to you, Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you. Scoping Draft for Coral HAPC Amendment 7, staff presented the scoping document for Coral Amendment 7. The committee requested that more information be provided for the goals of the amendment and general biological information about deep-sea corals and overarching information about the areas proposed. Staff will modify current regulations for octocorals to better reflect Florida's regulations.

There was discussion on the inclusion of octocorals in the fishery management unit, as Florida manages octocoral harvest off of Florida. Staff will provide the council with a brief presentation on the information available for these areas and the different types of corals, so that the council can be better informed moving forward. Staff will bring a revised document to the January 2017 council meeting. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Any other comments or questions on this topic before we leave this report? Okay. Seeing none, the next item on our agenda was a Vote on Exempted Fishing Permit Applications, but we do not have any of those.

1 2 Then, next, we have Supporting Agencies Update, and we actually 3 did that a little bit earlier in the meeting, and Charlie referenced us to a couple of items that he had in the briefing 4 5 if we wanted to take a look at those. Lieutenant Commander showed us a few slides, and I think everybody else was 6 7 okay, unless they have something new to tell us about. 8 9 Then the last item on our agenda is Other Business. Is there 10 any other business to come before this council? Seeing none, we are officially adjourned. I will see you in January. 11 12 13 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 20, 2016.) 14 15