1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	262 ND MEETING
4	
5	FULL COUNCIL SESSION
6 7	Astor Crown Plaza New Orleans, Louisiana
8	ASCOI CIOWII PIAZA NEW OIIEAIIS, LOUISIAIIA
9	
10	FEBRUARY 1-2, 2017
11	
12 13	VOTING MEMBERS Kevin Anson
14	Leann BosargeMississippi
15	Patrick BanksLouisiana
16	Doug BoydTexas
17	Roy CrabtreeNMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
18	Pamela DanaFlorida
19	Dale DiazMississippi
20	Tom FrazerFlorida
21	Johnny GreeneAlabama
22	Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley)Florida
23	Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller)Mississippi
24	Campo MatensLouisiana
25	Robin RiechersTexas
26	John SanchezFlorida
27	Greg StunzTexas
28	Ed SwindellLouisiana
29 30	David WalkerAlabama
31	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
32	Glenn ConstantUSFWS
33	Dave DonaldsonGSMFC
34	Leo Danaher
35	
36	STAFF
37	Steven AtranSenior Fishery Biologist
38	Matt FreemanEconomist
39	Douglas GregoryExecutive Director
40	Morgan KilgourFishery Biologist
41	Ava LasseterAnthropologist
42	Mara LevyNOAA General Counsel
43	Emily MuehlsteinPublic Information Officer
44	Ryan Rindone
45	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
46 47	Charlotte SchiaffoResearch and Human Resource Librarian Carrie SimmonsDeputy Director
4 7	Calife SimmonsDeputy Director
-I O	

1	OTHER PARTICIPANTS	
2	Greg Abrams	Panama City, FL
3	Pam Anderson	Panama City, FL
4	Kevin Beach	Venice, LA
5	Eric Brazer	Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance
6	Mark Brown	
7	Colin Byrd	LA
8	Shane Cantrell	CFA, Galveston, TX
9	Jim Clements	
10	Bubba Cochrane	
11	Mike Colby	
12	John Coulon	Empire, LA
13	Jason Delacruz	Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance, FL
14	Mike Eller	Destin, FL
15	Julie Falgout	LA Sea Grant
16	Myron Fischer	LA
17	Richard Fischer	Louisiana Charter Boat Association, LA
18	Troy Frady	Orange Beach, AL
19	Susan Gerhart	
20	Buddy Guindon	
21	Ken Haddad	
22	Chad Hebert	LDWF Enforcement Division
23	Scott Hickman	
24	Chris Horton	Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation
25	Gary Jarvis	DCBA, Destin, FL
26	Mike Jennings	Freeport, TX
27	Laura Jezewski	
28	Bill Kelly	
29	Bobby Kelly	Orange Beach, AL
30	Michael Kelly	
31		Destin, FL
32	David Krebs	Destin, FL
33	Deb Lambert	NMFS
34		New Orleans, LA
35	Chris Moran	Fourchon, LA
36	-	Orange Beach, AL
37	-	Lynn Haven, FL
38	<u>-</u>	Lynn Haven, FL
39	Bonnie Ponwith	
40	Lance Robinson	TX
41		Orange Beach, AL
42		Madeira Beach, FL
43	-	
44		Orange Beach, AL
45	=	NMFS
46	<u>-</u>	Dauphin Island, AL
47		Dauphin Island, AL
48	Steve Tomeny	Port Fourchon, LA

Clark Trosclair	.LA
Russell UnderwoodPanama City,	FL
Ed WalkerTarpon Springs,	FL
Billy WellsVenice,	LA
Wade WellsVenice,	LA
Wayne WernerAlachua,	FL
Tom Wheatley Pew Charitable Trusts, Tampa,	FL
Johnny WilliamsGalveston,	TX
Dale WoodruffOrange Beach,	AL
Bob Zales, IIPanama City,	FL
Jim ZurbrickSteinhatchee,	FL
	Clark Trosclair Russell Underwood. Panama City, Ed Walker. Tarpon Springs, Billy Wells. Venice, Wade Wells. Venice, Wayne Werner Alachua, Tom Wheatley. Pew Charitable Trusts, Tampa, Johnny Williams Galveston, Dale Woodruff. Orange Beach, Bob Zales, II. Panama City, Jim Zurbrick. Steinhatchee,

	TABLE OF CONTENTS
Tahl,	e of Contents
Table	; or concents
Tahlα	e of Motions
Table	; or motions
Call	to Order, Announcements, and Introductions
Call	to oracly immodifications and incroducerons
Adop [.]	tion of Agenda and Approval of Minutes
<u>_</u>	
Revi	ew of Exempted Fishing Permit Applications
Pres	entations
	Louisiana Law Enforcement Presentation
	National Standard 1 Guideline Revisions
	Law Enforcement Report on Fiscal 2016 Maritime Boundary
	Line Activities
	Commercial Fishing Vessel Classification Standards
Sout.	n Atlantic Council Liaison Report
~	
Comm.	ittee Reports
	-
	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
	-
	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report Migratory Species Committee Report ic Comment
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report Migratory Species Committee Report ic Comment
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report Migratory Species Committee Report ic Comment Littee Reports (Continued) Data Collection Committee Report Mackerel Committee Report Shrimp Committee Report Reef Fish Committee Report Spiny Lobster Committee Report
Publ	Administrative/Budget Committee Report Migratory Species Committee Report ic Comment Littee Reports (Continued) Data Collection Committee Report Mackerel Committee Report Shrimp Committee Report Reef Fish Committee Report Spiny Lobster Committee Report
Publ Comm.	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ Comm.	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ Comm.	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ Comm. Vote	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ Comm. Vote	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ Comm. Vote	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ Comm.	Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Migratory Species Committee Report. C Comment. Littee Reports (Continued). Data Collection Committee Report. Mackerel Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Reef Fish Committee Report. Spiny Lobster Committee Report. Joint Coral/Habitat Protection & Restoration Committee On Exempted Fishing Permit Applications. Corting Agencies Updates. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.
Publ Comm.	Administrative/Budget Committee Report
Publ Comm.	Administrative/Budget Committee Report. Migratory Species Committee Report. C Comment. Littee Reports (Continued). Data Collection Committee Report. Mackerel Committee Report. Shrimp Committee Report. Reef Fish Committee Report. Spiny Lobster Committee Report. Joint Coral/Habitat Protection & Restoration Committee On Exempted Fishing Permit Applications. Corting Agencies Updates. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

1 2

TABLE OF MOTIONS

3 4

<u>PAGE 59</u>: Motion to keep the existing four Ad Hoc APs for another year without re-advertising any of the memberships. <u>The</u> motion carried on page 59.

6 7 8

9

5

<u>PAGE 59</u>: Motion that the Red Drum AP openings not be advertised, but be rolled over until the three-year term ends. The motion carried on page 59.

10 11

PAGE 142: Motion to accept all the preferred selections within the South Atlantic Electronic Reporting Amendment. The motion carried on page 142.

1516

1718

19

20 21

22

PAGE 142: Motion to approve the South Atlantic Electronic Reporting Amendment 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 145.

232425

26

27

PAGE 145: Motion that the council accept the IPT recommendations for the alternatives in Action 3, Trip Notification and Reporting Requirements. The motion carried on page 145.

282930

31

PAGE 145: Motion to accept the IPT recommendations for Alternative 4 in Action 4, Hardware/Software Requirements for Reporting. The motion carried on page 145.

32 33 34

PAGE 146: Motion in Action 1, to make Alternative 3 the Preferred Alternative. The motion failed on page 159.

35 36 37

38

39

40 41

42

PAGE 160: Motion in Action 1 to modify the language in Preferred Alternative 4. Preferred Alternative 4 is to require that the owner or operator of a charter vessel for which a Gulf charter/headboat permit for reef fish or CMP has been issued submit fishing records to NMFS for each trip via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software) prior to offloading fish. The motion carried on page 169.

43 44 45

46

47

48

PAGE 172: Motion in Action 2 to modify the language in Preferred Alternative 4. Preferred Alternative 4 is to require that the owner or operator of a federally-permitted headboat for which a Gulf charter/headboat permit for reef fish or CMP has

been issued submit fishing records to NMFS for each trip via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software) prior to offloading fish. The motion carried on page 175.

3 4 5

1

2

<u>PAGE 177</u>: Motion in Action 3 to deselect Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 180.

6 7

8 <u>PAGE 180</u>: Motion in Action 4 to add the IPT-recommended 9 language in Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. <u>The</u> 10 motion carried on page 184.

11

12 <u>PAGE 184</u>: Motion in Action 4 to select Alternative 3 as the 13 Preferred Alternative. The motion failed on page 187.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

PAGE 191: Motion to approve the Generic Charter Vessel and Headboat Reporting Requirements Amendment and that be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary appropriate, giving staff editorial license to 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 193.

222324

<u>PAGE 198</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 208.

252627

PAGE 208: Motion to postpone CMP Amendment 29 indefinitely. The motion carried on page 210.

282930

<u>PAGE 210</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 210.

313233

PAGE 211: Motion in Action 2 that the preferred alternative be Alternative 2. The motion carried on page 211.

34 35

36 <u>PAGE 211</u>: Motion in Action 3 that the preferred alternative be 37 Alternative 2. The motion carried on page 212.

38

39 <u>PAGE 212</u>: Motion in Action 4 that the preferred alternative be 40 Alternative 4, changing the number of shrimp moratorium permits 41 from 1,300 to 1,175. The motion carried on page 213.

42

43 <u>PAGE 213</u>: Motion in Action 5 that the preferred alternative be 44 Alternative 2. The motion carried on page 213.

45

46 <u>PAGE 213</u>: Motion that Shrimp Amendment 17B be sent out for public hearings. The motion carried on page 213.

<u>PAGE 215</u>: Motion in Action 2 to move Alternatives 2 and 3 and associated options to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. <u>The motion carried on page 215</u>.

3 4 5

6

7

1

2

PAGE 215: Motion in Action 2 to move Options 4a and 4c in Alternative 4 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. The motion carried on page 215.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

PAGE 216: Motion to instruct staff to develop a white paper outlining the changes necessary to include red snapper, gag, gray triggerfish, greater amberjack and red grouper in the management program for charter/for-hire allocation-based management consistent with Charter/For-Hire AP recommendations and joint Charter/For-Hire/Headboat AP consensus. This should explore: required changes to current amendment, including purpose and need, title, et cetera; method for determining charter/for-hire ACL for gray triggerfish, gag, red grouper, and greater amberjack; develop mechanisms for trading different accommodate regional differences; species to illustrating how initial allocation of shares would change through cyclical redistribution, which was discussed at length during the joint for-hire AP meeting, based on the reported landings methodology chosen. The motion carried on page 218.

232425

26

27

28

29

30

PAGE 226: Motion to request staff to craft a stand-alone action to address cyclical redistribution for shares of red snapper that are not being used by permit holders (permits that do not report landings after program implementation) and include a suite of options for redistribution methods with timelines, including an appeals process for permit holders. The motion carried on page 226.

313233

<u>PAGE 227</u>: Motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 227.

343536

PAGE 227: Motion in Action 1 to add an alternative to look at 0.85 times BMSY, or proxy. The motion carried on page 227.

373839

40

<u>PAGE 228</u>: Motion in Action 2.2 to accept the IPT recommendations in Alternative 4. <u>The motion carried on page 228</u>.

41 42

43 <u>PAGE 228</u>: Motion to send Amendment 36A out for public hearings. 44 The motion carried on page 228.

45

<u>PAGE 229</u>: Motion in Action 4 to make Alternative 4 the preferred alternative. The motion carried on page 230.

47 48

PAGE 235: Motion to direct staff to add carryover provisions in the ABC control rule amendment and modify the framework procedure to allow for National Marine Fisheries Service to update the appropriate quotas once landings data are available. The motion carried on page 235.

<u>PAGE 241</u>: Motion to have staff review federal charter/for-hire permits transferred for the purposes of fishing outside the federal red snapper season and to identify options to address the issue. The motion carried on page 242.

<u>PAGE 246</u>: Motion to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative in Action 1-1. The motion carried on page 246.

PAGE 246: Motion to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative in Action 1-2. The motion carried on page 246.

PAGE 247: Motion to bring the Revised Scoping Draft of Coral Amendment 7 out for scoping hearings. The motion carried on page 247.

PAGE 249: Motion to direct staff to develop an amendment that would specify a single ABC and ACL for yellowtail snapper in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic. The motion carried on page 255.

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Astor Crown Plaza, New Orleans, Louisiana, Wednesday morning, February 1, 2017, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND INTRODUCTIONS

CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE: I am going to call Full Council to order. We have already made a few introductions today. We introduced our new secretary. If there is any other introductions, please don't hesitate to stop me and we can do that.

If you look at your agenda, we have a couple of presentations coming up today. Are there any items that need to be amended on our Full Council agenda? Is there anything that anyone would like to add to Other Business or do we have a motion to approve our Full Council agenda?

MS. MARTHA GUYAS: I want to talk about yellowtail snapper when we do Full Council, but preferably after public testimony, because I think we're going to hear some things.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have that added under Other Business, Martha, and we should have plenty of time, since we're ahead of schedule. In just a second, we will go around the table and make our introductions. Let me read my Chair's opening statement real quick, before we get too much further here.

Welcome to the $262^{\rm nd}$ 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. Also, in order for all to be able to hear the proceedings, we ask that you have any private conversations outside.

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

1 from a range of geographical areas in the Gulf of Mexico and 2 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 considered by the council throughout the process. Anyone wishing to speak during public comment, which is later today, should sign in at the registration kiosk located at the entrance to the meeting room. We accept only one registration per person. A digital recording is used for the public record. Therefore, for the purpose of voice identification, each person at the table is requested to identify him or herself, starting on my left.

20 MR. JOHNNY GREENE: Johnny Greene, Alabama.

22 MR. KEVIN ANSON: Kevin Anson, Alabama.

24 MR. DAVID WALKER: David Walker, Alabama.

26 MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine 27 Fisheries Commission.

29 MR. ED SWINDELL: Ed Swindell, Louisiana.

31 MR. PATRICK BANKS: Patrick Banks, Louisiana.

33 MR. CAMPO MATENS: Camp Matens, Louisiana.

35 DR. TOM FRAZER: Tom Frazer, Florida.

37 MR. JOHN SANCHEZ: John Sanchez, Florida.

39 MS. GUYAS: Martha Guyas, Florida.

41 DR. PAMELA DANA: Pam Dana, Florida.

43 MR. MARK BROWN: Mark Brown, South Atlantic Council.

45 MS. MARA LEVY: Mara Levy, NOAA Office of General Counsel.

47 DR. ROY CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.

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

DR. BONNIE PONWITH: Bonnie Ponwith, NOAA Fisheries.

5 MR. ROBIN RIECHERS: Robin Riechers, Texas.

MR. DOUGLAS BOYD: Douglas Boyd, Texas.

9 DR. GREG STUNZ: Greg Stunz, Texas.

11 DR. KELLY LUCAS: Kelly Lucas, Mississippi.

13 MR. DALE DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Mississippi.

LCDR LEO DANAHER: Lieutenant Commander Leo Danaher, U.S. Coast 16 Guard.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Martha added one item under Other Business. Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: In light of the fact that we are probably going to have considerable discussion about the mackerel amendment, I would like to move the Mackerel Committee Report from 10:45 on the final day to the slot at 8:30. In other words, swap Mackerel and Shrimp, if you all are okay with that, so that we'll be sure that we have enough time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is everyone okay with that? Dr. Dana, that's your committee report. Are you okay with that? All right. We will bump Mackerel Report up on the agenda. I think that's probably a good idea.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Not a problem, sir. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I was just going to say, if nobody had anything else, I was going to move approval of the agenda.

chairman bosarge: Okay. We have a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Do we have a second? It's seconded. Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the agenda is approved as amended. Next, we have our minutes from our last meeting, which were in your briefing book. Are there any amendments that need to be made to our minutes? Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. On Line 36 and 42, it says "state and federal meeting", and that actually should be the "State and Federal Fisheries Management Committee meeting", if they could make those changes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted. Any other corrections or amendments to the minutes? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

MR. GREENE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's so moved by Mr. Greene. Do we have a second to the motion?

MR. BOYD: Second.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's seconded by Mr. Boyd. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Next on our Full Council agenda is Review of Exempted Fishing Permit Applications, and so I will look to the NOAA/NMFS side of the house to run with that one.

REVIEW OF EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT APPLICATIONS

MS. GERHART: Thank you. We did have one EFP application that came into our office. This was from the Gulf of Mexico Shareholders' Alliance. The proposal is for a two-year study to test electronic monitoring, to record and avoid turtle bycatch in the longline closed area.

The proposal would use up to eight vessels that would use longline gear in the area and collect both biological and economic data. The reason for this proposal is that this area is ideal for fishing for red grouper. It's good habitat and it's closer to shore, and so there is lower fuel costs with a higher CPUE.

The closed area was set through Amendment 31, and it's east of Cape San Blas, Florida, inshore of the thirty-five-fathom line, and it's for June, July, and August. The Amendment 31 also set a couple of other restrictions to protect sea turtles. One was the longline endorsement, which reduced the fleet by about 40 percent, I believe, to about sixty-six vessels that use longlines now.

Another was to limit the number of hooks that can be fished on a longline, to protect the sea turtles as well. With these other restrictions, the question that is trying to be answered here is can they safely fish within that area, using those hook and reduced effort management measures, and still fish in that area during that closed time without endangering the sea turtle population that's there.

Right now, we have sent this proposal to the Science Center for review, and we're reviewing it ourselves. Our Protected Resources Division is setting a CPUE of sea turtles based on what the take is outside of the area, and, if level is reached, then fishing would have to stop in that area entirely, and so the idea is to continue to protect the sea turtles while they're fishing there.

We will also publish this in the Federal Register and take public comment on the application, and so, if you have questions about the details of this proposal, Mr. Eric Brazer, who is the Deputy Executive Director for the Shareholders' Alliance, is in the audience, as well as Jason Delacruz, who is the Vice President.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is there discussion? Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: One of the things, as I read in the document here, is they're going to do video monitoring of their activities during that time, and how many vessels would be participating?

MS. GERHART: They requested up to eight vessels, and, yes, they would have video monitoring equipment on the vessels that would record the line as they retrieve it, to show what's being caught on there.

MR. SWINDELL: I would assume then that this video monitoring would be readily accessible to NMFS, or is going to do the monitoring of their activity?

MS. GERHART: Let me have Mr. Brazer come up, if he would, and he can answer your questions probably more thoroughly than I can.

MR. ERIC BRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair and council, for the opportunity to speak. To your question, Mr. Swindell, we are partnering with Mote Marine Laboratory in Sarasota. We've been partnering with them for I think four years now. This is one of the more recent iterations of collaborative research that we've done with them.

They have established a data collection protocol, where they

meet the vessels. They know when the vessels are landing, and they meet the vessels once they land. The obtain the hard drive with the video information on it. We have a chain of custody protocol. They take that back to the laboratory, and they review 100 percent of that videotape and provide summaries to myself and to the agency. The data is available to analyze the success of this program.

MR. SWINDELL: I assume then that you've had direct discussions with the laboratory there, to make certain that they feel comfortable that they can do this without having somebody on the vessel 100 percent of the time?

MR. BRAZER: Correct. Mote has been a great partner for the last four years. They work really well with the fishermen, and, over that period of time, they have developed a really comprehensive protocol for how they review, access, and analyze these video data.

MR. SWINDELL: With that in mind, have you done any kind of preliminary work to show that this is realistic and that it's not -- I mean, you're putting out a lot of vessels and a lot of time and effort, and so I assume that somewhere you've got an idea of whether or not you can do this reliably without catching turtles.

MR. BRAZER: We do. We do, and I think there are two parts to my answer. Part one is that we've been engaging on the ground with video monitoring systems for the last decade. We fully believe that, if implemented properly, they can be a valuable data collection and enforcement tool, and we have worked with partners in the other regions, in Alaska and New England, who already have these systems working in on-the-ground, implemented systems that the agency is working with, and so they've basically been able to provide us a roadmap, so we don't have to repeat the mistakes that they made over the last ten years, and so we've got some good partnerships. We've got a solid program that is available in other regions to help us.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Mr. Walker and then Dr. Stunz and then Mr. Sanchez and Lieutenant Commander.

MR. WALKER: Thank you. This is kind of for Jason. Jason, could you kind of give us a history of your fishing vessels before and after the amendment and how it's affected the other areas you're fishing now and how this could possibly help and just kind of expand on it?

MR. JASON DELACRUZ: From the boat side of this, the reason that this has developed -- We've been the guys that have always been willing to pioneer new stuff. We were willing to put cameras on boats to test them for reasons, and we had a EM workshop a year-and-a-half ago, and one of the things that we established in the EM workshop was that we didn't really see a clear path forward to do anything with cameras, and probably even before that, actually, this idea kind of spawned into my head.

One of the challenges that we have is that, when we had this original amendment come down that closed us and moved us outside of thirty-five fathoms during that time, that was a sea turtle reduction issue.

When we did it, we did three things. We reduced the fleet to sixty-one, we reduced the amount of hooks we could fish with to 750, and then we took everybody outside of this area for three months of the year, and the shotgun approach was great. It got us back on the water and we were happy with it, but what we have learned is that it becomes really challenging for the boats to be profitable.

When you go from twenty fathoms to thirty-five fathoms, you remove about, from the east to west, probably fifty miles of coastline, or fifty miles crossways of what we can actually fish, and so, in essence, from thirty-five fathoms to about fifty fathoms, where we catch red grouper, is eight or nine or ten miles. It's not much, and so you've really put all the guys in a really tight box.

During the summertime, they fish on top of each other, and what happens is, the first couple of months, or the first month, the first couple of trips, it's okay, but it steadily goes down. The guys just aren't making -- They're not catching fish, and we, unfortunately, are pounding bottom that we don't really want to be.

I mean, we catch more snapper and more gags there, which the gags aren't a bad thing, but snappers are something we try to avoid, just because they're not as profitable. We would much rather be in the shallow water fishing for red grouper, and we pushed out to that spot. We beat it up, and, by the end of the season, by the time September 1 gets here, most of the boats have lost money, and that's one of the things that we're trying to avoid.

The idea was to figure out a way to use the cameras to make it more economically viable for the guys to fish. If we can use

the cameras to identify this large bycatch, which is a much simpler thing to do with cameras, and then get the guys in an area that's closed now and let them be profitable and then also move EM forward in the Gulf of Mexico.

For us, it was -- I don't want to say it's a survival thing, but it's just a hardship time, but it's really useful, and an interesting thing from the seafood side, which I think, although this council doesn't address that a lot, it's really important. Demand is great during that time of year, and so fish prices stay high and we can sell all of those fish, no problem.

As soon as we get back into the shallow water, in September, the demand goes way down, because all the kids go back to school, and so that's a big consideration. This plays directly into the economic value of our fishery in making sense of when we should and shouldn't fish within an IFQ.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz, you were next.

DR. STUNZ: I have two questions, but I think that sort of answered it, Jason, but I'm still not real clear why — Certainly we want to minimize interactions with the gear and sea turtles. There is no question about that. By the way, the proposal was written well and all of that, but I still wasn't real clear why it needs to be in the closed area. Is that what you were just getting at? It seems, to me, you would want to test it in the area where the fishing is occurring, because it's more of —

JASON DELACRUZ: To be honest, we've kind of already done that. We're been running cameras for long enough now that we know that we can do this. We're clear, and we've actually -- This last go-round with cameras, which we got a little NFWF money to help Mote out with it, but we actually specifically kind of retweaked the way the cameras work to be able to look right now over the top of the hauler, so that they can see anything big really easy, and so we built special arms this time around, and so we know it works. Honestly, it's not a question of whether it will work, but it's what the interactions are.

Really, what we're looking for is the science, at this point. The hardware, we know does its trick, and so it's getting in there and seeing if we really do have those interactions, like we expect, or was 700 hooks and sixty-one boats the solution? The sample size, the eight boats, that gets us close to the -- If we for sure get six or seven boats fishing, we're at a sample size of about 10 percent, which we thought was useful.

1 2

DR. STUNZ: Okay, and my other question is, and this is to you, Madam Chairwoman, and so Dr. Gerhart just said this is going to the Science Center. Do we act on this today or do we wait to hear back from them what the Science Center's input is from this or what is the -- I am not real sure what the procedure is on these.

DR. CRABTREE: That's really up to you. I think the council procedure has been that you would want to see the package ready to go to the Federal Register, and we're not at that point yet, and so we're not going on to the Federal Register until we get the comments back from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and resolve some of the protected resources kinds of issues, but I think one of the things that you guys are talking about is important here.

We did do a number of different things to reduce turtle takes, and turtle takes came down, but we don't really know which of those things brought the turtle takes down. Was it limiting the number of vessels or limiting the hooks or the closed area or is that the fishermen have learned how to fish and not catch turtles?

I think they're doing shorter sets now than they were back then, because of some of the research that showed that you don't catch any more grouper by doing longer sets, and so it would be useful to get to that, and I don't know, Jason, what you guys are thinking, but, if we had the ability to monitor turtle takes with cameras onboard all of the longline vessels, then we might be able to eliminate the closed area and let them fish, with the understanding that if they catch their allowance of turtles that they're done.

I don't know if they would want to go there or not, but that's one of the things that we could evaluate if we got there, but there is merit in being able to tease out what is primarily responsible for bringing turtle takes down, and, depending on the Center comments, this may be a way to get at that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: You may have said this already, but that package that's going to be put together, we'll have an opportunity to review that at our next meeting, before any final decisions are made, or is April too late?

DR. CRABTREE: Before any final decisions are made, yes. Now, we might get it together and put it out for comment in the Federal Register, but, if you want to wait until the next

meeting to make your recommendation, you certainly will be able to do that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I certainly think that we definitely want to continue this discussion today, while we have these gentlemen in the room and we can ask them some questions, but certainly we want to see the full package as well and see all of that. Dr. Stunz went, and so then we have John Sanchez and then Mr. Boyd.

 MR. SANCHEZ: I want to thank you for coming, and I am going to -- I guess I don't know what we're looking to do as a group, but I will support you on this, and I appreciate your sincerity in coming forth, because obviously there is a risk with a camera rolling.

 It's going to show what it is, and we're going to get to the heart of this, as Dr. Crabtree was alluding to, of whether the rules in force, that you're trying to see if you can operate in, if they have an impact. They clearly have an impact on you, but on the resource that we're concerned about, and so I appreciate your sincerity in trying to do this.

MR. DELACRUZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, I am going to go to Lieutenant Commander Danaher, because I somehow skipped him on my list, and I apologize.

 LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a couple of questions. I skimmed though the document, and I'm really just trying to get a better sense. Will there be any changes to turtle mitigation gear that's required onboard the commercial and headboats?

MR. DELACRUZ: No, but we did add education in there, and so, interestingly enough, we don't require our boats to actually go through the turtle release protocols that we have to for HMS, but we're making it mandatory for the captains that are participating in this, to go to that class, but, gear-wise, there is really no difference. We have kind of established that that gear really seems to do the trick well.

LCDR DANAHER: Perfect. You basically answered my second question, with regards to the education and outreach, which I think is a great idea.

MR. DELACRUZ: There is a class on March 7 on Seminole Boulevard, about ten miles from where everybody lives, and we

will all be there, I promise.

LCDR DANAHER: The only other question I have is, if you do start seeing these encounters, where they are freeing the turtles or, if they come up with a turtle that is deceased, is there any mechanism to capture that count during this study?

MR. DELACRUZ: One of the requirements is that they have to report every turtle immediately, and so, as soon as they have an interaction with a turtle, they're going to call in and let us know where they were and how they were, and also one of the things that came out, in speaking with Dr. Ponwith, was that we can probably begin to tweak and get the guys to understand —They will actually tell us, before we know, why they found that turtle in the area. What was in that area? Was there sargassum or what were the nuances, so that we can identify hotspots.

As that happens, in real time, we can establish that, hey, there is something going on here and let's move away from it. The guys will solve this problem faster than anybody else, and so giving them the carrot to solve the problem, by letting them fish here, is, I think, going to be a faster solution than anything else we can do.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. No more questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Thank you. Dr. Stunz asked my question, but I do have another question for Dr. Crabtree or someone else. I cannot remember the original reason for the closed area. Was it because of the red grouper and something having to do with the population or was it because of the numbers of turtles in the area?

DR. CRABTREE: It was turtles. We had, based on the observer program, we had a high number of turtle takes in the longline fishery. They went over their incidental take statement, and the council began work on an amendment, the goal of which was to reduce turtle takes.

In that, we created a longline endorsement that reduced the number of vessels fishing longline gear. We put restrictions on how many hooks they can fish, and we put this seasonal closed area in place, but it was about reducing turtle takes and not grouper.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

 MS. GUYAS: I have two questions. One is for you, Roy. What is the -- When I first read this, the first question that popped into my mind is what's the likelihood of this triggering a bi-op or something like that?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that's part of what we're looking at, and I think the question is -- There is an incidental take allowance for the fishery. The question, I think, is whether an EFP would modify that or not and then whether we would have to amend the bi-op and how extensive all of that would be, and so that's part of what we have to figure out.

MS. GUYAS: My other question is can you talk more about the bycatch hotspot avoidance program? Are the fishermen reporting when they not only interact, but also see a turtle, like if they're getting ready to put out a set? Can you just explain how that works?

MR. DELACRUZ: That's really exactly what it is. When they see a turtle -- If we see a lot of turtles in the area, the guys, we're going to respond right back to them, and, with these days of satellite phones and VMS and emails, we know stuff instantly.

If they see turtles in that area, if they see any kind of predominance of it, just move on. They don't want this to happen any more than we do, and so they're going to go out of their way to solve that.

Then the real-time side of that too is we're going to actually try to work to build a map and an understanding of, okay, the guys are in this area, and this group of guys are pretty close-knit, and they're going to communicate. They have what I like to call the coconut telegraph. Man, it gets stuff out really fast, and so they're going to know to move from those areas, and so, yes, that exact thing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree, I had you next on the list, but you may have already addressed any comments you had. All right. Then Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Chairman Bosarge. I should know this, but, in the Shareholders' Alliance, how many longliners do you have as members?

MR. DELACRUZ: That's a good -- We don't specify our membership by gear, and so I don't really -- I would have to ballpark that. We probably have, if you look at it by individuals, I would guess ten maybe, but, if you look at it by boats, it's probably close to thirty.

DR. DANA: The way I'm reading this, the participants, those eight longliners, probably are Shareholders' Alliance members.

MR. DELACRUZ: They are all members, yes.

DR. DANA: Is it eight individual owners or is it one or two owners, because it's all from Madeira Beach right now.

MR. DELACRUZ: Well, we're sea turtle central, right? I mean, that's where the problem lies, and that's also where longlining in this area, the closed zone, is, and so that's where the focus is, but it is going to be probably four different owners. In that four owners, that is where the eight vessels are.

One of the challenges is we really have to work with vessels that already have cameras. Then there are a couple of vessels in there that the owners have already agreed to buy the cameras, and so, if that becomes necessary, there might be money out there to do it, but it's really speculative how that that is, but this is viable enough for us that it's worth the expenditure of the cameras, and so that's kind of what the caveat is. We are really working with the people that already have cameras.

DR. DANA: Okay, and so the participants will come out of Madeira Beach, based upon where the closed area is, and it's going to be four owners with eight boats, and it's 10 percent, as I read it. There is probably about eighty, give or take, eighty longliners in the Gulf.

MR. DELACRUZ: There is sixty-one longline endorsements.

 DR. DANA: Okay, and so this would be 10 percent. Now, what would the other longliners in the other parts of the Gulf -- How are they reacting to it only coming out of one port and kind of excluding them, because it is a profit that you guys are going to gain, whoever the owners are.

 MR. DELACRUZ: No, absolutely, and I would think they would see this, and I've had discussions, a little bit, with them, that, if we're successful, that leads a path for them to do the same thing. This isn't just a, hey, let's try it for two years and get an advantage on somebody. Hey, let's try it for two years,

and, if this works, we're going to -- As a group here, us together, we're going to work through an FMP to try to build something to let the entire fleet get in there.

Two years doesn't give me enough to be worthwhile, but two years, this first two-year program, I also kind of think that it has to be established with the guys that have already done all the hard work. I've got guys that have cameras on boats for five years now, and I don't think it's fair that they go, hey, you've had a camera for five years and you don't get to do it, because we have to do it to this guy. These guys have done the hard work already, and they deserve this opportunity, because they have pioneered this stuff.

It's a little bit of that, and it's also we've got to get in there and test it, and I've got to have captains that have already dealt with it, that know what to expect. They're not going to fight with me. They know what the goal is. They are working towards achieving something.

MR. BRAZER: If I may add to that, the number of eight is roughly 12 or 13 percent of the entire fleet. We had some discussions, with the agency and others, about expanding that and looking at ten boats or twelve boats or fifteen boats.

At that point, aside from the risks that Jason just mentioned, it kind of pushes the boundary of what defines an EFP. An EFP is defined as limited testing, and so the larger the number, the more questionable that definition of limited becomes, and so that's the process of how we ended up at eight boats, a cap of eight boats.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Did you have a follow-up, Dr. Dana?

DR. DANA: I just asked the question. I'm not saying good or bad, but I'm just asking the question, because it's similar to the headboat pilot of the past. Who gets to participate and who does not? It creates, so to speak, winners and losers at that time. I mean, it just depends on how you look at it, but that's why I asked the questions.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Just following up on that, we don't manage fisheries by EFPs. We test things and try to demonstrate that something will work. If we do this, it will be for a year or two years, some defined period of time.

Then, if we are able, through the EFP, to show that there is a better way to refine management, where we can achieve the turtle protection we need, but we can allow more flexibility and allow more grouper harvest, then that would come back to you as a council and we would be looking then at a plan amendment to how to adopt this in a way that it can apply to the entire fleet, or maybe we can get into a situation where, okay, vessels can fish in this area, but only if they agree to put this on their vessels, and so the goal would be to come up to something that we could then do and apply to the fleet.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dale.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess this might be for Ms. Gerhart, and I think you kind of mentioned this, but I am not positive, exactly. You said that Protected Resources is looking at the amount of turtles that might be allowed, and do you know at this point if that would be additional turtles for this area or if it would come out of the amount of turtles that is currently allowed for the fleet in the area that's open outside of thirty-five fathoms?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: The question that we're looking at is whether issuing this EFP can be done under the current biological opinion on the reef fish fishery and is that opinion broad enough to cover issuing this EFP? If it's not, then we would have to do a separate consultation and biological opinion on issuing the permit.

If we can issue it under the bi-op, the bi-op has an ITS, and I guess NMFS could potentially -- Any turtle catches would come under that incidental take statement that's in the bi-op.

 I suspect that NMFS could, as a condition of issuing this permit, say your limit for this permit is X, Y, and Z, to sort of cap it somehow, but the first decision, or the first thing we have to figure out, is whether it's actually that we can issue it under the bi-op or whether we need to do a separate consultation for it, and that's what we're looking at right now.

DR. DIAZ: Just one more comment. Thank you, Ms. Levy. When I read through the EFP, and a lot of good points have been brought out, but you know sometimes we have to close areas for different reasons, and this was an area that we had to close, but it is a substantial area.

When you close an area, you shut off the data that you get from fisheries-dependent data, and so there might be some value in this program, if it was opened back up during this time period in this area, that the flow of data would come back in and we would have some more information from fisheries-dependent data.

As turtle stocks rebuild, we're going to have to think about ways to manage the success, and so, whether it's this EFP or other ones, we're going to have different things that we're going to have to consider in the future as we are successful at rebuilding the turtle stocks. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, I have Kevin Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a couple of administrative questions and kind of looking-down-the-road types of things. If this were to be approved and we wanted to take action on that and some sort of amendment development for including EM in the longline reef fish fishery, but how much --Of the NFWF grant that you received, if that's 100 percent of the money will go for these eight vessels or if there's a portion of that was siphoned off to do something else, but how much, administratively, is going to Mote to pay for the counting analysis and all of that? I have another question after that.

MR. BRAZER: Thank you for that, and I don't have that number off the top of my head, but I can get you the number. There is an existing research program. Mote has applied for NFWF funding, and they received funding to look at bycatch in general on the longline fleet in the Gulf of Mexico.

The overlap in vessels is what we're talking about here, and so these boats have cameras onboard already. They're already working with Mote under the NFWF grant, and so we are able to basically tweak the protocol to focus specifically on turtles, in addition to everything else they're doing, in order to meet the objectives of this EFP, and so this is really coming at no cost to the fishermen and to the organization at this point, no additional cost. Any additional hardware, obviously, would be expensive, but this is all encapsulated in that existing NFWF grant, and I can get you those numbers, if you would like.

 MR. ANSON: I would appreciate that, yes. Thank you. Another question, related to that, is you've all heard the discussion we've had relative to VMS and hardware and such in the charter/for-hire and that there's been some concerns among those that would have to abide by those regulations of the costs associated with acquiring that required gear.

1 2

 I realize there is an economic incentive and benefit if this were to go through and it showed that there would be no or very minimal impacts to turtles, so that that area could be reopened, but how is that cost -- Looking in the future, is that something that industry would come forward and say, hey, tell us what you all need and, 100 percent, we will go forward or there might be some kickback with some of those longline permit holders?

 MR. DELACRUZ: The beautiful part about this is that we're businessmen. This is what we do for a living, and so, once we get to that point, if we figure out that this does the job, then we have to look at, okay, what does it take to maintain this and in what form?

Another sidebar, slightly to that, is that one of the companies, camera companies, Saltwater Inc., that we're working with is pioneering what they call a stereo camera system that actually works for visual image recognition, and so it's conceivable that the most expensive part, and I guess this answers the question, is the most expensive part of this whole program is the review of the data.

It's conceivable that we might get to the end of this and they will have already pioneered an autonomous system that will do this, and so, from us as businessmen, this is absolutely worth doing and looking at. When we get there, we will go, okay, this is the cost, and it is what it is.

I see an FMP, or a fishery management plan, that we would do is a voluntary one, because I don't want to push it down anybody's throat, but, as a businessman, I want the flexibility to be able to look at it myself, and so I'm going to look at it and go, I can catch this much, it costs me this much, the cameras are going to wear out this much, and this is a good business move and go forward.

I think that's the way the commercial industry gets to look at it, and I'm really glad that we get to, and so I see in that direction. I don't know that if that answers your question specifically or not, but that's how we would look at it.

MR. ANSON: It does. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd, I have you next.

MR. BOYD: Thank you. For Dr. Crabtree, a question. This is proposed to be a two-year EFP. If, at some point, in the life

of this EFP, you determine, or the Science Center determines, that there are too many encounters, too many takes, would you stop the EFP in the middle? How would that work?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I would guess that's how that would work, that we would monitor the takes and, if it exceeded what we anticipated, we would terminate it, unless there was some other modification that could be made to get you there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Brazer, did you have a comment to that point?

MR. BRAZER: Yes. To that point, Mr. Boyd, we are fully aware of the risk of this program, and that's why we've been talking to the agency quite a bit. We understand that we could come to a point where, if this proposal is approved, day one, set one, hook one, if there's a turtle, the program may be done. It may over, and that's -- We are fully aware of that. We don't believe that will happen, but we understand that that could be a risk, and we're still moving forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Kind of related to that, Roy and Mara, I guess, if we get to the point where we do this EFP and they exceed the turtles takes that are allowed, would there be impacts to the industry that is working in the open area at that point? They still, potentially, could be catching turtles as well. Maybe you don't know the answer to this question now, but I guess there is the potential for --

DR. CRABTREE: Are you talking about the longline industry working outside of that area?

MS. GUYAS: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Let me point out that this area is only closed to longline vessels, and so you can go in there and vertical line fish. I think we would try to set this up in a way where the chances of that happening are slim, and it's only eight vessels, and so, if we monitor them pretty closely, I think we can avoid having that happen. I certainly would want to make sure that we weren't jeopardizing the whole fishery.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. This question is really for the folks at NOAA. I am just wondering, and it's a follow-

up to Dale's question. We probably know that the turtle stocks are rebounding, to some degree, and that's a success story, but we also have a lack of fisheries-dependent data on take in that area, and so I'm wondering who at NOAA right now is collecting the data to assess the turtle populations and whether those data might be spatially explicit.

DR. CRABTREE: The Science Center does that. The best index we have of turtle abundance comes from monitoring nesting activity on beaches, and there is a whole network of partnerships with state agencies and all, where they monitor that, and most of the takes we're talking about here are loggerheads, and loggerhead nesting has been going up.

When we do the bi-op and we do the incidental take statement, it's based on what we think they are likely to catch. Then we determine whether that's a problem or not.

As the turtle populations grow over the years, in all likelihood, the amount of incidental take we expect to see will go up with those activities, because, if there are more turtles, you are going to expect more encounters, and so we take steps, one, to reduce the mortality of the turtles that are caught, and you can do that through things like tow time restrictions or limiting how long you set and those kinds of things and then trying to reduce the mortality through release mechanisms and things, but that is the best index we have of turtle populations.

We would like to have more in-water monitoring, and Bonnie can talk about this, but the Center has done aerial surveys and things like that, but there are difficulties with all of those types of approaches.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

 DR. PONWITH: Certainly understanding the numerator and the denominator in the take question is important. We have a keen interest in the strong ability to quantify how many animals are encountered in these fisheries, but, to give that context, understanding what the population levels are is also important, and that's hard, and it's expensive.

We have done aerial surveys and in-water surveys to help interpret those aerial surveys to get at that, as a way to supplement what's happening on the nesting beaches, because the problem with the nesting beaches is they don't show up there until they are reproductively active. It creates these

mysterious years between when they hatch and swim off and when they come back.

2 3 4

One of the things that we're doing right now is we're actively engaged in conversations with BOEM to partner on doing some intensive work in the Gulf of Mexico that would focus on mainly marine mammals, but also sea turtles, and it would be a combination of ship-based and aerial surveys to get a better handle of what's happening at sea, in the water, with these animals.

We recognize that that's an area of interest to provide context for these takes, but that doesn't diminish the importance, I think, of really good, sound stewardship and management for minimizing those takes to the fullest extent possible.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I think we've had some very good discussion. I have just one technical question for you all. We do have this on our agenda on Thursday, at three o'clock, which we may be a little ahead of schedule, to vote on any exempted fishing permit applications, and we may choose to vote at that point or the will of the council may be to see this full package and vote at that time. I don't know, but will you gentlemen be here on Thursday?

MR. BRAZER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Good. Were there any other questions or discussion around the table? Thank you for your time. We appreciate it.

MR. BRAZER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: At this point, we have a scheduled break, and so we're going to take a fifteen-minute break. When we come back, I believe Captain Hebert is ready for his presentation, and so we look forward to seeing that. Fifteen minutes, and so let's just say eleven o'clock.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are going to move into presentations, and I believe we have Captain Hebert with us from the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. Sir, we look forward to your presentation.

PRESENTATIONS LOUISIANA LAW ENFORCEMENT PRESENTATION

1 2

CAPTAIN CHAD HEBERT: Thank you, Madam Chair and council members. I appreciate you all letting me be here. I am Chad Hebert, a Captain with the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Enforcement Division.

 Let me give you a quick rundown of our JEA year for Fiscal Year 2015/2016. This is not going take long. It will be real quick. Our division, in Fiscal Year 2015/2016, had a total of 7,197 patrol hours. Those are broken down into commercial and recreational hours. Commercial hours were 4,480 and recreational was 2,717. For commercial activities, we had 2,213 at-sea man hours and 808 vessel hours for commercial activity. Recreational activity was 2,717 man hours and 992 vessel hours.

The public contacts for that year were about 13,500. We had 5,327 public contacts for commercial activities and 8,261 public contacts for recreational activities. Once the ticket is written though, the work is not over with. We have the investigation follow-ups, report writing, and administrative hours. Those hours, after the initial ticket was written, totaled 2,145 hours, 989 being commercial and 1,156 being recreational.

These are our observed compliance numbers. In the commercial activities, in the top left-hand box, you can see the different fisheries management plans that we worked: coastal migratory, highly migratory, reef fish, and shrimp inspections. We inspected 491 vessels. In each different fishery management plan, we have the number that we checked for each one of those.

To the right of that box is our observed compliance. We took the number of inspections we took for each fishery and looked at the number of citations that we made and came up with our observed compliance. That's for the vessel inspections for commercial activities.

The bottom box, on the left, is our dockside or dealer inspections. We did 430 dockside inspections in each one of the fishery management plans, and you can see those numbers. To the right of that is our observed compliance. As you can see, our observed compliance is a little higher at the dock than it is on the vessel.

Then we went into our recreational activities, and it's the same situation. We did our observed compliance and inspection breakdown. We inspected 1,002 vessels for the different fisheries management, and the number of inspections for each one

of those are in the top-left box. The top-right box is our observed compliance for the recreational activities.

The bottom box is for charter vessels. We checked eighty-two vessels, and the number of inspections for each different fishery, and the observed compliance is on the right side of that box. You can see the observed compliance numbers for the charter fisheries.

We had a few cases made. I just wanted to share a couple of them with you. Three men were cited for commercial tuna violations. They possessed numerous skipjack yellowfin tuna with the intent to sell. They didn't have any permit, no HMS permit, issued to the vessel or the crew. They were charged with failure to comply with taking and possessing tuna without the required HMS permit, and they face fines up to \$5,000.

We had a case in 2012 that we made. Three men were finning sharks. We discovered them to have over 2,000 fins, and they were actually hiding them from us. They had hidden compartments underneath the stove in their vessel, and we ended up catching them with twelve sacks of fish hidden underneath the stove. The reason why I am bringing that up is because, in February of 2016, NOAA sent down their settlement, and they were ordered to pay fines totaling \$45,000 in that case.

Along with the cases, last night -- It was interesting. This happened last night, but we did have a shipment of red snapper come into the state illegally. It was about 1,400 pounds of red snapper, but the JEA program is working really good with the different state partners. We communicated with Mississippi and got some information of this fish that were illegally coming into the state, and we ended up stopping them last night, and we seized 1,400 pounds of red snapper, and they were trying to get it in without putting it towards their quota.

The JEA program is working wonderfully. I think all the guys are really committed to it, and it's working well. In fact, Senior Agent Marquez, who is working security today, got the call, and he ended up working until midnight last night on that particular case. That concludes my presentation. If anybody had any questions, I would be more than happy to try and answer them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Excellent presentation. Any questions for the Captain? Yes, sir, we have a couple. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Hebert. That case you made last night, was that a commercial IFQ holder?

CAPTAIN HEBERT: Yes, sir, it was. They left the dock and didn't call in to get their federal dealer inspection number, and they were bringing it into the state without any records or anything, and so we intercepted that and made the case. Then, of course, it's still under investigation. It's ongoing today, but we should wrap it up today.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Captain Hebert. I do want to make another comment. This was actually last year, but I was boarded by a couple of your officers while I was fishing for speckled trout.

CAPTAIN HEBERT: Uh oh.

MR. DIAZ: No, I have to say that your officers were very professional and very efficient. You should be very proud of the two folks that interacted with us. They did a very good job. Thank you, Captain Hebert.

CAPTAIN HEBERT: Thank you. That's very kind of you to say, and we try. We're not out there to write as many tickets as we can. We're out there for the resource and for the people and public safety, and so we do what we can, and we try to be as professional as we can.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Lieutenant Commander.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Captain, thank you for the presentation today, and I commend you for the comprehensive data regarding compliance, observed compliance, rates. That is something that I am extremely interested in, and also Admiral Callahan, who represents the Coast Guard's 8th District.

CAPTAIN HEBERT: Yes, sir.

LCDR DANAHER: One of the questions, or the question, that I have for you is just, with a quick comparison of numbers on the reef fish inspections for commercial versus recreational, it was evident to me that you were boarding many more recreational vessels for the reef fish management plan. Is that because of the size of the fleet or is that because of certain suspicions that you have on recreational versus commercial? I am just interested in your thoughts there.

CAPTAIN HEBERT: Yes, sir. Whenever we go out on patrol, we're not targeting one specific type of violation. Basically, if we

can check one recreational fisherman and one commercial fisherman, but, whatever we come across, we inspect it. Definitely the commercial fleet is smaller than the recreational fleet, and we tend to get to know a lot of the commercial fishermen, because we check them often, because they're out there all the time, just like we're out there all the time, and so the fleet is definitely smaller, and we get to know the fishermen. That is probably what you're seeing. Weekends, we have a lot of influx of recreational fishermen, and so we tend to, because of the size of the fleet, we will check them.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Captain. That was a very interesting presentation. I just had a comment or sort of a question for you that you may or may not know in the shark finning case that you processed. That was 2,000 fins, and they were fined \$45,000, which was good, but I'm wondering, do you have an idea of what that is selling for to them? I'm just wondering if that fine is even -- They are probably making so much more with what you're not --

CAPTAIN HEBERT: I am not sure what the retail is on shark fins. I really couldn't answer that. I am not sure. That was the judgement that NOAA came down with. As far as what the retail is, I can't answer that question.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker and then Mr. Matens.

MR. WALKER: I would just like to thank you for your presentation and express my gratitude for the job that you guys are doing. I actually had a little communication with one of your officers last night. For the commercial industry, we like to see things enforced too, and we try to help out as much as we can.

CAPTAIN HEBERT: Great. Thank you.

MR. MATENS: I am going to take care of you guys. I don't want to embarrass you. Your boss is here, but I'm a lifetime Louisiana resident. I have been on the water and in the field all of my life. I don't really have that many interactions with you guys. I must go to the wrong places, but these guys have the most difficult law enforcement role in the State of Louisiana, and it may well be in your states as well.

They have to be wildlife guys and they've got to be fishing guys. You can tell by his accent that he's not a foreigner. In the last few years, two of our agents have been shot. They both survived. One of them is not going to walk again. I understand the other one is going to be okay. They're out there in the middle of the woods with people with guns at night. We in our community can't do enough to thank and commend them for what they do. Thank you, sir.

CAPTAIN HEBERT: Thank you, Mr. Matens. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any other comments or questions? Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Captain, thank you. Just a quick question. Do you all use canines to search for protein, as opposed to drugs?

CAPTAIN HEBERT: No, sir. We currently do not have a canine program. We're actually in the discussion of possibly getting one started here in Louisiana. I know that Alabama has one, and I've been talking to Scott Bannon a lot about their program. That one seems to be going real well, and so we are actually in discussion of possibly getting one started here in Louisiana.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Anyone else? Thank you, sir, and thank you for all of your hard work. We appreciate everything you do.

CAPTAIN HEBERT: I appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next on our agenda, we're going to have a presentation on the National Standard 1 Guideline Revisions, and that is going to be Ms. Deb Lambert, if you are ready.

NATIONAL STANDARD 1 GUIDELINE REVISIONS

MS. DEB LAMBERT: Thank you for allowing me to talk today about National Standard 1 Guidelines. My name is Deb Lambert, and I work for NOAA Fisheries, in the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, in Silver Spring, Maryland. I worked on this most recent guideline revisions.

 As I think you all know, in October of 2016, we published a final rule with final revisions to the NS 1 Guidelines, and that is what I will go over today. A little outline of the presentation is I will provide a little bit of background, describe why we set out to revise the guidelines, and then summarize the major features within the new revisions and have some opportunity for questions at the end.

1 2

 As you all know, the Magnuson-Stevens Act has ten National Standards. National Standard 1, we feel, is a critical component to the Magnuson Act's successes for conservation and management. It requires that U.S. fisheries management prevent overfishing while achieving optimum yield, and the guidelines for National Standard 1 provide guidance on how to meet these two objectives.

 A little bit of background. When the Magnuson-Stevens Act was reauthorized in 2007, it introduced new requirements for ACLs and AMs in federal fisheries, and NOAA Fisheries, back in 2009, revised the National Standard 1 Guidelines to incorporate quidance on these new requirements.

Since then, ACLs and AMs have really transformed fisheries management. We have learned a lot through the implementation of these provisions, and we felt that there was some room for improving the guidelines, based on some of the experiences that we gained.

We started this whole process of guideline revisions back in 2012, when we published an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking, and, throughout this whole process, we had basically three major objectives for revising the guidelines, and the first was to improve and streamline the guidance.

 I will note that, throughout this presentation, I am referring to the National Standard 1 Guidelines, but we also did revise the guidelines for National Standards 3 and 7, predominantly to get at this objective of streamlining the guidance, particularly as it relates to our guidance on stocks in need of conservation and management, and I will get into that more later on in the presentation.

We also wanted to address the experiences that we gained during the implementation of ACLs and AMs, and we felt that the guidelines could be revised to provide some flexibility to address management issues, all while keeping within the current statutory mandates of preventing and ending overfishing.

I will note that the recent revisions to the Guidelines do not introduce any new requirements that would require councils to revise their FMPs. Rather, they provide some additional tools that can be used, if councils desire to do so.

I am going to provide some overview of five of the major features within the new guidelines, and this is not the extent

of all the changes that were made, but these are the major topics, and I will note that, in your briefing book and on our website, we have a red-line version of the Guidelines that shows all the recent changes that were made in this recent revision.

The first topic that I will go over today is increasing stability to fisheries. That topic, there is three sort of components to that, to increasing stability topic, and the first one is about phasing in changes to catch levels.

Typically, when we get new information that suggests that cuts are needed to be made, those cuts are typically taken all at once, and that can lead to dramatic changes in the way fisheries operate. We have introduced into the Guidelines a provision that explains that changes to the ABC can be phased in over a time period up to three years, and that would be incorporated through the control rule, the ABC control rule.

The Guidelines explain that, if councils desire to use this type of approach, it should be explained within the FMP. They should explain when this provision can and cannot be used and consider whether or not it's appropriate in situations where stocks are overfished or in a rebuilding plan.

This slide here shows a really simple example of how this could This example is for a stock that maybe is assessed every During that time, ABCs and OFLs are set static three vears. over a three-year period, and so the red line here shows the the blue line here shows what the ABC would have traditionally been under a traditional ABC control rule, and the black line is just showing in a phasing in of reductions in the ABC. I will note that this phase-in process could also be used situations where ABCs are increasing, based information.

The next topic under the stability theme is about carryover, and so, in fisheries that don't catch the full ACL in one season, the NS 1 Guidelines do allow councils to carry over a portion of that underage into the next year.

Typically, carryover has been used in situations to relieve pressure on fishermen to fish in unsafe conditions at the end of the fishing season or in other situations, to reduce the risk of exceeding the ACL at the very end of the season, and so the Guidelines provide two examples of how this carryover approach could be used, and the first one is a more simple example, and this is illustrating situations where an ACL has been set less than an ABC.

1 2

In that situation, the Guidelines explain that a portion of the underage could be carried over into the next year to increase the ACL in year two, as long as that new ACL does not exceed the ABC that's been specified.

Another approach we describe within the Guidelines is the carryover provision through the ABC control rule, and what this is essentially saying is that a portion of an underage could be carried over into the next year to essentially increase the ABC in the next year, and the premise behind this provision is that there's been an increase in abundance resulting from the fishery harvesting less than the full ACL.

Again, the Guidelines explain that this type of provision, this carryover provision within the control rule, would need to be explained within the FMP and that councils should consider both the condition of the stock as well as the reason for the underage before using this approach. For example, if an underage occurred because the fishing season closed too early, then that might be a good reason to allow carryover, whereas, if an underage occurred because of poor stock status, then that might not be the -- That might suggest it might not be appropriate to carry over, but we just note that you should consider the reason.

I will move on to the next topic under the stability theme, which is about multi-year overfishing status determinations. NMFS and NOAA Fisheries, we report on the status of stocks annually, and we report on whether stocks are overfished or are subject to overfishing, and we know that, oftentimes, our last — These determinations are based on the most recent year for which data is available and, especially looking at fishing mortality rates, we know that the terminal year's estimate of fishing mortality is often more uncertain than prior years' estimates of fishing mortality, and so this can lead to situations where stocks are bouncing off and on the overfishing list.

 To address this uncertainty, we have introduced into the Guidelines that overfishing status determinations can be based on a multi-year approach, over a time period of up to three years, and that this approach, if used, should be described within the fishery management plan.

This is a very simple example here showing comparisons of fishing mortality to the fishing mortality threshold. In this situation, if you look at the average from the last three years,

it could lead you to the conclusion that the stock was not subject to overfishing. Again, the Guidelines explain that, if council wants to use this approach, it should be described in the FMP and consider the situations when it would be appropriate to use this approach.

We got a lot of comments on this provision at the proposed rule stage, and so we really tried to emphasize in the final rule that this provision is about looking backwards to see whether or not overfishing occurred and that it should not be used to set future catch levels that do not prevent overfishing, and so, for example, you can't set future catch levels above the OFL, anticipating that the average of the last three years' worth of catches would be below the OFL. This approach does not allow for that.

Moving on to the next topic, which is about increasing flexibility in rebuilding plans, the Magnuson Act requires that, for stocks that are overfished, rebuilding shall occur as short as possible and not exceed ten years, with certain exceptions, and the National Standard 1 Guidelines provide some guidance on how to determine the minimum and maximum time period to rebuild, and that minimum time period to rebuild is -- We describe it in the Guidelines as the time it would take to rebuild the stock if there was no fishing.

In situations where that minimum time, Tmin, is greater than ten, the Guidelines provide some guidance on how to determine the maximum time to rebuild. Under the old National Standard 1 Guidelines, that maximum time to rebuild was estimated by using Tmin plus one generation time for the stock.

Under the new revisions, we've introduced two additional methods that can be used to determine that maximum time to rebuild, and those are Tmin times two or the time needed to rebuild to BMSY when fished at 75 percent of the maximum fishing mortality some additional threshold. We feel that this provides flexibility for using a method that best fits the available, and the Guidelines recommend that councils should relevant biological data consider the for а stock, uncertainty of that data, and consult with their SSCs when determining which method to use.

 For example, in situations where there is high uncertainty in generation time, or if generation time doesn't adequately reflect the productivity of the stock, then it might be appropriate to consider some other methods, these other two methods.

 The next topic under the rebuilding theme is about discontinuing rebuilding plans. Typically, in the past, once a stock has been declared to be overfished and it entered into a rebuilding plan, it remained in a rebuilding plan until the stock was demonstrated to be at its BMSY.

We do have situations though where we find out, later on, down the road, that a stock -- Once a stock had entered a rebuilding plan, we might find out later that a new assessment shows that the stock was actually not overfished in the first place, and so we have introduced a provision into the guidelines that explains that, if you find out later that a stock was not in fact overfished at the time where that determination was made, then the rebuilding plan could be discontinued.

The third theme I will talk about today is about adequate progress in rebuilding. The Magnuson Act requires that the Secretary review rebuilding plans to ensure that adequate progress is being made for rebuilding stocks. Previously, we didn't have any guidance on this within the National Standard 1 Guidelines, and so we decided to introduce some guidance on this topic and some criteria that the Secretary could use in determining whether or not adequate progress is being made.

 We have introduced two criteria that could be used by the Secretary, and those are if F rates are exceeding F rebuild, or if catches are exceeding the ACLs, and the AMs are not effective at addressing those overages, that could be a reason to determine that adequate progress is not being made. This is putting emphasis on things that managers can control, like catch and fishing mortality rates and accountability measures.

The second criteria that could be used is if new or unexpected information significantly changes the rebuilding expectations for a stock, and so this could include, for example, if we get new information that significantly changes our understanding of what BMSY is for a stock. That could lead us to determine that adequate progress is not being made.

The fourth feature we will move on to is determining which stocks require conservation and management. The Magnuson Act establishes that federal management is required for stocks that are in need of conservation and management, and that means that those stocks would need to be managed through a formal fishery management plan and managed with ACLs and accountability measures.

 The previous guidance, previous NS 1 guidance, did not have explicit guidance on how to address this topic of which stocks need conservation and management, and we had some guidance on it in NS 1 and as well as the National Standard 3 and National Standard 7 Guidelines, but it wasn't all comprehensive on how to determine this guestion.

We set out to sort of streamline the guidance and lay out a framework for how to determine whether or not stocks require conservation and management. The framework we have is that, if a stock is overfished or subject to overfishing, or likely to become so, and is predominantly caught in federal waters, then it requires conservation and management and needs to be put into a federal FMP.

In addition to that, for other stocks, we provided ten additional factors that could be considered, and I'm not going to read through those here, but they're listed here and they're in the Guidelines, and so these are factors to consider when deciding whether other stocks might need conservation and management.

The Guidelines explain that essentially any of these factors might be relevant for a particular fishery. There is pretty much a lot of flexibility on evaluating these factors. We do explain that, when removing a stock from an FMP, you should consider all ten of these factors, but, when adding a stock, any one of them might be relevant.

Lastly, moving on to the last topic of optimum yield and aggregate MSY, we have gotten a lot of questions over the years about what the relationship is between optimum yield and the ACL framework, and we have tried to clarify this relationship in the final rule, the final guidelines, and we explained that optimum yield, as defined, is supposed to include economic, social, and ecological considerations, and we explain that these same considerations can also be incorporated within the ACL framework.

The Guidelines explain that while OY is a long-term average amount of desired yield, there is, for each year, an amount of catch that is consistent with achieving that long-term yield and that, if councils choose to express OY on an annual basis, then that annual OY cannot exceed the ACL.

 Second, we acknowledge in the Guidelines that because fisheries do not -- We don't always have quantitative data and that a qualitative analysis can be used to describe the OY for a

fishery.

 Last, we have introduced into the Guidelines that an aggregate approach can be used to specify maximum sustainable yield for a group of stocks and that that aggregate MSY could be used to serve as a basis for determining the optimum yield for a fishery, in which case that optimum yield could serve as a cap on the total removals from a fishery. In this example, we're showing that the sum of the ACLs in that fishery would be constrained by that overall cap, and so this is meant to provide tools for allowing better accounting of multispecies interactions within fisheries.

In conclusion, the recent revisions to the Guidelines do not establish any new requirements for councils to revise their FMPs. Rather, they provide some additional tools that could be used to increase stability and flexibility within fisheries management. With that, I will stop, and I'm happy to take any questions that you might have.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Ms. Lambert. Is there discussion or questions from the council? I am amazed, but thank you very much for the presentation, and I guarantee you that we were all listening very attentively, and we appreciate the flexibility, and so thank you, ma'am.

All right. Next on our agenda, we have our Law Enforcement Report on Fiscal 2016 Maritime Boundary Line Activities, and so I am going to turn the floor over the Lieutenant Commander Danaher.

LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORT ON FISCAL 2016 MARITIME BOUNDARY LINE ACTIVITIES

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, Madam Chair and council members. The following slides are the Coast Guard Law Enforcement Report for Fiscal Year 2016 activity on the maritime boundary line and several of the key domestic cases. Before I begin, I would like to recognize the District 8 Chief of Response, Captain Jose Jimenez, who is here today in the audience.

 Of the known and suspected maritime drug smuggling conveyances in the Gulf of Mexico, Mexican-flagged lanchas are the most well defined vector, based upon historical case information, custodial interviews, and network analysis. On this slide, you will see the general area of where the Coast Guard and partner agency resources focus. Also note the two pictures of the

lanchas. Their design is very similar to that of a go-fast boat, but smaller in size and usually only propelled by one outboard engine.

On this slide is a composite view of the locations of Coast Guard lancha sightings and seizures and lancha GPS positions. This view includes your calendar year 2011 to 2016 available data. In fiscal year 2016, there were 176 detections and forty-five seizures. It was a record year for Coast Guard enforcement of illegal fishing in the U.S. EEZ. Thus far in fiscal year 2017, we have had thirty-two detections and ten interdictions. This is right on track to meet or exceed the previous year's metrics for the fiscal year.

From 2013 to 2014, District 8 partnered with our superiors at Atlantic Area Operations Research, and their experts developed an academically-defensible analysis of the number of lancha incursions and economic impact from illegal fishing in the U.S. EEZ. Based on the magnitude of detection and interdictions in fiscal year 2016, Atlantic Area determined that this data analysis is still accurate.

How they determined that, just a brief summary from them, is when a range of data was available, the study purposefully used the smaller number to create a conservative output. This ensures that the study did not inflate the results and remained academically defensible. Profits from illegal fishing activity are likely being funneled to the Gulf cartel. Funds may be used to support other illicit cartel operations.

 All of the estimates listed were achieved using low threshold numbers, meaning that the actual impact is likely much higher. We assess 1,100-plus incursions per year and 750,000 pounds plus of red snapper illegally taken from U.S. waters.

The study supported Congress passing of the Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2015, placing Mexico on the IUU list and giving two years of notice before sanctions. Then, on January 18, 2017, NOAA promulgated the first set of sanctions against Mexico, restricting routine U.S. port entry for any Mexican-flagged fishing vessels in the Gulf of Mexico.

District 8 has not seen significant activity from Mexico to combat the lancha threat, although that doesn't mean that the Department of State hasn't seen progress. I have heard some different unofficial reports, but, in partnership with our Sector Corpus Christi, the Coast Guard continues to engage the Mexican Navy officials, and we look for opportunities for Mexico

to make meaningful progress with this issue.

This slide depicts several domestic cases where red snapper were being illegally harvested. On particular boarding by Coast Guard Cutter Resolute in November of 2016 -- They were in federal waters off of south Texas. During the boarding, several TED and BRD violations were identified and corrected on the spot. However, forty-eight red snapper were located in the fish hold. Many of the fish were under the legal size limit and the vessel did not have a permit for Gulf reef fish.

We did request a seizure through the local NOAA Office of Law Enforcement Office, but there was some disparity, I think, there with the request, and it was not granted for seizure. Total monetary penalties are still being assessed. The boarding officer in this particular case did instruct the master to dispose of the red snapper prior to entering Texas waters, but the Coast Guard cutter did not remain on scene to confirm that action.

I am continuing to work with NOAA General Counsel, Southeast General Counsel, and the South Texas Office of Law Enforcement, just to ensure the transparency during future cases where seizures are requested.

The second one, the second case, was a recreational cabin cruiser in Freeport, Texas, in November of 2016. A Station Freeport boarding officer requested to seize the catch through their Coast Guard chain of command in Houston/Galveston. They engaged with NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, and Texas Parks and Wildlife.

Texas Parks and Wildlife offered to take the case for prosecution, and so this is an excellent example of our partnerships in the field, because TPWS authorities issued an \$8,000 fine to each of the four members onboard the vessel and they seized the catch. There were a total of sixteen citations and a total of \$32,000 in penalties issued, and I just wanted to recognize that TPWS has been an outstanding partner for our Coast Guard units in Texas, and we hope to continue that. Pending any questions, Madam Chair, this concludes my brief.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Any questions? Dr. Dana.

 DR. DANA: Thank you. Thanks for the presentation. With your interaction with Mexico, how has that interaction been with the Mexican Navy? Are they taking it as seriously, I guess, that border patrol, as is the U.S. Coast Guard? If they are, or if

they are monitoring that area robustly, do they find American vessels going onto their side?

LCDR DANAHER: I don't have any data that suggests that U.S. fishing vessels are illegally fishing in Mexican territorial seas, or their EEZ. We did meet with Mexican Navy representatives. We as in the Coast Guard met with them last week, in Corpus Christi, and we conducted another coordination meeting to pursue some exercise opportunities with the Mexican Navy.

From their agency, or from the Mexican Navy standpoint, they are trying to do what they can, but they're also a resource provider for their government, and so, if there is any other members from NOAA that would have further comment on that, they're welcome to chime in.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have David and then Mr. Riechers and then Dr. Stunz.

MR. WALKER: Thank you for the presentation. This is kind of a question of like maybe the average top speed, and I'm sure that it depends on the sea conditions, of these vessels and the source. Are they pretty much coming from the same mold? Is someone manufacturing these boats consistently for these lanchas? Have you checked the source of where these are coming from, to kind of trace them a little better?

 LCDR DANAHER: Based on the GPS slide that I had, and I can go back to it here if you would like, Mr. Walker, most of the fish camps that we have observed through the GPS exploitation, and you have to bear in mind that there are some things that I cannot mention in this venue, but a majority of the fish camps are located in Playa del Bagdad, which is not that far south of the border, maybe about fifteen or twenty miles, if that.

When they operate, they generally will go out beyond twelve nautical miles before they incur into the U.S. EEZ, further offshore, and so the top speed -- It just depends, of course, on that sea state and how much cargo they already have onboard. We have tracked them moving around to twenty-five to thirty knots, but it's usually about four personnel onboard. If they're loaded with catch, they will be moving a little bit slower.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: First of all, I want to thank Lieutenant Commander Danaher for the presentation and certainly for the

cooperation as well from Texas Parks and Wildlife, on behalf of our law enforcement group. It's a great partnership that we have down there. I wish we weren't having to be so active, but we are where we are in that respect.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the impact estimates that you all have created. We had that presentation, and I want to say it's been in the nature of a year-and-a-half ago or so, but, as I understand it, these numbers, as you're presenting them, you all continue to refresh that analysis, and I think I heard that, that you all have kind of updated and looked and tried to make sure that these were minimum estimates, et cetera. Did I hear that correctly?

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, sir, you did. I am in regular contact with the operations research, which is essentially just a fancy title for applied mathematics, at Atlantic Area in Norfolk. He actually happens to be a classmate of mine from the academy, and so he's doing his due diligence on ensuring that the numbers are updated. Thankfully, he understands math way more than I do.

MR. RIECHERS: As a follow-up to that, and we don't have to ask the question today, but I know that, at the time we had that presentation, given the significance of the catch, I think we were having at least some discussion about how we think about incorporating that as a mortality within the stock assessment, because it basically does mean both more biomass as well as more catch, and I think we were discussing ways to do that last time or the possibility of doing that, and we may just want to follow up on that at some point.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Dr. Stunz.

 DR. STUNZ: Robin made one of my points there at the end, about how are we building this in, because, as I'm looking at this, and -- By the way, that was a great presentation. It's sort of sad that we're having to sit here and actually hear about it, in terms of this is happening, but, at some point, I am suspecting -- I know you've been very conservative in your estimates, but I was doing some back-of-the-envelope calculations on like these record seizures and how many you see per day, and I'm guessing it's a lot more than that.

 I know the reason you're doing what you're doing is certainly justified, but then -- If you go back, and you didn't present one of the last slides, or at least it was in my presentation, and why I'm bringing this up is -- Could you go to that? It's the seizures versus the detections. Is that in your

presentation? It was towards the end.

LCDR DANAHER: It was a backup slide, in the interest of time, but I'm happy to discuss it.

 DR. STUNZ: That's fine, but I am just looking at that. One, it's like obviously there's a lot of stuff going on that you don't catch, and that's just the way it is, because there are so many of them, but 2017 has been a good year, if you're part of the lancha fleet, and I'm thinking that -- January is not a good month to be out there, and so I'm worried that this trend is getting even worse, if we've already got thirty in one month. What is this going to look like in December? Who knows, I guess.

Being in our backyard, I am concerned. Anyway, I think this council needs to look harder at this and try to figure out how this is affecting our management as well as ways to curb it, but then my last question is, if you go back to your map slide, and this is just because I don't understand and I am interested in this, because we see this a lot in our research activities and find pieces of gear and things all the time.

The little orange dots -- I get the lanchas and seizures, and some are below that boundary, but is that just tracks that you guys have of them? I am trying to figure out what the smaller dots are.

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, sir. The smaller orange/yellowish dots are GPS locations that were exploited from seized GPS units on lanchas. Provided that they do not erase them, upon interdiction by the Coast Guard, all of that equipment is seized and processed through the chain of custody.

 DR. STUNZ: The reason I'm asking is I don't know how proprietary that is for your agency, but, as certain groups around the Gulf are trying to get at snapper abundance in the Gulf of Mexico and looking at areas we don't know about, this kind of information is actually pretty valuable, to know where they're fishing, because obviously they wouldn't be there if there wasn't snapper in that region, and so there may be other utilities for this type of data outside of just enforcement.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Lieutenant Commander Danaher, on the graph that you just showed in the backup slide, is there any idea, between those years, what you guys' level of effort was on detection?

Did you still have basically the same number of man hours out trying to make these detections? Is the problem truly getting higher, or are we just paying more attention recently?

LCDR DANAHER: That's a good question, sir. As best that I can determine, the focus of Coast Guard resources has maintained as constant as possible. The station in South Padre Island is really the primary resource for conducting the interdictions, and the training of those crews and the equipment that they use are usually how we perform the interdiction once we have detected the lancha.

The patrol boat presence, your eighty-seven-foot-size patrol boat that can remain out for several days at a time, our scheduling coordination really tries to ensure that there is 24/7/365 presence on that MBL. If you don't see that patrol boat out there, it doesn't mean that an aircraft isn't above, and the aircraft that are based out of Corpus Christi are making daily flights along the MBL. In addition to that, when there are other partner agency resources available, we do apply them as often as possible.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: These vessels that you've got positions on and the vessels that you have intercepted and seized, what kind of fishing activity are they doing at the time?

LCDR DANAHER: They are mostly engaged in the longline equipment, and I would say that 95, if not greater, percent of every seizure that we've conducted, when there is fish onboard, it's red snapper and shark, most of the time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: A follow-up, Mr. Swindell?

 MR. SWINDELL: What concerns me is you realize that, if all of this is being observed in this relatively small area, the fish don't stop there. The fish are either going south or coming north, one or the other, and so I really don't -- We don't really know how much effort by the Mexicans is really taking place beyond the border. This may just be a very small part of the effort that is going on down there and how many fish are down there and so forth. Unfortunately, it's all still tied into our resource that we're looking at. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ed, I was kind of thinking something that was similar to that. I was just thinking about the Mexican waters versus the U.S. waters and the actual fish, the stock of fish,

and, just judging by the number of lanchas that are coming over here, I would venture to guess that this is just not opportunistic fishing, where the CPUE in U.S. waters is a little better than the CPUE in Mexican waters.

I would venture to guess that they have probably bottomed out their stock, and I may be completely off on that, but I would say it's probably not nearly as healthy as what ours is, and so, from almost a grand experiment point of view, I was wondering what kind of landings data, historically, do they have on their Mexican fishery, just to look at it and say, hmmm, how much pressure did that stock withstand before it finally took a turn for the worse, just to look at it as something outside the norm of any experiment that we would ever want to conduct here in the Gulf, but just to get an idea of what can that stock withstand, what did it withstand, and where is it at now, just looking at those trends as some sort of hypothesis and experiment.

LCDR DANAHER: Madam Chair, I would be happy to take that information for action and see what I can do.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Add that to your many lists of items there. Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. This just reminds me to mention also or remind all of us that the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem Program was funded by the Global Environment Facility, and one of the actions included in there is a collaboration between Mexico and the United States to conduct kind of the first joint stock assessment for king mackerel, and we've been talking about this along the way.

It's an interesting opportunity, because, as we know, the lack of information from south of the border has been vexing, in terms of understanding what the exploitation rates are, and I think that joint effort that will happen in 2018 will cultivate the relationships, scientist to scientist, across the border to recognize how crucial it is to understand the status of the stock across its full distribution in being able to do a better job of understanding what our part of that is.

 I say that just because opening the door, by doing this first assessment, if it is a successful enterprise, where the scientists are satisfied that they are getting more by doing this jointly, and the managers are comfortable with the advice they're getting from the science, it creates opportunities for future collaborations and understanding those exploitation rates.

 In the history of red snapper, the United States, once they essentially pummeled the red snapper population in the U.S. at what was historically its center of density, as we understand it, which was the Florida Panhandle, they headed across the border and went to the Yucatan Peninsula and fished quite heavily there, until, essentially, between the U.S. and the Mexican fleet, they did the same thing in the Yucatan Peninsula.

Those patterns of changes of distribution of the animals and exploitation rates of the fleets are quite interesting, and the recovery rates are quite interesting. Of course, the thing that confounds that is whether people are fishing legally or not, because it creates mystery in our understanding of those exploitation rates, and so I would add my congratulations to our Coast Guard colleagues for this work, and we will continue to interact with them, in terms of how these data might be used or might inform the stock assessments.

We will also be careful, as we engage with Mexican scientists, of open up their data they have, the sort confidentiality issues they need to be attentive to, just as we If we can demonstrate that we can do this in a way that is requirements sensitive to all those in each of jurisdictions, I think it could open the door to a lot stronger collaboration across the border.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

 MR. GREENE: Thank you. Not to get into that conversation, but, Lieutenant Commander Danaher, have you guys reached out to the general public and that, if you encounter one of these vessels, you should notify us and you should stand clear and you should do this? Has there been any consideration of that?

LCDR DANAHER: Yes, sir. The sector office down in Corpus Christi, they are the command and control element responsible for pretty much all of south Texas and the EEZ. They do outreach with regards to if you see one of these vessels that here's who you should call or who you should contact.

I would also remind you not to approach them. That just really comes from my counterdrug background. I don't have a lot of experience with the lancha threats, as far as being on scene, but you just don't know what you're going to encounter if you try and approach them. If you see it, contact the Coast Guard as quickly as possible.

 MR. GREENE: The detections that you have reported in your report are U.S. Coast Guard detections and they are not phoned in by the general public or anything? That is purely Coast Guard?

LCDR DANAHER: That's correct. The classification or the definition of a detection is that a Coast Guard resource had to have eyes on it or potentially another Department of Defense or interagency resource.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Lieutenant Commander, I know I'm not telling you anything that you don't already know, and know extrapolation is dangerous, but I am in agreement with Dr. Stunz. It looks like these guys could be catching three or four-million pounds of fish annually, which is -- We have had this discussion before. Not only should it be cranked into our numbers and whatever shakes out shakes out, but this is an important theft from our country.

The other comment that I have to make, knowing a little bit about Mexico, is the men that you're catching, or the people that you're catching, they're not the principals. They're some poor guys trying to make a living and being paid by the pound. I know that you destroy the lanchas when you seize them. Looking at it here, you've destroyed a couple hundred lanchas, and that hasn't slowed them down. I would ask you, when you seize these boats, do you have repeat offenders, in terms of the people? Surely you do, and what do you do with them?

LCDR DANAHER: Mr. Matens, it's very common to have repeat In fact, we've had them as close as three days offenders. apart. The prosecution side really is -- The pressure is on the Mexican government for the prosecution. Every case package that across my desk from the maritime boundary line interdictions is copied and archived and then that copy goes to That's what we are instructed to do. the Mexican authorities. We are the enforcement arm, but we're doing it on behalf of NOAA.

We do generally receive permission to conduct interviews with each of the individuals. If there are any minors onboard, which is occasional, they are not permitted to be questioned, but the adults, we get as much information from them as possible before border patrol takes them to the closest border point.

MR. MATENS: Let me follow up on that, and I guess I should know

this, but I don't. If they are in the EEZ and not in Texas waters, are they in America?

LCDR DANAHER: If they're in the EEZ, yes, because they are fishing, and the EEZ is considered that sovereignty for the United States, with at least the fishing aspect. If they are in Texas state waters, then that could create a situation where Texas may desire to prosecute the individuals, and that has occurred, but that's something that we coordinate with NOAA and Texas state authorities.

MR. MATENS: I know it's a tough job, and if I'm inferring what I think I am, it's just not stoppable. You can catch some of them and you can destroy the boat and you can throw the fish away, because they're not on ice, and so that means they don't get utilized, but the motivation for these people to come is always going to be high as long as there is no penalty, because they're not buying the boats. Somebody else is.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Atran and then Mr. Swindell.

MR. STEVEN ATRAN: When we got a similar presentation a couple of years ago, there was some discussion or at least the question came up as to whether it might be possible for the Coast Guard to provide annual estimates of the illegal catches to the Science Center, so that it could be incorporated into the stock assessments as an additional source of mortality.

The amounts that are being illegally caught, at least based upon that previous study, exceed the recreational catch off of Texas, and so I was wondering if there has been any movement toward trying to provide that information to the Science Center.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I believe that request was made before you joined the council, and so, if you need to check into that, that is fine.

LCDR DANAHER: Madam Chair, thank you. That is something I will look into for you, Mr. Atran. It is something that we discuss regularly, but I wasn't aware of that information getting passed, and so I will take a look at it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

 MR. SWINDELL: This question I think maybe would be more for Robin. I'm just interested in what kind of structures are there? If he's talking about a lot of red snapper, there has got to be some reef structures or oil rigs or something in the

area that he is talking about. Do you have a good idea of what's going on there?

MR. RIECHERS: There is both, Ed, and, if you look at his dots closely, you can see where there is a lot of activity, based on GPS plots, and certainly that is where you see a lot of activity.

 I am assuming there is some level of structure there, but, in that part of the world, there is both, both oil rigs as well as some structure on the bottom as well, and so, additionally, I just might add, folks, and certainly the Commander knows this, this is not a last-ten-year problem. This has been an ongoing problem for a very long time.

I think there has been somewhat of a shift in focus, maybe more towards red snapper or including red snapper, where, in the previous years in the past, I think they were more focused on sharks a lot of the time, but it now has shifted into red snapper as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead, Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Have you had any direct contact with the oil rig operators and whether or not they're having any particular problems that we need to be somewhat aware of?

MR. RIECHERS: Ed, I can't really answer that. I can check with our law enforcement folks, who I assume would be more akin to getting that kind of information, if it came through as a threat in some way. We can certainly check on that, but, like the Lieutenant Commander says, a lot of assets and resources are being used down there on an every-day and every-week basis right now, and so we may have a better picture of that, but, to answer that question specifically, I would have to check.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Suffice it to say that I think your presentation was very interesting. We have one more question from Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Dr. Ponwith, in relation to the question on whether or not this data can be incorporated in the assessment model, would it be premature or would it be wise to have the SSC potentially review it, to kind of review the quantitative analysis, to see if it passed muster, so to speak, so that, when we got to the assessment time, that that data could be incorporated into the model somehow as an additional source of mortality?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, I think that would be valuable. We have looked at the methodology, but it's been sort of in a general way, because it wasn't specific to an ongoing stock assessment, and certainly the level of scrutiny that we would apply to the methodology would be much more rigorous if it were being contemplated for us as some other form of mortality in the estimate. Having that go to the SSC would probably be a valuable step to prepare for the next stock assessment.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Dr. Frazer, you're the last one. Go ahead.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. A similar question though, to follow up with Kevin. It's not just about catch or mortality, but it's about effort. Would the SSC consider how they might get any legitimate effort estimates from the Coast Guard?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have one last presentation before lunch. It's going to be our presentation on Commercial Fishing Vessel Classification Standards, and I believe I am correct that Ms. Laura Jezewski is going to be presenting today. Thank you.

COMMERCIAL FISHING VESSEL CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS

MS. LAURA JEZEWSKI: Good morning, everyone. I want to thank you for taking the time to let me speak to you this morning, especially since I'm the last person standing between you and lunch. My name is Laura Jezewski, and I'm with the Government Accountability Office, or GAO.

If you're unfamiliar with GAO, we are a nonpartisan, independent legislative agency, and so we're a federal agency that works for Congress. We are often called the congressional watchdog or the investigative arm of Congress, and we investigate how the federal government spends taxpayer dollars. We have offices in Washington, D.C. and throughout the country.

Our work comes to us through requests by congressional committees or individual members of Congress, as mandates and law, or through the head of our agency, the Comptroller General.

Our team is currently conducting a review of commercial fishing vessel classification standards, and this is our team. I am the analyst in charge, or the project manager, of the review. I am joined today by Erin Stockdale, who is another senior analyst on

the review. In addition to Erin and I, we also have two other analysts assigned to the review, as well as our Director and Assistant Director, who were unable to be with us today.

I would like to take a few moments to tell you about our review and why we're here. In the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015, Congress mandated that we examine commercial fishing vessel classification and safety and understand how classification requirements affect vessel owners, operators, and shipbuilders.

As part of our work, we interview government agencies, commercial companies, and other organizations, as needed, to collect evidence to support our review. After we have completed our interviews, we analyze the evidence that we've collected and publish a report of our findings. For this review, we will issue a publicly-available report later this summer.

The scope of our review falls into four key areas. First, the trends involving commercial fishing vessel accidents, injuries, and fatalities. Secondly is how U.S. regulations for commercial fishing vessel classification compare with other countries. Third is the costs, challenges, and any benefits associated with building and maintaining a vessel to classification standards. Finally, how an alternative approach, which was recently put into law, compares with classing a commercial fishing vessel.

If you're unfamiliar with classing requirements, these are specific rules or standards developed by a class society, for example the American Bureau of Shipping, that a commercial fishing vessel must be built and maintained to. Based on our understanding, fish processing vessels built after July 27, 1990 and catchers, tenders, or processors that are at least fifty feet in overall length and built after July 1, 2013, must be built and maintained to class society standards or also classed vessels is what they're commonly referred to.

Additionally, the most recent Coast Guard Authorization Act established another approach, which we are calling the alternative-to-class approach. Under this approach, vessels built after February 8, 2016 that are between fifty and seventy-nine feet can follow this alternative approach in lieu of classing them.

 This alternative approach lays out some requirements for how these vessels must be designed, constructed, and surveyed and maintained. The particular requirements under this approach can be seen here on this slide.

 We are aware that these requirements may have real cost implications to commercial fishing vessels, vessel owners and operators, and shipbuilders, and so, as part of our review, we are hosting a public forum this evening. At this forum, we would like to hear your candid opinions on the type and size of commercial fishing vessels used in the Gulf, costs and challenges associated with building and maintaining fishing vessels to class society standards, how these requirements have impacted vessel owner decisions on whether or not to purchase a new vessel, and any benefits or challenges to the alternative-to-class approach that I mentioned earlier.

Again, we would like to invite anyone interested to attend this evening. The forum is going to be held between 7:00 and 9:00 P.M. in the Toulouse B Meeting Room in this hotel. I would also like to take this time to thank the council for helping us to set up and host the forum on this very important topic, and we hope to see you this evening. Thank you for letting me speak to you, and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Do we have any questions or comments from the group? Thank you for coming. I will give maybe a little more background, so that maybe you can drum up some more attendance at your meeting tonight.

I am glad that you're having it here at the hotel. I know we have a lot of fishermen in the room now, and we'll have a lot more in the room later, and so maybe we can make another announcement right before public testimony and just let them know that you will have that next door.

First, I just want to say, for the proposed Coast Guard regulations, that they have changed a lot over time, and they are taking it very slow and being very methodical about it, and I want to commend them for that. They have reached out to the various fishermen across the U.S., and they are really trying to tailor a lot of their regulations to that region and even specifically to that type of fleet, depending on what you're out there targeting, and I think that's amazing. They are trying to make sure that it works for us.

It's my understanding, and you can correct me if I'm wrong here, but a lot of the proposed regulations, a lot of the impetus behind sort of what started some of this, was some data on fishing vessel fatalities across the U.S., but those fatalities were broken down by different regions, and I know we have Mr. Bob Perkins in the audience with the Coast Guard. We may have

to put him on the spot at some point, but stop me at any point if you need to.

2 3 4

Anyway, in the Gulf of Mexico, that data showed that the Gulf is a little unique, in some sense, as far as the fatalities in the commercial fishing arena. In the Gulf, the majority of our fatalities actually come from man-overboard situations, and that is not the case in any other part, along your Atlantic seaboard or your Pacific. Even in Alaska, where it's very dangerous, that's not the case.

I hail from the shrimp fleet, and that is a fairly large fleet in the Gulf of Mexico, and so I'm sure that there will be a lot of attention shown to the shrimp fleet, as far as looking at them and what we can do to make that a safer industry for those participants, and I am not going to speak on behalf of the entire shrimp fleet by any means, but I am from Mississippi.

Our boats shrimp in both state waters and federal waters, but predominantly federal waters. We shrimp throughout the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic, and I have lost a lot of friends over the years, and so I take it personally. They are not just statistics.

One thing that I see, as far as the people that we lose, is that, if it could be addressed in some way, it could really make a difference, and you may think, gosh, I can't believe this, but they fall overboard and they cannot swim.

I know a lot of the impetus has been put on the stability of these vessels and the physicality of the vessels and making sure that that's as rigorous as it can be so the vessel doesn't sink as we get into situations that are tough, as we're towing and we hang up or it's bad seas or whatever the case may be, but I think sometimes there is some very simple things that we can do to save lives.

 I don't know if that's a question that's asked by the Coast Guard when you investigate a fatality. Yes, it was a man overboard, but maybe we can add that question. Do you know if he could swim? Was he proficient at swimming, he or she, because, a lot of times, they are not.

 There is a couple of ways to try and improve that situation. One way that I'm sure every fisherman would go, lord, Leann, please do not say that, but you could mandate that they take a marine survival class. Make them learn to swim, or at least get that PDF on correctly if they go into the water.

I don't know if that's the answer. You need to be cautious when you do that and understand the demographics of our shrimp fleet, because these men are very, very intelligent, but there's not a job description for a shrimper that says you need to have a college degree or you need to have a PhD. That's not it.

It's years and years and years of being on that water and being very good at what you do, being an expert at what you do, and so the classroom setting is not something they're very fond of. That is just not what they've grown up with or that being the way to get where they want to be in life. It's more being there and doing it day after day and being really good at it.

That's one way. Another way that I'm sure, again, that they won't like it, but having to wear some sort of floatation device when you're working.

Now, you have to keep in mind that we work with winches, and so I would hate to see some sort of mandatory requirement that you have to wear a Type I or Type II Coast Guard-approved PFD. That's going to be more dangerous than it is good, because you have straps that hang off of these things and you don't want anything hanging off of you when you're close to a winch. That's a good way to get yourself killed, but there are a lot of floatation devices these days that maybe are not Coast Guard-approved, but it provides you some sort of buoyancy. The key is to just keep his head above water.

Anyway, that's my two-cents. I am not going to get into the stability side of it. I am sure that you will get very in-depth into that side, which is a lot of the dollar figure costs of meeting these regulations, later this evening, but, for the Coast Guard in the room and for my fishermen friends, I hope you will think about that, and maybe our focus might need to shift a little bit, from overall stability for that particular fleet to something that actually could be a simpler fix and get more bang for your buck if you're the one looking for the statistics to improve, and so thank you.

MS. JEZEWSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sorry. I got passionate and forgot I was in charge. I still have to let you know when you're supposed to go to lunch. All right. We have finished all of our presentations. We are scheduled for a lunch break from 12:15 to 1:45. We are actually, believe it or not, a little ahead of schedule, as far as knocking things off the agenda, and so let's

go to lunch, and we will come back at 2:00. See you then.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on February 1, 2017.)

_ _ _

February 1, 2017

7 8

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

 The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Astor Crown Plaza, New Orleans, Louisiana, Wednesday afternoon, February 1, 2017, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are ready to get started again. We are going to get back into our Full Council business, and we are actually going to let Mr. Mark Brown give us his South Atlantic Liaison Report.

I know we have a lot of extra people in the room, because we're getting very close to public testimony, but if I could get you to take your conversations just outside those doors, we would appreciate it. Thank you. Mark, I'm going to turn it over to you, sir.

SOUTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Leann. We had our council meeting in December, in Atlantic Beach, North Carolina, for the South Atlantic. I am just going to go through a real quick brief on this, because it is in your briefing books. One of the discussions we had was the issue was the for-hire reporting amendment, which has been sent to the Secretary of Commerce for final approval. The council will be working with this throughout 2017.

Also, we have a pilot program in place right now, and all of that should be pulled together throughout the year. Then it will be finalized to where it becomes mandatory on January 1 of 2018. We also have the for-hire limited entry. The council directed the staff to develop a white paper to explore limited entry options for the snapper grouper and for-hire fishery, but we also stopped on limited entry for the dolphin and wahoo and the coastal pelagics. The council will be discussing that more in 2017.

Mutton snapper, the Amendment 41, was sent for final review to the Secretary of Commerce, and a lot of the decisions in that were based on things of the past, where we incorporated the new adjustment to the catch limit from three to five, and so, anyway, all of that is in your briefing book, too.

 The red snapper, the revised scoping document was approved for scoping, and the scoping meetings are being held in January and February. Yellowtail snapper was split from a joint amendment with the dolphin and approved for public hearings, and those hearings have been going on also in January and February.

Commercial and recreational visioning amendments were approved for scoping, and those are being done on webinars. The webinar scoping meetings are also being held in January and February, and the council will review that in March.

Cobia has become a big issue over there, and it looks like the ASMFC is probably going to take control of that all the way down the coast. Amendment 30, the recreational fishing year was put on hold. Dolphin was split from a joint amendment with yellowtail, and we added actions for staff to analyze, and we included actions to allow multi-gear trips for the lobster pot fishery, and the staff and council are working on that with the SSC. That concludes my report.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate that. Did anybody have any questions for Mr. Brown? We definitely appreciate you being here, and we've called upon you several times. I know you have an early flight tomorrow, and so we appreciate you being here and giving us the report.

One other thing that we will try and knock out on our agenda, if there's no objections, while we have just a few minutes here, is we will go ahead in our Administrative/Budget Committee Report. I don't think we're going to hear anything at public comment on our Administrative/Budget Committee.

COMMITTEE REPORTS ADMINISTRATIVE/BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. LUCAS: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Committee adopted the agenda and minutes of the October 2016 Administrative/Budget Committee meeting as written.

Under Review of Advisory Panels, staff presented an overview of the four existing ad hoc advisory panels: Red Snapper Charter/For-Hire, Reef Fish Headboat, Red Snapper IFQ and Red Snapper Private Angler APs. There was some discussion regarding the Ad Hoc Red Snapper IFQ AP, since they have not met since it was formed in 2015. It was concluded the AP would be shortly convened to review draft Reef Fish Amendment 36B. The following motions were passed by the committee without opposition.

The committee, by consensus, recommends, and I so move, to keep the existing four Ad Hoc APs for another year without readvertising any of the memberships.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries.

DR. LUCAS: The committee then reviewed and discussed the need to re-advertise membership for the Coastal Migratory Pelagic and Red Drum Advisory Panels. The CMP AP has met twice since they were appointed in 2015. The Red Drum AP has not met, and staff suggested reappointing the Red Drum AP to another term without re-advertising.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the Red Drum AP openings not be advertised, but be rolled over until the three-year term ends.

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

DR. LUCAS: Staff was requested to contact the Red Drum AP members to determine their interest in continuing to serve for another three-year term. Based on the results of this poll, the council will decide if there are enough active members or if it is necessary to re-advertise the Red Drum AP.

Next up, we talked about the Marine Recreational Education Program. Staff also reviewed the Marine Recreational Education Program. The Marine Resource Education Program, MREP, workshops meet twice a year, and they reserve a spot each year for one council member to attend.

The two workshops consist of science and management training. MREP pays all travel expenses. Council members participate on their own time and do not serve as a representative of the council. Consequently, participation incurs no cost to the council.

 Staff is proposing a method for selecting council member attendance whereby the Executive Director will announce to the council when a MREP workshop is scheduled and request council members to indicate if they are interested in attending. If more than one person indicates interest, then the Council Chair will select a participant. If a council member has previously attended one of the two annual workshops, they will be given the first opportunity to attend the complementary workshop. There was no other business to come before the committee. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Dr. Lucas. We have one other report that I believe is ready. Dr. Dana, if you will take us through your report, please, ma'am.

MIGRATORY SPECIES COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. DANA: Thank you, Chairman Bosarge. The Migratory Species Committee met on January 30, 2017, and the agenda was adopted as written. However, approval of minutes was skipped, because none of the committee members from the last time the committee met, which was August 12, 2009, are still on the council.

Randy Blankenship, the Atlantic HMS Management Division Southeast Branch Chief, gave a presentation titled "Introduction to Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management", which highlighted similarities and differences with council management.

Division in 1992. HMS Management was created Ιt International Commission participates in the for Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, otherwise known as ICCAT, and implements ICCAT recommendations as necessary and appropriate through regulations under Atlantic Tunas Convention Act, ATCA.

 Current issues include bluefin tuna, which is Amendment 7; dusky sharks, which is Amendment 5b; swordfish revitalization; bycatch of sea turtles; billfish; marine mammals; and the Deepwater Horizon Oceanic Fish Restoration Program.

Dr. Craig Brown, the Atlantic HMS Branch Chief, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, gave a presentation titled "Overview of ICCAT Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Stock Assessment Process". ICCAT is responsible for the management of tunas and tuna-like species in the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent seas.

ICCAT's Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, SCRS, is

responsible for providing scientific advice to the Commission, including carrying out stock assessments and providing management advice. In 2017, stock assessments are planned for shortfin make shark, Atlantic swordfish, and bluefin tuna.

Dr. Brown provided several examples of HMS research being conducted in the Gulf of Mexico by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. These included a cooperative tagging program for several HMS species, a recreational billfish survey, and bluefin tuna larval surveys.

Dr. Brown also described a close-kin analysis, where genetic mark-recapture is used to estimate the number of western Atlantic bluefin tuna spawners. Other ongoing bluefin tuna research includes joint U.S./Japan/Canada/Mexico longline CPUE indices, a young-of-the-year, or YOY, sampling survey in the Florida Straits, and electronic tagging of bluefin and yellowfin tuna.

In questions following the two presentations, a council member asked what data sources were used for recreational landings, particularly for yellowfin tuna. The presenters responded that the data sources included the large pelagic survey, MRIP, headboat survey, Texas Parks and Wildlife survey, and tournaments.

The council member suggested using the LA Creel data as well. The presenters responded that they were open to using additional sources of data if they could determine how to incorporate the data into their analysis.

Another council member asked how the boundaries for the new pelagic longline restricted areas were determined. The presenters responded that the areas and closure ties were based on the timing of bluefin tuna interactions reported in pelagic longline observer data. A council member asked what types of outreach were used to inform fishermen about regulation changes, and the presenters responded that they sent letters to the HMS permit holders, published changes in the HMS e-mail, and communicated via VMS monitoring.

Pamela Dana summarized her participation in the ICCAT meeting held in Portugal on November 14 through 21, 2016. There were fifty-four nations represented at the meeting. Decisions were made by consensus. All nations had to agree to a proposal for it to be accepted.

Among the proposals that passed were the first ever conservation

and management measures for sailfish and North Atlantic blue shark. This included measures for live release and use of circle hooks. In addition, quota measures were extended for several stocks, including north and south Atlantic swordfish.

A proposal that sharks be landed with their fins attached was supported by a majority of the nations, but not by all, and so it did not pass. The U.S. delegation raised a concern about bycatch of juvenile yellowfin tuna by vessels fishing for bigeye tuna using fish aggregating devises, otherwise known as FADs. A FAD working group was formed to examine this issue. A summary report describing all of the actions taken at the meeting was included in the council's briefing book materials. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Dr. Dana. The next thing on our schedule is Public Comment, and that is scheduled to start at 2:30 sharp. I am pretty flexible on a lot of things, but that's something I am rigid on. We have nine minutes. We will take a five-minute break. We will all be in our seats in five minutes, quiet and ready to get started. That way, we will not be late for the 2:30 schedule. You have got five minutes. Thank you, quys.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We've got lots of people to talk to us today and try and help us down our path in fisheries management. Before we get started with public testimony, for the fishermen in the room and any other interested stakeholders, I do want to mention that the GAO, the Government Accounting Office, is going to hold a meeting at seven o'clock tonight in this same hotel, to try and garner feedback from stakeholders on the up and coming U.S. Coast Guard commercial fishing vessel safety standards that are coming out and classification standards.

If that's something you're interested in and want to learn more and give your feedback, that will be happening in this same hotel and not in connection with our meeting, but at this same hotel at seven o'clock tonight in Toulouse B Meeting Room, which is on the M-2 floor in the elevator, Mezzanine 2.

 All right. Good afternoon. 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.

2 3 4

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. Welcome. We are glad to have all of you here. First up this evening on our list, we're going to have Mr. Bart Niquet, followed by Mr. Chris Niquet.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. BART NIQUET: Good afternoon. I'm Bart Niquet, and I'm glad that you're giving me this chance to speak. I am ninety years old right now, and I've been making my living on the water since I was fifteen, and I was still doing so until this morning.

However, after yesterday's fiasco, I don't know whether these hearings -- I don't know what we're going to do. I'm not sure of anything. The requirement to have a boat and a reef fish permit was done away with by the council after the five-year review. I am sure surprised that you remember that, and that's why reverting back to it doesn't make any sense. These are the kinds of actions that cause the fishermen to mistrust you. Maybe different actions will work better.

Actions like these should be reviewed before brought to the council. The council needs to clarify what they mean by new entrants to the fishery. Do you mean the reef fish fishery? That is now under a moratorium.

 Do you mean the red snapper fishery? That's being met by the leasing program. Much ado is being made by some about the price, but where else can a starting fisherman invest three-dollars and, in just a little while, get back around five? That's the best percentage for a loan that I know of. That's 60 percent on your money. Maybe some of you mathematicians can figure that out.

Ask any of the fishermen who lease the fish and see what their feelings are. This is almost exactly the same program the State of Louisiana had for the alligator harvest.

I have had reef fish permits since the beginning of the program, until I sold my boat last year. Does this mean that I can no longer use my snapper allocation to use it as retirement income? That's discrimination against the elderly. Perhaps I've got to go to court to get what I think that I deserve.

On your kingfish, in the northwest Florida area, and, in fact, from Alabama all the way to Carrabelle, Florida, you closed the kingfish season down just as it was starting to get good. That's the reason your reports from up there in such a shortage. If you opened it up for another month, you would probably have a 20 or 30 percent increase in your reports. Something is wrong there. Those fishermen, recreational and commercial fishermen, need a break up that way. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Chris Niquet, followed by Mr. Ken Haddad.

MR. CHRIS NIQUET: I'm Chris Niquet from Panama City, Florida. I am here to talk about the red snapper, mostly 36B. The council's consideration of further restrictions on the leasing program and those who are involved in it should be met by skepticism by all members of the council, and here are the reasons why.

 The allocation program is now -- I think it's at 99-plus percent or 98--plus percent, and some of those are inactive permits that have never even been activated. They don't lease them, they don't buy them, and they don't sell them. You can't get in touch with the people. You can't even activate that poundage.

One fellow here that I know very personally, his fish house handled 800,000 pounds of red snapper allocation. You know he didn't use them all. He had eighty-eight pounds left over, one-tenth of 1 percent. That is inefficiency, folks. You need to correct that. You had better look around. You won't find a

program that has the efficiency that the allocation program has right now.

2 3 4

Don't put restrictions on it. The lack of restrictions has made it efficient. Anybody who is in the contracting business or the building business or the grocery store business knows that, if you put more restrictions on your business, the efficiency goes down, the cost of business goes up, and you must raise the price of your product to cover it.

 In addition to that, these restrictions are going to come with a price tag. That price tag is going to have to be paid. If the price tag is put on me personally, my thoughts are that I'm going to try to go to the courts and recover it from the government. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Ken Haddad, followed by Mr. Bob Zales.

MR. KEN HADDAD: Thank you, Madam Chairman and council members. My name is Ken Haddad, and I'm with the American Sportfishing Association. I am speaking on Amendment 29. First, as we've stated previously, we do not oppose the concept, and there is some things that we're okay with in the amendment.

I do want to point out that this is one of the few federal fisheries with happy recreational fishermen, and so we ask that things progress delicately. We are concerned that there is a trend towards this type of quota shift. We are seeing it in other fisheries. We see this as a one-way street, because of differences in how the sectors fish.

We are concerned that there has been no real policy discussion on the application of this type of conditional shift. What triggers action? Who triggers action? There are so many things that we don't quite grasp on how the council was thinking about this particular issue.

 We are concerned that OY is determined from a commercial perspective and not necessarily a recreational perspective, and this all goes back to maximizing benefit and not maximizing, necessarily, the number of fish. Your own AP recommends Alternative 1. The updated ABCs suggest questions on the stock. We have not yet experienced the results of a three-fish bag limit. There is no analysis or discussion of the impact of reduced abundance on the chances of encountering and catching a recreational fish. This is what Mr. Swindell very eloquently asked about in the committee meeting.

Right now, we look at this as, if we go over our ACL, we're punished. If we go under our ACL, we get our ACL reduced. Then, if we go over that ACL, we get punished.

Thinking about this, one, we still would like to see, if this were to go forward, that there is a clear 100 percent statement that the recreational fishery will not be held accountable if it goes over its original ACL.

Currently, you read it, and people will say, well, it's designed to kind of do that, maybe, but it's very confusing. It's not straightforward, and that always bothers me. From a big-picture perspective, we truly do not know where this is going, and so we're just concerned about too rapid of a pace on looking at conditional transfers. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Bob Zales, followed by Mr. Russell Underwood.

MR. BOB ZALES, II: Bob Zales, II, Panama City, Florida. Real quick, when it comes to the charter/for-hire allocation system that everybody is looking at, I can tell you that myself and probably pretty much the majority of the charter guys in Panama City would rather see a fixed season, because, the allocation schedules and the Excel sheets that we've seen, I'm not getting anywhere near the fish under that proposal, under a fixed quota for me, that I'm doing under the fixed season. I think pretty much the rest of them are the same way.

The only way that I'm going to get that is if you put a trading system in there, so other people can be bought out. Then you're going to have a fleet that's going to be dramatically reduced, and that's not going to be good.

On the data collection system, and pretty much everybody that knows me knows that data has been -- I have been involved in that since the late 1980s. I'm sure some of you, if not all of you, have seen the information that I've sent out on the recent review.

A VMS system, I am definitely not going to support. I am not going to support giving the Fisheries Service carte blanche on developing a device for me to have to have at some point in the future, unless it's some type of dedicated website that is secure. I've got a permit, a permit number, and I can log into a website, and I can be required to log into that website, but the Fisheries Service has to have the fortitude to enforce that

reporting, which they could do today for people. I am required to report today. If I don't report, they could take action against me.

A site can be developed pretty easy, to where, every day, I can be required to report whether I fish or whether I don't. I put the information down there, and the system can be designed such that, in four or five days, it sees that Bob didn't report five days ago and I get a generated email of where is your report? Either send us one or we're coming to see you.

In my mind, it's real simple. It's real easy, and it's cost-effective, because I can use my phone or I can use Doug's computer to go log in and provide that information. That is where I am, and that's where a lot of people that I know of would like to see.

The burden of trying to report before I get in, the reality is that there's not enough money, not enough manpower, to do the dockside validation that you're going to need to do. In the fixed season of snapper, there are days that I do three trips in a day. I normally do two, because I like two six-hour trips.

When I come in, I immediately turn around and go back out. If I'm going to have to wait on somebody to come see me, he's going to miss me, because my customers are waiting to go back and I'm leaving, and so that's going to be an issue.

At our dock, where there is a good number of boats, you haven't got enough people to sit at that dock to verify everybody that's there, and so that's part of the problem. Any questions? I will be glad to entertain them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Zales. Yes, we have a question from Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I have a quick question. Bob, you're referring to most of these devices are run by a webpage in the background that could easily just be used, like you're saying, just in case you lost your device in the water or something.

 I think that that would happen with anything. You would have access to a website, but the app is just an interface to get to it, but I have a question, and maybe you can expand on it. The issue that we're having is the validation component of that reporting before the dock, and I don't know if you were here and heard the presentation earlier in the week, but that's a big deal, and having that information ahead of time with landing at

the dock allows for matching of those reports, which is key for doing the estimate, but why -- If it was a short data entry process, just a few minutes, you don't think that still creates a problem as you're switching out to the new group of customers?

MR. ZALES: I don't see any difference in that and what's being done now. I mean, you've got dockside intercept people there. They walk the dock, and they see if boats are in or if they're not in, and they take that against the current data that they have.

If I am required to report every day and I didn't fish, I check off "no fishing". If I fished, I put whatever I did that's there. In their validation system, if they've gone to the dock that day and they say, okay, Bob's boat was gone on a day that he didn't fish, then that's an immediate trigger that there's something wrong with that, and so you can do exactly what you're doing now.

You will never have the money to hire the number of people that you're going to need to validate it. I'm not a commercial boat. I don't sit at the dock for two or three days after my trip. I immediately, on days -- In snapper season, I fished forty-three out of forty-six days.

Most of that time, it was two trips a day, and some of it was three trips a day, and there were a handful of single trips. In Panama City, at our dock, in snapper season, people are leaving at five o'clock. The fleet leaves. At the end of the day, around six or seven o'clock, everybody is back in.

In between times, it is shuffled all day long. I mean, it's just constant boats moving in and out, and you're not going to change that. I mean, my customers are important. I am not going to inconvenience those people to satisfy somebody when the fish don't belong to me to begin with. They're their fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. ZALES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Russell Underwood, followed by Mr. James 43 Zurbrick.

 MR. RUSSELL UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Madam Chairman, and I'm glad to be back at this council speaking again. I had a few health problems, but I'm doing pretty good. The first thing today is I'm Russell Underwood from Panama City, Florida. I've got a

little fleet of boats, and I've fished out of Leesville, Louisiana for the last thirty-five years, and I've been part of this council process, and I sit on a bunch of APs, and so I've been there and I've done this.

Anyway, I would like to talk today about Amendment 36B. There seems to be a little confusion about how we got to this good program. It's working very well. I sit back and listen to some of the recommendations, and I would like to clarify a few things, like the use-it-or-lose-it.

Years back, we talked this over, back and forth. We had seventeen panel members. There was recreational and there was environmental people and commercial. We all worked together as a team.

We brought that up quite a bit, about a use-it-or-lose-it, and the council decided not to go forward on this. Our concern was, at that time, we had problems in the fishery, and it was a new plan, and we thought, well, we don't want an environmental group, we don't want CCA, buying a bunch of quota up, and we wanted this program to be our commercial fishing program.

That's why we decided not to go that way, and I guess the council decided not to go that way, but the intent was not to penalize somebody if they didn't use or catch all of their quota. The thing about this is we've got 91 percent of the fish caught this past year on the snapper quota, on the commercial side, and so what's the big deal?

We left a few fish, and I think it's a good thing. We left a few fish out in this Gulf to repopulate and multiply, and I think that should be the thought about this council, is how can we use our fish and conserve too, and so we left 400,000 or 500,000 pounds or whatever we left out there, or a couple hundred thousand, and the way my thinking is that we just left a lot of fish out there to repopulate, so we're going to have more fish for these coming up years to come. It's going to help the recreational and it's going to help the commercial.

 From that point, I will go to another subject. The king mackerel, I am not in favor of -- If there is a TAC increase, it should be a hard TAC. I don't think these people back here in the audience wants to get an increase in TAC and, the very next year, you all take it from us. If the recreational are not using their TAC, I believe that we can use some of these fish and use the resource, if we don't go above the ACL and all of that, and so I would recommend status quo on the mackerel.

On the charter boat deal, I used to run partyboats for Captain Andersons in Panama City, and I can speak on that behalf. These people need a plan that they can live and manage their business. I support things like get rid of 30B. That's a hardship for the charter boats and other boats.

They need to keep on working on Amendment 41. That will continue moving forward on the charter boat industry. I think you all's job here is to not manage people and manage the resource. You know, the resource is coming back, and everybody wants a little bit more, but we just need to continue to do better and think about that next man, whether it's a charter boat or it's a commercial guy, but we're not out here to hurt somebody. We are out here to help the industry in both parties, recreational, and I'm excited to see the recreational fishermen — They're starting to come up with a little plan, and so I'm excited about that. They can work on it. They had a pretty good presentation yesterday.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Underwood, if you could wrap it up. I'm sorry.

MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm excited about that, and so I appreciate you all listening to me today, and I'm glad to be back to be able to see you all. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We're glad to have you back. Glad you're here, sir. Mr. James Zurbrick, followed by Mr. Steve Tomeny.

MR. JIM ZURBRICK: Thank you, council, for allowing me to speak in front of you. I'm Jim Zurbrick from Steinhatchee, one of the top five most dependent fishing communities in the Gulf on fishing. That's what they discovered when we were doing the IFQs, the grouper IFQ.

I do support the electronic logbooks for the charters. I support the hail-in and the hail-out and the fixed mount for GPS tracking. It works. The people that were on this council that remember that the commercial sector -- We thought it was the end of the world when we were forced to get those VMSs. We thought that it was Big Brother and we thought, oh my god, everybody is going to have our secret fishing spots.

It didn't do that. Then, when we won the lawsuit, as you all remember, we didn't want to have them taken away from us, and so that lesson learned needs to be a lesson learned here. The only folks who are not going to want to be tracked are people who are

jumping that line. We've got to call it out as it is. There is a group of people that don't want to, or they're just so scared that Big Brother is watching everything they do, and they resent that. Hopefully that goes forward.

I want to thank you for putting me on the five-year snapper review twice, and with the grouper. That's an honor, and when we -- The rationale for the use-it-or-lose-it was strictly what Mr. Underwood said. We were all worried, and it was like the Big Brother thing, but we were worried about the NGOs buying up quota and setting it aside for the greater good.

I can see their point. I see that mentality and how it works, and also some of the recreational groups thinking they can get their hands on it later on. That was not the rationale. It's documented in all of our minutes, and I'm sure you can find it if you want to.

The exempted fishing permit, how wonderful it is to have something well thought out. I've been up here now for almost twenty years, and the great grouper wars of 2000 -- I can remember when that got started, and, since that time, the industry is getting strong. We're getting smart. We're getting minded in conservation. It's embedded in us, and so these folks are willing to put a camera on their boat and take a chance because they believe that what they're seeing out there is not what is perceived. I think you ought to definitely go ahead with allowing that exempted fishing permit.

As for king mackerel, I am not a king mackerel fisherman, but listen to those folks that are in that business. If they want to get that 10 percent bump and then possibly lose it next year, but I do see where the recreational guy is coming from.

Mr. Swindell made a good point about catch and release. Those are fish that never get counted, and that might be a sizeable number, but I know that the king fishermen need some relief, because, the way it works now, it's shut all the time. They catch they quotas quick, and people are coming over, and so I know the chaos, and I thank you very much.

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

45 MR. STEVE TOMENY: Good afternoon. I am Steve Tomeny. I 46 operate a charter fishing business out of Port Fourchon, 47 Louisiana. I am also a red snapper IFQ holder and commercial 48 fisherman.

First, I'm going to hit on the ELBs. I have been up here many times saying that we need electronic logbooks. If it's VMS, I'm okay with that. I think it has to be a GPS attached to the boat, as a minimum. I am in favor of hailing-in and hailing-out. I think we'll have to have some kind of a backup, breakdown plan put into it, maybe if you've got to go for a couple of days on a phone while you fix your equipment, if it breaks.

I haven't had technical problems, to speak of, of any big problems with my commercial VMS. It's already on my two boats, and so it hasn't been a big problem, but some people perceive it, but, if we had this five or ten or fifteen years ago, some of these things that are bogging Amendment 41 down would have already -- We would have this data that shows what boats are fishing and what is not fishing and what the individual boat is catching. This is stuff that's really important.

Look at the amberjack situation this year. I don't think my charter boat, which really won't gear up good until later in the spring, will catch a single recreational amberjack this year, and we were probably a high-liner in the Gulf, if you go back a couple or three or four years. We're probably way up there, because we've got a big, multi-passenger boat, and the amberjack have been plentiful.

Somebody caught them, but -- That dovetails me back into 41 and having the multispecies allocations per your permit. It's just important that we go that way. I think that's the way we're going to end up having to go in the future, and I even had some folks kind of say, well, if weekly was good enough for the South Atlantic that it ought to be good for us. I heard that in one of the Louisiana charter boat newsletters.

 Well, look at their fishery, fellas. We don't want to be following the South Atlantic. Their reef fishery has been in trouble. They don't have fractions of the fish we have, and I don't want to follow their lead, and I don't mean to offend anybody on the South Atlantic and the council folks that work on it, but we need a timely -- We need to be the leaders in this deal.

 I'm going to get into the white paper for 41, and I think that needs to move along. I would like to hear that we will keep that moving. That cyclical distribution sounded good to me. I think it's another way to find out how we can redistribute the fish to the guys that need them. That's the big stuff. My time

is up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Eric Brazer, followed by Mr. Bill Kelly.

MR. BRAZER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. My name is Eric Brazer, Deputy Director of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance. Thank you for the chance to speak. First, I want to thank you again for the opportunity to answer your questions about the EFP. I really enjoyed that. That demonstrated, to me, that you guys are taking this seriously and that you read through the document, and we really do appreciate that, and so we will be around until the end of the meeting tomorrow. If you guys have any questions, please grab us, and we will be happy to talk with you.

On 36B, I think if we were to take a step back and to look at this from the perspective of an outside observer, or even for commercial fishermen, it seems like, at this point, we're at a mish-mash of ideas that penalize commercial fishermen, and this shouldn't be a surprise. This is what you've been hearing since this conversation has started.

These proposals restrict access, and they limit fishing opportunities. The amendment has no clear goal or vision. We don't have a consensus here of what we're trying to achieve, what you're trying to achieve, and you have fisherman after fisherman coming up and explaining about the unintended consequences of some of these ideas.

The IFQ systems have been in place for a number of years, and they are doing what they are supposed to do. Businesses have been created, and supply chains have been established. From that perspective, you should be able to see why there's a lot of consternation over some of these ideas.

If we're going to have this conversation, let's do it right. Let's figure out what the problem statement is and let's talk about goals and objectives. Let's talk about strategies. Let's come up with real solutions and let's give an honest answer to why we are doing this, why we are having this conversation.

As long as fishermen feel like these are unfounded attacks on their businesses, there is going to be pushback and there is going to be resentment, and it's going to make these discussions controversial. If you're asking us to work with you to find ways to improve the program, that is going to be a much more constructive conversation.

1 2

With regards to corals, we believe the amendment still has a long way to go. As we said before, we support coral protections, but we do have strong concerns with closing off big areas of the ocean to fishing, any type of fishing, especially areas where historical fishing has taken place.

We support taking a hard look at the data that was used to identify these expansion areas, and we support getting a more accurate assessment of historical fishing activity and true fishing impact in these areas. We see there are some major data gaps that need to be addressed. We want to make this work, but there are some data gaps that need to be addressed first.

Then, finally, real quick, we support increasing the commercial size limit on gag from twenty-two to twenty-four inches. It seems like a slam dunk. I think you get a 50 percent bump in fecundity doing that, and that is a great reason to do it, and so we support that. We support cyclical redistribution on Framework 41. Keep making progress on 41 and 42, and we support final action this week to give the for-hire sector the ELBs that they want. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Brazer. Next, we have Mr. Bill Kelly, followed by Mr. Gary Jarvis.

 MR. BILL KELLY: Madam Chair and council members, Bill Kelly, representing the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's I would like to talk to you about a couple of Association. Number one is allocation, of course. I think that action by all regional councils is appropriate for effective management of the species and best utilization of the resource. It provides the flexibility for the councils that we've been pressing for for years, and we hope to see it happen under the reauthorization of the Magnuson Act.

We have seen some concerns here expressed by the SSC, especially with regard to king mackerel. There's not enough new recruitment out there, the converse of which is there is too many old fish, and so suddenly now underfishing is just as detrimental as overfishing. That makes it incumbent upon the councils to allocate appropriate, so that we fish to OY and utilize those species.

 We think it would be appropriate to set the standard with annual reviews of allocation and then set intervals of action that would be deemed appropriate by the council to make these assessments. In many instances, we believe that a hard

allocation is appropriate. Why? Because you're going to hear alternative facts today, but the numbers really speak for themselves.

That is, that the commercial fishing industry is fully documented in their landings and so forth. We see that with regard to yellowtail snapper and king mackerel, in particular. America's consumers, the industry, we are all being short-circuited by these inappropriate allocations.

I want to first paint the picture for you on yellowtail snapper. Fully 90 percent or more of the yellowtail harvested takes place in the Florida Keys, in Monroe County. Early season closures have been having significant socioeconomic impacts on our small island communities. That has been exacerbated by problems with the early closures on dolphinfish as well in the South Atlantic and people turning their attention to yellowtail.

We think it's particularly inappropriate when the recreational sector is leaving nearly 500,000 pounds of a 1.5 million allocation underutilized and unharvested each year. We have made very positive steps. We have volunteered them to both the South Atlantic and the Gulf Council. That is changing the fishing year to August 1 through July 31, to protect spawning populations, in the event that closures are necessary.

I am here today to also volunteer and recommend the following. One, that we combine the Gulf and South Atlantic stocks and manage them as one, with the South Atlantic Council taking management responsibility. The reason for that is approximately 75 percent of the harvest comes from the South Atlantic and 25 percent from the Gulf.

Have the South Atlantic combine both the commercial and recreational ACLs, as is done in the Gulf without problems, and, from May 15 through July 31 of each year, impose a commercial trip limit of 500 pounds for day boats and 3,500 pounds for extended-day vessels, to cover additional costs and provide additional stock protections. Those vessels would be identified by the use of VMS. I see that I'm out of time. I've got a lot more to go, but I will address that in written comment to you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Kelly. We have a question for you.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Mr. Kelly. I was trying to write as fast as you were talking, but I wasn't keeping up very well with

you. In your original comments about king mackerel and the allocation part of it, could you kind of go back over your first comments on king mackerel?

MR. BILL KELLY: Yes, and we're concerned. Thirty years of rebuilding this stock and fully ten years of the recreational sector leaving three-million pounds on there, we think it's certainly time that you would take appropriate action. The comment of we're talking about the insufficient new recruitment, is that what you're referring to?

MR. GREENE: No, just the allocation between the two fisheries, between the recreational and the commercial.

MR. BILL KELLY: I think a hard allocation would certainly be appropriate. I mean, we've seen what's going on here for the past ten years, and we haven't taken any action on it. When we see these dramatic imbalances, I think it becomes incumbent upon the council to allocate appropriately so that we can get to OY.

Someone mentioned that the OY is the commercial definition, but it's not. The SSCs are looking at it and allocating X number of pounds of fish, and it's incumbent on us to go and catch them, to harvest them, because it can have repercussions both ways, if we overfish them or if we underfish them.

MR. GREENE: Thank you.

 ${\bf CHAIRMAN\ BOSARGE:}$ Thank you, Mr. Kelly. Next, we have Mr. Gary Jarvis, followed by Ms. Pam Anderson.

MR. GARY JARVIS: Captain Gary Jarvis, President of the Destin Charter Boat Association. I would like to thank you, council members, for hearing me out again. I am going to start by speaking personally, as a dual-permit holder. The use-it-or-lose-it provision, as discussed yesterday, is an unnecessary way to approach to improve the fishery.

It will have serious negative consequences for small shareholders like myself, who rely on supplementing their allocation and access to the fishery from those who don't fish their allocation.

 Before the IFQ, about 33 percent of the fishery was harvested by fishermen who leased Class 1 permits. Nine years later, 31 percent of the fish being harvested by red snapper fishermen are being harvested on leased fish from other shareholders who don't fish, and so, ever since its inception, from prior to the IFQ to

today, the actual execution of the fishery has changed very little.

2 3 4

If your intent is to improve the IFQ fishery and to help fishermen and not to subvert the IFQ program and, in essence, hurt small fishermen, then maybe perhaps, instead of discussing things like use-it-or-lose-it, which nobody could give a definition of what that really meant, maybe this council, with the help of the National Marine Fisheries, should really focus on a loan program that's allowable by law and in existence on the Pacific coast that allows fishermen to use those allocation shares as collateral, and that allows young, new fishermen the financial capability to buy into an expensive fishery and do so and pay for it with their hard work with the allocation that they borrowed that money. I think that would be real important.

Now, as a representative of the Charter Boat Association, we will start on the charter stuff. It's time to vote yes and take final action on ELBs. For ten years, we have analyzed, scoped, surveyed, workshops, webinars, hundreds of hours of public testimony in favor of actual catch data collection.

Preferred alternatives from the Charter/For-Hire AP, the Headboat AP, and the Data Collection Ad Hoc and compromises of technology to the different types that we can use to garner industry support have been made to change data collection in our fishery, and now, with the absolute failure of status quo management that has led to zero harvest of gray triggerfish in 2017, a dark cloud over the amberjack season, which will probably close before we reconvene next time, it's time for data collection, at least in the charter/for hire industry, that will improve the information to help you guys to make the management decisions.

 For over eighty years, the charter/for-hire sector has provided public access to the Gulf of Mexico as one, and that's why the Charter/For-Hire AP and the Headboat AP, joint AP, have recommended to this council that there will be multispecies and cyclical redistribution added to this document. I hope that we can get a motion and a vote in favor of those two items and in favor for the white paper, so that we can work our way and try to develop this fishery.

The last thing I would like to say is that status quo management started in 1981, and it's still a 1981 management system, and it happens to be 2017.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Jarvis. We have a question,

sir, from Dr. Crabtree.

 DR. CRABTREE: Gary, on the electronic reporting, one of the things that we had a lot of discussion about had to do with the GPS system and whether we should have some part of it permanently affixed to the vessel so we could be assured that what we're getting positioned on is actually the vessel. What's your feeling on that?

MR. JARVIS: Well, we all know where a segment of our industry stands on VMS. They're against it, it's cost-prohibitive, they don't like the idea of Big Brother watching you.

DR. CRABTREE: I am not talking VMS.

MR. JARVIS: I understand that, and I'm going to answer your question. We have tried to come up with compromises of using good technology to enter into a self-reported data collection system.

As we've worked through the system, through information from you and the SSC and council members, we also know that it's going to be expensive and that the agency and our fishery needs to have a cost-effective manner to validate our electronic logbooks that we report on our iPads or Palm Pilots or on our phones and that having a fixed GPS was kind of like the compromise.

It's cheap and it's easy and it doesn't require you to do anything, but, at the same time, it's probably the best bang for the buck for dockside validation of our efforts, because, if it's just on a smartphone -- Ms. Dana has got a charter boat, and I could go up to her captain and say, take my phone with you, bro, and I will stay at the dock, and I fill out a fishing report that I went fishing that day, or I could do just the opposite. I could leave my phone at home and go out and make my trip and not report, because I don't want to pay my taxes for that trip.

I'm an honest guy. I play by the rules. I have never had a fish violation, but not everybody aspires to play by the rules, and some of the pushback you see on these accountability measures are either there may be a bit of malfeasance intended on how they fish or perhaps they want to live in an underground economy, which does none of us any good, not our fisheries and especially our business.

DR. CRABTREE: Thanks, Gary.

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

MR. SANCHEZ: Gary, we had some talk about daily versus weekly reporting. I want to get your take on I guess the integrity, the quality, of the information of daily versus weekly and what you're going to get out of that.

MR. JARVIS: As a human being, if I put anything off, the further I get away from the actual event, the less I am going to retain and remember. We tried the bluefin web-based pilot, and Bonnie will tell you how it was not a resounding success, and it was based on a weekly reporting system, and here is how the day goes.

You get into the dock, you've been up in the bridge the whole time, you've had very little communication with your people, and so you spend some of the time while they're cleaning fish and taking pictures and talking to them. You have a soft drink and the wife calls up and she doesn't want to cook dinner that night, and so you go out and eat dinner. Then, before you know it, it's 9:30 and you're on the twelfth twelve-hour trip in a row and it's time to go to bed. That happens for a couple of days, and, all of a sudden, on Thursday night, you're like, dang-it, I forgot what I reported.

You go back and now you're digging through your booking book and you're like, okay, what did we catch that day. I had two sixhours, and was one with four people or did I have nine people that day, and so I've got to report. Now I'm grasping for straws and reporting.

In the scenario that we talked about earlier, if a guy knows that he's only going to get dockside intercepts that will compare what he reports on his reports, he knows what day he got dockside sampled, and his report is going to be extremely — This is I'm talking about maybe an unscrupulous operator, but his report is going to reflect on what that guy sampled that day, but he may change his reporting later.

You cannot have a reliable, validated reporting system that we so desperately need and to quit being extrapolated and surveyed out of the fishery, and the only answer to that is to have some type of validation affixed to the vessel and daily reporting, so we can report what we caught that day, while it's fresh, whether you're on an outboard or on a sixty-five-foot enclosed bridge, to report what you catch. When your daily bag limit is twelve fish, it's not all that hard. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Jarvis, I think we have a question from Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: One quick question, Gary, and I appreciate the extra information. When you say daily reporting, do you feel like it has to be before you hit the dock?

MR. JARVIS: If you want to increase the accuracy of your science and your data collection, I would say yes. It's just commonsense. All of us have times in our day, even if it's ten foot out there, to where, if you can move your coolers and get your beanbags out to get everybody comfortable before you come in, while you're doing that, it takes ten or fifteen or twenty or thirty-five seconds to report that I caught twelve red snappers and four triggerfish. Well, not this year. Then a grouper. Then you punch it in and you're done.

With some of the smartphone applications that we tested with iSnapper, Dr. Stunz, it relied on cellphone communication. It would store that, and, as soon as you got cellphone coverage, it would pulse it out, and you didn't have to worry about that. You reported in the phone offshore and, once you got back, it did it by itself.

Of course, VMS, a bunch of us -- I'm a dual-permitted guy, and so I've got it. I am in the habit of reporting what I catch before I hit the dock, but, if you want to increase your accuracy and the science and the value -- If we're going to take this burden on financially as an agency, and for us, as fishers, the better our self-reported data, the more confidence you have and I have that it's right, then the better management decisions every single one of you are going to be able to make, because you're not going to have to spend thousands of hours reading your briefing books and trying to figure out what are the errors of this information.

We are living in a 20 percent buffer world. You talk about instant access to a fishery, cut that down to 13 percent or 7 or 5, like in the commercial industry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Ms. Pam Anderson, followed by Mr. Bill Staff.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Pam, before you get started, I want to ask those of you all in the back of the room not to be talking in here. If you must carry on a conversation, please take it out in the hallway. Thank you. Pam, can you turn the microphone on? You all can leave the microphone on in between

people.

 MS. PAM ANDERSON: Madam Chair and council members, I am Pam Anderson, Operations Manager at Captain Anderson's Marina, Panama City Beach. We're the home of thirty-seven charter boats and five headboats, and I am also the fishery rep on the Bay County Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

 A lot of time and effort and money, private money, went into the document presented by the Gulf Angler Focus Group, in an attempt to address all options and to flesh out what is needed to go forward in each option and what consequences may be in store for each.

I strongly support using this document for a guideline for the private angler AP. In order to make the process more effective though, I urge you to address the data needs in the document. I believe, in all of these discussions of management, the right decision for the council comes down to your goal for the recreational fishery, whether it's on data collection or catch shares or traditional measures. Is the goal of this council to conserve the fishery while maintaining adequate access to promote a positive economic benefit to our coastal communities?

It's not good for our communities to lose jobs and businesses. I truly believe the VMS will eliminate some of those smaller operators. 50 percent of my charter boat owners that I questioned yesterday said it would be quite a hardship to pay for a VMS. The others already had it, because they are dually-permitted.

You have been given other options to lessen the cost burden. They all know logbooks are important, but they don't want a financial burden that will have such a negative impact on their businesses. They need to feed their families and pay their bills. They are very honest people. They are not trying to get away with anything.

 It was indicated in the combined AP discussions this month that the reason some of the industry are pushing VMS is that the expense will indeed eliminate some of the operators who cannot afford it, giving themselves more allocation, again making winners and losers and redistributing the wealth to the winners, as in the commercial fishery.

Another observation is, when the report says "consensus", it is on the basis of cooperatively working on the document at hand.

In my case, and that of others, it is not because we want sector separation or catch shares or VMSs. Several of us agreed to work through the questions given to the AP, even though we preferred traditional management of seasons and bag limits.

1 2

If we go down this road in Amendments 41 and 42, designing and implementing catch shares, we will eliminate businesses in the industry. We need more days to fish with adequate bag limits and many species to keep our customers interested in this sport.

At our marina, there are forty-two boats that need a variety of fish with adequate bag limits and seasons to stay in business. With the current Amendment 42, on my husband's headboat, instead of forty-six days to fish for red snapper, we would have had fifteen to seventeen days, with only a one-fish bag limit, if this catch share amendment had gone forward. That's not acceptable, and it's certainly not good for any business to be forced into such restraints.

Do we need a good data collection program for charter boats? Yes. Do we need an improved method of measuring harvest data for private anglers? Yes, and we believe that that's coming with the states. Do scientists need every harvested fish counted in order to make sound decisions on the health of the fishery? No. You need more accurate, timely data than you have for charter boats, but you don't need the most expensive, most aggressive program.

Just with the private angler data that is coming online, plus a fair method of collecting data from charter boats, will be quite adequate to improve the accuracy of the catch levels significantly.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Anderson, can you bring it to a close, please, ma'am?

MS. ANDERSON: I will. This is my last little bit. In business, we are required to give the government many reports of state sales tax, corporate tax, state park fees for local access to an island, and they don't stand over my shoulder to see if I'm doing it right. They spot check and they watch for inconsistencies and they address those who are operating illegally, with the laws that punish them. You can do the same here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Ms. Anderson. Next, we have Mr. Bill Staff, followed by Mr. Troy Frady.

 1 MR. BILL STAFF: I'm Bill Staff from the Charter Boat Sea Spray. I've been charter fishing for thirty-five years. Thanks, Madam Chair and the council, for the opportunity to speak. Never more than now have we ever needed electronic logbooks. Guys, imagine having a fiscal year of forty-five days to try to make a living with no jacks, basically, and no triggers and no snapper, but a forty-five-day season. That's where charter/for-hire are.

8 9 10

11

12 13

2

4

5

6 7

> Many times, through the years, I've been uncomfortable with closures. This year, I feel threatened. We need real-time We need a hail-in and hail-out with an electronic I've been using CLS since June, and I've had no problems with it.

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Some of these closures might be a little easier to swallow if we knew these fish were being caught and by who. Who better to do a stock assessment than us, using the real-time data? I think, with no jacks and no triggers, I think it would be a good time for you all to look at possibly letting us have a few of the snapper that we've left on the table with Amendment 40. Please implement Amendments 41 and 42 with the multispecies at the same Cyclical distribution is a good plan and reallocation alone. Thanks.

24 25 26

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question, Mr. Staff, from Dr. Crabtree.

27 28 29

DR. CRABTREE: Bill, on the electronic logbooks, the issue of the GPS and having something affixed to the vessel so we can be sure that the position --

31 32 33

30

I have no problem with that. Mine is fixed in the MR. STAFF: tower right now.

34 35 36

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have one more question for you, Mr. Staff. You're going to get your exercise today.

37 38 39

MR. STAFF: I need it.

40

41 Thank you, Bill. Do you find it difficult to 42 operate your VMS system?

43

44 MR. STAFF: No, and I'm not computer literate either. Anybody 45 else?

46

47 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think you're free. Mr. Troy Frady, 48 followed by Mr. Wayne Werner.

1 2

MR. TROY FRADY: Madam Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Gulf Council, my name is Troy Frady. I'm a charter boat operator out of Orange Beach, Alabama. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

The first thing I would like to talk to you today is about data collection. We have talked about it, we've kicked it around, and we've finally got some real teeth, to where we can move forward with it.

I come from an industry where we had 19,000 employees, and all of them submitted daily logbooks, and the reason we submitted daily logbooks was from a DOT standpoint. It was for safety, but it was also from a compliance standpoint and trying to keep up with reconciliation of the data that was coming in.

Many of you have spouses that have had checkbooks, and they never reconciled their checkbook, and they ended up getting overdraft notices, and that made you feel very uncomfortable. Thinking back on my previous years and having had to deal with some insufficient funds notices at one time or another, through spousal failure to reconcile, I would urge you to encourage and develop the data collection program to where it's done daily, so you will know what you've got in your checking account.

I think a single unit attached to a vessel, a logbook that's permanently attached, would be the way to go. I have submitted over a hundred reports this summer, through the CLS program, and I found it very simple.

 It didn't take any time away from me or cause me to do anything that was unsafe, and there are a lot of people who are against electronic logbooks or having Big Brother know what's going on, but, you know, I look back on the years with the DOT and the transportation industry, and we never had the IRS come audit one of our DOT logs to figure out where we were operating in commerce.

I don't think we have to really worry about anybody coming there to take something away from us or to really spy on us. I am willing to sit there and give you every bit of information, like I did this summer, so we can have something that really works in the future. I just think the reconciliation and accountability and all of these things have to come into play in order to have a successful program.

If you allow me to wait until the end of the week, I am telling

you that I get brain fog at the end of the week, after doing seventy-two hours on the water, and the accuracy of my reporting will go down. The whole purpose of data collection is to improve the data collection.

4 5 6

7

8

2

When it comes down to Amendment 41 and 42, you all have introduced a white paper and wanting to get that rolling to do the multispecies and cyclical distribution, and that's fine, but I urge you to keep 41 and 42 moving along. Basically, I want to thank you so much for allowing me to go over my time, and thank you for allowing me to speak to you. I appreciate it.

111213

10

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Hold on. We have a question for you from Mr. Walker.

141516

17

18

19

MR. WALKER: I hope it's okay to ask this. A lot of people probably don't know that Troy was at MREP, and he was the moderator there, and could you speak for a few minutes about how you felt about how the science and the management part of that went, as far as with the constituents who were there?

202122

23

2425

26

27

MR. FRADY: Well, having been involved with the MREP Steering Committee, the Marine Recreational Education Program, for the past five years, it has enlightened me to see the need for education. The outreach that the program teaches and what it does for you is it gives you an opportunity to open dialogue and not close doors, but it opens doors, to where you can reach out to fellow fishermen.

282930

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

has an interest educating encourage anyone who in bettering themselves and wanting to know how federal fisheries are managed -- I encourage people to participate, and there is actually an opportunity for a few people to join that, but everyone that I've seen come through the program, I have seen them sit there in their chairs with their arms crossed at the beginning of the meeting, which means I am not willing to accept anything you're saying and they've closed off all dialogue, but, after a couple of days in the MREP program, I have seen people start relaxing and kicking back in their chairs, and they started interacting and asking questions. Why? Because they became educated on how federal fisheries is managed and how it works.

42 43 44

45

46

47 48 I think it's probably the best program that I've ever seen, because it takes the average person, and it diffuses and puts us all in a neutral environment, to where we can learn and understand from each other, and I'm real proud to be a part of that program. Thank you.

...

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I would ask anybody testifying, if they're a graduate of MREP, to just mention that. I know Mr. Zurbrick was, and there is some notices in the back about the upcoming workshops. We just got these this week, and so take a look at that and consider applying for sitting through the workshops. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Wayne Werner, followed by Mr. Mike Eller.

MR. WAYNE WERNER: Good afternoon. I'm Wayne Werner from Alachua, Florida, owner of the Fishing Vessel Sea Quest. I've been fishing out of Leesville, Louisiana for thirty-two years. I would like to say that this is our tenth year, ten years, with the IFQ system.

What you don't see up here is you don't see 90 percent of the fishermen coming up here and telling you how bad of a system it is and how it needs all this work. You don't see that. All we see is a lot of positive things. You hear positive things from the people.

I was part of the IFQ panel and, the use-it-or-lose-it, we were concerned about the environmentalists holding our fish. We didn't do it. I mean, we wanted it, and the council didn't do it. You know, I've been watching this process go along, and we have a good system. We have a lot of trading going on, but it sounds like it wants to be kind of interrupted and messed with in a way that isn't healthy.

It sounds to me like you want to kind of stop me from leasing any fish, which I always do to address bycatch in the eastern zone, and then, if I broke my leg and I didn't use the fish, then you're going to take them away from me. How does that make any sense? I mean, I just don't see it. I don't see where you all are headed with this amendment. I don't see where it's good.

 On the other hand, it's appropriate that it's Groundhog Day, because, when you look at the recreational fishery, it's definitely Groundhog Day. We're twenty years or twenty-five years into the same program, doing the same thing over and over again, and it's not working. You need to move forward. You need to use some inventive ideas, and you need to get with the program.

1 2

I just can't believe that the only option that you can come up with is trying to reallocate fish. There has got to be other ways, other ways to address problems, and that can't be it. As far as the mackerel, I like status quo. I would like to see it left alone.

With my last few seconds, I would like to make one comment about the VMS system. I have a CLS system on my boat, and it was down for almost six weeks last year. You have to have a backup. You have to have something to back it up. In my case, I wasn't allowed to go fishing during that six weeks, and so I want you all to keep that in mind. Thank you.

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

MR. MIKE ELLER: Madam Chair and council members, thanks for the opportunity to speak. I'm Mike Eller, a thirty-five year veteran charter boat fisherman from Destin, Florida. I am here in support of ELBs. I have an ELB on my boat. It's been on my boat for a little over a year now. It takes me about one minute, and that is no lie, one minute, to do my fish report. It is very, very, very simple.

I do it on the way in, and it's no big deal. If I forget about it, I do it on the way out the next morning. It's important that we have daily reporting. The other thing that is important is for us to push aside the naysayers and for us to finally -- All we hear from the naysayers and the bogeymen is how expensive it is and how terrible it's going to be and what a burden it's going to be.

I can remember my grandfather distinctly telling me that he was not going to wear a seatbelt, that he didn't believe in it and he thought it was dangerous. He thought it was terrible, but you know something? If you want to drive your car, you're going to wear a seatbelt. If you want to drive your car, you're going to submit to alcohol testing when the police pull you over. If you want the privilege of having a federal permit and fishing in the EEZ of the United States of America, then you need to report your fish on an approved electronic device that is attached to the boat.

It can be on something, but the antenna has got to be on the boat. It's got to be attached to the boat, and so it's very important. I have been coming to meetings for a very long time, and we've spoken about this for a very long time, and let's

please move the ball forward. Technology has caught up with us to allow us to do this now, and so we need to move it forward.

2 3 4

It's no big deal to do an electronic logbook. Last year, they were giving away VMSs, CLS was. Anybody in Panama City that said they can't afford one and it's a burden, they could have got one for free, and maybe they chose not to.

 Anybody that doesn't want a -- It doesn't have to be a VMS. If a VMS is the big holdup, then let's do something else, but, if you don't want a VMS on your boat, it's because you're doing something illegal. It's because you are so stuck in the past or you are doing something illegal that you don't want big government to -- Just like Captain Jim Zurbrick said, everybody thought that VMSs were this terrible thing on the commercial boats, and low and behold, they weren't. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Tom Wheatley, followed by Mr. Bubba Cochrane.

MR. TOM WHEATLEY: Good afternoon. I'm Tom Wheatley. I live, work, and fish in Tampa, Florida. I am here representing the Pew Charitable Trusts. We're in support of final passage of the charter/for-hire electronic logbook amendment. As outlined in our letter that we sent last Monday, we think it's important that stakeholders are involved in the design and also the implementation of the program after the regulations are approved.

We would recommend that potentially the council create a working group of NOAA staff and council staff and experienced charter captains and others that would essentially allow the stakeholders to have a seat at the table as this process actually moves forward.

As we all know, when this program is implemented, it has the potential to improve the quality and the timing of the data in the charter/for-hire sector. It can improve estimates of discards and release mortality that can be used in stock assessments, and it can also potentially allow for responsive, in-season management changes, and I think mainly, most importantly, as we're hearing here today at the podium for many of the stakeholders, is that it can increase confidence in the data that's being used to make management decisions.

Ultimately, as management certainty, over time, decreases or wanes, because of steps like this with using electronic logbooks and other things that need to happen, of course, we can see the

buffers that we're using between our annual catch targets and our annual catch limits decreased, and I think that's a goal that a lot of us share here, is actually providing more recreational fishing opportunities for folks like myself and others who actually utilize the charter/for-hire sector to get out on the water. That's all I had to say. I appreciate your time, and thank you for your hard work.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Bubba Cochrane, followed by Mr. Chris Horton.

MR. BUBBA COCHRANE: My name is Bubba Cochrane, from Galveston, Texas. I'm a commercial fisherman and a federal charter boat permit boat owner and President of the Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance.

The red snapper IFQ will not be improved with Amendment 36B. This amendment is so restrictive in nature that, if anything, it's going to cause real problems for commercial fishermen. I think this will be made clear when the amendment goes out for public comment and my sentiments are echoed by other commercial fishermen, particularly those who lease allocation to run their business.

Back in 2007, when the red snapper IFQ was implemented, my first thought was how are we going to get people to lease out allocation? Now, ten years later, this council is trying to keep individuals from leasing out red snapper allocation or make it so difficult that they don't bother.

I don't lease out any of my allocation. I catch every pound on my boat, personally. Now, if everyone who had shares did the same thing, I guarantee that 36B would look a lot different. Instead of restricting leasing, it would be forced, so other fishermen, including new entrants, could have access. I don't hear much complaining about shareholders leasing out allocation to fishermen that want it. I probably hear more complaints that I don't lease out my allocation.

In yesterday's council discussion on 36B, the concept of use-it-or-lose-it was brought back up. I thought this idea had been put to rest some time ago. The original fear was recreational groups or some NGO might buy up large amounts of shares and not harvest them and basically shelve them. It had nothing to do with people leasing too much of their quota and not catching it themselves.

In my opinion, as long as the quota is being harvested, it is

being used, whether by the original shareholder or by someone who has leased it. The bottom line is 36B is going to be a mere technicality. I believe Dr. Crabtree said it best yesterday, that people will find loopholes around these restrictions, and I think it is likely the very fishermen that are being perceived as taken advantage of are going to pay the price.

On corals, I believe it's important to protect corals. I also believe it's important to protect commercial fishermen's historical access to fishing grounds. There must be a way to work together to maintain both, instead of choosing one or the other.

Charter/for-hire, I would like to see the council continue to make progress with the Charter/For-Hire AP. I also like the idea of the cyclical distribution approach for charter boat allocation and continued development of electronic reporting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Chris Horton, followed by Mr. Dale Woodruff.

MR. CHRIS HORTON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I will be quick. I just want to speak, real briefly, on Amendment 29. We can't support this amendment at this time. There seems to be a lot of uncertainty, not the least of which is how many fish we're actually landing. I mean, there seems to be at least some indications, from the new and improved MRIP, that we may be landing more fish than what we think we are now.

 When we have a better picture, maybe that margin of what we're leaving in the water is not quite as big as it seems. To that point, leaving fish in the water, the whole optimum yield thing -- From a recreational angler's perspective, we don't have to maximize -- We don't fish to maximize every fish that we can harvest or take out of the water.

There is value in those fish being left in the water. There is value to encountering those fish. Whenever you go to the Gulf and there is no other season open, you can at least go out and catch kingfish with the family, and so there's value in that. How we measure that value, we don't do a very good job of that, and I think it's something that we need to put some emphasis on, in how do we get a handle on what is the true value of a fish left in the water or fish harvested for the recreational community.

It's not easy when you don't have a market to sell the fish to

and to count, from an economic perspective. Then the third reason is just from process. The AP, it seems like they, overwhelmingly, support the no-action alternative here, and so, anyway, thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Chris, thanks for the comments. I just wanted to know what your affiliation was.

MR. HORTON: I'm sorry. The Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Dale Woodruff, followed by Mr. Billy Neff.

MR. DALE WOODRUFF: Good afternoon. I'm Dale Woodruff, out of Orange Beach, Alabama. I have two boats, one multi-passenger and one six-pack that is dually-permitted. Right now, I'm going to speak for the Alabama Charter Fishing Association.

We, the members, are in full support of an affixed ELB system in our industry in Orange Beach and for the industry in the Gulf of Mexico. We have been asking for this, some type of system, some type of real-time data, for years now, ten years, or maybe even longer. I don't know.

NMFS has neglected and failed with the amberjack, and NMFS has neglected and failed with the triggerfish. Now we're looking at being neglected again if we don't get these ELBs on the boats and get some real-time data.

Now I'm going to step back and speak for myself now. Amendment 41 -- You can't pass Amendment 42 without 41, multispecies. It sounds good and sounds great. I would like to see what we're going to get out of it before I fully support it, but I am in favor, but, full support, I would like to see kind of what we're looking at.

To me, people that don't want the ELBs on their boats -- Some of them may have been fishing for years and some of them may just be getting into the industry, but we've got to move forward, quys. It's 2017.

People complain about things not working. I mean, they hop on their boats and they've got \$60,000 worth of equipment, or they awy have \$500 worth of equipment, but they're going out in the Gulf of Mexico and going fishing no matter what. If there is a problem with being able to afford one of them, call me. I will pay for it myself.

This is how strongly I feel about having some real-time data. I've got seven kids. One of these things costs about threegrand. I'm not going to pay for it monthly, but I will put it on your damn boat. That's how strong I feel about this. It's time to move on. How many more days, how many more years, are we going to keep doing this? Sorry for being a little too passionate.

I'm worried about not being able to catch all the fish for the charter/for-hire. I know I ain't got much time left, but, when the time for recalibration and reallocation comes up, I would hate for the charter/for-hire to lose fish because they're not able to catch at least 90 percent of what's out in the Gulf of Mexico, which we should be able to catch. Instead, the private recs keep the good fishing and they get the state seasons, and so they get to overfish, and the charter/for-hire gets punished again. That's got to stop. Thank you.

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

MR. BILLY NEFF: Good afternoon. My name is Billy Neff, and I'm with Class Act Charters in Orange Beach, Alabama. We have two boats. One of them is dually-permitted. I am definitely for the electronic logbooks on all charter/for-hire vessels. They work. We have them now and we use them. We have used it -- I have used it with the commercial side and the charter side. We've got to get data. It's the best way to get the data that we have to have so that we can make the decisions that we need to make.

We have used it since June of last year, and I ran a trip seven days ago, where, on that electronic logbook, I reported that, on a six-hour trip with four people fishing, we caught and released 108 triggerfish. That is insane, but I was able to report it. 108 triggerfish and forty red snappers, and we got to keep about seven fish on a six-hour trip.

If you can't report those kinds of things, then we can't make the decisions we need to make, and so we've got to have these electronic logbooks. They work. Some of us are using them now. They are very simple to use, and I don't know why anybody wouldn't want one. I support 41 and 42 and hope it moves forward, and thank you for your time.

1 2

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

MR. MIKE COLBY: Thank you, Madam Chairman and council. Thanks for taking my comments. In case there was anybody that missed it, and it's been out in the hallway, and this is it. This is the VMS unit made by CLS. You can stick it right on your console. It's about the size of a kitchen match box and that's it.

The interesting part of this unit is that the information flow from this to the satellite is ID protected. The position data, the sensitive position data, plus the catch reports, go through that protected pathway from the satellite right to the processing center, and it is mounted with a negative ground, twelve-volt system. It draws about one-half to three-quarter amp, about the same as a festoon bulb on a small boat in your bathroom. It's not much.

For my money, for my security, I prefer an ID-protected satellite pathway versus one where we have a data logger of some sort in an archived smartphone or tablet, where I then produce that data through the cellular environment, AT&T or T-Mobile or wherever it goes. That is a personal observation. I mean, any fisherman in here can take that one and massage it around any way they want, but, for me, I prefer that sensitive vessel position going through a satellite pathway versus a cellular network.

Quickly, on Monday, Dr. Stokes was asked a question, and correct me if I'm wrong, but, Robin Riechers, I think it was your question. It was about why, in our ELB project, there might be 10 percent or so that are not reporting, and I think she indicated that she would prefer to have that passed on to Bob Gill. Since Bob Gill isn't here, I thought he wouldn't mind if I just jumped in on that one, because I don't think she fully answered that.

I believe, and I say this guardedly, but I'm sure there is a very small number of fishermen that probably just game the system. Hey, I got a free VMS and I'm out of here, but the overall majority of our fishermen just got overwhelmed. I think they saw that -- They didn't go to the training sessions and they didn't go online to the training videos, and they got overwhelmed, and it just slipped right out their pathway.

The larger question is the frequency of reporting. As she tried

to put together in a presentation, matching a trip to a report, and that's pretty important, and that goes back to the frequency of reporting, and one of the solutions was to increase frequency of reporting by using a downloaded ping to the tablets, and that software, in this particular tablet that goes with this unit, it's already there.

You can ping a boat on a hail-out and hail-in an eighth of a mile from the dock, and for me, that's right around the fuel dock. For most people, they can turn around and shout at the dock from that distance, and so I think you can increase the frequency and pull together that three-hour, plus or minus, variable that she mentioned, that they tried to use as an equation to account for that lack of understanding of putting a trip to a report. That would be an excellent way to do it, and we could do that right now on our project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Hold on just a second, Mr. Colby. We have a couple of questions for you. Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Mike, I appreciate you thinking that I asked that question. I think it was someone else, but I do have a question for you. My question is, and because some folks have suggested that there are people saying they don't want ELBs -- I will be honest. I don't know what you're hearing, but I'm going to ask you. Is that what you're hearing, because that's not what I am hearing.

MR. COLBY: No, I will tell you, and I will dial this back a year-and-a-half ago, when I got on the phone and called over a hundred fishermen in the eastern Gulf, and there was a minority of them, a very small minority, that hung up on me. The minute I used the words "data collection", they just hung up.

 There was another small minority that said, look, I've been in this business for a lot of years and I don't want to be bothered with this, and then there was a larger group of those hundred or so people that I called that said that I see the value in doing this and I understand this and, as long as the platform is reasonable, I will do it. Then you had the rest of them that said bring it on and let's do ELBs.

MR. RIECHERS: Thank you for confirming that, because that's what I am hearing, is that the discussion is surrounding the platform and exactly when we report to reduce recall bias and not I don't want them.

MR. COLBY: Yes, right.

1 2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Just a second, Mr. Colby. Mr. Boyd has a question for you.

MR. BOYD: Mike, thank you. That is the first time I've seen a real VMS. What is your keyboard that you enter the data in. What do you use?

 MR. COLBY: It's a Google tablet that was specially designed for the project. It has internal parts that are vibration resistant and a weatherproof coating and vibration coating around it. It's about the size of -- It's smaller than a Kindle Fire, if any of your kids have those kinds of things. It's about that big, about like that.

MR. BOYD: Does it physically attach to the VMS?

MR. COLBY: No, sir. The minute you turn the tablet on, it powers up and makes a Wi-Fi connection that is unique to the boat to this box, and it doesn't matter if you're eighty miles offshore or if you're sitting at the dock. As long as you're within about fifty feet of your boat -- There it is. This is the tablet.

As long as you're within about fifty feet of your boat, you will get that Wi-Fi connection, and we did that on purpose, because we didn't want Hooters Restaurant or Starbucks Wi-Fi clogging the system up, and so it is Wi-Fi unique and unique to the vessel with its own TID number.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

MR. COLBY: You bet you.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Mike, for being here. I want to understand what you said during your three-minute testimony. At the end, you mentioned something about within an eighth of a mile of where the boat is normally docked and it would sense that you're crossing the line, so to speak, and you left your home port, your dock, your home dock, and then you crossed a line that would send a ping saying the vessel just left, and then it would do the same thing on the way back, and is that what I heard you say?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: One more. Hang on, Mr. Colby. Mr. Anson.

MR. COLBY: Yes, and, right now, this tablet already has that software downloaded to it. We can do that right now, and, after

listening to Dr. Stokes's presentation, particularly with how one of the problems in that calibration of the data was matching a trip to a report, and, if you remember one of the two slides, she indicated on there that one of the ways that she got around this in the initial calibration process for her was using the three-hour, plus or minus, window of when that vessel was pinged on the one ping per hour.

That's as close as she could get, and so there is a way to increase trip reporting frequency. There's a way to do that right now, and I will probably say that, in the second year of this ELB project, we're going to do that. It could be an eighth of a mile or it could be 400 feet. It's whatever, and it does fall back to the configuration of your home port.

For me, an eighth of a mile is -- I can throw a stone and hit our fuel dock at the Clearwater Marina, and that will be a special ping, one that is injected other than the one ping per hour that fishermen will get off of a traditional VMS as they move through their fishing trip.

MR. ANSON: Just, again, a point of clarification. You held up the pad and said the software is capable, but the pad can be turned on and off, and so it's really coming through the VMS, the other thing that you had in your pocket that you showed earlier. It's actually going to be checking, as that is affixed to the vessel and the vessel moves, it's that unit that's actually going to ping and not the handheld tablet that has to be activated or it can be turned on and off, correct?

MR. COLBY: I haven't -- I should have dug deeper into that, but that's a good question, because, right now, I can leave the dock and I don't turn my tablet on until I'm ready to go home. I've just got it in a bag in the bunkroom, because, right now, I am leaving and my hail-out is whenever I get pinged. Then I come back in, and I'm usually reporting three or four miles off the beach.

That is when I turn this on and make the Wi-Fi connection and then go and put in my time. I am estimating that I will get there at 14:30 or something like that. I will say this cautiously, and the CLS people, one of their techs, may answer it better, but I believe, to get that special ping, that in the morning that you would have to simply just turn the tablet on and set it aside. You wouldn't have to go monkeying around with it. Just turn it on so that it makes a Wi-Fi connection to the transmitter. Thank you.

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

MR. MIKE THIERRY: Thank you, all. I'm Captain Mike Thierry from Dauphin Island, Alabama. I've been fishing, charter fishing and headboat fishing and commercial fishing, for over fifty years from Dauphin Island.

Charter and headboats want and need the electronic logbooks. It's just time to do it, folks. We need this so that we can get good and timely data, so we can better manage the for-hire sector. Electronic logbooks will help make the for-hire sector more accountable, which we all seem to want.

I have had no problems with my electronic logbook that I have now, the CLS. It takes me, and I'm pretty slow, three to five minutes to program in what my day was. So far, it has been absolutely no problem. As a matter of a fact, I have enjoyed looking back on what I've caught and keeping the records and stuff like that.

No action on the king mackerel. I don't feel like there should be any allocation shifts at this time and just status quo with the king mackerel. There is too much uncertainty in it.

The triggerfish population has increased dramatically. I can't answer why. They are just there. They're really a nuisance now. It's time to reassess this triggerfish data as soon as possible, so we will be able to catch some of these fish that are out there.

You need to leave the red snapper commercial IFQ system alone. It is working. It's great for the fishery and the fishermen using this fishery who depend on it. If it's not broke, let's don't try to fix something that's not. Let's not waste time on this. It's valuable time that seems like it could be used somewhere else that would go to a better use.

We need to move forward with Amendments 41 and 42 and include multispecies in these amendments. The for-hire industry desperately needs the amendments to move forward as quickly as possible to get much-needed stability, both economically and socially in the for-hire sector.

Folks, we make a living at this. This is how we pay our bills. This is how we -- We have a substantial investment in our business. We're proud of what we do. I don't know how that enters into it, but this is how we pay our bills. It's how I

put my kids through school and how I'm able to do what I'm able to do. The fish is great, but we're small business people that make a living at this. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question for you from Mr. Boyd.

8 MR. BOYD: Thank you, Mike. You're a commercial fisherman, and you're dually-permitted, right?

11 MR. M. THIERRY: I have through the years, but, no, sir, not now. I decided not to proceed with it, but, through the years, 13 I have done it.

15 MR. BOYD: Okay. I think you have insight though. You said 16 that you're not for Amendment 29, the shift in allocation for 17 mackerel, because of uncertainty.

19 MR. M. THIERRY: In the status of the stock, yes, sir.

MR. BOYD: All right. Do you have other reasons? I would like to know if you have one or two other reasons that you're not for it other than just the uncertainty in the stock.

MR. M. THIERRY: This year, mackerel wasn't as good as I feel like what it should have been. We had some nasty water move in, and that affects our mackerel fishing, but I am not so sure the stock is where we think it's at.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

32 MR. M. THIERRY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Skipper Thierry, followed 35 by Mr. Robert Spaeth.

MR. SKIPPER THIERRY: Good afternoon. I am Skipper Thierry, a charter boat and headboat out of Dauphin Island, Alabama. I don't support any reallocation of the mackerel either. The mackerel in our area, and I can't speak to the whole Gulf, but, in our area, they've been smaller and fewer each of the last few years. The answer to that doesn't seem to be to catch more of them commercially or recreationally. That doesn't seem like that would be helpful.

I support the longline EFP. Allow fishermen to help solve their own problems, especially when it's as well thought out as this EFP seems to be. Also, if it's successful, incorporate it into their management plan.

Use the headboat EFP as a model to move Amendments 41 and 42 forward. The only negative that I am aware of in the headboat EFP was that it wasn't inclusive enough. More people wanted to do it. The ones that weren't in it, or some, weren't happy about that.

Please include the five species in 41. A multispecies approach would be more effective for providing the most access to the public. Focusing on red snapper does not meet the needs of the charter or headboat fleets, and that is very glaringly obvious from the multiple closures that we're going to have this year.

Please continue to explore the cyclical redistribution of fish as it was presented at the joint AP meeting. The idea was well received by almost everyone there and many people that I've shared that idea with since then. Please reconvene the charter and the headboat panels separately though, as soon as possible, before everyone gets busy for the summer. Both panels still have lots to work on.

Everybody has said it, and everybody knows it. Electronic logbooks are long overdue. Please move forward with the ELBs for all charter/for-hire. Daily reporting before you land your fish seems to be the most accurate reporting method, and the ELBs we used in the Headboat Collaborative just took a minute or two a day and gave very little trouble.

 Please don't focus your time on tearing down the commercial IFQ program. I mean, a year-round, multispecies system that doesn't overfish and is safer for the user and better for the fish and the fishermen doesn't seem to need a whole lot of adjustment. As a matter of a fact, I'm a little jealous of it. I would like to see you all focus instead on solutions that will allow the charter and the recreational sectors to have those same opportunities. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Just a second, Skipper. We've got a question for you from Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Hi, Skipper. On the electronic logbook and the positioning part of that, do you believe that it's important that some portion of that be affixed to the vessel, to verify where --

MR. S. THIERRY: I think it has to be affixed to the vessel, for accuracy. Whether that's just the GPS or the VMS, and it

doesn't make any difference to me, but it's got to be there for the accuracy, I believe.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. S. THIERRY: Thank you, all.

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

 MR. ROBERT SPAETH: Thank you, council members. My name is Bob Spaeth from the Southern Offshore Fishing Association, and I want to talk a little bit about the VMS. There have been a lot of positives that came from the VMS system, but, when we first started it, I was one of the people that helped negotiate it, and we were promised that it would be only used for enforcement purposes only. A couple of times, we had issues with it, and we have discussed it.

The other day, a newspaper article came out in the St. Pete Times, and I want to read a little excerpt from it: Commercial fishermen carry satellite trackers that show each hour of each day where they are. The scientists will combine that data with entries in the fishermen's logbooks showing where their catches were landed, et cetera, et cetera.

Well, we understand that you all need good science and you're using VMS data that you said that you weren't going to use, and we can deal with it, but the big problem is that I've got a document, and here it says "red grouper commercial hotspots" and that concerns us, and my phone blew up.

What I think would be good is if we could figure out, and I know that other people are looking at the VMS system, that you give some real guidelines of what information is going to be used and how it's going to be used, so that information that these people have created over the years and years -- We used to have a LORAN book that we carried around, and everything has gotten so sophisticated now. Times change, but we would hope, as you move forward, that you, council, would put up some guidelines, possibly, to take that into account.

 One of the other things that I will mention quickly is that we're very concerned in the grouper fishery that you have removed so much capacity, through different regulations. We've got turtles and we have the IFQ program, et cetera. Now we can't catch what we've been allocated. Then, yesterday, I heard the use-it-or-lose-it, and that would even complicate things

further. If we couldn't catch it, what would happen? It brings up all of those questions, and we hope that we come up with some good solutions other than the use-it-or-lose-it. Thank you very much.

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

MR. BOBBY KELLY: Good afternoon, council. My name is Bobby Kelly. I own and operate a dual-permitted vessel in Orange Beach, Alabama. I charter boat in the summer and spring and fall, and I commercial fish in the wintertime, to supplement my income.

I want to first address Amendment 41 and 42. Henry Ford once said that if we move forward together that success will take care of itself. I would like to see 41 further developed, only to be implemented at the same time as 42. We cannot leave the largest majority of the fleet behind to satisfy just a few businesses.

In doing so, in developing 41, I ask that you try and implement the multispecies approach into it. I believe that's favorable after this year that we've seen the closures on amberjack and triggerfish.

I strongly support ELBs in any form. Whatever tool that the council needs to make it palatable to the industry, I support that. I also believe that there should be a part of the system that is permanently affixed to the boat. There is no other way around that. It has to be attached to the boat.

It takes just a few minutes to report your catch at the end of the day, the end of the trip, and I personally have been asking this council to count every fish, that I am willing to count every fish, since my very first council meeting in July of 2013.

It's my understanding that this council is wanting to modify the IFQ system. I started commercial fishing in December of 2015. I received a CLS VMS and I leased a reef fish permit, and I acquired allocation that I was allowed to pay for after I caught Since then, I've been able to buy my own permit. actually paid for the \$5,000 worth of safety equipment that is required for the commercial inspection, and I've purchased all of the fish boxes, the bandit reels big commercial evervthing. I've got about \$25,000 wrapped up in this investment just to commercial red snapper fish.

 I lease fish. I wasn't around for the inception of the IFQ system. I am not mad and I'm not bitter about it. That's just the breaks. I am happy to have access to the fish that I do right now, but, when you guys start talking about changing this and use-it-or-lose-it, the first thing that's going to get cut out is the little guy like me that just started.

I don't have history by leasing these fish. I lost fish this year because of the shrinking fish. I wasn't able to get as much as I was. I was happy to have what I did get, but I don't think the council wants to put me out of business. I appreciate you all addressing this and trying to make the system better, I do, but there is other ways to do it.

The first thing is, if there's a way -- The Alaskans, they can borrow money to purchase IFQ shares. Hey, I borrowed money to start a charter business, and I don't mind borrowing money to purchase shares. No big deal, but we've got to have it federally backed. We can't federally back it as long as we're talking about changing shares and reallocating this and reallocating that.

I don't want any of their fish, of these shareholders' fish, because, when I'm old and gray like half these guys are, I don't want somebody coming after my fish that I've paid for. Most of this stuff is done as an investment, either monetarily or blood, sweat, and tears is how they got their shares. Other than that, and there is also 14,000 pounds in inactivated accounts. If you all want to help out the new guy like me, dole some of those pounds out. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I believe we have a question for you from Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I appreciate your testimony. You're the first I've heard of a new entrant.

MR. BOBBY KELLY: Yes, sir.

MR. BANKS: I have heard a lot about the current system doesn't allow for new entrants, and so give me a little bit more information on how you were able to make it work, so that I can better understand whether --

 MR. BOBBY KELLY: Permits are available, the commercial permits. They're available and they're out there. You just go and purchase one and put it on a boat, just like I did. I came into it and I leased a permit to start with, and I took all the money

that I made in 2016 and reinvested it right back into my boat. I didn't spend a dime of it on myself or personal. I bought a \$10,000 permit and I paid my credit card bill for the life raft, the flares, the EPIRB, and I was actually able to have a little bank rollup to purchase allocation for 2017. January 1, 2016, I shoved every penny I had into purchasing allocation so that I could fish for 2016.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Johnny Williams, followed by Mr. Scott Hickman.

MR. JOHNNY WILLIAMS: I'm Johnny Williams from Williams Partyboats, Incorporated, in Galveston, Texas. I'm a third-generation partyboat operator out of Galveston. I would like to urge the council to try to be expeditious and get 41 and 42 implemented as quickly as possible.

I urge 41 and 42 to be two separate documents. I was just at the AP meeting and, as you all know, we had a consensus that they should be operated as two separate documents, rather than one document.

We're probably a little bit farther along on 41, but we're willing to hold back and -- I'm sorry. We're a little bit behind on 41 compared to 42, but we are willing to slow down a little bit and wait for 41, but we don't want to wait long. We want to get this in place as quickly as possible. We don't want to drive the ball all the way down to the one-yard line and then fumble.

We believe that 41 should have multispecies. I think that's probably the best way to execute that fishery. We've got multispecies in 42, and I think the participants in 41 desire multispecies as well.

For these reasons, I think we need to move forward with 41 and 42. I think it would be a good idea to convene these panels separately again to work out a couple of issues that were brought up with the joint meeting. I think it was a very productive meeting, and I think that we can iron out some of these minor issues that we have in 42.

 Like I say, it's probably going to be a little bit more of a challenge to accomplish 41, but, the sooner we can convene these things, the sooner we can get them ironed out and be on our way with 41 and 42, which, as you all know, I've been a proponent of for a long time. I thank you very much for the opportunity to address you, and, if you have any questions, I will be happy to

accept them at this time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Williams, I believe we do have a question for you from Mr. Sanchez.

 MR. SANCHEZ: It's not a question, but I just want to say thank you for coming always and testifying and for your willingness, demonstrated willingness, to just come into the joint meeting and everything with a true spirit of compromise. It was something that I was impressed with, in watching everyone. The first day was a little bit of a dustup. Then, the second day, kind of everything coalesced, and I really appreciate that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Sanchez. I appreciate that, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Leann.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Scott Hickman, followed by 21 Mr. Mike Rowell.

MR. SCOTT HICKMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the Gulf Council. Thanks for letting us speak today. I'm Captain Scott Hickman from Galveston, Texas. I'm a new entrant in the IFQ system. I have both a federally-permitted charter boat and a commercial federal reef fish boat in Galveston, Texas.

I would like to see final action on the ELB amendment. I know that sounds like a broken record. I've been up here for about ten years saying that, and I can remember Harlon telling me that we were going to get this done before he got off the council. I am kind of thinking we will probably get final action when he's in like an old folks' home or something.

Anyway, let's move forward with this. We are way past due to get that done. I would like to see the council reconvene the Headboat and Charter/For-Hire APs, so they can finish up their programs, and I would like to see the council look at maybe doing some type of split season on greater amberjacks. All of our amberjacks are being caught in the eastern Gulf, before folks in Texas can even get their boats out. Something has got to be done on that.

 I would like to add an allocation redistribution system in Amendment 41. As far as Amendment 29, the kingfish whatever you want to call it, move fish over to the commercial side, I was just at the inauguration up in D.C., and the one thing that our

new President said was to put America first.

We import a lot of seafood in this country. A lot of it comes from Indonesia, places that are not so friendly to this country. We tried that with oil, and it didn't go real good for us. If we can utilize natural resources that we have here currently that are not being harvested that are usable, we need to be doing that for the American people. That's putting America first.

The Mexican lanchas, the nice presentation they gave us on that, being somebody that operates all over the Texas coast, we've got a huge, growing problem. It's not just all the illegal fish that are being taken back to Mexico and sold back to us illegally on the market. They're bringing drugs in and human trafficking. It's being funded by the Gulf drug cartels. It's a bad situation.

Texas Parks and Wildlife is doing a heck of a job trying to fight that. They're doing it in boats that are 1980 model boats on the stuff that can stay all night. They can't even stay out there, except for day boats. When the JEA stuff starts going again and you're looking at doing money, Texas needs a big boat to be able to help this.

People in the eastern Gulf, your fish are coming from the western Gulf. If they start beating them down on the west side, you're not going to have as many fish coming to the east side, so Florida and Alabama can continue to catch the numbers of fish they've been catching, and so this Mexican illegal fishing thing can grow to the point where it's going to affect everybody. That's it. I appreciate it, and you all have a great day.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mike Rowell, followed by Ms. Lisa Schmidt.

 MR. MIKE ROWELL: I'm Mike Rowell from Orange Beach, Alabama. I'm a charter boat operator and owner. I would like to see us, like most everybody has said, go ahead with the VMS. We have them on our boats, most everybody in Alabama does, and we have had very little trouble. I am not going to reiterate most of what everybody has already said, but I am in favor of that.

I am going to change the subject a little bit, since there's been a lot of good things already said about most of these issues today. I am still frustrated, as a fisherman, with the lack or the lag time in the data and what we're actually seeing out there in the fishery.

1 2

There is a lot of waste going on, and it makes me sick. We've got zero triggerfish this year, and, yes, I would say that the triggerfish population, in my opinion, from what I saw, was down for a couple of years. Now, last year, all of a sudden, and I can't tell you why, but they're everywhere.

Sometimes we can't catch snapper to get to the amberjack. That's the way it used to be. We would say we would have to beat the triggerfish down to get to the snapper, and it's getting that way again now. There are so many triggers, and they're huge.

We used to not see hardly any release mortality from triggerfish. Now we're catching so many that we're having release mortality, and so you can't -- It's almost like we have a plan to make sure that we fail, because we are wasting fish. We're just passing up the fish that are abundant and trying to get to the fish that are not abundant, and it just doesn't make sense.

I wish there was some kind of way that we could figure out a way not to kill the fish that are plentiful to get to the fish that are not plentiful. It just does not make any sense to me. I would love to see some kind of way where we could keep the first ten fish or whatever it is, five fish, some reasonable amount of fish, and keep them and throw them in the boat.

If they're reef fish, once you get your limit of reef fish, start trolling and do something else. The people would be happy. I would be happy. We would take care of our resource. We wouldn't burn as much fuel. I mean, it would just be better for everybody, all the way around, but, now, we're struggling to bring home a nice catch of fish, and we're watching fish float off behind the boat dead. It makes no sense whatsoever, and I am just as frustrated as I can be about it. That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Ms. Lisa Schmidt, followed by Mr. Jim Clements.

MS. LISA SCHMIDT: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Lisa Schmidt, and I am the owner of three commercial vessels in Madeira Beach, and this is only the second time to give testimony. Last year, in Clearwater, was my first time, and it's only slightly less terrifying. Besides, I would much rather be packing fish down at the docks than standing up here, but I would like to weigh in on three things that you're

discussing this week.

 Amendment 36B, based on what I've heard this week and read online, this amendment doesn't seem to have a clear goal in mind. If the goal is to improve the performance of the red snapper program, there needs to be an explanation of how the proposed ideas will actually do that. Most, if not all, of what I've read seems to be restricting and not improving the program.

I hope that you spend some time at this meeting and the next one really trying to figure out what it is that you want to do before you dive right in and put the cart before the horse and start to destabilize this fishery.

Corals, this is a touchy one, but an important one to talk about, and I'm a very avid scuba diver and spear fisherwoman, and I do appreciate the value and the beauty of corals, but I don't think that closing off areas of the ocean is the only way to do this. These are historical fishing grounds, where fishermen have historically done a good job of avoiding corals. Let's find a way to make sure that responsible and selective fishing can continue to take place here in a way that protects these important areas.

The Shareholders' Alliance EFP, I have been working with Mote Marine Laboratory for over a year now testing cameras on my boats, and I plan to be a part of this EFP. We have worked a lot of the bugs out of the system, and we're still doing it, and data collection protocols, and we're operating pretty smoothly right now.

This EFP is going to build on the work that my captains and I have done, and I think it's going to be really successful. This is a voluntary program, so that the guys that join are the ones that really want to find a way to catch more of the red grouper we're allowed to, while at the same time avoiding running into sea turtles. I hope you will keep an open mind and recommend to National Marine Fisheries that they work with us to implement this program this summer. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you very much, Ms. Schmidt. Next, we have Mr. Jim Clements, followed by Mr. Greg Abrams.

MR. JIM CLEMENTS: Hello. My name is Jim Clements, and I'm a commercial fisherman from Carrabelle, Florida. I would like to address all my comments to Amendment 36B. There is nothing in this amendment that meets the purpose and need or that improves the IFQ program. In fact, most of the options hurt it.

1 2

Mr. Walker asked repeatedly yesterday what problems each option would solve, and not one council member could give an explanation. I have leased 65,000 pounds of red grouper each year since the beginning of the IFQ program. Everyone who needs allocation has arrangements with people who do not fish their allocation.

 If you require shareholders to have a permit, if they can find one, and that's a big if, they would have to buy a boat, a VMS, and they will fish their allocation, and the 65,000 pounds of red grouper allocation won't be available to me, my captain, or my crew. With only the shares that I own, we can't operate, and we will be put out of business.

I also lease 10,000 pounds of red snapper allocation, which won't be available to me, because they will fish this, too. The 10,000 pounds of red snapper that I will incidentally catch will go back in the water dead, and that means that 20,000 pounds of red snapper will be killed and only half will be available to the public. Is this conservation?

There is a big elephant in this room, and you council members don't want to talk about it, and don't even want to admit that it's here. The name of that elephant is Jealousy. Opponents of the IFQ program are jealous that it works for the benefit of the commercial fishermen, that it provides real-time reporting, that it prevents quota overages, and that it enables commercial fishermen to make a little money. This council should concentrate on things that conserve the fish and protect the fishermen and not destroy them. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Greg Abrams, followed by Mr. David Krebs.

MR. GREG ABRAMS: I'm Greg Abrams from Greg Abrams Seafood. Roy, you have worked for the government for a long time, and you make a pretty good salary, but you've got a great retirement coming. I lease a lot of fish from fishermen that have retired for independent boats that is young, that is catching pinks and amberjack and b-liners that need that, and I lease fish from some widows that their husbands died and left it to them for retirement.

The leasing program has worked. There is some young people that is getting into the business in Panama City, and it's enabled them to fish, and we need the leasing program. It's essential, because a lot of them don't have the finances, and so we have to

lease them for them and give them 250 to 500 pounds per trip.

It's a good program. It has worked. Five years ago, when you all made it to the public and anybody could buy them, nobody bought them. Everybody was scared. We didn't want it. You all wanted it, but we didn't want it. The CCA wanted it, but nobody -- We were scared that the environmental groups were going to buy them up and sit on them and tie them up, but it didn't happen, and so nothing has changed. There is no problem, and I don't know who is trying to create this problem, but please continue to work on the leasing program. It's working.

Next, we've been working on amberjack for ten years here, and it ain't changed. January and February and March, it closes. Then in May and June -- It opens up in June for one month and it's closed. We are derby fishing amberjack, small boats catching 1,500 pounds and running in and out. Restaurants won't put it on the menu, because it's not consistent. We've got amberjacks that is getting too big. Seventy or eighty or ninety-pound amberjack, they're everywhere.

Triggerfish, twelve per boat on an average commercial boat, went, for me, from seventy pounds to a hundred pounds, twelve fish, and not high-grading, not high-grading. That there, you need to work on amberjack and to get it back on the menu, so we don't have to buy them off of the east coast and from Mexico.

Next, on the grouper, you know a lot of people ain't been here long. Fifteen years ago, we had over 200 longline vessels in the Gulf of Mexico, mostly on the eastern Gulf. 200, and we're down to sixty-four or sixty-seven permits. You all know in June and July and August where the red grouper are at. They're inside of thirty-five fathoms. They're in twenty fathoms, or eighteen to twenty.

 Open it back up, like you do snapper. Go catch your quota where you catch them. It doesn't need to be closed. I don't know why we closed it. I know why we closed it when we put a lot of boats out of business, but now we've got it down to sixty-seven. We could catch the fish, but we've got to go inside to catch them. In the pilot program, if it's there, try and get it to work. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Just a second, Mr. Abrams. We have a couple of questions for you. Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Greg, for your testimony. You have longline operations out of Panama City. Have you had a chance

to look over the exempted fishing permit? What it does is, if it goes through, it would allow eight longliners out of Madeira Beach only to test out an electronic video system that would go into that closed area that is partially what you were referring to

It would enable those pilot boats to catch or longline fish for the red grouper, but this system, this video system, would be able to survey where the turtles were and hopefully not -- It would be an effort not to impact the turtles, catch the turtles, and do you -- What's your thinking on it, because you've been doing this for a long time.

MR. ABRAMS: I've cameras on my tuna boats, and you've got pros and cons, as far as working. I just want to see the program enacted, because we fished there for so many years, where we caught our quota, and we should be fishing there now, and so if it takes it -- I think everybody should get a chance, a lottery system, to get a chance, because he's in there fishing and you're outside fishing and you're not catching and he is catching, it's going to -- That's the way it bounces, but I think it should be equal, a few boats in the Panhandle and a few boats in south Florida, and mix it up.

I try to tuna fish in the months that we're pushed outside, but we need to get inside, and the science is there, and the scientists know it's there, but they just don't want us in there for some reason, but you all need to get this program working. It will prove the point, and we will catch our quota then. We won't have so much fish left on the table. We will catch our quota.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker has a question for you too, I believe, sir.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Greg. I have two questions. About the gag, twenty-two or twenty-four inches?

 MR. ABRAMS: Me in the Panhandle, we had a great year, and I'm twenty-two. That way -- If you go to twenty-four and you've got to throw him back, he's not going to make it back. You can vent him, and he won't make it. He will go back belly-up. Then you've got discards, and that's not what we're trying to achieve here, and so I'm twenty-two. We came close to this year to filling the quota.

47 MR. WALKER: Also, on king mackerel, do you have any comments on the king mackerel?

MR. ABRAMS: Yes. The eastern Gulf got treated like the redheaded stepchild. We ain't -- By the time the king gets here, and they just get here, and the season is closed and we haven't got our quota yet, and we got it taken away like seven or eight years ago, and there is plenty of king mackerel.

I think, in Monroe County, they keep their kings and the fishermen in the Gulf keep their kings and no swapping. You don't need to swap fish. That causes chaos and a lot of paperwork. Leave it like it is, but the eastern Gulf needs their fair share of king mackerel. It will take the pressure off of other species, because there is plenty of king mackerel. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Next, we have Mr. David Krebs, followed by Mr. Richard Fischer.

MR. DAVID KREBS: Thank you, Madam Chair and council. My name is David Krebs. I own Ariel Seafoods in Destin, Florida, and I also have a fish house in Sebastian, Florida, on the east coast. I buy king mackerel on the west coast, the east coast, the western Gulf, and the Panhandle of the Gulf.

I am going to start my comments today, and I hope that I can read through this. My good friend, Steve Rash, sent you all an email. He owns Water Street Seafoods, and he asked me to read his statement. He wanted to come over here, and he has promised to be more involved in the future. Here it goes.

 My name is Steven Rash, and I owned and operated Water Street Seafood in Apalachicola for over thirty years. Water Street Seafood employs sixty people and processes and distributes seafood to customers all over the country.

One of our main markets is the Gulf Coast. Water Street Seafood buys fish from over twenty boats and from many other fish dealers on the Gulf Coast to distribute to the restaurants on the Gulf Coast. Of these, locally-harvested grouper and red snapper are the two most popular products. Tourists and visitors come to the Gulf Coast to enjoy our local seafood, and snapper and grouper are the top two items that the restaurants need to offer to our visitors.

The IFQ programs implemented in the red snapper and grouper/tilefish fisheries have stabilized our supply and access to these fish. Water Street Seafood has invested millions of dollars to ensure that we have quotas for our boats. Any

restriction on use of the shares and allocations would have a disastrous effect on Water Street Seafood.

2 3 4

The system is working, and there is no need to change it now. Market price for shares and allocations have been established. If restrictions are imposed on the use and transfers of shares and/or allocations, Water Street Seafood itself stands to lose millions of dollars and dozens of jobs.

In addition, our fishermen will lose millions of dollars in quota value, as well as many other jobs. Hundreds of jobs are at risk in the restaurants and markets that depend on the commercial fishermen and the snapper and grouper they produce. Steve just wanted me to convey that the IFQ is working and happy tenth birthday to the red snapper IFQ. It's been the most successful fishery plan that I have seen in my forty years of being associated with this industry.

Real quickly, on king mackerel, I support what Mr. Haddad said. This is not the time to discuss allocation sharing in this fishery. We've got major changes this year that are going to take effect, if ever approved with Ms. Sue, and we're going to have extra fish in the Panhandle, 300,000 pounds of that fish that's produced in late fall, right before Christmas, before those fish leave to head to the Keys, and the western Gulf is going to get a bump too, and so we don't -- The recreational harvest has changed. We don't know what consequences are going to come from this additional harvest of these migratory fish as they're moving because of the historical spawn. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a couple of questions for you. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Hi, David. I know there are a lot of dealers who are shareholders. Are there a lot of dealers who are shareholders but don't own vessels or have permits or do most dealers who are shareholders also have some ownership interest in a vessel and a permit?

 MR. KREBS: I think the evolution has been most of the dealers had boats at one point or time, and a lot of dealers have looked at the liability side of it. I had eight boats at one time, and now I have three and I'm fishing two. One thing is we consolidated, and so all the boats I had are attached to Class 1 licenses, but when the IFQ came out, because of the formula, I didn't end up with a third of the fish that I had that I could catch under the Class 1 licenses, and so I think that changed a lot of the dynamics of who kept boats.

In the case of Steve Rash at Water Street, he leases a lot of snapper from me, and I think from the Shareholders' Alliance, to cover bycatch for his grouper boats, because he's predominantly in the Apalachicola grouper fishery. I think that the dealers that are left have some shares. I don't think any dealer that's left has enough shares.

DR. CRABTREE: Right, but are there any dealers who have shares and don't own any boats at all?

12 MR. KREBS: I can't speak for that. I have boats, and so we're 13 a dealer.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker has a question for you.

MR. WALKER: David, I would like to hear some comments on your size limit of gag grouper from twenty-two versus twenty-four.

MR. KREBS: I was on the Reef Fish AP, and I'm also on your Mackerel AP, and the AP on mackerel was unanimously against any allocation sharing. Then, to the grouper point, last year was the closest we had been to filling the gag quota on the commercial side in years, and that was on the twenty-two-inch size limit.

The discussion at the AP level was that the biggest reason to go to twenty-four was that it would take the pressure off of the difference between recreational fishermen and commercial fishermen at a dock that was complaining that it was unfair that the commercial industry had a two-inch advantage, and so I think the thing is we have a resource that we need to catch. We don't need to encourage discards.

We're no different than red snapper. We fish on a different size limit for different reasons on red snapper. We don't want to have discards in our fishery. We don't want to catch, necessarily, the trophy fish. We want to leave fish in the ocean and keep moving forward, and so I think, from the commercial perspective, catching the harvest with minimal discards is to the benefit of the resource for us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Richard Fischer, followed by Mr. Ed Walker.

 MR. RICHARD FISCHER: Hello, council and Madam Chairwoman. Thanks for having me here today and letting me speak for a few minutes. I am here representing the Louisiana Charter Boat

Association, and I will keep my comments today strictly on the electronic logbooks discussion.

2 3 4

As for VMS, from talking to the majority of our captains, they are staunchly opposed to VMS. They do not want to be tracked real time. They would much prefer a less stringent system that doesn't track them real time.

The council's technical committee agrees, as we heard at previous meetings, and so hope that this is something that you all are going to consider, minimum archived GPS, and that should be just fine. We have had some of our captains be able to kind of look at some prototypes of different types of devices, and one thing that a lot of them think is pretty cool is this kind of map to where they can have different general regions and kind of click a little bit and click on each region and generally say where they are, as opposed to being tracked with a VMS/GPS device.

As for it being affixed to the vessel, that is also something that, from talking to the majority of our captains, that they are opposed to. They would much rather have a less cumbersome device, one that they can take with them, and so we hope that that's something that can maybe be looked at, and we know that, with kind of the wording in the amendment, "National Marine Fisheries approved hardware/software", that might be a little bit more difficult to get around, but it's something that is our captains' wishes, and it's something that we hope that it's something that you all will also consider whenever you vote tomorrow.

Finally, when discussing daily reporting or weekly reporting, our captains would be in favor of weekly reporting as to daily reporting, and we want to thank you all for having a discussion on that on Monday. However, it kind of didn't really look like there was much steam on weekly reporting, and so, if daily is the way we're going, we would like it if the council would consider it being due by noon the next day, as opposed to having to report on the way into the dock.

In Louisiana, we've got several center console six-pack boats that just aren't as big as a lot of these boats that you see in other parts of the Gulf, and so it's a much more cumbersome process for our captains to have to report while driving on in and navigating tough waters. There is plenty of logs in the Mississippi River at various times of the year, and it's much more treacherous terrain in not quite as luxurious boats in Louisiana, and so it's something that we hope that you all would

consider looking at also.

With the discussion earlier this week about in the South Atlantic and about how they have a headboat survey, which is weekly, and so they're going to go ahead and make the six-pack charter boat survey weekly also, I know it's daily reporting, but we submit weekly for the Beaufort Survey here in Louisiana and as well as the rest of the Gulf, and so, in a lot of ways, the same argument could be used there. I am past my time, and thank you all so much. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have one question from Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: You've been in here and heard the testimony. A lot of these guys who already have the logbooks, almost everyone has testified, said it takes two or three minutes to fill out your report and submit it. Why is that so cumbersome or difficult? I am having a hard time understanding that.

MR. R. FISCHER: It's because of the terrain that our captains have to traverse through, as opposed to some of the other captains across the Gulf, as well as the type of boats that we have compared to -- When you look at it from a percentage standpoint, we're almost entirely small vessels here in Louisiana, and so feel like a lot of those opinions that you're given come from much bigger boats. Some have enclosed areas where the captains operate their vessels, and so it seems like an argument could be made that it would be an easier process for them, as opposed to the captains from Louisiana.

DR. CRABTREE: Where your guys are fishing, when they're running in, there is no point on the whole trip where they could stop for two or three minutes and submit a logbook?

MR. R. FISCHER: I didn't say it was impossible. I said it was difficult, more difficult.

DR. CRABTREE: Thanks.

41 MR. R. FISCHER: Thank you, Dr. Crabtree. Anyone else?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we have a question from Mr. Walker.

 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Richard. You said that the majority, and so I guess you have some members who are not opposed to have a fixed antenna, where you could still have a device that you could carry with you, but the antenna would remain on the

vessel. There are some people that would still support that? The devices still could be portable.

MR. R. FISCHER: Right, and I think that would be something that they would be much more open to, yes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. R. FISCHER: All right. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Ed Walker, followed by Mr. 12 Jason Delacruz.

MR. ED WALKER: Thank you very much. My name is Ed Walker, and I'm from Tarpon Springs, Florida. I am on the Mackerel AP. I'm a commercial king fisherman, I'm a recreational king fishermen, and I'm a charterboat king fisherman, and so I'm a little bit of everything when it comes to kingfish.

I didn't have a really strong opinion about Amendment 29 at first, but I thought about it a lot, and I've read all the material that they gave us at the APs, and I don't believe that this is the way to go, the allocation sharing from the recreational side to the commercial side, and I can tell you -- As Mr. Boyd asked earlier, of can you give me some specific reasons, and I have a list of reasons. Actually, I have emailed them all to you, but it wasn't very long ago, and so they're probably in your file somewhere.

The first reason against quota sharing from king mackerel from the recreational to the commercial side is that the AP has voted it down three times, and the AP is made up of people from a variety of regions and a variety of backgrounds. We've got tournament kingfish guys in there and we've got David Krebs, who buys all the kingfish in the whole Gulf of Mexico, and all of them keep saying the same thing.

 Look, we've thought about this, and it's a really good AP. There's a lot of smart guys in there, and it's been kicked around this way and that way, and we keep coming back to the same thing, that we don't feel like it's the right thing to do, and I agree with them.

 Number two is the unexplained anomaly in the recreational landings that we don't really know where that came from, and that could cause a problem if that does that again. I mean, I know there is some safety valves built into the idea, but it would be a tragedy if the recreational guys ended up getting

closed by some oversight when they were handing something off the other way.

2 3 4

The increased bag limits for the recreational side, going to three, we don't know what that's going to do to the landings. Along those same lines, a likely effort shift, now that amberjack is going to be closed and triggerfish is closed and red snapper closed, and kingfish is going to become a bigger thing for charter boat guys. You've got to be able to bring something back to book a charter, and so I would expect some charter guys to be marketing kingfish a little more than they did in the past, because that's how they're going to put people on their boat. Hey, come on out and kingfish is open.

You're going to get an effort shift on the recreational/charter side. How big, we don't know yet, but I would be cautious about that. We're getting an increase Gulf-wide on king mackerel commercially anyway. Amendment 26 has, I believe, already passed, and so most of the zones are already getting an increase.

Probably the thing that pushed me over the top was what I call decreasing recreational or charter opportunity. If you take 900,000 pounds of fish out of the Gulf, statistically speaking, the fishing for kingfish isn't as good as it was before that, and it could be argued that recreational quota is best allocated when it provides a robust fishing opportunity for recreational fishermen rather than transferred to a handful of commercial guys to sell for two-dollars a pound. There might be a market crash, or maybe not a crash, but a reduction in value of kingfish if this transfer takes place.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker, you're out of time, but I would like to hear the rest of your reasons. If you will just keep going, I would appreciate it.

 MR. WALKER: Thank you, ma'am. Reason Number 8 of 10 is the vast majority of stakeholders don't want it. Look around the room. None of the recreational guys want it and some of the commercial guys want it. I don't, and some of the other guys don't. The AP doesn't want it, and so where is the need for this?

A couple of commercial guys would like to have some increased allocation, and I understand that, but I don't really see a pressing need to go forward with it, and then there is the small fish thing. There is the strange small fish thing going on in the Gulf right now, and nobody seems to really have a good

answer for it. It could be cause for some concern. I'm not sure, but, off the top of my head, that's ten reasons.

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

MR. WALKER: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Jason Delacruz, followed by Mr. Shane Cantrell.

MR. DELACRUZ: Thank you, everybody. I will try to be real quick. On Amendment 36A, one of the biggest things that I think that I support is three-hour notice for all reef fish trips. I think that is at least the beginning of plugging up some of the loopholes in our system.

36B, I am literally scratching my head, but I understand the reason the agency wants to go through this exercise, because there is so much heat, so many people that want to complain about this or that, even though we don't, but I kind of feel like, unfortunately, we're in that movie <code>Backdraft</code>, where we're going in and setting the fire. Then it catches fire and then we come in with a fire extinguisher, and we're the ones that set the damn fire.

I don't know that we have a problem, but I see the value, I guess, in the exercise, that we can go through it and talk about it, and I really hope that, at the very least in this amendment, is that we put a lot of very specific, concerted time in talking about it and you guys take the time to ask the questions of us, so that we can explain to you things, because, really, the only thing I think you're doing, in the long run, is you're going to actually consolidate more, because any people that are small shareholders, that are on the fringe that are just leasing a little bit of quota here and there, like they've got a couple thousand pounds, those guys are going to divest, and it's going to consolidate into more big guys' hands, which you don't want, which doesn't seem to be like you discussed that you want.

I don't know whether that's the smart play or the bad play, but it seems like it's going in the wrong directly completely. Just really, really spend time and energy on that.

Also, personally, I would like to thank you guys for the questions with the EFP and thinking a lot about it, and we tried really hard, and I think this is one of the things that I really believe in, which is putting really good thought into solving our problems with technology and things that are coming down the

pipe, so that we can actually have more robust fisheries.

I understand that there is worry, and there is worry on my side, too, trust me. My entire business is predicated on the landings of red grouper. I am one of the top guys these days, and I don't want to hurt myself, but, on the same token, I think this makes complete sense. I think all the reasons in the world are to get in there and do it and to use the cameras the right way, and we have put a lot of energy in these cameras, getting out there and testing them to make sure that we can do this the best way we can. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Shane Cantrell, followed by Mr. Jason Klosterman.

MR. SHANE CANTRELL: Hello. I'm Shane Cantrell. I'm the Executive Director of the Charter Fishermen's Association. We're the largest federally-permitted fishing for-hire association in the region.

The CFA is committed to working constructively with the council to address the issues facing professional fishing businesses. We have submitted written comments to the council outlining a broad suite of things facing our federally-permitted businesses. I want to touch on a couple of them and some other ones as well.

 This council needs to support improving management for professional fishermen, commercial and charter boats. Ill-defined attempts to weaken the commercial management system should be supplanted by a focus on working towards solutions in the charter boat and private angler portions of the fishery. That is where we have problems in accountability, that's where we have problems in overages, and let's fix them. That's what we need to be here to do.

Amendment 36B, without defined goals and intent, is a distraction on the progress of the charter/for-hire and private angler segments of the fishery. This council is tasked with a difficult issue facing every segment of this fishery, and each of you were nominated and entrusted by your governors and the Secretary of Commerce to face these problems.

 There is a lot of them, and they're difficult, but that's what you've been entrusted to do. Identifying that they're hard isn't going to find a solution. We know that they're hard. We're the ones that are living them, and there is nothing harder than trying to run a business in a closed season. It just doesn't work. We need to get those fixed.

Considering the preliminary landings of the recreational sector for 2016, I would like to highlight an opportunity for this council to address subsector-specific accountability measures within the recreational fishery.

 We've got a significant overage on the private angler component, and we've got a significant underage in the charter/for-hire component. This is de facto reallocation, and this is a problem, and we need to get that addressed. We've got an opportunity to further charter/for-hire management under Amendment 41, with the multispecies comprehensive charter/for-hire management plan. We could add cyclical redistribution to that. It seems like it holds a lot of promise.

The difficulties identified in developing a stable and flexible business plan are not nearly as difficult as trying to run a business in these closed seasons. Amberjack is likely going to close, triggerfish is already closed, and red snapper is going to have some type of a season, and that makes it really difficult.

Electronic logbooks, the opportunity for more accurate and more timely data is finally here, and we've got the opportunity to get this council to do it. Let's approve it with the preferred alternatives and move it forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Jason Klosterman, followed by Mr. Mike Jennings.

 MR. JASON KLOSTERMAN: Good afternoon, council and Madam Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Jason Klosterman, and I'm a second-generation charter fisherman from Destin, Florida.

Today, I would like to see the council pass the electronic logbook amendment allowing the for-hire/charter sector to utilize more accurate and timely data collection in a multispecies facet.

This will allow the fishery to better understand not only how much red snapper each region is harvesting, but other highly-targeted species as well. ELBs will bring to light many permits that are active versus inactive, as well as historical captains' licenses, and I believe this is a necessary tool and this is an issue that we need to bring to light.

Recently, I attended the Headboat and Charter/For-Hire AP

meeting. I believe this was a very productive meeting that left with me with the conclusion that Amendment 41 and 42 are complex issues that we need to continue working toward a multispecies program. Adding cyclical redistribution in Amendment 41 will allow a fair and efficient transition of data from active participants.

Something else that I would like the council to keep in mind when we talk about costs with permits is I'm twenty-nine years old, and, like I said, I'm a second-generation fisherman. For me, getting in right now, I operate vessels under other owners, but, before the next time we convene, I will be acquiring a vessel and permits, and the cost right now -- I would say that I see, on average, between \$15,000 and \$20,000 for a charter/for-hire reef and pelagic packaged together and about the same price for a commercial reef fish permit.

Now, if you look back, prior to 2004, when we implemented the moratorium on charter reef permits, guys didn't have to go pay \$20,000 to get a reef fish permit. My father didn't, but what I will say is that I'm willing to pay this cost if this gives me some added security in my investment in the long run, the same way that you hear guys stand up right now and talk about how allocation and leasing benefits their retirement.

Well, to me, personally, if I have to put more into my business right now, so that when I get to some of these other gentlemen and ladies age, where I want to retire, if that's going to be there, then that's certainly worth it, to me at least, to pay that extra cost now so that I can benefit from that in the future. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Mike Jennings, followed by Mr. Clark Trosclair.

MR. MIKE JENNINGS: Hello. I am Mike Jennings. Council and Madam Chair, I appreciate you all letting me speak today. I am the President of the Charter Fishermen's Association, and I own two federally-permitted charter boats. My company operates three, and, like I need another job, I'm now the managing partner for Gulf Coast Marina in Freeport, Texas.

As an association, we support the white paper. We would like to see the council staff and what they come up with and help us look at the possibility or the ability to move 41 forward as a multispecies. We think that's necessary to make those two amendments more palatable to the industry, and we support adding the cyclical redistribution to 41, and it seems like a pretty

ingenious way of equaling things out over time.

 Mainly, today, I want to focus on the electronic reporting and the electronic logbooks. We would ask you to move forward with this. We have asked, for years now, that we move forward with some kind of electronic reporting, and we support the current preferred alternatives that the council has chosen at the moment.

When it comes to the electronic reporting, I think that you need to take into consideration the people who have actual experience with what's being used. I personally was involved in Dr. Stunz's iSnapper program. I did it one year on an iPad and then I moved it to the iPhone. I wanted to see it on both formats, and I used for one year and one the next and one the next, and it was actually very simple. There were some little bugs early on, but they were really fast to fix those, and I also volunteered for the recent CLS ELB.

I did it simply -- Regardless of what the outcome was, I wanted to personally have that thing on my boat, in my hands, and see what it was like and have that personal experience, rather than standing up here falling victim to the word "VMS" being demonized and used as profanity in some circles, and I think that it's become evident to me that it was really simply to use and really easy and not intrusive, and we've used them everywhere from -- You had Shane Cantrell up here a few minutes ago, and he's got a twenty-seven-foot Contender, and it's been almost flawless on his boat. I've got it on a larger boat, where I can keep it dry, and so I don't have those types of issues.

Anyway, there is a lot of testimony out there to the difficulty of this thing, and it's just not that difficult. That's why I put myself in these pilots and volunteered for them, so that I can stand up here and speak from experience rather than speculation. Anyway, my time is about up, and I appreciate you all listening to me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we have a question for you from Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Mike, on the issue of having some portion of the GPS part of it affixed to the vessel, what is your view on that?

MR. JENNINGS: I think it's fine. We all understand, or I think most of us do anyway, that we have to have the ability to track that boat and what brings to the validation of what we're doing

here. The being able to carry it home or carry it with them, I don't see the purpose for that. It needs to be on the boat. The boat is what is going fishing. It's not my pickup between the dock and the -- I made a comment about the VMS, and I know it's not the preferred, and we've spent a lot of time on that today, but something simple affixed to the boat that is as cost effective as we can make it I think is acceptable with this.

DR. CRABTREE: With all the units I've seen, and so tell me if this is true with the one that you used, the pad that you enter in, you can take that home. It's just that little box.

MR. JENNINGS: You can, but the actual unit that transmits and sends the ping and tells them where the boat is -- I can carry the pad home. You can still tell that my boat is sitting at that dock or my boat moved.

DR. CRABTREE: Thanks, Mike.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have another question from Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: What size boats do your association have?

MR. JENNINGS: In our association, we have everything from sixty-some-odd feet down to twenty-five-foot center consoles. A lot of our western Gulf fleet are center consoles. I spent a lot of years in one myself, and one of the issues that we're having with the center consoles is the issue of the thought that it's going to be difficult to handle or difficult to use.

Because it's a smaller boat, you're not as comfortable in it and you can't just lean back and you're not making a fifteen-knot cruise with the autopilot on, but, by the same token, you take these same individuals that are saying that and you can watch the hours upon hours of Facebook Live videos on their Facebook page, hours of them.

I can tell you, from experience, that I literally -- I don't run a center console anymore, because I'm too old and fat and I'm tired of getting beat up, but I can tell you from experience that I can sit on a leaning post, and I think I said this before. I can sit on a leaning post and drive with my feet and turn the radio down and text, once I get a phone signal.

 When the navigation becomes difficult or our river is up -- We've got a big river in the western Gulf of Mexico that dumps a lot of logs and refrigerators and dead cattle and everything else into the Gulf of Mexico, and I slow down, and I make it

safe. We slow down for everybody to grab a beer or to make it to the restroom safely and back, and so it's not something that eats up massive parts of your day. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a question from Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mike. I would just like to ask you what you think about the cost of this versus the net benefits.

MR. JENNINGS: If the benefit is -- Some of these are anywhere from twenty to -- Depending on the units, you're hearing anywhere from twenty-dollars a month to where I'm paying about seventy-five right now for the one that I've got on my boat. The benefit to having email when I'm seventy-miles offshore is pretty nice.

If the benefit is one more fishing trip, I can cover the cost. It doesn't take many fishing trips at about a 40 percent profit, which is pretty average within this industry, of the major operators, and it doesn't take very many fishing trips to pay for a twenty-dollar-a-month fee, if you can see that benefit, over the long run, to your fishery and lengthening those seasons and understanding it.

You know, we all talk about -- Whether you read a blog or you stand up here and you listen to the people that speak every day, but we talk about they need to fix this fatally flawed data, they, they, they. They need to do something, but, when it's put back on us to be a part of that fix, we don't want to be a part of that. It might be difficult. It might be hard. I might have to slow down for about thirty seconds and enter a few numbers.

I want the best data collection system that we can get that meets what the agency needs to get us to a point of where we understand what we're catching and what this effort is like. If it takes me slowing down a couple of minutes a day or paying twenty-dollars a month and it's a benefit to my business in the long run, I think it's pretty cost effective at anything under a hundred dollars a month.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Clark Trosclair, followed by Kevin Beach.

 MR. CLARK TROSCLAIR: Thank you, all, for being here and thank you, all, for giving me the opportunity to speak. I own my own business, a charter boat for-hire. I'm against the VMS. I would prefer -- I would rather use a cellphone. We already pay

that coverage. Why have to pay more?

I am against the fixed vessel for the National Marine Fisheries. I would like them to remove the words "National Marine Fisheries" from the approved device. I am in favor of weekly submitting. All these guys talking about not being able to remember what they did two days ago, in my day and age, we would take pictures of all of that. You can't tell me that we can't take a picture of something and remember what we did that day. It's documented time and date.

I am in favor of the council giving long-term harvest, historical, greater credence to the recent harvest history in the allocation formula. I will make this fairly brief.

I am in favor of assigning the allocation to the captain's permit and not to the captain himself. I believe that the owner of the vessel permit must fish for the quota allocated and it's not fair that large environmental non-profit groups and corporations buy and lease shares, thereby running small businesses out of business. Thank you, all, for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Kevin Beach, followed by Mr. Wade Wells.

MR. KEVIN BEACH: Hello. My name is Kevin Beach. I've been working on the water for the last twenty years and full-time for eighteen, charter fishing. I am co-owner of the Mexican Gulf Fishing Company. We fish out of Venice, Louisiana, running eight boats.

I would be willing to say that I'm in the extreme minority of charter fishermen who has a fifty-five-mile-an-hour cruise on his boat. That is where my big issue is with these logbooks before you get back to the dock.

 Yes, there is fog, and we've got logs. You might have it in other places, but I don't have an enclosed bridge for just the captain to go up there, where you can take your time doing twelve knots and go ahead and put in your catch data, and I'm all for the fishery, number one.

Is it going to be a problem if I do it after I tie the boat up or after I clean the fish and get paid and the people leave? I take pictures of everything. I mean, if you're charter fishing and you don't take any pictures of anything you catch, you might want to go take a marketing class. That's just -- I don't get that.

Tonight, while you're sitting and watching TV or listening to the radio, there is 7,000 commercials that you're going to hear of don't text and drive, don't text and drive, and you're going to mandate us to basically text and drive a boat. I am very anti that, and there is other options besides just the VMS.

There is the obvious additional cost in there, but there is AIS and a mobile app. If you need something fixed to the boat, I have AIS on mine, because there is days that we're fishing that all day long I will be fishing by radar and radar only. It's safety first, and I'm all over it. I've never had a ticket or an issue. Thank you, all, for hearing me.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Just to ask again, but how big did you say your 18 boat was?

MR. BEACH: It's thirty-seven feet.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

 MR. RIECHERS: Kevin, I certainly appreciate you being here and testifying. You've heard a lot of the testimony, and you may have heard me ask Mr. Colby this earlier, but I am not hearing that you all don't want the VMS or a transitional device that tells where you are. I am not hearing that you don't want to report electronically. I am hearing that it's just a question about how you do that, when you do that, and you're saying you want to do it, but it's just a matter of what is the best time to do that.

MR. BEACH: I want whatever is best for the fishery, number one. I mean, I do not want the additional cost, where, like I said, there's an app on your phone that logs everything for you, where you can do it simply and, for us, safely. That's number one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Wade Wells, followed by Mr. Colin Byrd.

MR. WADE WELLS: Hi, council. Thanks for having me. I work for Mexican Gulf Fishing Company, charter boat/for-hire. We are for the daily logbook. We would love to have at least a day-and-a-half. It's very treacherous. Our climate changes every day. When it's a south wind, we're socked in fog, sometimes forty or fifty miles offshore. You fish all day with ten foot of visibility.

Also, you have the logs, and we're navigating the International Waterway, and so you're dodging tankers and this and that and the other fishing vessels. Other than that, really just a convenient way. We have people coming in, six customers, and we don't want to be putting their life in danger every day, another six people, and we don't want to put their lives in danger.

Other than that, coming up with some kind of tracking device, like you were saying, but, really, that's about it. At least a day-and-a-half. It's all about the safety and then the next generation. We're all about protecting the fish and stuff like that. There is multiple days where we don't catch our limit. We could, but we don't. We are more than happy to log our catch.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I think we have a question 18 from Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Thanks for being here. Where do you fish out of?

MR. W. WELLS: Venice, Louisiana.

DR. CRABTREE: Venice, and so you come -- You run up the river and then come off the river and get into your marina?

MR. W. WELLS: We run about -- Each pass is different. South Pass is about twenty miles from the dock until you get in the open water. That's twenty miles, and about five miles of it is in the Mississippi River. Then you branch off of that, and those get really dangerous, those shoals. They're always changing, and you have to be watching.

DR. CRABTREE: When you get off the river though and you're outside your marina, before you've tied up, could you fill out your logbook and submit it then, before you come in and tie up?

 MR. W. WELLS: No. In our marina, we have all these oilfield companies. You have this other boat traffic, and sometimes, by the time you untie your boat, it's fog from then to the time you go to where you're fishing and by the time you get back, and I can literally barely read the writing on the front of the boat.

DR. CRABTREE: Because of fog?

46 MR. W. WELLS: Yes, just because of fog. Other than that, there 47 is the logs and the trash in the river and stuff like that.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, but I'm talking about after you get off the river and you're at the entrance to your marina.

MR. W. WELLS: It's still foggy, and, after you're off the river, that's where all the oilfield companies are. We're going through that.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next ,we have Mr. Colin Byrd, followed by Mr. Billy Wells.

MR. COLIN BYRD: Hi. How are you all this afternoon? I just want to touch on a couple of things about the VMS and the reporting of the catch. I am all for reporting, in some way, shape, or form. I understand there's got to be numerous different options that we can figure out how to report. From what I'm gathering, the South Atlantic just approved a weekly reporting, with an interactive map and not an actual fixed unit that is on the vessel.

I feel like that would be best for us. Some of these other guys here behind me, they're larger vessels, and we've been talking about they have the option of sitting in an enclosed wheelhouse or taking five minutes at the dock. They might have crew, extra crew, and staff to help accommodate the clients or customers or people, whatever it may be on the boat, and so they are comfortable.

 A lot of us in south Louisiana fish solo. I am by myself. A couple of the guys with me, we all fish by ourselves, and so, in order to enter a daily log and deal with customers and get fuel and re-spool reels and change oil every ten days, it's just a little excessive.

Again, I feel like there is options available to be presented to us. This fixed system, there is a gentleman behind me that was six weeks out of work. I mean, I'm sure -- Most people here might be salary, but for me to lose a day of work is tough. Two days of work is really tough. Six weeks? That would crush me for my entire year.

My whole season would be flopped, and so it would be nice to have a couple of days off to assess the damage and fix what it may be, but there's got to be another option, as far as restricting a vessel from leaving port and as far as having their system fail, and so that's something I feel like we have another option somewhere, paper logbooks or whatever it may be.

 The big deal is I agree that we do have to document what we are catching and what we're pulling out of our Gulf. There is no way that we can tell what we have without actually reporting it, and so I'm good for it. I think it's great and that it will benefit our fishery for years to come, but reporting prior to arriving at the dock is nearly impossible when you have inclement weather.

Most of you all, I'm sure, are from the south somewhere, and so rain is a huge deal and lightning and thunder and pulling up to the dock and rushing people off the boat to get them to safety underneath the marina is a big part of what we do. We take care of these customers. We are not here to harm them or put them in potential danger. I feel that prior to the dock is just not an option. Maybe before noon the next day. That would be perfect.

Then also a remote unit and not having the affixed unit. Some of these other vessels, it works for them, but I think there ought to be two different options. If you have a fixed unit that you like and it works, great, but we ought to be able to choose and select if we want to do a remote location from our camp at the end of the afternoon, after we shower.

After a long and hot and sweaty and nasty and sticky and fishy day, we want to have that option of going to our phone that is coordinating with our permits and our vessel and, in our own peace, sit and be able to log what we did for the day. That's what I feel. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Billy Wells, followed by Mr. Chris Moran.

MR. BILLY WELLS: Hello. Thank you for having me. I work out of Venice as well for the Mexican Gulf Fishing Company. I have been fishing in Venice for twenty years, and I think there seems to be a bit of a theme here going. You might think that nobody in Venice wants to report what we're catching, and that's not the case.

We are all for sustainable fisheries. We all want to continue to do what we love to do, and that's why we're doing it, and so reporting fish seems to be something that needs to be done, but it just doesn't seem, to me, that it needs to be done before you hit the dock.

If weekly reporting is good enough for the South Atlantic, then why is it not good enough for the Gulf? If you can't remember

what you caught five days ago -- If you have five seconds to log your catch, why don't have you have five seconds to write it down?

I am not saying that, if I had weekly, that I would wait until the end of the week to report it. I think you should be able to report every day as well, but I am sure everybody here has had a day where you get done with work and you sit down and, the next thing you know, it's four o'clock in the morning and the day is over, because you just wanted to sit down and take a breath and decompress for two seconds before you did anything else, and now you've missed your deadline. Well, if you give us, at the very least, until noon the next day, you can log your catch in the morning before you leave the dock again.

We have short seasons. Last year, there were forty days or something like that for snapper, and you have to fish every single one of them that you can. If you have a VMS affixed to your vessel, as Wayne said, and it goes down for six weeks -- I mean, if I have a VMS on my boat and I'm not allowed to fish if it breaks, and it breaks June 1 and I'm out of work from June 1 to the middle of July, I'm sunk. I'm done. That's it. There is no recovering from that.

Venice is a little bit different. We're an hour-and-forty-five-minutes from New Orleans, from support. If you have something broken, it's not like you can wait until someone opens at seven o'clock or eight o'clock in the morning and get a part to fix it or have someone come to your boat and fix it and still have the trip run off without a hitch. It's just impossible. I mean, it can't work that way. I am against a fixed VMS. As Colin said, if people have fixed VMSs and they're happy with it, then great, but it just seems, to me, like there should be options.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Dr. Crabtree has a question for you.

DR. CRABTREE: What kind of electronics do you have on your 39 boat?

MR. B. WELLS: I have all the latest and greatest and all the safety equipment. I have AIS and GPS and radar and VHF.

44 DR. CRABTREE: How often does that stuff break down?

MR. B. WELLS: Often enough to where --

48 DR. CRABTREE: What do you do when have that break down?

MR. B. WELLS: I am very redundant. I have three screens for my radar and my GPS. I have three VHF radios. I mean, it's very redundant.

DR. CRABTREE: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have another question from Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I was just going to mention that I think what Wayne was trying to mention was to have some type of back-up system. I've had problems with my CLS system one time, and I asked them to overnight it to me, and I had it the next day and we were right back in business, but I think what he was mentioning was maybe some type of back-up, in case it didn't work.

MR. B. WELLS: Absolutely.

MR. WALKER: And they're easy. I have fished out of Venice, out of Tiger Pass, and I have fished in the fog. We've got radar and we've got single sideband and we've got plotters and we've got autopilots and we've got all kinds of -- I know what you're talking about.

When you get used to these tablets, and it doesn't take you very long, just a minute or so, and you just touch the -- You take your finger across the screen and you tap a button and tap it and tap it and you're done, and so I don't think it's very hard.

Of course, there is other -- I think there could be other potential systems too, but the main thing is it's portable. You can take this device with you, but there's a lot of things -- Like you said, you would like to have better data, and I like that you like that too, because I think it's important for you guys to have better data, because it gives you better science. It will give you, hopefully, more access to your fishery, a better, longer fishing season.

MR. B. WELLS: Yes, but it definitely seems like there should be options. I mean, if you think about it -- Put it this way. Say you're from North Dakota and you get five of your friends from college, fraternity buddies, from New York and California, six different parts all over the country, and you plan this trip ten months in advance, because that's how long it takes everyone to coordinate their work schedules.

You buy airfare and you've got hotel rooms and rental cars. I mean, you are just completely set up. You get all the way to

Venice, after a full day of travel time, to fish for one day and you wake up in the morning and the captain gets on the boat and says that my VMS isn't working this morning.

Everything else on the boat is completely fine, ready to roll. The engines are running and the electronics are on and the fish are biting and it's time to go. You got to the dock early and watched all the boats come in and you're pumped up and the captain says, well, this little piece of computer right here that tracks me says it's broken and so we can't go. Put yourself in his situation. Would you come back? I would lose a customer for life.

MR. WALKER: But if you had some type of back-up system to --

MR. B. WELLS: That's what I'm saying, is there needs to be options. Anyone else?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think that's it, sir. Thank you. Next, we have Mr. Chris Moran, followed by Mr. Buddy Guindon.

MR. CHRIS MORAN: My name is Chris Moran. I'm the owner and operator of Port Fourchon Marina, Moran's Marina, in Fourchon, Louisiana. I also own Cajun Made Charters. I am just going to read straight off my phone. I can see the need for accountability in our fisheries management, and I am good to embrace some form of electronic logbooks. The following provisions should be considered.

In Action 1, Alternative 3, allowing daily reporting by noon the following day. That would allow me to train someone to take on that duty. Every night, I could pass -- We have a system for the invoices for our charter business. We drop them in a safe, and they're picked up every morning. We record all of our catch, pounds and species and everything, the count, on the tickets. We've been doing this since 1999. Anyway, to take on this duty, so that I could continue on the next morning, me or any of the other guys.

The vessel is rarely -- When we're on our vessel, on these open vessels, and we run all center consoles. There rarely is a barrier between me and my customers. My customers are right here and right here. We talk about kids and birthdays and what color fishing line and why are the hooks like that, and it never stops, not allowing me the chance to break free to do any of this, and I wouldn't put their safety at risk.

On outboards, which is predominantly what Louisiana consists of,

like I said, there is no barriers, and we entertain right up until the end. It would be much easier for me to record everything, as I always have done, on my invoices and delegate it on. The reason we've done this since the beginning is we charge for fish cleaning. Therefore, we count every fish and record the weights of every category.

Action 3, I could also live with Alternative 3b for charter vessels, where we hail-out. I don't see the point in the hail-in, given that I would like to have that time until the next day, and, furthermore, our local Department of Wildlife and Fisheries -- At my dock, I have a dockside survey person there every day. They cover -- There is not many docks in Louisiana, and, actually, what I've got to give to our Wildlife and Fisheries is they cover it well, unlike in Florida and other places, where I understand there is multiple outlets. We really don't have a lot of outlets in Louisiana. I don't really feel like the hail-in is that necessary, given that we want to carry it on to the next day.

Action 4, preferred, the two -- Some type of archived GPS and/or notebook combination. You know, it's much more nominal in cost, and I saw a sample of it, and it seemed like it worked well. It can be run with our current electronics or some type of phone app and no VMS.

I do have some experience with VMS, and I'm not just talking about some outboard guy that has never even seen it. I actually have a live bait operation at Moran's Marina. On numerous occasions, our VMS has given us problems and it prevents us from being able to catch bait at night.

Anyway, I am going to go ahead and close up. One other issue is the power down on the outboards. That's something to consider, how would you do that, and, by all means, I want what's best for the fishery. I am very invested in this, a lot of money, and I want to see us get to a place where we can continue to manage our fishery. That's it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. We have a question from Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Chris, I really want to tell you that you've got a Louisiana delegation here, and it's been so hard to get Louisiana people here. I understand these guys from Florida and the other states, and I understand. It's hard to make the point that we have different problems, and I am really pleased to have you here and that other bunch that you brought. God bless you.

MR. MORAN: The structure of Louisiana, our coastline is totally different. We don't have -- I mean, I just flew in from West Palm Beach and landed at 2:15. Believe me, I love the place. I love going there, but we don't have the condos and we don't have all of that.

We've got one opportunity with some halfway motels and homemade family camps that we convert over to entertain people, and we've got to take it to another level, because all we have to sell is our fishing, because everything is not like what it is in Florida. We don't have those condos and all of that. Our fishing is all we have to sell, and we've got a lot of fish. Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think that's it. Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. Buddy Guindon, followed by Mr. John Coulon.

MR. BUDDY GUINDON: Buddy Guindon, Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance. The use-it-or-lose-it has no use in our fishery, and, if it does, we will let you know. Amendment 36B puts restrictions on a market-based system. When you restrict a market-based system, it's like sticking a banana in your tailpipe. It won't run very well. It will cause economic harm.

 We don't need anything in Amendment 36B. When we need something, we will bring it to the council. The people in this fishery are doing very well, and let's just leave it alone. We're not going to accomplish any of the goals. You're not going to change any of the things that were set out that we wanted to accomplish when we implemented the IFQ system, and so it needs to be left alone.

 I am still going to ask you to put the rest of the reef fish in an IFQ. Allowing amberjacks to be caught and killed when it's not necessary, and those guys that have amberjacks that go out and catch 1,500 pounds at a time or 2,000 pounds at a time, whatever they do, they should sit at home and let other people give them money, and we can harvest them for them and then there won't be waste. There will be more for the recreational and the commercial fishermen that way. We will create more access to the fishery.

The co-op presentation, I am wondering if some of the things that were said in that presentation were opinions or facts, and I hope they were facts. We have been longlining in the Gulf of Mexico since the 1950s. There is less people longlining now than there ever was, and we have pristine coral reefs. We need

to allow access by fishermen to these reefs.

 We need a federal loan program or a federal register, where we can go into the private sector and get this money that we need to pass this fishery on to the next generation. They are begging for it. A lot of the older guys are having to finance it through, and hopefully they live long enough to get it done so the guys don't lose their businesses.

When it comes to king mackerel, putting fish in and then taking them out creates instability in that market and creates economic harm, and I know we don't want to create economic harm.

When we talk about Amendments 41 and 42, it's really time, guys. We need to move that along and get those people in a fishery management plan that's accountable and that brings more sustainability. It brings the level of harvest up, because we will have better data to do better stock assessments.

I want to talk about the focus group. I am a little disappointed that they're not going to meet anymore. I thought this was going to be the end-all for the recreational fishery, to bring them into a management system that will be accountable and sustainable.

With that said, they wasted a lot of our time in saying wait for us to build this, wait for us to build this. The council did it many times. They waited. Let's not wait anymore. Let's empanel that advisory panel and put them to work in getting a fishery management plan for the recreational fishermen that will work for them. I want to respect our new leader and stop talking, if somebody will ask me about gags.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I believe we have a question for you, Mr. Guindon. Hang on. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Tell me about gags.

 MR. GUINDON: You've heard a lot about the twenty-two and twenty-four-inch size limits, and I am taking my hat off for the Shareholders' Alliance, because I can't speak for them. I am speaking for myself.

In the red snapper fishery, we kept raising the size limit and we kept reducing our ability to harvest and kept increasing our ability to kill our own fish. A pound of fish is a pound of fish, whether it's one pound or whether it's twenty-five pounds.

I don't like waste. I have asked you many times to let's put in and implement a 100 percent retention fishery. I think that's what needs to happen here, but it is my own personal opinion that the stock will do better if you keep the fish you catch and let the rest of them grow up to spawn and be mature, but that is my personal opinion.

The reason the Shareholders' Alliance went with the twenty-four inches is because that's what the science says and that's what we say in our plan. Our dedication to this fishery is that we're going to follow the science, even if it's wrong. Thank you. Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana has a question for you.

DR. DANA: Not a question, but just a follow-up. When you said about the private recreational AP and the council bringing them together, there have been sent out notifications to call a meeting, and so that's moving forward.

MR. GUINDON: Just stomp on the gas and hold it there until they're done, will you? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, we have Mr. John Coulon, followed by Mr. Michael Kelly.

MR. JOHN COULON: Council, how are you guys? Good evening. My name is John Coulon, and I operate a twenty-passenger charter recreational fishing vessel out of Venice Marina, the fishing capital of the world, and rightfully named so. That's their motto.

I call Empire home. It's a little town twenty-five miles north before you get to Venice, and I remember calling Empire home before Venice was even known or recognized as a sport town. Now, between Cyprus Cove and Venice Marina, it gets the majority of the business in the parish.

Where we live, we have the Gulf of Mexico as the -- It's almost like a farmland. It's an area. We've got an unlimited amount of opportunities inland and offshore. The twenty-passenger recreational boat I run, without being biased, because I have no commercial permits, the need for it, I think is overlooked. Nowadays, the charter boats have evolved into center consoles. We have no more headboats.

At some point, we were labeled charter/headboat, and we're actually a partyboat, and that's for parties, family reunions

and larger groups, company functions, or just our immediate family, whatever it be. There is a need and there is a demand for a boat in our classification. I think we should be, without being biased, there again, I think we should be on the top of the endangered species list, simply because, when my dad started this business back in the mid-1960s, it was about the time my grandfather retired as the captain on the Canal Street Ferry Boat right here, just a couple of blocks away.

My dad wanted to go fishing when he was a young man. He wanted to charter a boat out of Empire, Louisiana, was the place, because Grand Isle was too far away. He was put on a waiting list for too long to satisfy his want to fishing. At that time, a charter boat consisted of a shrimp boat or an oyster boat out of season that might have did this in the off season.

They ran people to the Gulf and fished, and I'm sure it wasn't but a few miles offshore. They could catch many different species that we don't even recognize. Half the people in this room wouldn't remember them, right along with the reporting that we've done in the past. The majority of reporting, I would be willing to bet, on the recreational sector has been done from the partyboats, back when it was a voluntary thing, as far as the reporting goes.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Coulon, can you bring your comments to a close fairly quickly, please?

MR. COULON: Yes, ma'am. I would love to give you my whole fifty-year testimony one day when you have time. I would like to sit in with all of you guys, and I could almost take all of you on my boat, at least in two days, one weekend, reserved for you at a time you would like it.

Anyway, long story short, I am against daily reporting. I have been weekly reporting for a couple of years now, and it works for me. Mr. Ken Brennan that heads the reporting, the federal, he's got a lot of patience with me, because I'm a fisherman by trade, for the last fifty years that I remember, and I am not computer literate. I am not the greatest speaker, but I would love to sit in with you guys and give you, like I said, my fifty-year testimony on the whole thought. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, we would love to hear it, and we will 46 be here, and so you come see us.

MR. COULON: I will follow you wherever you go. You come to

Louisiana once a year. Come and see us, please.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir.

MR. COULON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next, we have Mr. Michael Kelly.

MR. MICHAEL KELLY: Madam Chair and council, my name is Michael Kelly from CLS America. Our company has made a commitment to supporting fisheries science and fisheries management here in the Gulf, and I wanted to clarify a statement that was made from Monday in Dr. Lynn Stokes's presentation about matching data with a trip.

It's actually easy, within the technology that exists, to do that. It wasn't part of the specifications for the existing Gulf of Mexico charter pilot project, but it is something that is implemented in other parts of the U.S. right now, so that as soon as a vessel crosses a line or enters into or out of a zone, it changes the frequency of reporting automatically, so the captain doesn't have to do anything.

We've done our best to make the application that the captains use in the charter pilot project and in other fisheries very, very user friendly and simple and quick. We are always working to improve that, and so I just wanted to clarify that point.

MR. ANSON: Thank you. I asked Mike Colby and kind of put him on the spot earlier, when he was providing testimony, and I just wanted to get a confirmation. Which portion of the hardware is actually sending that signal? He had two pieces of hardware. He had the one that was affixed, permanently affixed, to the vessel and the other was the iPad thing, and which one is it, because a captain could not turn on the iPad, but he's going to need the vessel, and so where is that signal coming from?

MR. M. KELLY: Sure. NOAA has published very strict standards for vessel tracking in the VMS program, and the companies that are able to meet the type approval standards and get certified in those fisheries have to meet those standards, and they have to do with things like that, with data security and with data timeliness, even customer service on the part of the provider. You have to meet a lot of hurdles.

 In Mike Colby's case, the signal is actually coming from the equipment that's mounted on the vessel. The only thing that's coming from the tablet, that's coming through the tablet, is the input that the captain provides in the form. Everything else goes directly through that unit that's hard-wired on the vessel.

MR. ANSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Michael, I can understand that there would be a technical solution to the matching problem. The matching problem is vexing. It takes wonderful data, if you can't match, and forces you to use averages or erroneous matches, and that wreaks havoc on your precision. My question is, is Dr. Stokes still working on the program? If so, is it possible to rerun some of those statistics tables on projected precision, assuming 100 percent matching?

MR. M. KELLY: The answer is yes. Dr. Stokes will be working on the project throughout 2017, on all the data that we collect in 2017. Our goal in 2017 is twofold. One is to make revisions to the existing electronic form and the app that's inside that tablet, so that it can do extra things like that, data log more positions and report more frequently when it gets close to shore and things like that, add more species. We're going to make those changes to the application for year two, and Lynn Stokes might be here a year from now with a completely different conclusion.

DR. PONWITH: Whether or not you're able to implement that frequency change that would give you the 100 percent matching, that would be a statistic in sort of your contingency tables that would be a valuable statistic to have of what your precision would look like with assumed 100 percent matching. That would be a valuable statistic.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think we have one last question from Dr. Stunz for you.

DR. STUNZ: Just a quick question, Michael. For a vessel that doesn't have anything right now, the iPad to connect to the junction box that stays on the boat, what is the cost again to a captain to outfit his boat?

 MR. M. KELLY: That depends. The reimbursable price for vessels that are in the reimbursement program for NOAA is up to \$3,100 for a type-approved VMS with an input device. Ours, we have

sold to NOAA for part of the project for just \$1,999 and so we cut it to discounted price to work within kind of the framework of what was needed for the program, and so \$1,999 is the price for the hardware, and that includes everything. Then the service, the ongoing service, goes between forty-five and sixtynine dollars a month, depending on what plan they choose.

DR. STUNZ: Just so I'm real clear, for the 1,300 or whatever number of charter boats that would be required to do something like this, if that's the direction the council goes, you would change them only nineteen-dollars per unit or -- I am not talking about the VMS program. I am talking about what Mike Colby showed us today.

MR. M. KELLY: The equipment itself would cost \$1,999 for the hardware that would get installed on the vessel. The ongoing monthly service, satellite service cost, would range between forty-five dollars a month and sixty-nine dollars a month, depending on what other features the captain chose to use, satellite email and satellite weather and other things like that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. That concludes our public testimony for the evening. We don't have anyone left on the list. Tomorrow is Thursday. We are going to start at eight o'clock in the morning tomorrow, and so I will see you all bright and early, at eight o'clock. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on February 1, 2017.)

February 2, 2017

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Astor Crown Plaza, New Orleans, Louisiana, Thursday morning, February 2, 2017, and was called to

order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: This morning, we are going to start with our committee reports, and we're going to adjust that agenda schedule a little bit, the way that Mr. Boyd had talked about. First, we are going to get started with Data Collection, as scheduled. Dr. Stunz, if you're ready, I will turn it over to

you, sir.

COMMITTEE REPORTS (CONTINUED) DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. STUNZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Data Collection Committee met on January 30, 2017. First, was the CLS America Pilot Report. Dr. Stokes gave a presentation on Tab F, Number 4, summarizing the CLS America electronic reporting pilot project.

She summarized preliminary results of their research, highlighting the need for improved matching of trips between reports and dockside intercepts. She also showed that variance estimates of catch are currently higher than comparable estimates from the APAIS. She indicated that research is ongoing to improve trip matching that may be necessary to improve results.

Based on the current matching rates, she provided estimates of the sampling increases necessary to achieve estimates of variance that are comparable to the APAIS estimates. She proposed several methods to reduce variance that could be considered when developing the electronic reporting program for federally-permitted for-hire vessels in the Gulf.

Next, we discussed the South Atlantic Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendment. The committee reviewed the South Atlantic Council's Generic Amendment that would modify charter vessel and headboat reporting requirements, Tab F, Number 6a, that was approved at their December 2016 meeting.

Staff highlighted the revised text in the document that clarified that vessels possessing federal permits in both the South Atlantic and Gulf will be required to report by the more stringent Gulf reporting requirements whether the vessel is fishing in South Atlantic or Gulf waters.

This amendment would require federally-permitted South Atlantic for-hire vessels to report all fish harvested and discarded on all trips, regardless of where the fish were caught, weekly by Tuesday following each fishing week. They are also requiring federally-permitted charter vessels to report location fished electronically by manually entering latitude and longitude, in degrees and minutes, or by clicking on an electronic chart.

Mr. Brown, a council member on the South Atlantic Council, stated that this requirement is already in place for headboats.

However, their council is currently working on updating this application for charters vessels, so that fishermen can download trip location track information.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to accept all the preferred selections within the South Atlantic Electronic Reporting Amendment to the Full Council. I will stop there for now.

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.

DR. STUNZ: Thank you. The committee recognized that the codified text accompanying this document were not yet available, but are expected to be available for review at Full Council. Madam Chairwoman, would you like me to stop there? Do we need to deal with the codified text at this point, or would you like me to move forward in the report?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I will turn that over to Mara. Mara, do we need to deal with the codified text?

MS. LEVY: Well, I believe you did receive the codified text for both the South Atlantic data reporting amendment and the Gulf Council's data reporting amendment. I guess you need to deal with it in the fact that you need to decide whether to vote to approve and submit to the Secretary of Commerce.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, council. We have the codified text in our briefing book.

DR. STUNZ: Would you like me to make a motion?

35 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: If you want to make a motion, yes, sir.

DR. STUNZ: Is that protocol for me as the Chair?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are in Full Council now, and so you can go ahead.

DR. STUNZ: I move that we accept the codified text regarding the South Atlantic Electronic Reporting Amendment.

45 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy, do you have a comment?

MS. LEVY: I think what you can do is your general language about submitting to the Secretary of Commerce and deeming the

codified text. I would note that the codified text for the South Atlantic -- What you have in your briefing book is what they had in their briefing book, but that is not what ultimately it's going to be, because it has been going through some revisions at NMFS.

It's going to go back to their Chair at some point, I believe, and then probably back here for re-deeming, because we're working out just some language things, and so you can deem it and then it has that language about re-deeming, whatever that general language is that we use.

DR. STUNZ: That's perfectly fine with me. It looks like it's coming up on the board here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Staff is working on pulling up that language that we always use. We will give them just a second here. Dr. Stunz, if you wouldn't mind, would you just read it into the record for us, and then we'll see if we have a second.

DR. STUNZ: Okay. Sure. The motion is to approve the South Atlantic Electronic Reporting Amendment 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: Thank you, sir, and we have a second from Mr. Greene. Is there any discussion on the motion? This will be a roll call vote. Mr. Gregory, whenever you're ready.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Yes, ma'am. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Anson.

39 MR. ANSON: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Dana.

43 DR. DANA: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.

47 DR. STUNZ: Yes.

```
1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Riechers.
```

3 MR. RIECHERS: Yes.

5 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Swindell.

7 MR. SWINDELL: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.

11 DR. FRAZER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.

15 MR. BANKS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Lucas.

19 DR. LUCAS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Crabtree.

27 DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Captain Greene.

31 MR. GREENE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.

35 MR. WALKER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Diaz.

39 MR. DIAZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.

43 MS. GUYAS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd.

47 MR. BOYD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The motion passes unanimously.

DR. STUNZ: All right. Next, the Gulf Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendment. Staff reviewed written comments received since the October 2016 council meeting, Tab F, Number 5b.

Next, staff reviewed the Gulf Generic Amendment to modify charter vessel and headboat reporting requirements, Tab F, Number 5a. Staff reviewed the revised notes under Actions 1 and 2 and the IPT recommendations in Action 3 that clarified the council's intent. Staff also noted that language was added, noting that an approved emergency system would need to be developed if the VMS or any other selected system is non-operational.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that the committee accept the IPT recommendations for the alternatives in Action 3, Trip Notification and Reporting Requirements.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion on the motion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

DR. STUNZ: The committee also reviewed the IPT's proposed changes to the alternatives in Action 4. These changes clarified that the geo-positioning portion, GPS, of the reporting hardware be permanently affixed to the vessel. The committee discussed that this was necessary for Alternative 4, but did not agree it was necessary for Alternatives 2 and 3.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to accept the IPT recommendations for Alternative 4 in Action 4, Hardware/Software Requirements for Reporting. Require vessel operators to submit fishing records via NMFS-approved vessel monitoring system hardware/software that provides vessel position data to NMFS. The antenna and junction box area are permanently affixed to the vessel. Option a is for charter vessels and Option b is headboats.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. All right. We have a committee motion on the board. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: This is one that still concerns me, and do we want to go back now and talk about some of the issues in the amendment?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think now would be the time, because Dr. Stunz has one last line in his report, and it just says "Madam Chair, this concludes my report."

10 DR. STUNZ: Can I finish that?

12 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead, Dr. Stunz.

14 DR. STUNZ: Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Now, would you like to have some further discussion? Did you have discussion on this particular action right here? Is that what you were wanting to address, the other IPT language?

21 DR. CRABTREE: I want to go back to the others.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Let's do that. Let's take it in order. If we're going back through the document, Action 1, does anybody have anything to say about Action 1? Yes, sir, Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: I would like to move that we make the preferred alternative Alternative 3. If I get a second, I will have some discussion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We will give staff just a minute to get it on the board and everybody else a minute to get to that in their document.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: That is Tab F-5(a).

37 MR. ANSON: I will second it for discussion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The motion is coming up on the board, and it does have a second from Mr. Anson. Yes, sir, go ahead.

MR. RIECHERS: We had this discussion in committee, and I believe we centered around a motion at that point. As far as the discussion goes, while it will be a lot the same, I think we centered around the weekly reporting, much like the South Atlantic had chosen, and like the headboat reporting has been, in some respects.

We heard a lot from people yesterday, and, I mean, let's remember that the real issue is not about the inconvenience. It's not about who can do it or who cannot do it. It's about the amount of recall bias that might occur from the evening to the next day or a week from now.

When you think about recall bias, and certainly there is a lot of literature out there about recall bias, and there's a lot of literature out there about recall bias associated with bags and how many ducks and geese and other things have been killed, and fish, as well as a lot in the health literature as well, but the thing is that most of that is dealing with annual recall or quarterly recall versus daily or next-day recall.

Really, I don't believe the expectation that there is going to be a lot of bias from reporting by noon the next day is there, and so I think, in the lines that we're going from really a sampling system now to a census-based system and one that will certainly increase the amount of data and reduce the recall that we now have in these situations already, I think, kind of hearing what we heard yesterday from some, and knowing that there's a lot that aren't here, I just think this is a reasonable solution to that and at least try this and see how that works.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I think there is more to this than just the recall bias though. One of the main reasons we wanted the reports submitted before they hit the dock is that we want them to submit the reports before they know whether their vessel is going to be subject to a dockside interview.

If they come in and don't have to report until the next day, if they get an interview, then they know that we're going to compare what they report to what the folks saw, but, if they come in and they don't get an interview, then they know that we're not going to be able to do that, and so it seems, to me, that significantly weakens our ability to enforce this and validate it and check it.

What I heard in public testimony yesterday was overwhelming support for reporting before you hit the dock. What I heard was that it's simple and it takes a few minutes. I just heard one group of fishermen from Louisiana who were opposed to it and wanted until noon and a couple of people from Panama City, but it seems to me, over the past meetings, we've heard, time and time again, from people who have actually done this and tried it

that it just takes a couple of minutes and it's simple to do and it's not a problem.

2 3 4

I think anyone, in all the discussions we've had with the technical folks and everyone about our ability to validate it, I think reporting before you hit the dock was a big part of our ability to make this work. Guys, if we put in place a system that just is never going to produce data we can use, it's going to make it that much harder down the road.

We're going to get people to invest in equipment, and then we're going to have to come in and tell them, well, we've got to change the requirement and things are going to have to be different, and I just think that we're way better off to get this right now.

We've heard, time and time again, from these guys that they want better data. My impression is that most of them are willing to do this, and so let's do this right, if we're going to do it, so that we can get data that we can use.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I appreciate Roy's statement, Dr. Crabtree's statement, and I understand that we're always trying to find ways to tighten down and make enforcement and all this, and my Mississippi charter/for-hire feel about the same way as Louisiana did. That's what they're sending back to us, is they don't mind reporting. They want to have better data.

They do it for our electronic reporting system, and they think it works great. They hail-out, and they know we're looking for a report when they come back to the dock and they start unloading. That's when they're filling out their report, and they're good, and they're even happy if you say, hey, before you can go back out, you've got to make sure that report is filled out, and it seems to be working really well.

We have blanketed the docks where these guys are going. They're not trying to skirt the system. They know that we want the data, and they know that they need the data in order for them to do their jobs well and get more fish and all of that, and so they're not trying to cheat the system.

 Those people that are trying to cheat the system are going to cheat the system anyway, regardless of what measures you put in place for the enforcement. If we're really looking at this for getting the better data and being able to validate, I think you

can still get the validation done by having those reports filled out on a daily basis. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

 MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would speak against this and remain in favor of the current preferred alternatives. I think we've heard, time and time again, as this document has been developing and blossoming, and we already have preferreds that we've taken an awfully long time to get at, and I would speak against this in favor of the leaving the current preferreds for this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I speak in opposition to this. While I understand where people are at, and I understand that there is the desire by some for reporting the next day, and it seems like, when you're looking at, well, that's not really a big deal. If you do it today or tomorrow, what's the big deal?

Well, we also had public testimony yesterday that there were guys running two and three charters in day. Well, that becomes a form of a deal, because I have used this program and I have run three charters in a day and I have been a part of running two charters a day. I have been through the whole process, and I'm telling you that it's way better to go ahead and do it prior to landing at the dock and being done with that.

It does not take more than two to three minutes for an average person to do that. I feel that it's paramount that we do it at that point, so that, as you're coming to the dock and you've got your stuff filled out, you don't know if the enforcement guy is there or not, but, in the back of your mind, you know that you better get it right, because, if your information is not correct and it doesn't match up, then it's going to create some variances and problems and issues for you down the road.

 I really believe that's the fundamental thing that we're looking at here. I don't think it's that people are trying to get away with something or whatever, and, as was mentioned earlier, those people are going to continue to do that, but 99 percent of the people are going to do it right anyway, and we might as well do it.

I know that, in my state, we have a reporting system, and it requires you to report prior to landing, and so obviously there's a reason for that. The commercial IFQ program also requires them to report before they land, and so it has worked in other fisheries. It has worked in other states, and there is no reason not to do it here on this particular issue.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: It's not difficult to do. You just get your boat heading back toward the dock and you put your autopilot in. You don't have to go wide open. You can idle back and enter the information. It doesn't take long.

These guys already have all kinds of equipment. They have single sideband and they have radar and they have plotters and they have anything you can imagine, radios and stereos and everything going on. It's not difficult to pick up that little pad and enter in your information, and I even had some discussion with some of the guys after, and they were like, whatever it takes, you know.

Some of them said the noon the next day could be a problem, because they're out on another trip already, and so they were basically like, whatever it takes to get this, we want it. They were speaking obviously to this too, because it's easy. It's not difficult to enter in your information.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Ms. Bosarge. I am going to speak in favor of this, and the reason that I'm going to do that is I understand people like Johnny, who are maybe running multiple trips, and I understand David's position.

Yesterday, we heard a lot about those guys from Venice and one from Fourchon. If you haven't run out there, you can't imagine what it's like. I don't think -- Of course, a lot of those guys wanted weekly. I think daily, by noon of the next day, is a good compromise. If it's convenient to log in on the way back in, great, but, if it's foggy or if it's stormy and these guys are not getting in until five o'clock sometimes, and they have to do some marketing work with their customers before they get off the boat.

How many of them would wait until noon? I really don't know. Some, of course, and I think there's some that would log in that same day, particularly if they have an early charter the next morning, and so, accordingly, I speak in favor of this, and I hope this passes. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Although I seconded the motion, I'm not going to support the motion. Obviously we all heard testimony from a lot of the Louisiana vessel operators and their concerns of trying to operate the vessel safely and getting back to the marina, the dock, and certainly that was a consideration that we took in prior to developing the Snapper Check Program in Alabama.

Granted, we have both private recreational and charter boat vessel operators required to report, but we looked into the time of report and the ease of enforcement, or the impact of timing of the report on the enforceability of the regulation, and, considering that certain locations, marinas and ramps, are difficult to get to, and, particularly in the summertime, there is lots of vessel traffic, and so that could be a potential, trying to operate the vessel and get on a smartphone and report at the same time, and so we allowed for the report to be submitted prior to landing the fish.

That gives people an opportunity to safely dock and also report. The time between -- Whether you're fifteen seconds from tying up the rope and officially tying up at the dock, in this regulation, or you wait a couple or five minutes later to land the fish, there might have been some concerns or people might have concerns of that impact on reporting, but you can see people walking around the docks just as easily as before landing the fish as you can after landing the fish, and so I will bring that up after this is dispensed, but those are my comments. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is your comment to that point, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, because one of the questions we've had about the current preferred alternative is it's before or prior to arriving at the dock, and so I guess, in the IFQ program, we allow them to come to the dock, but they can't offload the fish, and so you're talking about landing the fish, meaning the fish coming off the boat.

That would be kind of a modification to the current preferred alternative. I guess I am looking at -- Like everybody here, I'm trying to judge where we are on this, and it seems, to me, we're pretty split. I don't know if we're going to pass this motion or not.

Would a compromise position be that they have to submit the

report before they land any fish, meaning, before any fish comes off the boat, they have got to submit it, but that would allow them to hit the dock and tie up and then fill out the report and submit it?

Is that a compromise that people could get behind? It seems, to me, that's better than noon the next day, although my preference would be to stay with the current preferred alternative. I think you kind of were alluding to that, Kevin.

 MR. ANSON: That's kind of where I was leaning to, yes. It would be a compromise, in my mind, and that's probably where I would lean, as far as voting, is to modify the current preferred to allow that the report be submitted prior to landing.

DR. CRABTREE: I think, procedurally, if this motion passes, then, to do that, because we're taking final action, there would have to be a motion to reconsider and all of that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Do we have any more discussion on this? I have a list of people to speak here, but, if there is discussion on this particular topic, I will take that, to this point, before we go back to the list. Yes, Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Since I've been on this council, we've been dealing with the problematic red snapper fishery, and one of the big deals in it has been the accuracy of the data that we have been able to obtain. I think this is really not a good thing to do, to have built in more inaccuracy potential to the information that we're trying to get, and so I speak against the motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To this point, Dr. Stunz?

DR. STUNZ: It's not to this point.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Go ahead.

DR. STUNZ: Well, I mean, I've sat here a little quiet, because I am a little bit conflicted, given that I'm the one that is piloting programs like this, but then I figured that I guess that I should say that what we're piloting, having done this for the captains, many that you heard, through iSnapper, we do have it in there to report before you hit the dock, and it works fine, and they have done it just fine. It was just pretty much a non-issue.

I see Robin's point, and I hear these guys in Louisiana and what

they're saying, and I guess what I would say is it has worked in the past, before you get to the dock, and it just hasn't been an issue, and so it would be a little bit hypocritical for me to have piloting programs ongoing, as we speak, that report for the dock and then vote for this motion, but maybe I can assure the council that this just hasn't been a problem with the captains. It's a two-minute, if that, procedure to enter this catch, and it was pretty much just a non-issue.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am going to go back to my list. Martha, you're next on my list.

MS. GUYAS: I think my question is germane to just our general discussion that we're having here. Let's say we stick with the current preferred of landing before you hit the dock. What happens if they don't and they forget until the next day? A couple of people that spoke yesterday that are in these pilot programs and they have VMS and they're all onboard, but it's not a big deal and I forgot and I just do it when I get in the boat the next morning, and like what happens?

Where I'm coming from here, I just want this to be easy for people. I want to find a system that we can all live with. Maybe it's one where they can do the report before they actually get off the boat. I don't know, but what happens if they don't do the report?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I believe, the way this is done, is that, if you fail to report, then you're not allowed to fish, under your permit, until you correct the report, and so I think -- Mara, help me here, but I think, if they came in and didn't report, if they then got on the boat and went out the next day fishing without having submitted their report, I think then they could be subject to an enforcement action, but I think, if they just were late -- I am going to ask Mara to comment on that, because I don't think all the details are yet put in the codified text.

MS. LEVY: It's very similar to what we did with the dealer electronic reporting, and it says it in the note that we went over during committee, that an electronic report not received within the time specified is delinquent. A delinquent report automatically results in a prohibition on harvesting or possessing the applicable species by the permit holder, regardless of any additional notification to the delinquent permit holder or operator by NMFS.

 This prohibition is applicable until all required and delinquent reports have been submitted and received by NMFS according to the reporting requirement, and so it's essentially saying, if you don't do it, you have a delinquent report. Therefore, you are no longer authorized to go out and fish, pursuant to your permit.

I think it sets up a situation, because a lot of the discussion we had in the dealer reporting was how do we enforce this? How do we enforce the reporting requirement? I think it sets up the situation where you're setting up a potential enforcement or a violation if they don't submit the report. In addition to just being late, if they go out and fish, then we have a mechanism to say, hey, you were delinquent and you weren't allowed to fish, and so it sets up a way to allow for some type of enforcement.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Martha?

MS. GUYAS: I think what I'm hearing is, if you have the situation where you go out one day and you forget to do your report, and you do your report before you leave the next morning, you're still good and you're not going to have a violation.

 MS. LEVY: I think, technically, you would still have a violation. Well, I am not going to say one way or another. That would be up to the discretion of -- I mean, if you're in a situation where potentially someone is forgetting 80 percent of the time, you may set up a situation where enforcement feels like there's something that they want to issue a violation for, but that's something that is going to be within the discretion of the enforcement agent and of NOAA General Counsel in terms of pursuing that, but it would be a violation not to report consistent with the requirements.

DR. CRABTREE: But we have not been aggressive about doing that. Our approach with dealers and headboats and all of them has been to correct the problem and make sure people understand the requirement and try to get people to comply, but you need to have that possibility of an enforcement action to do that, but I think our goal would be to contact them and make sure they understand the requirement and why are they late and try to fix it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Is it to that point, Mr. Riechers? All 46 right. Then I have Mr. Boyd.

MR. RIECHERS: Roy, I certainly understand the enforcement

aspect of this, and we deal with this, but I can tell you, though I am not a law enforcement officer, if they correct the problem, I suspect we're not going to run down to a county judge and be trying to have them do a ticket, because it's just not going to go anywhere.

Now, your enforcement officer, as you suggest, if there is multiple -- Even ours. If there is a continual pattern, then that gives someone a reason to go investigate, but that's a continual pattern issue, and you will have that continual pattern whether it's the day after or that night, if there's a problem there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd, you have been waiting patiently.

 MR. BOYD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I am conflicted on this motion. I understand the need for accurate, timely reporting, and I understand the need to validate and for enforcement, but I also listened to what I think is a substantial number of captains who have spoken against reporting before you hit the dock.

They say it's a safety at-sea issue, and they say that it causes them problems with their customers, and so I am conflicted, and I have a question for Dr. Crabtree. If we voted this in and we have reporting the next day, is there anything to preclude the council from coming back at a later date and saying that now we want to go to daily reporting before you hit the dock?

DR. CRABTREE: No. You would have to come back in and, I guess, amend the plan and change it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Speaking to that scenario, it would not be difficult to picture a situation where a captain came in and got sampled and went back to their tablet, either on the boat or back in their office, and reported precisely what that sampler say in their catch, as opposed to -- Basically erasing any reporting error. It's, okay, well, I watched the sampler offload this and this is what I will report, because that's what I have.

 What that does is it erases our ability -- That's a logical behavior, right? I would do it myself. I want my report to be excellent, and, if I see them out there, what that does is it creates a lack of an ability to understand reporting error in the sample.

We've talked a lot about whether people are going to be honest or not, and let's assume that everybody is honest and everybody wants to give the very best data they can. There is still such a thing as reporting error. It's a chaotic scenario out there, and there will be reporting error.

 The ability to have a report button pushed before they know whether they're going to be sampled gives us the ability to compare what they thought they had on their boat to what an observer, a dockside sampler, sees in a less chaotic situation and make a correction.

I could picture, in this scenario, where there would be 100 percent agreement between the report that was sent in and what the observer or the port sampler saw, because the captain is standing there watching and doing that count at that point, and it eliminates our ability to have that correction factor when it's anticipated that there will be reporting error, and so I am worried about this one.

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

MR. BANKS: Dr. Ponwith, is there any way for you to understand the reporting error of your samplers, because certainly we have that from time to time in our samplers, and what you're talking about is reporting error from the fishermen, and I am just wondering about on the other side. Do you have a way to determine that?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, there are certainly -- Reporting error is a statistical phenomenon in every single sampling program, and the thing that you have to do is study reporting error and understand whether it's unidirectional, where it's a one-way bias, which is the worst-case scenario, versus whether it oscillates up and down and has the potential to cancel itself out.

Typically, and just generically, the way you would deal with sampling error is quantify it by having a sampler do their job without knowledge in advance of a second sampler coming in and doing that same job and then comparing those two results, and that is typically the way that sample bias is managed.

 MR. BANKS: I'm sorry. What I really meant to ask, I guess, was do you all have a program in place to determine your samplers' sampling error already? I mean, it looks like we're trying to put something in place to help us understand the fishermen's

sampling error. Do we already have a system in place that understands the other side's sampling error?

DR. PONWITH: I would have to consult with the MRIP folks, because they manage the dockside intercept program. I could do that and ask if they've got a system in place for sampling error.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a couple more people to speak, and then we will vote it up or down, but it's pretty important, because at least one of them hasn't spoken yet. All right. Dr. Stunz, you have been waiting. Go ahead, sir.

 DR. STUNZ: I just wanted to say, regarding to the honest forgetfulness of reporting a trip, which is certain to occur, and maybe this is within the framework of this generic amendment, but there is technological solutions to that.

For example, you just don't allow a hail-out again until you have submitted a report. Then, obviously, if you're going and you have been through those checkpoints, then that's a little bit different level of violation than you just accidentally forgot, and so there are some solutions to that that I think are probably built in already.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I was just going to mention that I've been in the charter business myself, and I think it would be interesting to have your charter come up there, maybe right at the end of the trip, and say, hey, guys, I want to show you how we enter the data to get better science and hopefully a lot better season, and just show them. Scan them through. It takes a couple of minutes, and they can watch you and get them involved. I think a lot of people would be interested in that as well.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

 MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think we all know where we stand on this issue, and we've talked about it long enough. That said, I would like to offer a substitute to approve the generic amendment to require electronic reporting for for-hire vessels and 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 necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the text as necessary.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara has her hand up.

MS. LEVY: It seems, to me, that this may not be a proper substitute motion. It's not going to -- It's not germane to the issue before the council, which is the alternative in Action 1. It's almost like you have to dispense with what you're doing with Action 1 before you can vote to approve the amendment.

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are going to withdraw the motion back off of the board then. Is that correct, Mara? Is that what you're saying? All right. Okay. As long as we're all on the same page. We have Lieutenant Commander Danaher.

LCDR DANAHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just trying to listen and take in everybody's stake in this particular decision, I am just trying to offer a little bit of a perspective. When we were discussing the enforceability and the concern of the timeliness of the reports, the law enforcement officers that are out there, they can't be everywhere at one time, but there is also some complications to how do you measure each officer's instincts?

 I mean, you have the regulations, but then you've got thirteen years of experience that you have to depend upon, and each officer is going to be a little different. They are forming partnerships with some of these mariners, and they know the trends of some of these mariners, and they're going to know who is deliberately out there breaking the law and who is being a little forgetful from time to time.

I would say that the other aspect is the trends. We pay attention to the trends. If we board somebody and there are a lot of violations, guess what? We are going to be looking for you, and we're going to board you again, and we're going to board you next season, until we start to see improvement, and that's just the way it is. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Greene, and then we're going to take a vote.

 MR. GREENE: Okay. The deal we're dealing with here is do we report before we get to the dock or do we wait until the next day or the following day before lunch, and so we heard a lot of testimony about guys that are operating a boat by themselves and they have the charter on the boat and they were worried about

going fifty-five miles an hour and texting and driving.

Here is the real deal. I have run small boats. I currently have a big boat with an enclosed wheelhouse and satellite TV and air conditioning. I have a lot of nice amenities. It is no problem for me. However, I have run, and still do run, small outboard boats, and so the reality of the deal is you're going to have a ride in and a ride out, a ride offshore and a ride back in. That's just the way it goes.

Some guys sit in beanbags and some guys sit down and do whatever, and so, when you come running in out of the Gulf and you've run for an hour or two hours or three hours, or, in my case, six or eight hours sometimes, when you get up to the beach and you're close to the Mississippi River or the pass or whatever it is, you're going to slow down, because everybody on the boat has to go to the bathroom.

It's going to happen. I am counting down the minutes right now to the ten o'clock break, because I ready to go to the bathroom right now. That's just a reality. There is going to be a point that you're going to have to slow down and take care of your customers, because somebody is going to have to go to the bathroom, and you're not going to do that at fifty miles an hour or thirty miles an hour or whatever on a small outboard boat, but that is just the reality.

There is plenty of time to report this catch before you get to the dock. It will aid in enforcement, it will aid in validation, and it will aid in a lot of things, especially someone's bladder, and so understand that is the reality of what we're up against right now.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion on the board. We have had extensive discussion, and so let's take a vote. All of those in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Six.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All of those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Nine. The motion fails six to 43 nine.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We are done with Action 1 then. No? 46 Okay.

MR. ANSON: I would like to -- I was trying to think as to how

best to do this, and so I'm going to go with Option a. That is to offer a motion that the Preferred alternative 4 to require -- If you want to copy the entire alternative, but I just have one change at the very end of the motion. The change would be, at the very end, that after "prior to", "prior to offloading fish." If I get a second, I will talk a little bit about it.

4 5

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion that's going up on the board. We have a second by Dale. Mara.

MS. LEVY: Just to clarify, the motion is to modify the language in Preferred Alternative 4 as shown or something like that.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Mara. That's where I was having trouble, was how to express that. It's to keep it as the preferred, but modify the language, yes. So modify the language in Preferred Alternative 4.

MS. LEVY: Okay, but, just for the motion writer, it's not to -- Alternative 4 is already the preferred, and so we don't want to say to make it the preferred, but it's just to modify the language in Preferred Alternative 4 or something like that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Kevin, does that look like your motion?

MR. ANSON: That appears to be my motion. I touched on it earlier. Again, I'm trying to, as Dr. Crabtree had noted, trying to come up with a compromise. Not everybody's docking situation and entry or reentry back into port are the same, and to try to then allow opportunities for folks to get their customers and themselves, quite frankly, back to shore safely, without having to try to manipulate any other additional device.

This provides them the opportunity to tie up and then, a short time later, the fish are offloaded, normally, and so this would allow them that little bit of time to go ahead and do everything they need to do and hopefully do it correctly, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I was just hoping that Dr. Crabtree could let us know what his ceilings are on this compromise and how that impacts the data quality, from your standpoint.

 DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think it weakens it. I think it's better than the next morning. The tricky part of it is so that boat comes into the -- I mean, a lot of this has been that you want

them to submit the report before they know if they're going to be subject to a dockside interview, and so the question becomes, if they're tied up to the dock, and I assume the customers get off the boat before the fish come off the boat, and so they're sitting at the dock and the guy is going to fill out his report after he's tied up, is he going to be aware that a dockside intercept is coming with that or can we work with the dockside intercepts to make sure that they don't announce themselves or become apparent until after the fish hit on the dock and how effective can we be at doing that?

It's a lot better than noon the next day. Whether it will create a problem or not, and how much of a problem, will be hard to say, but I'm a little like Johnny. I used to be a charter boat captain in the Keys, and I just find the notion that you can't stop for a few minutes at some point -- That is outside of all of my experience running charter boats, but it's hard for me to judge how much of an issue this might be or not.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson, to that point?

MR. ANSON: To that point, again, as I mentioned earlier, the current language, as the Preferred Alternative 4, says prior to arriving at the dock, and so that can literally be fifteen seconds.

They just idle and they're sitting there and they're within two arm lengths away from the dock and they report, and they have the same field of view as they did if they tied up, and so it will be very difficult to give instructions to samplers to kind of hide out in the bushes and wait, and so most of the marinas that I'm familiar with are fairly wide open, and most of the samplers, at least the ones working for the states, have clothing that kind of separates them out from the normal folks that are walking on the dock, and so it is something to be considered, but I think it's very minor, and, again, trying to come to some point to accommodate some of these things.

 On a perfect day that the sun is shining and the winds are calm and everything is going right, then great, but, as some of the captains had said yesterday, not every day is like that, and there might be thunderstorms, and there might be wind or that a cold front comes up on you earlier than you thought and you're out there and it goes from five knots to twenty-five knots. Anyway, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Mr. Banks next. No? Then I had Mr. Walker next.

MR. WALKER: In the commercial industry, we can unload the fish from 6:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M., and so I don't know how that would factor in as the timeframe when someone would come in. If they tie the boat up at eleven o'clock and unload the fish at three in the morning, that just kind of -- I wanted to ask about that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Do you have an answer to that, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: Not to that, but, Kevin, in Alabama, with your Snapper Check, do you require that they report before they tie up to the dock, or do you allow them to tie up and do it before the fish come off? How do you do it?

MR. ANSON: It's prior to landing the fish. Again, we tried to do this so it was equal to everyone, and we took into consideration private boat owners, but there are some inshore state-guided boats that are on trailers, and so we said that landing fish, and so landing could be, if there are boats that are trailered, federally-permitted and are trailered, landed fish is kept on the vessel, but then it's put on the trailer, and then that's the point of landing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Martha, to that point.

 MS. GUYAS: It was to David's question about whether there should be some kind of time limit in here, and I don't know that I would support that here. I mean, I can think of a few captains that I know that run night trips at various times for certain things, or they're doing an overnight and they're coming in at four in the morning or whatever, and, if everybody is ready to get off the boat and go home at that point, then I'm sure that that's -- With customers in the mix, then I think they need the flexibility to do what they need to do.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

 MR. SWINDELL: As I have been on charter boats, outboard motor charter boats and all, it's twice that I know that we have been inspected, and twice the inspectors were at the cleaning table. I mean, they offloaded the fish and then the inspector showed up and he looked at the fish that were coming off of the boat.

 I think there needs to be some way or another that has some sort of leeway. I don't like the fact that, if they don't report and the weather does get bad for everybody, that we penalize them so severely, but I do want some way or another to get better information than we're getting now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To Ed's point, Dr. Lucas? Go ahead.

DR. LUCAS: I was just going to say, in states that operate MRIP, it's a twenty-four-hour -- We have people who are cycling through for twenty-four hours of time, and so they would be the same chance if you came in at 11:00 P.M. as if you came in at 11:00 A.M. of running into it. It's the same chance, because MRIP samplers operate twenty-four hours.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: Well, I am usually always in the spirit of compromise and trying to work things out, but I'm going to have to speak in opposition to this, because I can picture situations for everything that you can come up with.

My intent with the way -- If it was truly up to me, I would want you to report your fish when you leave a spot. In other words, when you get through fish, go ahead and report them right then and just update as you go spot to spot to spot. When you're through fishing and you're going home, hit the "send" button and be done.

My hope, at that point, would be that, if they are intercepted by the Coast Guard, then there has been a report already sent. The enforcement guy at sea can say, okay, let me see your fish, and it all checks out. When you get to the dock, you have a similar situation, and that may be kind of lofty. It might be kind of dreaming or whatever, but it does end the argument about offloading fish.

If I pull up to the dock and don't offload my fish and don't see anybody there, well, all of a sudden, I'm trying to get my report together and I just pulled up to the fuel dock. I'm not really at my dock and I'm going to move over here or I'm going to move over there, and I just think that the current preferred alternative, because you arrive to the dock, solves the issue.

Before offloading fish could be interpreted a lot of different ways. Now, I know, in the commercial fishery, which is a little different, that we allow them to tie up to the dock, because they can unload from a certain time to a certain time.

 I just think that, while I am always in the spirit of trying to work things out, I just think that this opens up a door that we don't need to open up. It's already going to be a change, as it is, to do it, and so let's just go ahead and be done with it and

make them offload before they arrive to the dock. The offloading fish thing is just cumbersome, to me, and I don't think it really is as good as what we have currently preferred.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: One question. If you have to report prior to offloading fish, are there charter or for-hire trips where they just do catch and release and they don't offload any fish? Then what does that mean for those trips, because one of the reporting elements that I think that we were looking at is all fish caught or released, and so when would they be reporting under this?

MR. ANSON: I think, as was pointed out earlier, is that they're already going to have a hail-out report, and a hail-in report, I guess, would be the report, and so there would be some sort of check that you would match a report or a hail-in or something to say that I've got zero fish. That might be the way to try to account for those. I understand that it does happen. You might get customers that just want to go catch fish and not keep any, but that's how I envision it.

 MS. LEVY: The reason I'm asking is to just to figure out how it's going to work, and I didn't bring this up now, but, if this does pass, we're going to have to talk about what the hail-in is and what it requires, because, the way the original alternative is written, the hail-in was going to include the reporting of the fish, but now, if it was when you have to do it prior to offload, I guess it could include it, but it might not include it, and then, what that means, I think we would need to flesh out.

Kind of to that point, then what you're saying is that, potentially, as part of the hail-in, if you aren't bringing any fish back, you would be reporting all the fish that you released? Like that would be the component of the hail-in? Because we have to figure out sort of how to write the regulations and what the requirements are of each part of this.

MR. ANSON: Yes, and, just off the cuff, I could see that it could be built in that you have a hail-in. I am hailing-in to complete my hail-out, or match my hail-out report, and then, at that point, do you have fish to report? Yes or no, and then it depends on how you want to set it up, but I don't see it being a major hurdle.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, Mara, to that point.

MS. LEVY: I am just wondering, does it raise the same concern that you're talking about if you're on a trip and you don't have any fish to offload, but we expect you to report all the different types of fish that you released and you need to do that as part of your hail-in. You're doing that before you hit the dock, and so I just want to -- I just want to make sure that everyone, when you're talking about changing this, what the implications are and that there still might then be folks that are being required to report things before they actually get to the dock, because we're not just asking you whether you caught fish or not. I think the expectation was, for those fish you released, what were they? There is questions that go with it. It's not a yes or no question, I don't think.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I am going to let Mr. Mark Brown, for-hire operator from the South Atlantic -- He had his hand raised. Go ahead.

MR. BROWN: I just wanted to put my two-cents in, because I do a lot of reporting. As I've told you, I do reporting for the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey, which has been going on for about a year-and-a-half now, and I fill mine out coming in. I just put the autopilot on and just stand up there and watch where I'm going and tap it in there, and it's not that hard.

With us too, if we don't have an internet connection, you can put it in there and hit it a button. Then it saves it. Then, whenever you get into the range, it will send it for you. Also, if you wanted to wait and do them all at one time, at the end of the week, you can hit a button and it will send the batch, like you would with a credit card batch or whatever. What I'm saying is you can fill it out and send it in daily, and it's not that hard.

 Then I do one for the South Carolina electronic logbook, which became mandatory on January 1, and it has a lot of different criteria in it, with economic data too, and your fishery information, and I have a six-pack inshore guide boat, and I use the iPad for that, and also for processing my credit cards and stuff, and so I've got everything right there, and it's not that hard.

You slow down, and I come into a creek, and it's fairly long, and we've got lots of people on paddleboards and kayaks and everything, and you've just kind of got to go slow and navigate through there, but I still have time to punch everything in and do their credit card, and they can step off the boat and leave,

and so it doesn't take that long.

 I'm also doing the pilot program for Harbor Lights for this upcoming charter logbook that we discussed, and it has different -- All three of them are a little bit different too, and so it takes a little bit of time trying to navigate through it, but it's not that hard. You just kind of shoot through there, and you can do it in a short period of time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next, I have Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Getting at Mara's point a little bit, I think what you're trying to make the distinction in, Mara, is it's not necessarily a catch report, but it's a trip report, and so, while you won't be offloading fish, there will be some sort of context of, before you would take the steps of leaving the dock area or whatever that is, you are going to make your trip report.

We may not have worded it well here, because we're changing things on the last day. Maybe we need to go back and change it and word it better, if this is the intent and you don't like this wording, but the simple fact is that we're throwing up enforcement issues and we're throwing up reporting issues and sampling error, and, folks, what we really need to be looking at is we're going from a sample to a census.

We're going from what has been piloted to probably 1,200 or 1,300 boats, and to think we're going to get this completely right the first time is probably wrong. To think that we're not going to have to come back and look at it again at some point is probably wrong, but what we've got to do is get this adopted.

In order to get it adopted -- If you put up enough hurdles and you make it hard enough, you're not even going to have people want to do it. If you don't get reporting and you get basically people non-reporting, we're not achieving the result we want to have, and so I think we've got to think about this.

I like Kevin's example. I am certainly not going to write in my operations manual that the dockside samplers should hide and jump out when they get to the dock. I mean, that's kind of a little bit crazy, in some respects, and so I mean we've got to put this in a way where we get that adoption, so that people will want to report and not that we're throwing up every hurdle to make it more difficult.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: I am not saying -- My issue is not whether I like it or not or the wording. It's I'm trying to understand what your intent is, because, if we don't know what it means, we can't write the regulations to tell folks what it means, and so I'm trying to understand what folks who aren't offloading fish -- What we're supposed to tell them about when they need to report, and that's the part that I'm getting at.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Have we made that clear yet? No? All right. Dr. Lucas.

 DR. LUCAS: I'm on the same thinking as Robin. It's a trip report. It's about whether you catch. If you hailed out, when you come back into the dock, your report is basically your hailin report. If you went out fishing or attempted fishing, or you were leaving the dock and thought that you were going fishing, you need to report something on the way back in.

We have guys that hail-out, and they get down there and their customers decide that they don't want to go, and so, when they have to electronically report, they send us a note saying, hey, we didn't go fishing and this happened or something happened, and so it's a trip-level reporting. If you hailed-out, then your report, when you come back in, needs to show how you were fishing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Dr. Crabtree?

 DR. CRABTREE: All right. This is still getting confused, because -- The hail-in, they have to report their discards, and, on most of these trips, they've got more discards than they have fish that they're landing, and so that probably takes more time than doing the actual report.

From what you just said, I think you're saying they have to do that before they come to the dock. If we're going to make them do that before they come to the dock -- All right. Then when? Because this says prior to offloading fish. If they don't have any fish to offload, then when do they have to do it?

MR. RIECHERS: (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

DR. CRABTREE: I am trying to get at did you want to put a hard time in there, that they have to do it within thirty minutes of tying up to the dock, but it sounds like your intent, if this passes, is they don't have to do anything before they tie up to the dock. Then, if they don't have any fish to offload, we are

going to put some timeline that they have to do it within X minutes, and we will just come up with something and put it in the rule and you will see it down the road and is that --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson, do you have a response to that?

MR. ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, they are not mutually exclusive, and so, to answer Mara's question, as far as direction, my opinion would be, for those instances where they are not completing a report because they have landed fish, of which this applies, then, for those trips where there are no fish harvested and brought to shore -- In those instances, they maybe have thirty minutes, or something like that, to report.

As far as enforcement, they're in double -- I hate to use the term, but they're almost in double jeopardy here, if you're looking at it from those who don't want to comply, in that they're required to hail-out, and so that's going to have a chance to check them, if you will, and then they're required to hail-in.

We're looking at the return part of the trip, and so they're going to have to not to do two things in order for that trip not to be recorded in some fashion, and so that's what I would say. Then, to give some direction, my opinion would be that within thirty minutes for those trips for which they do not have any harvest that they would be expected to file a report. Whether it's part of the hail-in or not is up to discretion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I think the hail-in is in the next action, and we had sort of envisioned that your trip report was going to be your hail-in. Now, when we get to the next action, we're going to have to decide if there even is a hail-in or is this going to be the hail-in, but they hail in after they're already in, or do we have some other function built into this where they have to submit something before they hit the dock? I guess we'll have to clarify that in the next action.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are about forty-minutes over schedule on this report on Action 1 of the document, and so I think we've had a lot of very good discussion. Are there any final thoughts? This is kind of complicated, and so, if there's any final thoughts, I will take a final thought, but then we need to vote this up or down. All right. No final thoughts. We have a motion on the board, and we did have a second. All those in favor, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Nine.

3

4

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

Seven.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara, do you have anything else for Action 1?

2 was about submitting the no-fishing reports, which may or may

not end up being relevant, but it says that no-fishing reports

could be submitted up to one month in advance, meaning, under

any of the time schedules, the Science Center has allowed folks

to submit things in advance. If you know you're going to not be

fishing for two weeks or three weeks, you say that I'm not going

I just wanted to note that, in the codified regulations, the way

it's written now, it says "at the discretion of the SRD", and we

basically did it that way not to codify the one month, because

there may be a point in time when the Science Center would say,

well, we will let you do it up to two months in advance, and so

I just wanted to note that we built some discretion into the

regulations for that, and I wanted to make sure that folks here

were okay with that, because it is a little bit different than

understand, in a logbook, where you're kind of just randomly selected that you might be able to do that, but this is a

census-based reporting, and the report occurs when the action

what's written in the note about the up to one month in advance.

Is there anything else on Action 1?

I guess I will make a motion that in Preferred

Thank you. I just wanted to note something that was

Part of what was in the note for both Action 1 or

I must have skipped over that, because I can

The motion passes nine to

Mr.

5 6

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: 7 seven.

8

9 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: 10 Greene.

11

12 MR. GREENE: 13 Alternative 4 that we add the language by the IPT to have the GPS unit affixed to -- We're not there yet? Okay.

MS. LEVY:

in the note.

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

33 34

35 36

> 37 38

39 40 41

42 43 44

45

46 47 48

occurs.

In my mind, I thought, if there was no report being submitted, then there is no action occurring. What you're saying is that

you can say that in the next month that I'm not going to be

to be fishing for three weeks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

169

taking any trips and you're not going to report, and is that what you're saying? I mean, I thought the act of fishing would be triggering all of the reporting.

MS. LEVY: But we have a requirement in there that, if you're not going to be fishing, you still have to submit a no-fishing report, just like if -- You report, but, if you're not taking a trip -- For example, when you were going to report weekly, if you didn't take a trip that week, you would still submit a no-fishing report for that week, to confirm that you didn't do any fishing, and so it still requires you to report.

With the trip reporting, it was a daily no-fishing report. At the end of each day, if you didn't do a fishing trip, you would have to say that you didn't do a fishing trip, but there is flexibility built into that, because it allows you to say that I'm going on vacation and I'm going to submit a no-fishing report for the next two weeks, because I'm not going to be fishing for the next two weeks, and so it gets you out of having to do it every day.

All I was saying is that we wrote the regulations in such a way to give the Science Center some flexibility to increase the amount of time in advance you could say that you're not going to fish. If you then take a trip during that time when you said that you weren't going to, you have to file a trip report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, it's important, because there will be late reports, where people fish, but they're delinquent. What happens in the programs that I'm familiar with is there are expansions built into this to account for late reports, and so, if you don't have a no fishing report from someone, you don't know if they're really not fishing or they're just delinquent, and that makes the expansion factors more cloudy.

 It's important to know whether someone is not fishing or whether it's a late report. This is a big deal in the dealer reports, where we're trying to track this stuff, and we get dealers who are late. Every time I look at the data, there is people who are late.

You can't just assume they didn't have any fish, because they invariably show up and they did land fish and they are just late, and so there's an expansion factor that goes in, and it may be close and it may not be close, but if we have a wedidn't-buy-any-fish report, then you don't put the expansion

factor in.

If a charter boat knows that he's not going to be fishing for thirty days, they can file an I'm-not-fishing report on it, but, without that, it will make the expansions more significant.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I thought that was the whole point of doing the verification, Dr. Crabtree, is that you're going to sample the population of trips, and that's where you're going to get your expansion factor, is based on that ratio of those who submitted a report that you've verified and those who did not submit a report that you've verified, and that is supposed to account for the sum total of trips that are occurring.

DR. CRABTREE: Fair enough, but you're never going to know with certainty, if a vessel doesn't report, whether it just didn't fish or whether he is late reporting. Maybe you can get at some of that through the sampling, but, if you have a no-fishing report from them, then you know for sure that they didn't fish, presumably.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: I also want to say that has been in the document all along. This isn't something that we added, and I also just want to say that it's consistent with what you did with the electronic dealer reporting.

They have to report weekly. If they don't receive any fish during that week, then they submit a no-fishing report, but also they're allowed to -- Not a no-fishing report. A no-receiving-of-fish report. They're also allowed to do that in advance, and so we pretty much modeled this after that.

The one other thing was it also says in there that if the VMS or the location-recording device is required to be affixed to the vessel that you wouldn't need the no-fishing report. This was only if you had a system by which you didn't have the location device permanently affixed to the vessel to get no-fishing reports to confirm that there was no fishing. If the location device is permanently affixed, then you know whether they are taking a trip or not, and so you don't need to have the no-fishing report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Dr. Ponwith.

 DR. PONWITH: Just to Mr. Anson's point, the dockside sampling is really focusing on catch per unit effort, the how much time were you out there and what did you catch, as opposed to effort itself.

The GPS unit permanently affixed to the vessel or the fishing/no-fishing reports or the hail-in and hail-out are all methods to get at effort. The problem that you get is, if you work really, really hard to get superb catch per unit effort data, which is what the trip reports and the dockside sample validation are designed to do, and you get that superb number and multiply it by kind of a flaky number of what your total effort is, you're going to get a flaky number for your total landings, and that's what we're trying to avoid.

We saw, in Dr. Stokes's presentation, that, statistically, one of the most powerful things you can do to improve the strength of this program is to have absolute perfect knowledge about how many people went fishing, so that you've got a good number to apply that catch per unit effort to.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Are we all comfortable, as much as we can be? Okay. All right. Are we done with Action 1? Okay. Let's move on to Action 2. Do we have any discussion on Action 2? Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Action 1 was charter boats. Action 2 is headboats, and so I assume you want to make the same changes for headboats that you did for charter boats, and hopefully we don't have to have a debate about that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: If we want to make that change, hopefully we've had enough discussion about it that we can do it or not do it. Is that a motion, sir? Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I would assume that we need to, procedurally. I will make the same motion, to require headboats to report prior to offloading fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are getting the motion on the board, which will be essentially a copy and paste of the last motion, except that this one will be for Action 2, which will apply to headboats. Do we have a second for that motion? It's seconded by Dr. Lucas. Do we have any discussion on that motion? It's okay if we do. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: It's a good thing that I'm not a fish, because I had to take the bait. They've been doing this for a couple of

years now, and they haven't had any trouble, and I just don't see the reason of going and changing this at this point.

2 3 4

I mean, I know that maybe it's just language and maybe it doesn't seem like that big of a shift, but there's a reason that initially it was passed the way it was written of before arriving at the dock, and headboats are typically bigger. I understand that, but there is also thirty or forty or fifty or sixty or seventy or eighty or ninety people on these boats. When you start unloading ninety people off a boat, that's a whole other ballgame. I speak in opposition to this, strongly.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Let's remember though that this isn't what the headboats have been doing now. Now they report once weekly. They don't do this now, and I see no reason why we would require the headboats to report before they hit the dock and not the charter boats, and so it just seems, to me that -- I mean, I didn't agree with what we did in charter boats, but, given that's where we are, it seems, to me, that we need to make the same change here for the headboats.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Well, in follow-up to that, I certainly don't think that we need to do it separately here, but that also begs the question of why we're doing things separately from the South Atlantic, and it would have been interesting to be in their discussion regarding this, just recently, to hear some of that and how much opposition there was to some of this.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have a question. I am going to play devil's advocate for a minute. Bonnie, if we went two different ways on this, like if we had the charter boats going with sort of the compromise way that we passed in the last motion, and we had the headboats going this direction, where they have to report before they hit the dock, would we then be able to --Maybe that's a nightmare for enforcement and for everybody else, but would we then be able to maybe have some comparisons as to as far as the accuracy of the data and our errors around different things and which way is working better, to give us room for improvement in the future, or would it probably not be worthwhile?

DR. PONWITH: To clarify, you're saying, hypothetically, if the headboats were required to submit before they hit the dock, but the charter boats did this, it would provide some contrast to

look at the degree of sampling error from one to the other.

 The thing that that would require is any difference that you have in how you treat a charter boat and a headboat puts a premium on a very, very crisp definition of what a headboat is and what a charter boat is, and so that's another thing that you would have to take into consideration if you selected different alternatives for the two of those.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: There is no good reason why we would require one to do it and not the other. We had a long debate and we made a decision. In my judgment, if we do something different here than we did with the charter boats, we're bordering on arbitrary and capricious, and I think this whole thing potentially falls apart, and I may vote against the whole amendment. We made the decision that we were going to do it before they land. Let's be consistent and do it for the headboats and move on.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Now I'm getting us off schedule. Have we got any more discussion on this? Really? Okay. All right. Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: In both cases, Dr. Crabtree, you have the charter boats and you have the headboats, and all we're saying is that you at least have to report prior to offloading fish, is what this means.

I mean, I would think that a lot of the headboats, a lot of the charter boats, are going to keep doing it before they get anywhere close to the dock. That would be my opinion, because I think it's the simplest thing for them to do, to take care of it as they're moving down the waterway. I don't see that this is a requirement. It's just saying that, hey, before you offload the fish, make sure you've got your work done on the reporting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had one other hand over here somewhere from Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: I agree with Dr. Crabtree. I think we ought to be consistent in our landings. To Johnny's point, Johnny, any of these captains coming in could report whenever they want to. They don't have to wait until they touch the dock. If they are at idle and somebody's bladder is too full, they can report. They don't have to wait.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Is everybody ready to vote? We

have a motion on the board. All those in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The motion passes sixteen to zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. All right. Is that all for Action 2? Action 3, do we have any discussion on Action 3? Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, there is the issue about the hail-in now and what it is. It seems, to me, where we are now is we're saying they don't have to hail-in and we're going to let them come to the dock and then they will report whatever they're doing, and so it seems, to me, if that's where we are, we just would not select Alternative 3 as a preferred. Otherwise, I guess then we're going to have to specify what is the hail-in and what is it exactly that they have to send.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: It may be semantics, I guess, but they have a trip report, whether it's part of the hail-in or it's not part of the hail-in, but, potentially, I see maybe taking away the -- To make it easier, programmatically, to go forward and try and to determine how to set up things, to possibly remove the hail-in option as a preferred.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, because, right now, it says to hail-in and submit fishing records. I guess we could get rid of the "and submit fishing records" and then they have to send something in, but I'm not sure what.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have Dale.

MR. DIAZ: This might be a question for Dr. Crabtree. When I first was thinking about it, I was thinking that we would change the language in the Preferred Alternative 3 and it would say prior to offloading fish there, just like we did in the other one, and go that route, but I'm not sure if that's the right way to go or not, after a little bit of discussion here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara, to that point?

MS. LEVY: Action 1 and 2 already say when you have to submit your report, right? Prior to offloading fish, you've got submit your report, and so, to say it here, to me, would be redundant. Unless there is something specific that you want them to hail-in for that's separate from the fishing report, it doesn't seem, to me, like you need this.

If you keep it and just remove the "and submit fishing records", you're going to need to specify what the hail-in is and what are they telling you during the hail-in, because we're going to have to tell them what to tell you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Dr. Dana next, I believe.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Chairman Bosarge. I think the hail-in would be to verify the effort in terms of the length of time that the fisherman was out, but my question is for Dr. Stunz. If we were to keep that our preferred, Alternative 3, but revise it to take off that "and submit fishing records via electronic reporting", knowing now that the reports can be done prior to offloading the fish at the dock, is there, in the things that you've designed, a way to just hail-in, so that the dockside interviewers can know that someone is coming in, so that they could be in route to check them, if they're in the vicinity or whatever. Then, of course, the electronic reporting still needs to happen, but it would be supplemental to the hail-in.

DR. STUNZ: Yes. In what we have done, it was a separate hailin and then the trip submission, but, in reality, your trip submission was pretty much the hail-in. There wasn't that big of a difference, but there is instances where people, from an effort calculation, people come in, and maybe you're getting fuel or maybe you stopped fishing and you're doing something else with the clients, like sight-seeing or whatever, and so you're done with the fishing activity, but you haven't landed the fish.

I guess, in some instances, there is value to saying, okay, this is the end of my actual fishing activity, but I haven't landed my fish, but I feel like we're kind of splitting hairs, but there was a separate button for hail-in and then you're done, but then you actually press another to actually submit and complete your landings report, and so I don't know where I am on this. It's kind of -- I guess you could have a quick hail-in button, like we've always had, that's very easy. You just hit a very big button the screen and you're done with your fishing trip and then you submit later, but I don't know.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

 MR. RIECHERS: I was going to make a motion, and I will. I move that we delete the preferred from Alternative 3, 3a and b. Contextually, I'm not certain -- I am just removing it as a preferred. I will wait for a second, if I get one, and then I will hit another point here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's been seconded by Martha.

MR. RIECHERS: In relation to what Greg was just saying and the question from Dr. Dana, the reality of it is, folks, is, if we really want to get down to catch per unit effort, it's the effort of the actual fishing time that we're most interested in, and, in actuality, what we're getting, in a sense, is a trip time, and the trip time can be much, much different than the actual fishing time, as we know, given different distances to fishing grounds and given that some people may sight-see on the way in or the way out, and, to think we're getting it that fine, we're, in some respects, probably -- We are cutting hairs a little bit, and we're thinking we're getting greater precision than we actually are, because those situations are going to be very dramatically different from Brownsville to Key West, and we know that.

It's going to be -- Those trips are going to be a lot different, time-wise, to get in and out, but it is what we're going to have, but, to think that we're going to get it down to what we've got these people fishing -- They said they're fishing for six hours, when it's really four hours and thirty minutes or two hours and thirty minutes. That's what we're really trying to get to at some point, but we're just not going to be there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and I think staff has clarified the question that I had. You don't mean to delete this from the document, but you mean to deselect it as the preferred. The alternative will still stay in the document, but it would not be a preferred anymore.

MR. RIECHERS: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Mr. Greene next, if he still wants to 44 go.

46 MR. GREENE: At the risk of sounding redundant and everything else, I want to make sure -- I am going to ask Mara or Dr. 48 Crabtree or anybody, but does this satisfy our earlier

conversation about the catch and release portion of the discussion with what we're doing?

DR. CRABTREE: I think what we decided there is that we're going to write some period of time that, in that event, that they have to submit within thirty minutes of tying up at the dock. We will put that in the rule, and the rule is going to come back before you, and so you will see it, but I think that's what we decided on that issue.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Next, I have Dr. Frazer.

 DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. This question is actually for Mara. I am just curious, if you modified the language in the hail-in, to -- Instead of saying "and submit fishing records via electronic reporting", if you could have some language, for example, that says "with the intent to submit a fishing report" and that would be consistent then with the previous actions.

MS. LEVY: I guess my question is just, if we're going to keep a hail-in requirement, what information are they giving you in the hail-in, because it's not the fishing report. If you want to keep a hail-in requirement, that is certainly up to you. I just wanted to know what we're going to tell folks that they're required to tell you in that hail-in report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point?

DR. FRAZER: What I am interested in is making sure that they're letting people know that they, in fact, intend to submit a report.

DR. CRABTREE: Presumably you know that from the hail-out. If they hail-out that they're going fishing, then they're required to submit a report. In the hail-out, they tell us when they expect to be back in the day, and so, I think, if you want to have a hail-in, I think you could tell them to submit a revised estimate of when they're going to be at the dock or something like that, but I'm not sure that that gives us much of anything that has value.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you.

44 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: It sounds like we're talking about something that we're probably not going to be able to solve today, and this is sort of to Robin's and Mara's points, and maybe it is the best

idea to remove this from preferred, because it's not real -- I guess we, maybe as a council or the Science Center, we haven't conveyed what the real purpose of the hail-in is.

Some believe the hail-in is that you can hail-in and then you know that you need to go validate that, which I know all the issues with that, but hail-in, to some, means that, when I hail-in, I have completed my trip and that is some effort calculation, but that's not really the case either.

By the way, we struggled with this in our pilot. This was a big issue, of what constitutes a trip. Then you've got a whole reporting side, and the report, probably, and I'm not even sure, and so I'm talking about something that I can't remember, but I'm pretty sure that you're going to have a reporting field that says how many hours did you fish.

That's different than hailing-in. That's a different effort calculation than Bonnie would use, and so I guess what I am confusing my own self with, but maybe this is something that we leave to the Science Center or the Regional Office as they develop this, to see what are they really trying to accomplish here and don't make it a preferred, because I don't know that we have thought through this as a council even at this point.

As a scientist doing this, we're still even struggling with this effort calculation, and so it's a little more difficult than just the discussions we're having around the table here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas, did you still have a comment?

MS. GUYAS: Yes, and I was just going to say that I'm going to support this motion. I think a lot of the data elements that we're talking about that we're going to get from the hail-out and then from the trip report together. In terms of having some kind of notification so that the samplers can find them, the samplers are already going to know when they're coming in.

 They may not be close enough, within truck range, to get to them anyway. At least in Florida, we have samplers that work from like Apalachicola to Pensacola. They've got a large area, and so they kind of already know what area they're going to be in for the day, and so I think we just let this go.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Bonnie, I am going to give you the last word. It sounds like we're coming to a conclusion on this.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The last word that I have

1 is that the Science Center is comfortable with this motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion on the board, and we've had discussion on the motion, which is to de-select Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative. It will stay in the document. All those in favor of this motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen. The motion passes sixteen to zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. All those opposed, same sign, just for the record. None. Thanks.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I apologize. I assumed the Chair was not going to vote.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Good work, Doug. Okay. Are we done with Action 3? All right. Action 4. Johnny, I think you tried to make a motion on this earlier, and so we are finally to Action 4. Do we have anything we want to talk about with Action 4? Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I would like to make a motion for Action 4, Alternatives 2 and 3, that we add the IPT-recommended language that the GPS portion of the hardware is permanently affixed to the vessel.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Dr. Crabtree has made a motion, which we're working on getting on the board, and it has been seconded by Mr. Greene. I will go ahead and open the floor to discussion as they're getting that on the board. Ms. Guyas.

 MS. GUYAS: A question. It's still not clear to me, and I know that there were some of the CLS, the VMS, where they had the separate unit, the transponder from the tablet, and, if you are not using a VMS and you're using your cellphone or a tablet or whatever, what does this look like? Are they having to screw their phone down to the console or what is the device that they are affixing to the vessel?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I wasn't going to answer. I just had a question 45 after, I guess, Dr. Crabtree responds.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: The way we've set it up now is it's going to be a NMFS-approved hardware/software, and I think what it will be is a small box like what you saw with the VMS or an antenna that is fixed to it and that's what sends the GPS signal through, and I believe, for example, Benny Gallaway had an archived kind of system like that, and I think it has that capability.

I know, on the shrimp vessel electronic logbooks, that is affixed to the vessel, and it does that, and so I think, whether it's archiving it and then, when you get in cellphone range, it's dumping down or not, there is going to be some portion of the antenna that is -- "Permanently affixed" basically means that it's screwed to the boat, so it's not convenient to take it off, and it's hard-wired to the power. We will have to identify that piece of hardware to do it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: What I wasn't clear on, and, in fact, I was trying to even get some clarity on this this morning, was that. I guess, when we were originally putting together, I was envisioning this as part of the normal electronics that would have been on the boat, just that the captain would have had anyway, and now we're talking about, I guess, some new device that is permanently affixed.

 I guess I don't necessarily have an issue or a problem with that, but I don't know if everyone was clear that this is a different device, and so that sort of complicates things. Now, with that being said, there are really cheap, inexpensive devices. I mean, during this meeting, I am watching my crew offshore, where they're at, doing their thing, and texting back and forth, in the sense that they briefly communicate, for very inexpensive.

Those devices could be -- I guess the technology is there. It's not \$1,900, like we heard in public testimony. This is more like a hundred dollars, and so that technology is there, but I guess, for clarity, I wasn't assuming that it wasn't buying extra devices, which now it seems like we are talking about that.

DR. CRABTREE: To that point?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, sir.

DR. CRABTREE: So far, we are deferring the hardware specification to the Fisheries Service. If they have something

on the boat that is capable of meeting the specifications of this, then I don't see why that wouldn't be acceptable. I don't know if that's going to be how it works out or not.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: You could easily get bogged down on this one by thinking about what would that piece of equipment be. I think the starting point is to be absolutely clear on what the intent is, and the intent is we know where that boat is, if the boat is at the dock or if the boat is out at sea.

I think it was very eloquently illustrated in the conversation during public testimony yesterday that you want to avoid a situation where someone is trying to build a robust history by handing their cellphone, which they're using to submit their electronic report, to someone to go out to sea or, conversely, to avoid having their ACL be met earlier and leaving their cellphone home.

The notion is we know whether that boat is working out on the water or whether it's at the dock, and, to do that, the ideal way to do that is to have some piece of equipment that is permanently affixed to the boat. That's the intent. We can get into the weeds on what piece of equipment that is later, but I think the first thing is are you comfortable with that as the intent?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Mr. Greene next and then Mr. Riechers.

MR. GREENE: I think the intent is to have some portion of the hardware permanently affixed to the vessel. Bonnie made part of my point about it, but, yesterday, when they came up, it was a small, white box, and that is the brain, basically, of the unit. It hooks to an antenna, which all GPS -- Every GPS is there is has an antenna somewhere. There is an antenna built in.

 It hooks through. The way that your tablet attaches to the white junction box that he showed you is through a Bluetooth connection. Now, there were upgrades made to the tablet for vibration and anti-shock and those sorts of things, but that is the intent of how it would go.

 Now, exactly what it would be when National Marine Fisheries finally says, hey, this is what we're after, I don't know, but the intent of my understanding all along was that there would be something attached to the vessel, and I think that's the only way to move forward with this.

1 2 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

 MR. RIECHERS: This is really a question for Mara, because, while I understand the language is now suggesting that, clearly, in the discussion regarding Alternative 2, the language did not discuss that before. It does make distinction between Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, that one was real-time and the other was not, and, of course, it also suggested that VMS would be real time, in Alternative 4, but this is somewhat changing Alternative 2. While it's within the construct of the full alternative, I just wonder where that leaves us today.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Go ahead, Mara, or Dr. Crabtree.

MS. LEVY: Do you mean in terms of taking final action?

MR. RIECHERS: Yes, and notifying the public what Alternative 2 was really all about, because it's a -- Again, it may be insignificant in cost, though I don't think we have -- We talked about that in committee, but there was no real answer for what this other device might cost, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Look, if you want to really provide useful vessel position, then you have to have some way of knowing that the position that you're getting is actually that vessel. If you don't have something affixed to it, you have no way of knowing it. You're getting a position, but you don't know if it's the vessel or what it is, and so you still have the distinction here between 2 and -- 2 is archived and three is real time, but, inherent in wanting to know where the vessel is, is having some way to know if the position you're getting is really from that vessel, and the only way to accomplish that is to have the antenna or some portion of the device affixed to the vessel.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: Roy, I am not arguing that point, but what I am suggesting is, procedurally, that is changing the intent of Alternative 2. In your discussion, one, you've talked about being affixed, but, two, you did not, and so I think we just have to decide whether or not we believe that warrants either some explanation to the public or not.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara

 MS. LEVY: I think you can decide, as a policy matter, if you feel like it warrants further discussion. I think you've talked about the idea of 2 and 3 including permanently affixed or not permanently affixed for at least a couple of meetings, and you have decided not to say that it's permanently affixed during that time, but I think it's been an issue of discussion, and we have heard from comments, at a couple of meetings, about wanting it permanently affixed and not wanting it permanently affixed, and so I don't think it's a surprise.

I don't think it's something that isn't out there that the public doesn't know that you've been considering. I don't think it would prevent you from taking final action, if you decide to do so. You can also decide that you don't want to do so. That's up to you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas, did you have a comment? I couldn't tell if you had your hand up or not. No? Okay. Any other discussion on the motion on the board? The motion on the board is, in Action 4, to add the IPT-recommended language in Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. There is no further discussion, and we're going to vote. All those in favor, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fifteen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: One. The motion passes fifteen to one.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion on this action? Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I would like to make a motion to select Alternative 3 as the preferred.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion by Mr. Greene to select Alternative 3 as our preferred alternative. Do we have a second to that motion? It's seconded by Mr. Walker. While staff is getting the motion on the board, I will open the floor to discussion on the motion. Mr. Greene.

 MR. GREENE: When we first started this, I was really wanting to go down the road of VMS and that sort of stuff, and there were some arguments against that that -- There are good reasons for it, and there are good reasons against it. In looking at Alternative 2, by just archiving that information and sending it

at the end of the trip, it's still collecting the GPS data of where you went. It just sends all of the information at the end of the trip.

However, Alternative 3 is providing the information in real time. I just think that there are some advantages to that. If you think about it, some of the vessels had mentioned yesterday that they have AIS, which is an automated identification system that the Coast Guard does require on some fishing vessels and some charter vessels and everything else, and it puts your position out on a radar screen every -- I mean, it is there. It is for everybody in the world to see. If you have an AIS on your vessel, I can see your boat and your boat name and where you're at, your course, your speed, and your current position, right then and right there.

I heard an individual yesterday who had eight boats and claimed that he had AIS on them, and it is a thing that is coming to the fishing industry, whether you like it or not. I didn't put one on my boat until the Coast Guard made me. I kind of held out on it, but I find a lot of usefulness in that now that I have that piece of equipment.

I don't see how, if you're willing to -- If you have the AIS on the boat and it's showing your position, pretty much all the time, why you would be opposed to having a real-time GPS on the vessel. There are safety concerns along that. I mean, if it's sending a real-time signal and, all of a sudden, it stops, there might be a problem. There very well could be.

I think that it would help with enforcement, and I think that it would help with safety. I just think that it's a reasonable compromise between a VMS and not, and I think it's the way to go.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I am not speaking in favor or against Mr. Greene's proposal, but I do -- Does anybody have any information on cost? Because we did hear some fishermen, yesterday at public testimony, and in some of the written testimony, and some of the personal testimonies that I think some of us have heard from charter boat fishermen, about concerns about cost. The primary difference, to me, appears to be that one archives the data and one is real time. Does anybody have any information on the cost between the two different approaches?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

1 2

DR. CRABTREE: I think, in order to be real time, you wouldn't be able to use a cellphone-based system, because, most places you're fishing offshore, you're not going to be able to --You're not going to have cellphone reception, and so it won't be real time. I think it means that you have to have a satellite-linked-up system, which is what VMS is, but that is just off the cuff. That's my impression. I don't see how it could be real time if it's cellphone-based.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: That kind of puts the nail in the coffin for me then. I can't support this motion. I feel like, from a data collection perspective, this really doesn't get us anything that we wouldn't get under Alternative 2. It just takes away some of the flexibility that I would like to provide to captains that are going to be reporting under this system.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Bonnie, Dr. Ponwith, what, in your world, makes the difference between -- What is the difference between the archiving vessel position data versus the real time? What is the difference, for you?

DR. PONWITH: The Science Center could live with both of those, either of those, scenarios. In terms of execution of those, my knowledge of hardware is that the real time would require a satellite connection. The archive could require something that is cellphone-based, and so the major difference between those would be of cost. The cellphone would be much cheaper.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: A follow-up to that, Dr. Dana?

DR. DANA: Yes, thank you. In that, we, in moving this document through, we are then handing it over to the Science Center and to NOAA to develop a cost-efficient and effective data collection system, and so I understand where Johnny is coming from, but I would hate for us to tie the hands of those who are developing something that achieves that end goal.

Hearing what Bonnie said, I am kind of in the -- I mean, I understand where Johnny is coming from, and I would have probably voted that way too, but I also don't want to put extra burdens on the Science Center or the fishermen.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith.

1 2

DR. PONWITH: To that end, when we weigh these two motions, the sense is that these would be the minimum requirements. By that, I would mean that, if we went with the archival as the minimum requirement, it wouldn't prevent someone using something that had a higher quality, real-time capability to satisfy those needs.

In other words, rather than -- In some cases, what we would do is, rather than specifying this piece of equipment and this piece of equipment only, we would specify the criteria that have to be met for the piece of equipment to be acceptable.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Through that discussion, some of my points were made, Madam Chair, but I guess, just to follow up, through kind of where we're going with this, and I hear you, Johnny, and what you're saying, but, by adding this text that we're slowly adding back into this document, potentially, through real-time GPS tracking -- If you're not dealing with an archived system, the only thing left is going to be a satellite-based system, and so we're kind of de facto saying all we have left is VMS, in this case. There is not much left on the table that's going to fit our minimum requirements, and so I don't think I can support your motion, Johnny.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I think the advantage that I haven't heard anybody mention yet of the real-time system would be possibly for law enforcement and dockside surveyors. They probably could track where boats were at and plan if there were going to be an intercept on those boats.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion on the motion? All right. We have a motion on the board that, in Action 4, to select Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative. All those in favor, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Two.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Fourteen. The motion fails two to fourteen.

48 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Do we have any other topics for

discussion in this action? Okay. We have some hands. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I just wanted to bring up something for discussion that was brought up at public testimony a couple of times yesterday, and it may already be handled, but I would like for us to at least discuss it.

Some people were worried about backup systems yesterday and that potentially stopping them from making a trip. If we don't already have a back-up method in here, I think we ought to at least discuss it, and so do we have a back-up system currently in place?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree and Mara, or Dr. Gerhart, would you all like to speak to that?

DR. CRABTREE: There is some language in there about an approved emergency system would need to be developed if the VMS or any other selected system is non-operational. That hasn't been developed yet, but that is there. Now, to me, the backup system that we were talking about yesterday is the same backup system that they have for all the other electronics onboard their vessel, which I suspect costs them a lot more than the units we're talking about.

They need to own two units and so, if one fails, they have a spare that they can put on the boat. Otherwise, they're going to have to deal with it, but, as we were told yesterday, these guys have got a lot of money invested in electronics.

If your fish finder is not working, I suspect they have backup units and contingencies for that, but that language is in the document there, and we will come up with it. We have dealt with this with VMS units on the fleet that has VMS, where they can overnight to the vendor and get new units back and things like that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I would like, again, to make this easy for people and not have to have them have multiple units on their vessel. This is different than the commercial fishery, where they could be running multiple trips in a day. They're going every day, and it's not easy to get to the store to get a replacement part or go to FedEx always.

Is there not a way that we could have like a 1-800 number or something that they can, if something fails while they're out or

they've got to mail something out to a vendor, that they can do that for maybe even a specified period of time, so that they come up with a contingency plan?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think, if the vessel is out fishing and something dies, because this isn't real time, they will deal with that when they get back to the dock, but I mean, anyone who has run a charter boat, you've got all kinds of equipment that you have to have in order to make the trip.

You have to deal with backups and contingency plans on things that will fail. We can do the best we can to work with them and make it easy, but having a 1-800 number -- If they have an issue with the vendor, they need to go to the vendor themselves. If they have -- Now, with VMS, if we have chronic issues with vendors, then we will go to the vendors, and we will consider decertifying their device for use if they aren't providing the kind of service we think they need, but I am not sure how far down the path we can go, but I don't see why this is any different than what are you going to do if your outboard motor has a problem on it. Most of all of them have multiple outboard units, if they're going offshore, and so I just don't think this is something that these guys aren't already dealing with.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

 MR. DIAZ: I tend to agree with Ms. Guyas. I would like to see some type of a way where they could call in if they had a problem and maybe even that problem we could excuse them, through maybe reporting by phone for just some short period of time, to get their problem corrected. I am thinking that you can get almost anything overnighted nowadays.

 I would hate to see somebody miss -- The snapper season is so short, and I don't want to see anybody miss any chance to make any income, but I don't think that we can let them go for weeks at a time, either. If there was a way, if they had an emergency and they had an alternative route, to get their stuff corrected in a forty-eight-hour period or seventy-two or something reasonable -- I don't know what the number is, but the main thing is not to stop folks from making their living, if we can accommodate that. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Really, what would be kind of forgiven, I guess, for twenty-four hours or forty-eight hours, is really simply going to be the archived GPS, because, if your system goes down on your boat, there is already a 1-800 number that you can call for your hail-in and hail-out or whatever you want to

call it at this point, the notification.

You still are going to have to submit a fishing report, but that was being done on a tablet or this or that anyway, and you can still submit electronically a fishing report. The piece that would be missing is that archived GPS function for that twenty-four hours or forty-eight hours. I guess, if you're overnighting a piece, that would allow them to fish for that one day following or two days following, and we wouldn't have the archived GPS, but we would have everything else. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: We can work on some language to deal with what happens if their GPS is broken when they get to the dock that morning that lets them go fishing and come back in and report what they caught and get the unit fixed. I think we can come up with something for that.

We do have that kind of language in there, and we have -- All of these had contingency plans about what happens if there is a hurricane coming through and it knocks down all the cell towers and we're going to go months without the ability to do electronic reporting, and we have paper reporting contingencies in all of these fisheries, and so we can work on some language like that, to kind of address the short term with this, and come back with it at the next meeting, I think.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. It sounds like we're all on the same page then. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Diaz, for bringing that up. Is there any other discussion on Action 4 or any other piece of this document? Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I just wanted to say this before we took the final vote or whatever, and I meant to say it earlier, when I was the dissenting vote on moving the IPT language, but I was trying to pull the minutes back up.

When I originally voted for the Preferred Alternative 2, which I think was Ms. Guyas's motion last time, we had a whole discussion surrounding about whether that was fixed or unfixed in the minutes, and I went back and looked at what the technical committee had considered and the IPT and all that.

When I originally voted for the motion, my assumption was that was not a fixed piece of equipment, and, by moving the IPT language in there and making it fixed, it kind of fundamentally changes what I thought the motion was about when I originally voted on it, and so I just wanted to put that on the record, so that was known. That's all I had.

1 2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Well, I think we must be ready for our last motion on this document, right, if we are going to have one. Who wants to step up to the plate, because we are way past schedule. Mr. Greene.

 MR. GREENE: I would like to go ahead and make the motion to submit it, if you have it readily available. I'm sure it's coming up. The motion is to approve the Generic Electronic Reporting Amendment 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: All right. We have a motion on the board. Do we have a second for the motion? It's seconded by Dr. Dana. Mara.

MS. LEVY: This is probably obvious, but the codified text that you have does not reflect hardly anything that we just decided, and so, in terms of when they have to report, we're not going to have the hail-in, and the permanently affixed. That is definitely going to change and come back to the Chair for redeeming, to reflect all of the things that you have done today.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted. I think that's probably understood. Any other further discussion before we take a vote on this motion? This will be a roll call vote.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Walker.

38 MR. WALKER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Diaz.

42 MR. DIAZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Matens.

```
1
 2
    MR. MATENS: Yes.
 3
 4
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Dana.
 5
 6
    DR. DANA: Yes.
 7
 8
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Boyd.
9
10
    MR. BOYD: Yes.
11
12
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Captain Greene.
13
14
    MR. GREENE: Yes.
15
16
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Crabtree.
17
18
    DR. CRABTREE: Yes.
19
20
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Anson.
21
22
    MR. ANSON: Yes.
23
24
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Stunz.
25
26
    DR. STUNZ: Yes.
27
28
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Guyas.
29
30
    MS. GUYAS: Yes.
31
32
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Sanchez.
33
34
    MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
35
36
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Dr. Frazer.
37
38
    DR. FRAZER: Yes.
39
40
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Banks.
41
42
    MR. BANKS: Yes.
43
44
    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Mr. Riechers.
45
46
    MR. RIECHERS: Yes.
47
```

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ms. Bosarge.

1 2

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Is there any further data on Data Collection before we take a short break? No? All right. Ten minutes. We will be back in ten minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Next on our agenda will be our Mackerel Committee Report, which is under Tab C. Dr. Dana, when you get settled in, I will turn it over to you.

MACKEREL COMMITTEE REPORT

DR. DANA: Thank you, Chairman Bosarge. I am going to give the Mackerel Committee Report. CMP Advisory Panel Summary, staff briefed the committee on the proceedings of the CMP Advisory Panel, AP, meeting from November 2016.

The CMP AP Chair, Captain Martin Fisher, fielded questions from committee members about the sentiments of the AP on various topics, including CMP Amendment 29. Broadly, the AP supports the no-action alternative with respect to allocation sharing between the fishing sectors.

Their concerns include increased participation in Gulf king mackerel fishing by traveling fishermen, the effect of increasing the recreational bag limit from two to three fish per person per day, and the general degree of uncertainty surrounding the recreational landings.

They also expressed a desire for increased data gathering and reporting for commercial landings, an interest in zone-specific payback provisions, if accompanied by increased resolution in landings reporting, and supported increased scientific research into king mackerel.

Committee members discussed the membership of the AP, with it being noted that representation of fishermen from the southwest Florida region is currently limited to two members. Additionally, staff noted that the council recently co-signed a letter with the South Atlantic Council to request the expedited implementation of CMP Amendment 26.

We then moved into the King Mackerel Projections Update. Dr.

Joe Powers, the SSC representative, provided an overview of the Gulf king mackerel landings projections update provided to the SSC by the SEFSC.

3 4 5

6

7

9

10

1

2

The original benchmark assessment, which was SEDAR 38, provided projections through 2019, using landings data through 2012 and assuming 2012 landings for the fishing years beginning in 2013 and 2014. When the council requested the landings to be updated, that was exactly what was done. No new data on age or length composition, growth, reproduction, or other model inputs were updated.

111213

14

15

16

17

18

The estimated 2013 and 2014 fishing years' landings data were replaced with the actual data for those years, which were higher than what was previously estimated, yet still well below the stock ACL. Interestingly though, the updated projections showed a decreased ABC for 2017 through 2019 compared to that estimated by SEDAR 38, even though the stock ACL has not been harvested since 2000.

19 20 21

22

23

2425

26

The SEFSC cautioned that the degree of uncertainty in the updated projections was considerably larger than that of the SEDAR 38 assessment, especially due to the many other data inputs, which were not also updated. Further, the landings for the 2014/2015 fishing year, which were 63 percent higher than the previous fishing year, served as the last year of data for this projections update.

272829

30 31

32

33

34

35

landings for the 2015/2016 fishing year, which were The equivalent to those from the 2013/2014 fishing year, were not used, due to the timing of updating the projections. Committee members discussed the above points at length, with feedback provided by Dr. Powers, council staff, and the recommended Ultimately, the SSC not using the projections, largely due to the high degree of uncertainty in those projections.

363738

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana, can I interrupt you for just a second? I think Mr. Diaz has a question.

39 40 41

DR. DANA: Yes, ma'am.

42 43

44

45

46

47

48

MR. DIAZ: This might be for Dr. Ponwith or anybody who wants to weigh in and help out here. I am trying to figure out if there's a way where we can not have this happen again. Basically, we requested some updated projections, but they weren't done with including all the information that we need to actually use them, and so we're creating some work, but we're

not getting a usable product out of it.

Is it the way that the council is asking the question or where is the breakdown, where, next time we get updated projections, that everything that can be considered to make them usable is considered and done?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I will try that. These were not, quote, updated projections. It wasn't an update assessment. It's more like what we used to call, with red snapper, reruns, where you simply rerun the projections with up-to-date landings, and, typically, throughout, I guess, from 2010 to 2013, the Center did a lot of reruns without a stock assessment.

The council was encouraged to do that, because each rerun gave them a little bit more fish. In this instance, we thought the same thing would happen, but we thought the original projections were based on the ABCs and not the actual landings, and the thing that threw this one off was that 2014 year of increased recreational landings of an extra million pounds.

If it hadn't been for that, we probably would have seen increased poundage, and there was no in-depth analysis that was presented to the SSC about why that one year was anomalous or not, and there was no consideration of substituting that year with an average of the year before, and we didn't have 2015 landings at the time the projections were done that showed that the landings were coming back down. It wasn't that we asked the wrong question or that the analysis wasn't done right, but it was just the circumstances of the way the data were at the time.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Gregory.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Ponwith, did you have feedback as well?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, and just to reiterate, the projections that were run were precisely what were requested. We didn't skip anything. This is what you do when you update your projections with the known landings, substituting the known landings in for assumed landings, and so we did exactly what were asked, and the utility of the data, of these projections, are -- The utility of updated projections are very good immediately adjacent to the stock assessment year. The farther you get away from that, the more challenging using those numbers are, because those updated projections assume that everything else that goes into the stock assessment stays the same.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Dr. Dana, would you like to continue

on?

DR. DANA: Thank you, Chairman. We then moved into CMP Amendment 29. Staff reviewed the council's current preferred alternatives in Action 1 of Alternative 2, Options 2b and 2e, and Action 2, Alternative 3.

Public comments received during public hearings and through the online comment portal on the council website were summarized, with staff noting that support for allocation sharing seeming to wane as one moved from the eastern to the western Gulf. A committee member noted that millions of pounds of king mackerel are being left in the water annually and that, even with allocation sharing and an increased recreational bag limit, there will still be millions of pounds left in the water.

Staff asked for clarification on the council's intent with respect to the ACL to be used when determining whether allocation sharing will occur. NOAA General Counsel noted that the codified text for Amendment 29 specified that the current sector allocations would be used, while the amendment specified that the allocation used for a given year, regardless of allocation sharing, would be used. Committee members clarified that their intent was reflected in the codified text, and staff noted that the text of the amendment would be properly modified.

The committee discussed whether there was any desire to revise the current preferred alternatives and/or whether to proceed with final action on CMP Amendment 29. Based on the CMP AP summary, the SSC review of the updated projections, and public comments received, the committee determined it important to defer further action until Full Council, thus allowing for consideration of public testimony. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: My apologies, but there's a typo there. The council's current preferred alternatives in Action 1 are Alternative 2, Options 2b and 2g and not 2e. That's my bad.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Well, if you will permit me, I will speak for just a minute, since I was the one that kind of spearheaded this and pushed it to get this amendment started. First, I want to say thank you to the entire council, because, if you remember, this was an action in the prior CMP amendment that we were looking at, and we were trying to finalize that. For timing reasons, we couldn't really make any changes at that

point. It would have slowed it down.

You all made a promise to me that, if we went ahead to final action, that we would take that particular action item out and look at it again in an amendment, and we have done that, and so, regardless of where we end today, thank you. Thank you for that.

 I am going to let you be a fly on the wall in my mind for a minute. I am going to tell you what I've been chewing on upstairs here, and this was actually Tuesday night, and so this was before we even got to public testimony, which obviously was pretty much in one direction, but here's what Leann tries to balance in her head.

The first thing I went through, as we got close to final action, which is, I think, where you really start to really, really go, all right, we're getting to the end and is this what I want to do, and I thought back to red snapper and that reallocation that we went through, that huge battle, because that's what it was, and that was two-and-a-half percent, and I fought to the death, like this is the end of the world. You're going to take two-and-a-half from commercial and give it to recreational, right, and that was tough.

Then I look at this, and I go, now, Leann, this is 10 percent. This is four times as much, but it's going from recreational to commercial, and you didn't seem to bat an eye at that. I can't rectify that in my mind very well.

 Let me preface all of this by saying that I am still in support of doing this, of trying to share these fish, but I think that, if we go forward in doing this, it should be the most conservative way that we can do it.

I would be more in favor of a 5 percent sharing, for the reason I just stated, that I don't think that's fair of me to think that two-and-a-half percent is rough when it goes in one direction, but ten is okay in the other.

I will grant you that's a little different situation with red snapper, because both sectors are utilizing their allocation, and so there is a little difference there, but, still, 10 percent, as a percentage, is a lot.

Then the flip side of my mind says, yes, but 10 percent -- Even if you went 10 percent, Leann, there is still three-million pounds or so of fish in the water not being caught, and so why

are you so worried about 10 percent versus 5. To be me, huh?

I can never quite get there, but there's that, but the other part of it is that I think that the point that a lot of the recreational fisherman made is that it's nice to know that they can throw that hook in the water and catch a king mackerel if they can't catch anything else, and so I have to put a little bit of stock in that.

 If I was a recreational fisherman, I would like to know that that opportunity was there for me too, and so, for all of those reasons, I am more comfortable with Alternative 2. We can get to a discussion later about where we're going to go with the document from there, but I think we've got to learn to share.

I already heard commercial people come up to that podium and say, yes, I'm for status quo. We need a hard shift. If we think this is going away, we are fooling ourselves. It's not going away. You give it about six months or a year, and people will be screaming again that we're not meeting our goals and we're not utilizing the fishery fully and now we want a hard shift, and that was my whole goal in putting this out there, was to get away from that bloody battle. We'll share. Let's share.

It provides a safeguard for the recreational fishery that, if at some point in the future, they increase their effort in this fishery, this will stop. There is a stopgap measure there that says, all right, guess what? You get to use all of your fish now. If you need them now, they're yours. That's what I was trying to get to.

 I don't want to see this amendment die on the vine, because I do think it's going to come right back at us again, and we will be in a bloody battle, but baby steps of 5 percent. That is my spiel. I am the Chairman, and I'm not making any motions, but that is what has gone on in my head before we ever even got to public testimony, where we heard a lot of negative testimony towards it. Thank you, guys, for listening. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I really hate to follow you after you speak. I cannot communicate as well as Leann, and I will apologize ahead of time for that. I do share some of Leann's concerns. I also support this amendment. You all have heard me talk about it, but I did hear public comments yesterday. To try to get closer to where the public comments were and still move the document forward, I would like to make a motion that, in Action 1, that we make Alternative 2a the preferred alternative.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion in the board. In Action 1, to make Alternative 2, Option a, the preferred alternative. It's been seconded by Mr. Greene for discussion. I will open the floor to further discussion. Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: Is Emily here? Yes. Emily, in your compiling of public comments and written input, did you gather any input on a preferred for that more conservative transfer? I am just wondering if anyone commented on that or if it was just black and white.

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: It is my recollection that there wasn't any sort of specific -- You know, if you wanted to be more conservative, that would be okay. I can't speak to whether or not that would be acceptable, but most of the comments that we heard were either for or against, period, rather than sort of alternative-specific.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Have we approved the recreational bag limit to three?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have, yes. We approved it and forwarded it on to the Secretary.

MR. SWINDELL: I want to continue to reiterate, again, that catch is not necessarily harvest and that the recreational people are not harvesting their limit. Even though the ACL is relative to catch, that doesn't mean they're not catching a much larger amount than what the numbers are showing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Who did I have next? I didn't write it down, and so raise your hand again if you want to speak. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I have spoken at length at this, and we just went through a long, unpredicted ELB discussion, and so I certainly don't want to get into that, but you know the reasons that I support it. The folks down south, where I am from, they have been advocating this, and there was a lot of comment to the contrary, but for what reasons?

Is it fish dealers or maybe markets getting disrupted? I have been around fishermen and fish houses enough to know, while they do have a symbiotic relationship and need each other, they don't always share the same goals, and the guys, where I'm from, they feel that, for years and years, we have conserved and operated under tight restrictions to bring this fishery back.

1 2

Then you see things like the assessment that we saw, the presentation, where you're thinking, well, it's getting better. The projections going out to 2017 should show more fish, and they're doing the opposite, and so they're all out there scratching their head going, what?

Then here's an opportunity, when you're kind of trying to figure ways where you're filling your quota and how can we do something, and the National Standards, but, if there's a way to take some fish from a group that is underutilizing it and still, even if we took it -- I think we went through the explanations that the safeguards are there where they will never be penalized. If it ever happened, it would take two years, and they would never not be able to miss a fishing opportunity because of this action, but the other group could surely benefit from it.

I would be in favor of doing it, and, if it takes a reduction to 5 percent to feel good about putting your toe in the water before you jump in, I would concede and back that up.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. We heard considerable discussion yesterday among committee members and from the public, and we had public input that Emily told us about. There is, overwhelmingly, no support for this amendment in the industry.

We have the advisory panel has recommended that we do not do this, and they have recommended a different alternative here, and we had one of the members of the audience who is a recreational king fisherman, commercial, and charter/for-hire who gave us ten points. He brought them up himself. I can read them again, but I don't think that I have to.

We have heard from our SSC that the uncertainty around the numbers is great. There is uncertainty about the uncertainty. We have a sector that is going over their allocation six out of the last seven years, and this body has not done anything to constrain them. There is no buffer, there is no payback for it. I think that we need to go look at those things before we start doing allocation shifts. I move that in 2.1, Action 1, that we make Alternative 1 the preferred. That is a substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a substitute motion in Action 1 to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative, and we had a

second by Mr. Matens, I believe. Is there discussion on the motion? Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: This has been an interesting exercise and amendment. I have definitely been supportive of looking at this idea. I feel like we are in a tough place though with this. I mean, it's pretty clear that, outside of where John is, not a lot of people are supportive of this, on the recreational and the commercial side.

The AP has said no to this multiple times, and I realize that there is only a handful of people from south Florida on there, but I do think that is a very good AP. I have sat in their meetings before, and the problem is this fishery is very diverse. We've got recreational and commercial and we've got gillnets and we've got all the different zones and areas of the Gulf, and everybody is kind of doing something different.

The thing is, with that AP, we have all these different voices, and they have been able to have productive conversations and kind of rally around a lot of things. They have been able to build consensus, which is pretty cool to see.

Where I am hesitant about moving forward with this is there are a lot of unknowns, and some of those are regulatory. We have more fish that are going to eventually come to everyone. We have that quota increase hanging out there, and we've got the recreational bag limit hanging out there, and we've got amberjack that is going to close early. We've got triggerfish that is closed, and red snapper is only open for a small part of the year.

We don't really know what is going on with gag right now. There is, I think, a pretty good potential that this year, if it hasn't already gone that way already, that mackerel is going to be what people are fishing for, if you're a recreational fisherman. Maybe we wait on this and bring it back maybe when we have the next assessment, but I just -- I am hesitant about moving forward with this action right now.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: Doug largely made some of my points, the AP saying - I mean, all of our barometers of where we should go with this are definitely pointed south. We have the AP, and then we looked at the public testimony, and, unlike in John's area, I can talk about completely the other side of the Gulf, where we had really good attendance, which maybe wasn't the case for

others, and it was definitely resoundingly no coming from my community, and I did some calculations on the public testimony, which is well over 96 percent in opposition to moving with the amendment.

To add to all the issues of uncertainty, the numbers and all that kind of thing, which doesn't make sense to a lot of us, there is also these new MRIP numbers that are kind of looming, which everyone is kind of wondering what they are going to look like, and as well as the point that Martha just made, is that everybody is going to get some more fish in the more recent term, and so I support this substitute motion for Action 1.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: I am going to try not to repeat what other folks have said, but I will on a couple of these items. I mean, I think it is worth noting that, because we haven't had the three-fish limit fully in effect, we don't really know what that is going to do. We've seen one year of increased effort, where we saw landings go up, and that shows some of the potential of what that might do and how the fishery can react.

More importantly, we have kind of danced around this ABC question, though Bonnie certainly tried to answer it a moment ago. We can't use those ABC numbers revised only when we want to, because they tell us what we want to hear. We have to use them when they also don't tell us what we want to hear.

This whole discussion regarding uncertainty, if you have uncertainty, and the further you get away, your uncertainty grows in kind of a concentric cone kind of notion, but, if you have some fixed points in there that you now know, then you have less uncertainty surrounding that, and that's what occurred there. I can't speak to the SSC's determination of why they went back to the original, but we can't ignore those facts as well.

Then, lastly, we can't ignore the fact that this is an allocation amendment. You can call it sharing, or you can call it whatever you would like to, but it's an allocation amendment, in that respect, and so it would be shifting allocation, and I don't think we've done all the appropriate work, though this council obviously has difficulty in discussing allocation amendments, and I wouldn't say it's just this council.

I would say all councils seem to have some of that difficulty in how you get that information brought before you, but we're

certainly missing some pieces of information that should be in the document, if we were going to discuss this, because there is some relevant literature regarding catch and release and the value associated with that.

I had to date back to years when I was on some of the panels, dating back to some of the Milan work and the Leeworthy work, but there is actually work, of as late as 2012, that would deal with some of those issues regarding catch-and-release fisheries and values there. Given all of those things, I am going to support the current substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana and then Mr. Sanchez.

DR. DANA: Thank you, Chairman. This is just a question of process. If we were to vote in favor of this substitute motion, no action, does that essentially kill this amendment or does it table it?

I know that there's an assessment upcoming next year, and, as Dr. Ponwith said yesterday, the update showed -- It was just a one-year picture, and we have nothing to measure it. We can measure it against last year, but we can't measure it against next year, and so, if we were to see what the landings were for this upcoming year, to see if there is a trend of more fish being caught or whatever, would this action kill the amendment?

The staff has put a lot of work into this. Would it table it? If it tables it, of course, we could reintroduce it at a later date, if we find that it's the right thing to do. I am just asking the question for whoever is a process person here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

 MS. LEVY: Well, I will say there is one other action in this amendment. You don't have to go through with any of it if you don't want to. It doesn't table it or kill it. I mean, you can bring it back anytime you want. Basically, what you're saying is you're not going to do this allocation sharing thing right now.

Whether you want that to mean that the whole amendment stops right now and Action 2 you don't go forward with either, which would be fine, but you can do what you want with it, meaning you could always bring it back.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

 MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm sure we're going to take a vote on this in a little while, one way or the other, but I do want to just respond to a couple of things. Really, mainly, one thing.

I went through the table yesterday of 2.1.1, and I looked at the last ten years, where the recreational sector's ACL has been a little over 7.3 million pounds for ten years straight. I took out the average catch over those ten years, and there has been a remainder of that average catch limit of a little over 4.3 million pounds, on average, over those ten years, 4.3 million pounds.

If you was to take 540,000 pounds, which this 5 percent comes to, if I'm correct, and Ryan can correct me if I'm wrong, it still leaves, unaccounted for and uncaught in the recreational ACL, over 3.8 million pounds. I know people are talking about there are some things that is some uncertainty, and we're not trying to fish down to the last fish. There are extra fish in there to deal with some uncertainties.

To put that in perspective, 3.8 million pounds, on a tractor trailer truck, I think they can go through the scales hauling about 40,000 pounds. The average truck is about seventy-five feet, and this would be ninety-six fully-loaded tractor trailer trucks. If you put them end to end, it would be 7,200 feet, and so that's a lot of fish that are left out in the water.

I know there's some uncertainty, and there are fish out there that could handle some of that uncertainty, maybe, that is in peoples' minds, but just please keep that in consideration whenever you vote. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. I get it. There is a lot of balls in the air waiting to see what a three-fish bag limit does. There is concerns over the whole concept of reallocating, but when do you do it? When is it not warranted, when there's a such an imbalance and one group isn't utilizing it?

I guess we'll see how the vote, shortly, is going to go, and then this was kind of an approach to do this, I don't know, as a more diplomatic approach, a softer approach, where there were more safeguards.

I guess maybe it's more appropriate to, at some point, look at a real allocation shift, if it's warranted, after some of these

balls fall out, the three-fish and this and that, and see what we do and follow some of these National Standards, but just to say -- I am not belittling the comments from the public, because I was here and I heard them, and I understand there is differences geographically, but to say I am following the advice of the AP or I'm following the comment as of late, there is other instances here, in charter/for-hire, where we had overwhelming, resounding support for things, and they were always fought by the same people.

There was constant rooms filled with people in public commentary, and, again, it was ignored, and so, if we're going to listen to the public and the APs, let's listen to them all the time. That's have that logic apply all the time and not just when it's convenient.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: John, once we have some of these balls that have dropped and we kind of know what's going on, I am good with that, if we look at this approach or -- I, all along, have said let's look at a hard allocation shift. I am ready to have that conversation. I know not everybody is around the table, but I am good with that.

The other kind of uncertainty, in my mind, that I should have mentioned when I talked before, was with this quota increase that's coming and how that affects some of the commercial zones and what's going on in each of those areas, because there could be some -- With this on top of that, there could be some unintended consequences, in terms of traveling vessels and who is fishing where and what's going on, and that's another reason why I kind of want to see how that shakes out. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you. You know, I am -- The AP is wanting to see how the three-fish is going to unfold, and there is talk about anywhere from 1 to 10 percent increase there. Like everybody has said, there is a lot of uncertainties. Mike Thierry, we fish in similar areas, and he was talking about the small fish, and I've heard things about small fish in that area over to southeast Louisiana.

I also heard testimony for maybe looking at the hard TAC instead, and I think that's what some of the guys in the Keys are actually interested in, and so maybe we should look at that. Maybe we just need to table this, have the opportunity to table

this, or maybe look at a hard TAC, but there is recreational opportunities, too. The guys don't know how this three fish is going to work out and the MRIP surveys and the market.

Some of the guys are concerned about the market. Maybe we can see how the three fish unfolds. If there is still a lot of fish, maybe the market at that time could -- The commercial industry could appreciate a few more fish at that time, where they could keep that going.

 I think to kind of table it and maybe look at a hard TAC down the road here, but I certainly can appreciate where John and the Keys would like to see that, and Leann's thoughts on that as well, but I am just -- I would rather see it tabled or postponed somehow, but I do appreciate the opportunity to look at this for the commercial industry.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: You know, if we have gone up 50 percent on the bag limit, that means a lot to consider. We don't believe that the 50 percent bag limit is going to be a 50 percent increase in the total recreational catch, but, for the charter boat fishing, it may be a significant increase in the recreational catch in the charter boat sector of the recreational fishery. It depends on these other fisheries and everything else, and the charter boats may really target this fishery, at times, because of the increased bag limit and nothing else. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: I am not in support of the substitute motion, and, prior to the testimony and the discussion that was had at Reef Fish, I was inclined to go forward with the preferred at the time of 10 percent.

It is a little perplexing to me, I guess, as to why there is such a commonality among the user groups to not do something like this. I mean, in my mind, that is unusual, but I look, I guess, at our charge and what we're responsible for doing here on the council, and that is to provide fish for people.

Right now, we have quite a bit of fish that, according to the science, says we can go out and harvest and bring back to the dock. Right now, we have one sector that has been very efficient in reaching their portion of the ACL and able to do that and provide fish to folks, and I can understand, on the market side, what disruption that might have and not knowing,

1 year to year, whether or not that's going to be consistent and 2 that it might have 10 percent more one year and not the next 3 year.

Certainly the comments to the increase in the bag limit, there will be an increase. Will it be a 50 percent increase? I have my doubts. This is set up so that there are certain conditions that must be met in order for the allocation portion of the ACL to be transferred from one sector to the other.

 Although that appears to be an allocation transfer, in my mind, it does not qualify the same as the other allocations that the council normally deals with, and so I am going to not be in support of the substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I want to just say something, because it keeps coming up. Just because we are leaving fish in the water, it doesn't really mean that they're not available to the people. I mean, certainly, extracting them and selling them commercially or retaining them as part of your bag limit, that's a little more concrete, using the fish, but it really points to a fundamental difference between recreational, maybe, and commercial fishing, where there is a high value to have those fish in the water.

I know we have had similar discussions around the table, but having these high-catch efforts, and we kind of heard it in public testimony and chipped around the edges of that, and being able to catch fish, large fish, on a real consistent basis. That's of high value, and so leaving fish in the water like that is providing it for the people, and for particularly the recreational and charter boat anglers, to be successful for their clients and their families when they go fishing.

That is really, to me, versus this optimizing our yield at the maximum sustainability is what we're talking about in this amendment, but the core of optimum yield is optimizing the fishery for what other user groups might feel are important, which is having those fish available and easy to catch when you go out to do it. That is why I am supporting this substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I agree with Greg, and I think that we're going to have to think a little bit about what

our obligations are, and I think our obligations are to maximize the value of the resource to the various user groups.

2 3 4

I am going to be in favor of this particular motion, the substitute motion, but I would also like to say that, as a relatively new council member, I feel like we're obligated to listen to the APs. We put them in there for a purpose, and, again, I don't know what has transpired in the past, but I also take the public testimony very seriously, and so, in light of all of that, there is no real compelling reason for me to move forward on this one. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We've had a lot of good discussion, and I think it's time to take a vote on this. All those in favor of the substitute motion to make Alternative 1, no action, the preferred alternative, please signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Ten.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Six. The motion passes ten to six.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for the good discussion. I appreciate it, the months and months of good discussion. Yes, I did vote. I am pretty passionate about this one, Camp. I do think this will come back before us, not this, per se, but the issue itself, and it may come back in the form of a hard shift, and that's fine. I hope we will keep it in the back of our minds as we see where the sentiment lands on that, that there is something that could be more gentle. Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: The reason I voted to have it no action is, based on what Mara had said, that no action doesn't mean that this goes away and that it can be brought back up. In that, we are facing an assessment upcoming, and we can look at just how things transpire with all these new bag limits, et cetera. There is an opportunity. If it's the right thing to do in the future, we'll do it, or we'll bring it up again.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz, did you have your hand up?

MR. DIAZ: I was going to, and thank you, Madam Chair, make a 45 motion that we table the rest of the document, if I get a 46 second.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a motion on the board to

table the amendment. Johnny.

MR. GREENE: I see Mara has her hand up, and I think she may be on the same path I am, and I will let her speak.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: I'm just not sure that you want to table it. If you table it, then you're not allowed to talk about it. Then someone has to make a motion to untable. Do you just want to postpone indefinitely or -- I mean, you can just decide not to work on it. In doing that, in my mind, if you decide to do that, then Action 2 isn't going forward either and you're just not going to pursue the amendment right now.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for reminding us about the definition of tabling and the action taken after that. Mr. 18 Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Levy. I would like to change my motion to postpone the document indefinitely.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion on the board to postpone CMP Amendment 29. Do we have a second to the motion?

MR. WALKER: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's seconded by Mr. Walker. Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Matens.

MR. MATENS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Forgive me for asking this, but how does this affect the increase in the bag limit? It doesn't, right? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I just wanted to echo much of what Pam had said earlier, that to have the opportunity to bring this back up for discussion in the future, because we may be interested in looking at it, and then also we may be interested in looking at a hard TAC. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Any further discussion? Okay. 44 We will take a vote on this motion. **All those in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.**

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Sixteen.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those opposed, same sign.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Zero. The motion passes sixteen to zero.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

 MR. DIAZ: I just would just, really quickly, like to say that I think this -- Obviously this did not go the way that I voted, but I do think it is a success story for the council. We brought up an issue, it was thoroughly debated, and we had a lot of public comment.

The reason there are seventeen of us around this table is seventeen people make better decisions when we vote by majority than one person alone, and so, even in spite of the fact that it didn't go the way I would have liked that it had gone, I think it's still a worthwhile exercise, and I appreciate everybody's indulgence on this issue. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dale, I will echo those comments. Thank you. I appreciate it. Dr. Dana, did you actually finish your report?

DR. DANA: Yes, ma'am, I did.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. That's good to know. All right. Next on our agenda -- Let's see what time it is. It's 11:15. Let's keep moving right along. Next on the agenda then would be the Shrimp Committee Report. Dale, let's see if you can get us somewhere close to being back on schedule. I will turn it over to you, sir.

SHRIMP COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Staff presented the public hearing draft of Shrimp Amendment 17B. Action 1 defines an aggregate MSY for shrimp species. The committee recommends, and I so move, that, in Action 1 to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 is to establish aggregate MSY using the method developed by the Shrimp Effort Working Group. For the federal commercial Gulf shrimp fishery, aggregate MSY equals 112,531,374 pounds of tails. Madam Chair.

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

MR. DIAZ: Action 2 defines an aggregate OY for shrimp species.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2 that the preferred alternative be Alternative 2. Alternative 2 is, for the federal shrimp fishery, aggregate OY equals 85,761,596 pounds of tails, which is aggregate MSY reduced for certain ecological, social, and economic factors. Madam Chair.

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. DIAZ: Action 3 sets a minimum threshold limit for the number of valid and renewable shrimp permits. This threshold is to ensure that, if permits reach this low number, the council will review the status of the fishery and can take action.

It was emphasized that the council is not actively reducing permits. The number of permits in each of the alternatives is based on the predicted number of active vessels, which includes all offshore effort, even that in state waters. The predicted number of active vessels includes vessels that do not have a federal permit, which includes the state-permitted vessels.

These numbers of predicted active vessels are used to set the threshold, but the threshold will apply to a value that National Marine Fisheries Service can actually monitor, which is the number of valid or renewable permits.

Though the rationale used to set the threshold is based on a predicted number of active permits, the threshold will be applied to the valid or renewable permits. Staff will add language to the public hearing presentations and clearly define valid and renewable permits versus predicted active permits.

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 3, that the preferred alternative be Alternative 2. Alternative 2 is set a threshold number of valid or renewable Gulf shrimp vessel permits equal to the predicted number of active permitted vessels needed to attain aggregate OY in the offshore fishery. Aggregate OY accounts for relatively high CPUE and landings, while reducing the risk of exceeding sea turtle and juvenile red snapper bycatch. For Action 2, Alternative 2, it is 1,072 permits. Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. We have a committee motion. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: This is really in regards to the way all these alternatives are written, and I know Morgan tried to clarify it,

and she has got it nailed. She does not get confused when anybody does it, but everybody else around this table kept getting confused, and I was wondering, and you may have said why you couldn't do it that way, but if you couldn't just write the alternative that says valid and renewable permits or whatever is 1,072. Then, in the discussion, explain how we got 1,072, so that people don't keep entering that loop of getting confused on what it is.

I mean, even after we clarified it, everybody still seemed confused, and I am just thinking, for the public to read it and not get twisted in some way, regardless of -- I know you all do a great job at the public hearing, but there is people that are just going to read this, and I would like for them to be able to understand it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Kilgour, would you like to respond?

DR. MORGAN KILGOUR: Not really. I will get with the IPT and see if there's a way that we can clarify this a little bit more, so that it reflects those comments. This has been a group effort, and so I don't want to -- I will get with the IPT to try and do that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Dr. Kilgour. If we can work towards that goal, that would probably be very helpful to the public. We appreciate that. Any other discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. DIAZ: Action 4 lays out the response of what happens when the valid and renewable permit threshold is met. The committee discussed why the number was set at 1,300 in Alternative 3. There was discussion that the projected passive reduction in permits would take about fifteen to twenty years at the current rate of non-renewal, and that the current permit moratorium would expire before then. The committee felt that there should be a metric in place should the threshold be met.

The committee recommends, and I so move, that, in Action 4, that the preferred alternative be Alternative 4, changing the number of shrimp moratorium permits from 1,300 to 1,175. Alternative 4 is, when the number of valid or renewable shrimp moratorium permits reaches 1,175, the council will form a review panel to review the details of a permit pool and other options. If the number of permits reaches the threshold set in Action 3, any permits that are not renewed within one year of the expiration date on the permit will go into a Gulf Shrimp Vessel Permit

Reserve Pool. The panel would consist of Shrimp AP members, Science and Statistical Committee members, National Marine Fisheries Service, and council staff. Madam Chair.

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

MR. DIAZ: Action 5 addresses a transit provision for non-federally-permitted vessels through federal waters. The committee discussed the differences between Alternatives 2 and 3

The committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 5 that the preferred alternative be Alternative 2. 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. Fishing gear appropriately stowed means trawl doors and nets must be out of the water and the bag straps must be removed from the net. 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 trawl doors and nets must be out of the water and the bag straps must be removed from the net.

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

MS. LEVY: It just seems like the alternative is -- The same thing is written twice, and so that's not -- As long as we understand that I think that's a mistake, meaning there is the same language two times in that motion, but I don't think that's the way the alternative is written in the document.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara, I believe you are correct. Okay. With that clarification, is there any further discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. DIAZ: The committee recommends, and I so move, that Shrimp Amendment 17B be sent out for public hearings.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion to send this out for public hearings. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition and the motion carries.

 MR. DIAZ: Under Other Business, three items were discussed under other business. Dr. Ponwith provided some updated effort estimates for the shrimp fishery, which were still below the juvenile red snapper bycatch thresholds.

Mr. Diaz discussed the upcoming TED rule and expressed that the new definition of tow times and the requirement for TEDS in skimmer trawls could be problematic, as there could be an initial delay in obtaining TEDs because of demand.

Dr. Crabtree noted that National Marine Fisheries Service is aware of these two issues and is looking into the matter. Ms. Bosarge discussed the GOMRI report and climate change findings. Some species have evidence of distributions moving north, and the council should be aware that management may need to adapt. Madam Chair this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Diaz. Anything else under shrimp business before we leave the report? Okay. Next on our agenda is our Reef Fish Committee Report, and I have no idea what everybody's travel plans are, but it's always the case that somebody has got to fly out today.

To me, it's most important to have everybody around this table as we have those discussions, and so, if everybody would like to take a five-minute bathroom break before we start Reef Fish, the Reef Fish Report, that is fine, but we're going to push through and try and -- I hope we can get that finished before we go to lunch, and so you may be waiting a little while for lunch. You may want to get a bagel. I will see you back here in just about five minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right, Mr. Greene. Go ahead and get us started.

REEF FISH COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. GREENE: Okay. The Reef Fish Management Committee Report from January 30 and 31, 2017.

Draft Framework Action for Mutton Snapper ACL and Management Measures and Gag Commercial Size Limit, staff reviewed the background for the framework action, which examines changes to ACLs, size and bag limits for mutton snapper and to the commercial size limit for gag. Staff confirmed that the current season for mutton is based on the ACL and not the ACT, meaning

that the ACT is not currently used as a management target in the Gulf.

Committee members determined that not all of the alternatives and options for changes to the mutton snapper bag limit were necessary and voted to remove some of them to the Considered but Rejected appendix. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2, to move Alternatives 2 and 3 and associated options to the Considered but Rejected Appendix.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2, to move Options 4a and 4c in Alternative 4 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix.

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. GREENE: With respect to changing the size limit for mutton snapper, committee members asked how the State of Florida would handle transit issues, since the regulations between the state and federal waters now differ. Florida now has a minimum size limit of eighteen inches total length for mutton snapper, whereas the federal size limit is sixteen inches.

A committee member representing the State of Florida added that as long as a vessel which landed mutton snapper in federal waters transits continuously through state waters, they would not be penalized for potentially undersized mutton snapper. Staff will bring a final action document for council consideration in April 2017.

SEDAR Gag Update Assessment, SSC representative Dr. Joe Powers reviewed the gag update assessment. This assessment was an update to the 2013 SEDAR 33. The update assessment was a continuity model, meaning it used the same model as in SEDAR 33, but with additional landings data for 2013 through 2015.

When a retrospective analysis was performed to compare the continuity model to SEDAR 33, biomass estimates diverged in the most recent years, indicating uncertainty. Nevertheless, the results were sufficient to determine that overfishing was not

occurring and the stock was not overfished.

Sensitivity runs that included or excluded effects of the 2005 and 2014 red tide events produced large differences from the SEDAR 33 analysis, which had concluded that the 2014 red tide event was not substantial. This further added to the uncertainty about the results.

The SSC concluded that the continuity model was still the best available science, but, due to the uncertainty, only projected OFL and ABC yield streams for three years, 2017 through 2019.

ABC was calculated two ways. Number one was using the Tier 1 ABC control rule with a P* set at a 30 percent probability of overfishing and two was with ABC set at the yield corresponding to 75 percent of Fmax. The SSC felt uncertainties in the update assessment were not appropriately characterized by the Tier 1 P* approach. Therefore, the SSC chose to set ABC at 75 percent of Fmax.

Both OFL and ABC for the 2017 update assessment are less than the 2017 OFL and ABC from before the update, but are above the current gag ACL of 3.12 million pounds gutted weight. Therefore, there is no requirement to reduce the ACL.

Committee members and staff noted that there is an MRIP calibration update of the landings scheduled for later this year, which may result in new ABC projections. Consequently, the committee took no action on gag ACLs.

Joint Ad Hoc Red Snapper Charter Vessel AP/Ad Hoc Reef Fish Headboat AP, staff reviewed the summary for the joint meeting of the Ad Hoc Reef Fish Headboat and Ad Hoc Red Snapper Charter Advisory Panels.

The council requested a copy of the presentation given by staff to the APs. Staff noted that the allocation decisions tools discussed during the joint AP meeting were included in the briefing book for reference. Ms. Susan Gerhart provided a brief overview of the cyclical redistribution mechanism, as introduced at the joint AP meeting. Staff reviewed the portion of the presentation given to the APs that pertained to cyclical redistribution. The committee made the following motion.

By vote of nine to five, the committee recommends, and I so move, to instruct staff to develop a white paper outlining the changes necessary to include red snapper, gag, gray triggerfish, greater amberjack and red grouper in the management program for

charter/for-hire allocation-based management consistent with the Charter/For-Hire AΡ recommendations and joint Charter/For-Hire/Headboat AP consensus. This should explore: changes to the current amendment, including purpose and need, title, et cetera; method for determining the charter/for-hire ACL for gray triggerfish, gag, red grouper, and amberjack; develop mechanisms for trading different species to accommodate regional differences; scenarios illustrating how allocation of shares would change through cyclical redistribution, which was discussed at length during the joint for-Hire AP meeting, based on reported landings methodology chosen.

12 13 14

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Riechers.

15 16 17

18

19

MR. RIECHERS: I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion, but I suspect it's going to go much as the committee has gone, since all the members were present, minus a couple who either didn't vote or weren't in the room.

202122

23

2425

26

I am not opposed to getting together an options paper dealing with these other issues, but I am going to oppose the motion, simply because I do believe we're at a point where we're trying to deal with red snapper and the differences between the two industries and regarding catch history and how you might work through that.

272829

30

31

32

33 34 Some of this scenario that would talk about this cyclical redistribution certainly is appropriate, to see if there some means to deal with that issue for those groups, but I am going to oppose the motion, simply because of we're adding additional fish to that notion at this point in time, and I think we are — In actuality, that's a whole sector separation issue with all of those other species, and I think that will require a lot more than just development of a white paper at this point in time.

36 37 38

39

35

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

40 41

42 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Okay. We are voting the nays 43 first. Four.

44

45 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All those in favor, same sign, so we can get 46 a count.

47 48

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The yeas have eleven. The motion

passes eleven to four.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thanks. I will do it in the right order next time. Chairman Greene. I'm sorry, Chairman Greene. Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I have a question. I was considering making a motion to address something red-snapper-specific, but yet having to do with cyclical redistribution. Would now be the appropriate time to do that, before we --

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Chairman Greene says that he thinks that now is probably the right time in his report, and so go ahead.

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I would like to add an alternative, and you can add it where you want, maybe Action 5, but it would be to the amendment and not the white paper. It would divest and cyclically redistribute shares that are not being used by permit holders and include a suite of options for redistribution methods with associated timelines and include an appeals process for permit holders.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We are going to give staff just a second to get that motion on the board and then we'll ask for a second. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: What amendment are you talking about?

MR. SANCHEZ: The charter/for-hire, 41.

31 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I think it says it in the motion, Amendment 32 41.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't believe that amendment is on the agenda, and I would ask Mara whether we can do this or not, without it being on the agenda.

38 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

 MS. LEVY: I don't think that there's anything that precludes you from talking about it, meaning you're not taking any council action on it. It's just that you don't have it before you. I guess, if there is some way to figure out exactly -- I don't know what Action 5 is.

I guess we would have to look it up, but I guess the question would be is then staff supposed to be going ahead with the development of Amendment 41 by adding this and still looking at the white paper about how to address all these other things together? I think, from a staff point, that would be my question. What is the direction here, if this were to go forward?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: I guess I will try to explain what the intention was, and them I'm definitely agreeable, amendable, to the best way to get there, if possible. Again, the white paper dealt with adding species, five species, to the existing one, or four, rather.

This is more just red-snapper-specific, and so I wanted to flesh out and not leave behind really having alternatives created to vet and flesh out how this cyclical redistribution is going to play out, so the public can weigh in on this. Then, of course, based on some public comment, have an appeals process for some legitimate hardship cases and just see -- Include some of that safeguard in there.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I have a question for John. In the white paper, when it started talking about the cyclical redistribution, were you not -- You were only talking about that for the species above, or were you also trying to include red snapper there as part of it?

MR. SANCHEZ: The thought process was this is a white paper, and it included the addition of the species. Obviously cyclical redistribution was discussed at the AP hearings as well in that context, since there was support for both, but, in Amendment 41, we're just looking at snapper, but I think there was a lot of merit, given the fact that that for-hire sector doesn't have logbook history, to have some alternatives to help flesh out that cyclical redistribution approach as an initial way to allocate and address these things over time, since there wasn't a logbook.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Let's make sure we have a second to this motion. Do we have a second? We have a second by Dr. Dana. Thank you. I am going to let Doug Gregory speak for just a minute, because he actually wanted to speak before Dr. Lucas. Go ahead, sir.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: If you don't tie it directly to 41, you could call it a white paper or just ask staff to do an

analysis, a preliminary analysis, of this for the council consideration. I mean, the white paper that was passed earlier is something that would go in 41 if the council votes to put it in 41, and so I see this along the same lines. It's just kind of a parallel, independent analysis.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Riechers.

MR. RIECHERS: John, not to suggest that you don't want to do it this way, but, in your earlier prelude to your previous motion, you also included red snapper.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I do think we probably have to have some clarification for staff, so that when we leave this meeting — I am not sure which way this is going to go, but what our intent was. Even when we were in committee, I had a little confusion about — I know what the white paper was going to bring me, but like the ultimate goal.

Your ultimate goal, since you made that motion, John, originally, the white paper motion, was we had the report on the two joint APs. In that meeting, they decided that they really think that multispecies is the way to go, and so you wanted a white paper that was going to essentially, outside of the 41 document, so that it doesn't become something like this, it was going to give us all the different things that we're going to have to change, consider, analyze, look at, and make some decisions on, in order to decide whether we want to put multispecies into 41.

What you're asking for here is that cyclical distribution — What you're saying is that, in that joint AP meeting, there was a lot of consensus on that. They really, really want to look at it. Regardless of whether we decide to go multispecies or not, they really want to look at that for what they have going on right now in 41, and so you want that to come back to us at the next meeting in 41, so that we will look at it in regards to 41, and am I right? Am I on the right path here?

MR. SANCHEZ: That would be ideal, given that -- How long is it going to take to have a white paper ready and presented to review? I also heard yesterday that in this joint meeting that we had that there was support for going forward in unison. In fact, you heard some testimony from folks that participated that, if we go to referendum, we go together. Let's keep this together, but let's not take forever to do this.

The way may be -- My concern and my thinking here is, since red

snapper is already in there, and there seems to be a lot of cross-support for cyclical redistribution for that, I don't want to convolute and not going forward some with 41, while the white paper is being generated, and then staff this process, to the detriment of the headboats, which have said let's go, let's go.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

MR. ANSON: In my mind, I thought this motion to develop the white paper, in concert with the comments that both the headboats and the charter boats go together, I thought the white paper was going to, in effect, redirect efforts to bring both of those together.

Yes, expand the species and, yes, expand, potentially some items in there for discussion relative to bringing them both forward, but that might not be how they originally wanted it, and I don't know if someone, staff or someone, can address that, but that was, in my mind, what -- There was consensus that both or none and that the white paper was going to then take it to the next level, with both of them together looking at the other additional species, of which would tie into the headboats. That's where I thought we were going, and that's the direction I thought -- I thought 41 and 42 then would just kind of hang off on the side.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: Doesn't Section D cover that, where you're talking about the cyclical redistribution? Wouldn't that cover the red snapper issue, which is one of the stocks in the white paper?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: I think what John is trying to say is that, in the event that multispecies did not go forward, that 41 should still continue to go forward with at least the red snapper and then to have a thorough evaluation of how the cyclical distribution would work.

I don't -- Roy, you might be able to help out here, but I think that's his main intent, that it not be ignored and that we be able to see what cyclical redistribution looked like in a multispecies scenario and also in a red snapper scenario. Is that right, John?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

1 2

MS. GUYAS: To me though, I feel like we would be -- We got a really quick-and-dirty presentation about how this cyclical redistribution thing works, and that's cool, but I think, to me at least, doing this white paper was digging into that concept more. Yes, I guess with the five species, but, in my mind, if you're looking at five, you could kind of -- If you only decided that you only wanted to do it for one or two or however many species, then we would pull that out. To me, I feel like we're already covering this in the white paper.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. LEVY: Just to the actual motion that's on the board, first, I don't think that's the action you want it in. If you want to move forward with the alternative, I guess my suggestion would be to ask staff to bring back a draft alternative that would address cyclical redistribution for red snapper and then it's not --

We don't have Amendment 41 before us, and so it's sort of odd to add an alternative, but, if you ask staff to provide you a draft alternative or some draft action that would address cyclical redistribution just for red snapper, then you could look at that at your next meeting. Then, if you wanted to do something with it, you could. That's an alternative if you want something focused on red snapper.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

 DR. CRABTREE: It seems then that we could bring -- Assuming staff can get the white paper done by the next meeting, then we could put Amendment 41 and 42 back on the agenda and have them in front of us. Then we could make motions about adding actions to them then, if that would work.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We're going to give Mr. Gregory just a second, so that we'll have an answer on that point.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: I am not sure. I doubt we can have the white paper that was passed earlier ready for the April meeting. We have to get the information and run it through the IPT. I mean, we can certainly try, but it's a whole new tact, and so I could -- The June meeting for sure, but it's doubtful that we could get it by the April meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. So probably June. Possibly April, but probably June is what I just heard. I actually liked

Mara's suggestion. I was very interested in it, and that's the first introduction I had to it, was Sue's four slides. I think allocation is something that we always get bogged down on.

If we could get a draft alternative and we look at just that, because those amendments are pretty complicated, both of those amendments, and we tend to get pretty deep, but that would be an interesting exercise, to me, to look at a draft alternative for that and really put some focus and some thought into that. That's just my two-cents' worth. Ms. Gerhart.

MS. SUE GERHART: I just wanted to mention that this probably will need to be at least an action on its own, and possibly several actions, rather than an alternative, just for wordsmithing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. I still think we're probably going to have to clean up the motion a little bit, John. I'm going to let you try your best to clean it up as you see fit here.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: John, if you like, we will bring something to you shortly, a rewrite, and it's up to you to -- If you all want to, I guess, table this until we get an alternative motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It's probably going to be pretty different. Do you want to just withdraw this motion, so we don't have a motion sitting on the board?

MR. SANCHEZ: I will do that. I will withdraw it.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. The motion is withdrawn, with the notation that we'll come back to this here in just a little bit. Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: The Chair of the Headboat AP, Mr. Randy Boggs, requested that, upon completion of the white paper, the joint APs be able to review it before being reconvened. A committee member noted that, if there is no opposition to Mr. Boggs's request, a motion would not be needed to reconvene a joint AP meeting. No opposition was expressed.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Excuse me, Chairman Greene. Mr. Diaz.

46 MR. DIAZ: That's what I'm trying to get straight in my mind 47 right now. What Johnny just read is they're requesting to 48 review the white paper after it's done, to reconvene them, and so we do not plan to reconvene either one of those APs until after that white paper is done, and so it won't be before the next meeting. It possibly might not be before the June meeting.

If it does work out to the June meeting, we're in the middle of all their fishing season. I mean, the timing on this is not really laying out to be very good. Am I thinking about this right? Is that the way that other people are thinking about it?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Our goal is definitely to get the white paper done before the June meeting. Our June meeting is near the end of June, and so I see your dilemma there. They have a forty-day season, which extends through June.

Like I said, we'll get it done as soon as possible, but it's a new tact for us. We're got to look at all the landings data and get that from the Center and have the IPT analyze it, but we will do it as quickly as possible.

We can have the white paper before the council. What Mr. Boggs is requesting is that they get a chance to review it before they are reconvened. It doesn't say a particular time, but we could do it before the season, or we could do it after the season. If we can do it before the season, that's preferable.

If it comes out to where it's the middle of the season, we can just wait until the season is over. We usually do a doodle poll for the APs, and so we'll send them the document when it's done. Then we could do a doodle poll, and, if we don't get enough people coming to the meeting, even if it's during the season, we won't have the meeting.

If it's during the season and a lot of the people still can make the meeting, we will have it, and so it's up to them and their availability as to whether we have a meeting or not, because we try to not have a meeting if we don't get a quorum. Now, if we get one person less than a quorum, we may still go forward with a meeting, and so it's really up to the availability of the people on our advisory panels as to when we have the meetings anyway.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson.

 MR. ANSON: Thank you. Again, just for my personal clarification, where does 41 and 42 stand relative to this, because there is items -- I mean, we've got red snapper in here, and we're dealing with some of these issues that are being discussed with this motion for other species, and so does 41 and

42 still go on as proceeding or are there certain items in here, in this white paper, that could apply to red snapper that it would be administratively, potentially, easier to avoid doing 41 and 42 and just morphing 41 and 42 to include the species? I am a little confused, I guess, as to what the direction or what the request was from the AP, specific to what you just described, the timing, and then how it impacts 41 and 42.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: The council can give us specific direction. Our interpretation of what the joints AP said was to try to have 41 and 42 go into place, if not simultaneously, as close together as possible, which means slowing down 42, because it was on a faster pace, and we really wouldn't work on either until this white paper came back to the council and the APs and you all blessed it as being included in 41. I see the two as kind of on as hold as far as formal development and going forward with them.

MR. ANSON: Thank you, and that's what I thought too, but I just wanted to be clear and make sure that council members were clear and the public was clear and that we come back in April and it's not on the agenda and people are screaming that 41 and 42 aren't on the agenda, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas, and then I think John's motion may be ready.

MS. GUYAS: Another clarifying question, and this may be for you, John, since you attended that joint AP meeting. My understanding, from the white paper motion that you made earlier, was that white paper would go back to the joint AP. Yesterday, I think, in public testimony, I heard a bunch of requests to meet as separate APs before that joint AP comes together, and I'm just not sure what's going on with that. I see Carrie has her hand up too, and so somebody help me out here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Simmons.

 DR. CARRIE SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess my suggestion would be for staff to potentially work on this red snapper cyclical redistribution and for that to be our top priority and try to get that back to the council in April. We decide if you want to put it in Amendment 41.

 In addition, we would work towards getting a draft of the white paper that would look at all the species and the information that you have requested as well, but we just don't know that we

can do that. We'll do the best we can by April.

At that time, if we can, and you review it in April and you would like to move forward with that, then I think you should tell us that you want to reconvene the APs, and if you want to do that separately or together. That would be my suggestion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

MR. GREENE: I think another consideration would be that, if you're going to convene them together -- Last time, we had a two-day meeting. There's nothing that says that the first half of the first day that you can't convene them separately and let them look over it and then bring them together, and I think it would be a much more efficient use of the process, and so consider that as you move forward.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Excellent suggestion. Dr. Simmons.

DR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think just the most important thing is the council has to feel comfortable with that white paper before we get too far along in this process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. John, would you like to talk to us about your possible motion?

MR. SANCHEZ: At this point, I don't know what you want to call it, a motion or not or a request, as these things go, but that seems agreeable to me. It addresses the spirit of what I wanted to do, the intent, to really look at that. The language is perfect.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. The motion on the board is request staff to craft a stand-alone action to address cyclical redistribution for shares of red snapper that are not being used by permit holders (permits that do not report landings after program implementation) and include a suite of options for redistribution methods with timelines, including an appeals process for permit holders.

We have a motion on the board by John Sanchez. Do we have a second for the motion? It's seconded by Dr. Dana. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: Public Hearing Draft Amendment 44, Minimum Stock

Size Threshold for Reef Fish Stocks, staff reviewed the alternatives in Amendment 44. The single action in the amendment would select a formula to use for defining MSST for reef fish stocks. A second action to revise MSY proxies had been previously removed from this amendment and would be addressed in a later amendment.

A committee member noted that reef fish had highly variable recruitment, and there was often uncertainty in the assessment results. For species with low natural mortality rates, MSST, using the current method, resulted in a threshold very close to the rebuilt level.

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, overfishing must be ended immediately, which should prevent stocks from dropping below MSST. He felt that Alternative 3 struck a good balance between addressing uncertainty and preventing analysis from indicating an overfished status.

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative. Alternative 3 is, for all reef fish stocks, MSST equals one minus M times BMSY, or proxy, or 0.75 times BMSY, or proxy, whichever provides a larger buffer between MSST and BMSY, or proxy.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion on the board. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries.

MR. GREENE: A committee member noted that some environmental groups had recommended that setting MSST equals 0.85 times BMSY be considered as an additional alternative. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 1, to add an alternative to look at 0.85 times BMSY, or proxy.

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. GREENE: Another committee member asked that the SSC review the effect of 0.85 times BMSY versus 0.75 times BMSY. Staff noted that, due to the timing on the next SSC meeting and the additional time needed to add the new alternative and its analysis to the amendment, it would come back to the council for final action at its June meeting rather than April. The committee agreed that public testimony could be taken using a

webinar hearing rather than in-person hearings.

Public Hearing Draft Amendment 36A, Modifications to Commercial IFQ Programs, the committee reviewed the selected preferred alternatives in Amendment 36A and made no changes.

In Action 1, a question was raised regarding the penalty for failure to hail-in. According to NOAA's penalty schedule, a written warning and/or fine up to \$20,000 may result, depending on the level of culpability and the gravity offense level, as determined by law enforcement.

In Action 2.2, staff provided some modified language for Alternative 4. The committee supported the changes and passed the following motion. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, in Action 2.2, to accept the IPT recommendations in Alternative 4.

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 noted that, at the October 2016 meeting, the council agreed that public hearings will consist of one webinar and a direct mail-out to the program participants. The committee then passed the following motion. Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to send Amendment 36A out for Public Hearings.

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: Public Hearing Draft Amendment 46, Gray Triggerfish Rebuilding Plan, staff reviewed public hearing Draft Amendment 46, the Gray Triggerfish Rebuilding Plan. The council must prepare a plan to rebuild the stock as quickly as possible, but not to exceed ten years. The rebuilding plan has to be implemented by November 2017.

Staff reviewed the document action-by-action, noting that the preferred alternatives were selected for Actions 1 through 3. No modifications were made to those preferred alternatives during committee.

Action 4 would modify the commercial trip limit, and staff noted the committee has not selected a preferred alternative for this action yet. A committee member noted that he wanted to wait to hear public testimony before selecting a preferred alternative for Action 4 and approving the document for public hearings.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Simmons.

DR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Would the council consider selecting a preferred alternative for Action 4 before we go out to public hearings? It's the commercial trip limit action for triggerfish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: It sounds like we're having some discussion around the table.

MR. WALKER: I don't think we heard much testimony on triggerfish, and so I guess the sixteen -- Was that the recommendation of the AP, that the preferred alternative -- I move that the preferred alternative be the sixteen fish.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Simmons says that, yes, that was the preferred alternative from the AP.

MR. WALKER: Which alternative was that?

DR. SIMMONS: Alternative 4.

MR. WALKER: Alternative 4.

8 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So you're making motion, correct, Mr. Walker?

MR. WALKER: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Walker is making a motion that Alternative 4, which is sixteen fish, be the preferred alternative. We will wait to get that on the board, but, while we're waiting, do we have a second for that motion? We do have a second. I will go ahead and open the floor to discussion while that's coming up on the board. Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: That's that the AP had picked, and so to hopefully catch our ACL. There was some testimony, and there was not an alternative on there, to have it more seasonal. Triggerfish is more of a seasonal fish for the tourists and the folks who come down to the beach. They enjoy eating triggerfish, but that was not one of the alternatives, and so the closest one we had was sixteen fish, and that was the recommendation by the AP.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: More just a question, and maybe this is a David question, since you're in this fishery, somewhat. The limit that we have now is really like a bycatch allowance, essentially. Do you think this increase is enough that that would change and people might actually target triggerfish more than they already are now, which it sounds like they're not really, because they're not hitting that commercial limit, the commercial trip limit?

MR. WALKER: No, I don't believe they will target them any more with the increase in the bag limit. I think that sixteen fish - There were some concerns that people would like to have it more seasonal, when the tourists are in town and so forth, but I guess it will help address any discards that might come during the year, a full year.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We are getting close to having the motion on the board here. Okay. In Public Hearing Draft Amendment 46, Gray Triggerfish Rebuilding Plan, in Action 4, to make Alternative 4 the preferred alternative. Alternative 4 is to increase the commercial trip limit for gray triggerfish to sixteen fish per trip. Any further discussion on the motion? Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: This is just a question for Carrie. Would sixteen fish be enough fish to help us reach our ACL?

 DR. SIMMONS: Thank you. Based on the decision tools that the Regional Office staff, Dr. Mike Larkin, has developed, it is projected to have 43,592 pounds, if you increase it to sixteen fish per trip, whereas, currently -- What is the current one? I don't have it on the top of my head. Let's see.

Currently, I think it's been around 42,500 pounds, and so not a whole lot of increase, based on the model. It's closer to your ACT of the 60,000 pounds, but not right up to it is what the projections are. Remember that this still maintains the current fixed season closure of the June and July. The council elected not to change that, and so that still would be in place.

MR. WALKER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Any further discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. We have one technical question here. Now, we wanted to pick a preferred so that we could have a preferred when we went out to public hearings. Refresh my memory. Have we chosen those locations? Is that all set now? Staff is shaking their heads

yes. Okay. Those have been blessed by all of our respective states and council members? Is everyone good with that? Dr. Simmons.

DR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. At the October council meeting, you selected Spanish Fort, the Five Rivers Facility. For Florida, it's Destin and the St. Pete area. Louisiana is going to be by webinar. Mississippi is going to be by webinar. Texas, we're going to hold one in Galveston and Corpus Christi. Right now, we currently have those scheduled for March.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I am remembering that conversation now. All right. I don't see any discussion around the table, and so I think we're still good with those choices, if you want to go ahead and continue, Chairman Greene.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Options Paper for Amendment 47, Modify Vermilion Snapper ACLs and MSY Proxy, staff reviewed the actions and alternatives in the options paper for Amendment 47.

The SSC had recommended the yield at F 30 percent SPR as a proxy for MSY and had used that proxy in the assessment. As a result, Action 1, the MSY proxies, only contained two alternatives, status quo or the SSC-recommended proxy. Committee members cautioned that there needed to be sufficient justification to have only two alternatives. Staff responded that the number and range of alternatives would be discussed at the next IPT meeting.

Action 2 contained alternatives for either a constant F declining yield ACL or a constant catch ACL, based on the SSC's recommended ABCs for the years 2017 through 2020. A committee member asked about a discussion on page 9 of the options paper in which, following the 2012 update assessment, members of the Reef Fish AP and members of the public felt that the vermilion snapper stock was not in as good a shape as the assessment indicated.

A committee member who was on the AP at the time discussed his on-the-water observations and concerns about the stock at the time. Staff stated that the options paper would be developed into a draft amendment for the next council meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Wasn't there also discussion, and I think it might have been Dr. Crabtree that had brought up maybe looking at SPRs

of twenty and forty, and I am actually interested in looking at twenty-six and maybe keeping it consistent with the snapper complex. I think red snapper is at twenty-six now. I guess that I can get that in some kind of a motion here.

Motion to explore looking at other SPRs, and I think there was a mention of ten, twenty-six, and I would like to look at twenty-six, to keep it consistent with red snapper, and also maybe even look at forty, while we're looking at it. It's twenty, twenty-six, and forty.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion that is being worked on, that is being put on the board. Mara, did you have an issue for us here?

MS. LEVY: Just to make sure. So the motion is to add alternatives to Action 1, the MSY proxy action? Is that what we're talking about? We are adding alternatives to Action 1?

MR. WALKER: Dr. Crabtree, you could maybe help me here a little bit. We brought that discussion up when we were talking about maybe looking at -- We were talking about looking at -- You had mentioned looking at twenty and perhaps looking at thirty or forty. Then I thought maybe twenty-six, to keep it consistent with other snapper species.

DR. CRABTREE: I just wanted staff to make sure that we were on solid grounds with two alternatives, and, if we are, then fine. If we're not, then adding some other reasonable alternatives, but I didn't really want to get into specifics at this point. It may be fine like it is.

MR. WALKER: Okay. Well, if they'll look at other alternatives, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So, essentially, as a council, we want to make sure that we have a reasonable range of alternatives on that action item for our consideration, and we're asking the IPT and staff to get together and take a hard look at that and make sure that that's what we have when the document comes back before us again, and I am not crafting that as a motion. I am saying in general, for clarification. If you withdraw your motion, that's what you want to make sure happens.

MR. WALKER: That's right. I would withdraw my motion. Then I would like to make sure that they would look -- At least look at keeping it consistent with red snapper at twenty-six SPR.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I think we have that on the record, and the IPT is in the room, a couple of them, and so I think we're good. All right. Did you have anything else, Mr. Walker, before we continue with the report?

MR. WALKER: No.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GREENE: Gulf Anglers Focus Group Report, Mr. Ken Haddad presented the results and recommendations from a series of facilitated meetings held by the Gulf Anglers Focus Group. The group had a total of fifty-two participants representing private anglers, for-hire vessels, environmental groups, recreational industry, commercial fishermen, state regulators, and federal regulators.

It met every other month during 2016. The results were a series of options, not recommendations, to consider for further analysis. The options, along with their pros and cons, were organized as: status quo, maximizing fishing days within current framework, harvest tags, depth and distance-based management, reef fish season, harvest rate/recruitment-based management, and hybrid of various options.

The committee asked several questions about harvest tags, including how they would be distributed and return of unused tags. Harvest tags would need to be available to anyone from any state. Dr. Roy Crabtree clarified that a tag program could not discriminate against people from any state, but could be restricted to vessel owners or distributed based on past participation.

 Depth or distance-based management also attracted interest, but there was concern about how barotrauma would affect the management results. It was suggested that a modeling approach be used to evaluate the option, including the effects of barotrauma. Achieving a forty-day recreational season seemed to be an objective that would provide the greatest benefits to fishermen.

This material will be provided to the Ad Hoc Recreational Red Snapper AP. A doodle poll has been sent out to the to the AP members to schedule a meeting, which could take place either before or after the next council meeting.

A committee member noted that the Gulf Angler Focus Group report contained several data and analysis requests, some of which may have already been done. She asked that the focus group's report be forwarded to the Regional Office and Science Center and that a presentation be scheduled at the next council meeting on what analysis has been done that is relevant to the focus group's proposals. Dr. Crabtree responded that the focus group's analysis requests could be reviewed to determine which requests are feasible to respond to and which are not.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Gregory.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Before we leave the focus group discussion, we did a doodle poll with our Private Angler Advisory Panel. Today was the deadline, I think, or tomorrow, for them to answer, but, right now -- We wanted to have this meeting as soon as possible.

The only days that the staff and facilitators were available between now and the April meeting was March 20, 21, and 22. We only have thirteen out of twenty-five private anglers on the AP that can make those three dates. That is barely a quorum.

In May, May 8 and May 9, we have sixteen out of twenty-five. That's the most we've gotten to date, and so we will be working with the Chair to make the decision as to when the dates will actually be, but that's how it's shaking out. Sixteen is the most we've gotten to respond so far with a positive date, and thirteen is what we have between now and April, and so it's likely that the meeting will be after the April council meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for the update. We appreciate it.

MR. GREENE: Mechanism to Carry Over the Unharvested Red Snapper ACL to the Following Season, Dr. Joe Powers, the SSC representative, reviewed the carryover simulation presented to the SSC by the SEFSC. The presentation indicated that a carryover could be conducted for red snapper without risking the progress of the rebuilding plan.

Two important caveats were mentioned. First, the carryover simulation only demonstrated the effects of carrying quota over once within the rebuilding timeline and then never again. In reality, it is likely that multiple carryover events are possible between now and the end of the red snapper rebuilding period in 2032.

 Second, the carry-over simulation is sector-specific, owing to differing selectivities and sizes of landed fish by the various fishing sectors and components. Also, the two-year delay

between the year from which the quota was to be carried over to the year receiving the carryover was to ensure that finalized landings data were used in quota estimations.

3 4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

2

Committee members indicated that they were interested applying a carryover method to any applicable species. stated that the use of a buffer between the ACT and ACL would still be in place for red snapper. A committee member suggested that, if a carryover is used for a certain species, that the council may consider also instituting paybacks accountability measure for those eligible species an additional protection against jeopardizing a rebuilding plan.

12 13 14

1516

A modification to the closed framework procedure was recommended to automate the updating of the ABCs by the National Marine Fisheries Service, which would save considerable time when implementing new catch levels.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

1 to the National Standard Guidelines implementation of carryover plans and recommend doing so through the council's ABC control rule. The committee was advised that the best course of action would be to fold the current carryover framework action into the amendment, which addresses revisions to the current ABC control rule, and to include a modification to the closed framework procedure to allow National Marine Fisheries Service to automatically update the catch levels through the carryover method. Any carry-over would only be valid for one fishing year and would only apply to those species who were closed because their ACL was met or projected to be met.

30 31 32

33

34

35

Without opposition, the committee recommends, and I so move, to direct staff to add carryover provisions in the ABC control rule amendment and modify the framework procedure to allow for National Marine Fisheries Service to update the appropriate quotas once landings data are available.

363738

39

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Was there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? With no opposition, the motion carries.

40 41 42

43

44

MR. GREENE: By folding the carryover method for all candidate species into the ABC control rule amendment, staff will no longer continue developing a separate framework amendment to consider a carryover for red snapper.

45 46

Preliminary 2016 Red Snapper For-Hire Landings Relative to ACL, Mr. Andy Strelcheck reviewed the preliminary recreational red

snapper landings for 2016 by wave and sector component, the federal for-hire and private vessel. He noted that the recreational landings were at 99 percent of the ACL for 2016, with the for-hire component at 87 percent of their ACT and the private component at 150 percent of their ACT. The estimates did not yet include Wave 6 MRIP and headboat survey data or Texas Parks and Wildlife data for their high-use period. The preliminary MRIP data should be available by the middle of February, and the Texas data by March.

In response to a question on how payback provisions work for red snapper, Mr. Strelcheck responded that the payback adjustment is applied to the entire recreational ACL, but is only deducted from the component that exceeded its ACL the previous year.

A committee member noted that the territorial and federal-water landings reported by MRIP and the SEFSC differed occasionally, with the SEFSC numbers showing higher state-water landings than MRIP. He asked for a presentation at the next council meeting on how those numbers were adjusted.

Bonnie Ponwith explained that the SEFSC used a different method for converting numbers of fish to pounds that they felt was more accurate than the MRIP method. In discussions with MRIP personnel, it appears that MRIP is moving toward using the SEFSC methodology. She said that she could give a presentation at the next council meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: In tandem with that, I have kind of been wanting to see an update on all the different tweakings, maybe, that the states have been doing on their red snapper data collections.

We had a presentation like maybe a year or a year-and-a-half ago, something like that, and I know you all have been continuously trying to make improvements to those, and so this kind of goes out to all the states. Is it feasible for you all to maybe give us a little short snapshot of what you're doing now and maybe how it differs from before to go along with the other presentation that we're going to get?

 I just want to -- I am not in state government, and so I don't see all the changes that you all make all the time, and I know, surely, we must be getting a little closer, all the time, to maybe getting vetted to use some of this data for what we do around this table, and so I would love to see an update, if that's doable with your schedules. Is there any opposition to that from any of the states? Okay. Great. Thanks.

1 2

MR. GREENE: We just went through the red snapper for-hire landings, and we just finished up part of the carryover conversation, and then we talked about sector-specific paybacks and sector-specific overages, or carryovers, but what about subsector provisions?

One year, we have 87 percent for the for-hire and 150 percent, although we don't know where we are totally, and has there been any thought or conversation about subsector-specific carryover or paybacks?

DR. CRABTREE: I think the vision is that the carryovers would be subsector-specific and that the paybacks are subsector-specific, but they're only triggered, the payback, if you're over the overall ACL, and there would be only be carryover if we were under the overall ACL.

MR. GREENE: Thank you. That wasn't clear to me, and I just wanted to make sure, and I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks and then Mr. Diaz.

MR. BANKS: We can let one subsector, and not even one sector, but one subsector, way overharvest. As long as the other sectors are making up for that overharvest, nothing has to be paid back, and is that what you're saying?

 ${\tt DR.}$ ${\tt CRABTREE:}$ If the overall recreational fishery is below the ACL, there is no payback.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Two things. One is what I heard the SSC say is that the only way it could be done is that, if there was a payback, it could only go to the sector that experienced the shortage, and so that's what I heard in the SSC report.

 I just want to -- A hypothetical is in my mind, and maybe Dr. Crabtree can help with this, but, as the updated MRIP numbers sit now for red snapper, Dr. Crabtree, how would you envision this working?

We've got a year, right now, where the charter/for-hire is at 87 percent of their ACT, and the private recs are at 150 percent of their ACT, and, as it stands now, we're at 99 percent of the ACL, and so there would be no payback, because they're together and we haven't exceeded the 100 percent ACL, but, if you look at

it sector-specific, you couldn't give the charter/for-hire anything, because we essentially have captured 99 percent of the ACL. This year is a year that really puts us in a bind, and do you have any thoughts on that, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I do have thoughts on it. I mean, we project what we think is going to be caught, but then sometimes we -- We ask the states what they're going to do, and sometimes we get answers, but then, last year, after we had already put our season in place, some of the states changed their regulations in ways that allowed more fishing.

Also, last year, we had the changes in the state-water jurisdictions out to nine miles for three states, and so there was a lot of uncertainty in trying to project that, and so we will, again this year, come in and take into account what happened last year and project how long we think the two subsectors' seasons are going to be, and my hope is that we'll be a little closer this year, but we need some stability, in terms of stable regulations and stable boundaries, in order to be able to have a lot of confidence in how well we can predict these. When things are changing rapidly, especially if things change after we've already set the season, that's a pretty difficult situation.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Right, and I agree with everything you just said, and I think, this year particularly, National Marine Fisheries is in a bad spot to have to project seasons, and I understand that it's going to be very difficult to do.

Kind of back on what Johnny said, I think we're almost going to have to make all of this stuff sector-specific, because, in my mind, I can't see how we can make it work unless we don't make it crystal clear that each sector is responsible for what happens inside that sector.

DR. CRABTREE: That's fine, and I don't disagree with you, but just bear in mind that we still have Section 407(d) of the statute, which requires that we have an overall recreational quota and that, when it's hit, all fishing stops. While we can have subcomponents and have some degree of separation, as long as that provision is in the statute, we can't fully separate them.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: Dr. Crabtree, help me here. On the red snapper landings, in certainly Waves 1 and 2 for federal for-hire, how do we have landings there outside of the season?

DR. CRABTREE: I would like to ask Mr. Strelcheck to come up and address that, if I could.

MR. STRELCHECK: Can you repeat your question, Patrick?

MR. BANKS: Andy, thanks. Waves 1 and 2, especially, for the federal for-hire, is outside of what I remember the season being, but we still have landings in that subsector, and can you explain that a little bit to me, please?

MR. STRELCHECK: When Amendment 40 was implemented, and that's the sector separation amendment, it has a provision in it that if you hold a federal for-hire reef fish permit at any time during the fishing year that those landings will be attributed to the federal for-hire quota.

In that particular instance, the landings you're referencing, those are headboats that are continuing to report to our headboat survey that are removing their permit and fishing in state waters during the first four months of the year and then placing the permit back onboard their vessel to fish the federal season, and so they're essentially fishing state waters and then shifting back to federal waters throughout the year.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Something we probably need to have a discussion about, and I know a number of the for-hire operators brought it up to me, would be do we need to put some sort of constraint on permit transfers or try to do something that would make it more difficult for vessels to fish the federal season and then move their permit somewhere and fish state waters as well. I think that's something to talk about at future meetings if this is going to become a real problem.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene.

 MR. GREENE: I absolutely agree. This just isn't right, and it doesn't matter which side of the fence you're on. Nobody wants to be messing in somebody else's business, and so, whatever the appropriate path forward is with this, then I think we need to handle it, because it's not right for someone to fish in one person's quota and then jump over into somebody else's quota and then jump back out. That's just not right, and it doesn't

matter if you're a private angler or a charter boat. It just doesn't need to be that way, and so, whatever we need to do, I am in support of that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have had a couple of people that have asked if we could look at that in the future, and so, if there is no opposition to that, we will look at future schedules, agendas, and see when we can't get that on the agenda. Mr. Banks.

MR. BANKS: I think I asked this question during committee, but remind me of -- We don't have Waves 3 through 6 from Texas, but we're using estimated numbers, based on previous seasons? Is that right?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes. Now Andy is telling me no. Come tell us, 17 Andy.

 MR. STRELCHECK: The landings data that we provide you is simply reported landings data for the 2016 fishing year. It does not include any prior year estimates to fill in where we're missing data or don't have reported data yet.

MR. BANKS: So, to be clear, Waves 3 through 6 has zero landings included for Texas and zero MRIP landings for Wave 6?

MR. STRELCHECK: Correct, and so we are awaiting landings for headboat and MRIP for Wave 6, and so it's November and December, and then we're awaiting Texas landings for Waves 3 through 6. We get a portion of their landings for Wave 3, but, because they split the wave, we don't complete the Wave 3 landings until we get the high-use wave that they usually send us in March of the following year.

MR. BANKS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRELCHECK: The bottom line is the landings will go up, based on additional estimates that are provided to us.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Hang on, Mr. Strelcheck. We may have a couple more questions. Mr. Boyd and then Ms. Guyas.

43 MR. BOYD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Andy, go back to the 44 boats, for a second, that are moving their permits around and 45 fishing in state waters. I would assume that, if those boats 46 are in the headboat survey, they are still reporting their catch 47 in state waters through the headboat survey, and is that 48 correct?

1 2

MR. STRELCHECK: That's correct.

MR. BOYD: All right. Dr. Crabtree, if we want to look at this, do we need a motion to go ahead and start looking at restricting those permit transfers, or do we just wait for somebody to bring it up later?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that's up to you, but I think, if you want your staff to start pulling something together for you, then you probably need a motion to ask them to do that.

MR. BOYD: I would make a motion, Madam Chairman, to ask staff to review the transfer of charter/for-hire, federally-permitted charter/for-hire permits, transferred -- Help me, Roy. Transferred for the purposes of fishing in state waters. Is that too specific?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I would just say "outside of the federal season" maybe, "the federal red snapper season", because this is really just a red snapper issue. I guess you could ask them to identify some options to address the issue.

MR. BOYD: All right. Identify options to address the issue.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a motion on the board, and we do have a second by Mr. Greene for the motion. The motion is to have staff review charter/for-hire permits transferred for the purposes of fishing outside the federal red snapper season and to identify options to address the issue. Mr. Boyd, is that your motion?

MR. BOYD: That is my motion. Thank you.

35 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Is there any discussion on the motion?

MR. BOYD: We need a second.

39 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a second. Mr. Sanchez.

41 MR. SANCHEZ: Maybe just add "federal charter/for-hire".

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Boyd, are you okay with that friendly amendment?

MR. BOYD: Yes, I'm fine.

48 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The seconder agrees as well? The seconder

agrees. Any further discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. Ms. Guyas, I am sorry. You had your hand up earlier.

MS. GUYAS: That's okay. I think this is an Andy question. I can't remember this, and I should know, probably, from past season estimations, but, by the time you all come up with the season for the federal season, do you usually have all the Texas landings in hand or is that usually a projection? When do you get those landings, I guess?

12 MR. STRELCHECK: We typically announce the season in April or 13 early May, in years past, and we have final landings by that 14 point.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So you will have final Texas landings probably by our next meeting, which is early April?

19 MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, but you have a council member from Texas 20 that you could ask that question of.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Now, Lance, you just got to the table, and 23 we're already putting you on the spot.

MR. LANCE ROBINSON: Yes, I know. I think we'll have our landings -- That wave will be finished and our high-use will be available in March.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Martha, your question is answered? 30 Then Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Madam Chairman, I need to go back to the motion again. We were talking about headboats at the time, and, in the motion, I said charter/for-hire. What I meant to say was for-hire permits. I would like to go back and modify that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have already passed the motion. We 38 did vote on it.

40 DR. CRABTREE: If I could, there is only one type of permit, and 41 it has various capacities, and so I think that's fine.

43 MR. BOYD: I'm sorry, but can you say that again?

- **DR. CRABTREE:** There is only one for-hire permit. There is a reef fish for-hire and a mackerel for-hire, but there is not a separate headboat permit and a separate charter permit. They're
- 48 all the same.

1 2

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay, and so our motion will -- The intent of your motion will be carried out, and so I think you're good there. If we're going to have final landings in April, and we've had some discussion around this table, and this is probably going to be a charged statement, but we've had some discussion around this table about the paybacks being sectorspecific.

Yes, we can't stop all fishing until the overall ACL -- We have to stop all fishing when the overall ACL is met. That is fine, and that's not my concern. If that is a road we're going to go down, I feel like we need to have some discussion about that and make that intent clear, because I do think that has ramifications, at least for the states around the table, that they should know that ahead of time, so that they can make their decisions based on that information.

That may not change your decisions at all, but it may, and I just wonder, if that's the route we're going -- I would like to have some discussion about that at our next meeting, when we will have final landings.

I don't want to wait to have that discussion until June or August or something like that and then states are well into their seasons and may not have the ability to do things that they may have done if they had known that we were going to make some changes, and so just keep that in mind, and we need to have some discussion about this and be upfront with our states about where we're headed with that. Thank you. I didn't figure that anybody would want to talk about that, but just know that may be coming. Mr. Greene, go ahead.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Presentation on Amendment 36B, Commercial Reef Fish IFQ Modifications, staff reviewed the items the council is interested in addressing in this amendment. Committee members requested information be included in the options paper to facilitate further consideration for the design and intent of the potential actions.

With the assistance of Ms. Levy, the committee also discussed the scope of actions that may be included in the amendment without triggering a referendum before amendment development begins. Staff will begin work on an options paper.

 Standing and Reef Fish SSC Summary for Items Not Discussed Elsewhere on Agenda, Dr. Powers summarized reef fish items reviewed by SSC that were not discussed elsewhere in the Reef

Fish agenda.

He briefly described the approach used in the SEDAR 49 datalimited stocks assessment. This is a set of methods that can be applied where there are very limited data, just catches, or maybe some catch-per-unit effort index, or maybe just an average size.

 The methods available are applied to simulated populations to see how they respond and which methods are feasible for use in management strategy evaluation. Those methods that were determined to be reasonable useful with the simulated data will be used with the actual catch data, and the results will be presented at the March SSC meeting.

To use these methods on a regular basis, the SSC needs to provide some structure on how to proceed with items such as what reference years to use. This might mean creating a separate working group. Dr. Powers cautioned that these data-poor methods are more of a research project than an established assessment, and he noted that there is no substitute for good data.

Another item discussed by the SSC was a discussion of economic and social implications of ABCs and ACLs. For example, in setting P^* , an acceptable level of risk should depend on the costs of protecting the stock and the benefits that are derived.

Also, National Standard 8 calls for incorporating quantitative community factors about fleet sizes and distributions, shifting to other activities, et cetera. The SSC will evaluate whether these types of considerations can be integrated into control rules.

Other Business, Discussion of 2017 Recreational Fishing Season for Greater Amberjack, Dr. Crabtree stated that he could not yet provide an estimate on the recreational season length for greater amberjack in 2017. Last year, there was an overrun of approximately 750,000 pounds.

Greater amberjack has a payback provision. However, a greater amberjack update assessment is scheduled to be reviewed by the SSC at their next meeting in March. Depending upon the ABC projections, a reopening of the season after the scheduled June/July closure might be possible if a framework action to adjust the ACL can be implemented in time.

48 Staff noted that the SSC meeting is the week before the council

meeting, and it may not be possible to put a complete framework action together in such a short period of time. However, staff could look into putting together a skeleton document. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Greene, thank you very much. Dr. Simmons.

DR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to go back and talk a little bit about the timing for the 36B options paper. We would like to bring that in June, when we receive the five-year review of the grouper/tilefish. We thought it would be appropriate that those go together and finish up, in April, Amendment 36A. That will be on the agenda for final action, as well as two other documents for final action, in April. I just wanted to put that out there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. I see a couple nodding of heads around the table, and so that sounds like a plan. Now, for the rest of the plan, we have accomplished everything that I wanted to accomplish before lunch.

I assumed -- There was some rearranging of the committee reports early, and so I assumed, if somebody asked for that, there was probably a flight somewhere involved, and so we have done the heavy lifting.

I am going to put it out there to you all. I am just fine with going to lunch at this point. When we come back, we would have the following: Spiny Lobster Report, Joint Coral/Habitat Protection & Restoration Report, and a vote, or possible vote, on the exempted fishing permit.

We did have one item of Other Business with Martha on yellowtail, and I'm not sure how long that is going to take, Martha. Not long? So, it's up to you guys. Do you want to keep working and leave early or do you want to go to lunch and then come back and knock out those three items?

I am hearing a short break and then come back and plug away at it. Is that okay with everybody? All right. So a ten-minute break. It's one o'clock, and so, at 1:10, we will come back and finish up.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The Spiny Lobster Report and Ms. Guyas.

SPINY LOBSTER COMMITTEE REPORT

 MS. GUYAS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Staff presented the options paper for Spiny Lobster Regulatory Amendment 4. When the OFL was set in Amendment 10, it was set using a time period of landings that was historically low. During the development of Amendment 10, it was thought the fishery had changed and that the low landings were a new normal.

Since implementation of the management benchmarks set in Amendment 10, the ACT has been exceeded in three of the last four years, and the ACL has been exceeded twice. Both the Gulf and South Atlantic SSCs have recommended that the landings data from 1991/1992 through 2015/2016 be used to calculate the ABC and OFL.

Action 1.1 modifies the current definitions of management benchmarks for MSY, overfishing threshold, overfished threshold. Action 1.2 modifies the current definitions for the ACL and ACT. The committee recommends, and I so move, to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative in Action 1-1.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? No opposition, and the motion carries.

MS. GUYAS: The committee recommends, and I so move, to make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative in Action 1-2.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. I will go ahead and read the rest of it into the record. Alternative 2 is the ACL is equal to the ABC, as recommended by the Gulf and South Atlantic SSCs, using the mean landings from the years 1991/1992 through 2015/2016 plus 1.5 standard deviations, which is 9.6 million pounds. The ACT is 90 percent of the new ACL, which is 8.64 million pounds. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MS. GUYAS: For future documents, staff will include the pounds associated with these alternatives in the document and make other editorial changes to the document that the committee suggested.

Staff reviewed Action 2, which is a South Atlantic Council action, that would prohibit the use of recreational traps in the EEZ for all states, not just the State of Florida, in the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction. The committee made no motions

relative to Action 2. Madam Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Is there any further business for the spiny lobster topic? Seeing none, we will move on to our next agenda item, which will be our Joint Coral/Habitat Protection & Restoration Committee Report. Mr. Diaz, I will turn it over to you.

JOINT CORAL/HABITAT PROTECTION & RESTORATION COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Presentation on the Biology of Corals, staff gave a short presentation on deep-water corals in the Gulf of Mexico.

Revised Scoping Draft of Coral Amendment 7, staff presented the revised scoping document for Coral Amendment 7. Revisions include a brief description on the biology of coral, area descriptions divided into regions, and regulations were updated.

Under Option 1, staff will modify one sentence to read as follows: "Where corals exist in sufficient numbers or diversity would qualify would be considered for establishment as a HAPC as long as it meets one of the HAPC requirements". Additional suggestions were provided, and staff will include these in the options paper. The committee recommends, and I so move, to bring the Revised Scoping Draft of Coral Amendment 7 out for scoping hearings.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a committee motion. We have already chosen those locations. This is the amendment that will be sent out to the public in tandem with the shrimp amendment, and so those are going out together, so that we didn't have to delay either one of those. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.

MR. DIAZ: Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

VOTE ON EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT APPLICATIONS

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. Next on our agenda is Vote on Exempted Fishing Permit Applications, if any. We had -- I don't know if you would call it a presentation, but we had a discussion and kind of a question-and-answer session on the exempted fishing permit that has recently been submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service.

They are working on analyzing it, and so my question to the council is do you want to vote on a recommendation on that

permit today or is it your will to revisit it one more time at our next council meeting, maybe once we have some analysis? I have no preference here either way, and I would like some input. Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I think I would like to see that analysis, so that we kind of understand what we're working with and what potential impacts and level of risk may be associated with this EFP for turtles and for the longline fleet, considering they would be going into this area somewhat at their own risk, and so that would be my preference.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: I am fine with Ms. Guyas's preference, and I tend to agree with her also, but I did want to say a few positive things about it, from just my opinion. I think there is some value in this EFP.

There would be some fisheries-dependent data that could be collected, where there is no fisheries-dependent data now. I thought it was well put together, and I just wanted to say a few positive words about it. I think it has a lot of potential, and, after we see that analysis, we can make a better discussion, but I commend the folks that put it together and for trying to think to try to solve some of these fisheries problems that we have. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: I was just going to add that I think we're still waiting on the agency with some work, and I think I will be supporting the EFP, but I would like to see the rest of this work. The industry is ready to work and try to come up with some ideas, and it would actually take some pressure off some other areas, other species.

I have had some emails and questions about maybe perhaps including a couple of folks from the Panama City area. I think Greg Abrams had testified yesterday that he would like to have some vessels from over there, instead of just one particular area, and so I think they ought to entertain maybe adding some or changing the composition, just to get different folks from different areas in that grouper area, which is from Panama City to Madeira Beach.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Dana.

DR. DANA: I have received at three emails from various operators that are not included amongst the eight, but they're thinking that, if it's going to happen, it needs to be more diverse, geographically.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. So it sounds like, around the table, we want to see the analysis that NMFS is going to prepare, their final package on this, at our next meeting, which I think that's right around your timetable, and so that should be fine, and we will take another look at it at our next meeting and see if we can't come to a recommendation. That sounds good. All right.

The next item on the agenda, which I apologize that I somehow skipped over, and we already had one of our liaison reports, but, Mr. Dave Donaldson, I think you have a report for us as well?

SUPPORTING AGENCIES UPDATE GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I had a thirty-page PowerPoint presentation, but I decided that I will narrow it down. I just wanted to let you know that, at our upcoming March meeting in Gulfport, we're doing a general session on recreational fishing. It's going to be March 15, Wednesday, at 8:30.

The main purpose is focusing on data collection issues and looking at current systems and new and innovative ways to collect recreational data. If you need additional details, you can contact Greg Bray on our staff, but I just wanted to let you guys know that we will be holding that session during our commission meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate that. We do have one item under Other Business. Ms. Guyas, would you lead us through that, please, ma'am?

OTHER BUSINESS YELLOWTAIL SNAPPER DISCUSSION

MS. GUYAS: I've got a motion that I want to put up, and that will kind of get us started here. I think staff has it. My motion is to direct staff to develop an amendment that would specify a single ABC and ACL for yellowtail snapper in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic. If I get a second, I can explain where this is coming from.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: We have a second by Mr. Sanchez. Go ahead, Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: Those of you who have been on the council for a couple of years remember that we the South Florida Committee that examined a lot of south-Florida-centric species, like yellowtail snapper. We have actually already looked at doing this as part of that process.

At the last South Atlantic Council meeting, the South Atlantic Council approved a similar motion to this. They have been holding public hearings on some other yellowtail snapper issues and have wrapped that into what they would like to consider. For them to move forward, we would need to do the same thing, a reason why I think we need to go back to this and reconsider it, and Bill Kelly spoke to this in his comments yesterday.

Since we had these discussions with the South Florida Committee and then, subsequently, the two Full Councils together, the yellowtail snapper fishery in the South Atlantic had a commercial closure. They ended a couple of months early because their quota was, I think, exceeded just a little bit, actually. They went over a little bit.

They closed in October rather than December. There were a number of other closures that occurred at the same time with that industry, and it was pretty devastating for the Keys. It affected a lot of commercial fishermen.

Since this is a single stock that is just shared between the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and it's predominantly a south Florida fishery, one of the ways that it seems like Bill Kelly and a lot of the commercial yellowtail snapper fishermen down in that area -- One way to easily, potentially, deal with that would be to have a combined ABC and ACL, so that, when we have a situation, where the South Atlantic portion of the quota has been caught up, but there is still essentially the 25 percent that's been allocated in the Gulf just sitting on the table. That is my motion. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I have a question, from a historical context. How did we originally decide -- What was the rationale behind how we divided that ACL for yellowtail snapper between the Gulf and the South Atlantic? Was it based on a stock assessment and they said, well, we've got probably this proportion of the stock that's on this side of this line and this proportion on that or was it landings-based, where we said, well, historically, this percentage has been landed over on the Atlantic side and this

percentage on the Gulf side? I'm just wondering.

MS. GUYAS: If I remember correctly, and, Doug, if you remember this and I'm wrong, then tell me, but I think this was what they used, was a combination of historical and current, at the time, landings. I think the cutoff was like 2008. They used what we were calling the Bowtie Method. That is, I think, where the allocation splits for both yellowtail snapper and mutton snapper — That is the rule that was used, and so it was part of the Generic ACL Amendment that was approved in maybe 2010.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Where I was going with this is obviously something has kind of shifted since then. I think they're wanting us to do this because they are overshooting whatever their quota is, right, but the overall -- This is one stock, and so, when you look at it as one stock, it's not being overfished.

What I'm wondering is, when staff brings us this amendment, and I guess with some options in it, if things change in the future, where the landings start to shift back to the Gulf, and I want your advice on this, is this something where maybe we should almost make it a conditional sharing?

MS. GUYAS: Well, it's one stock, and I think it's largely -Maybe not completely, but largely the same group of people that
have two permits. They have an Atlantic and a Gulf, but most of
the effort is on the Atlantic side. That is where they prefer
to fish, and so I guess that is something that could be
discussed, yes, as part of this, but I think we have some
analysis that we had already done on this, and we could look at
that and see if that would work or not.

 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That's fine, and it doesn't have to be in there right away. We can just take a look at it later and just keep it in mind. I never thought of it being something we would use between two councils. I guess I always thought of it between two sectors, but I guess you never know, but, anyway, that is it. I don't have any opposition to the motion, but just a few questions. Ms. Gerhart.

MS. GERHART: Thank you. The South Atlantic Council has already started an amendment to do this, and would it be acceptable to - I'm not sure that we want to go this route, but would it be acceptable to actually do a joint amendment with them, rather than our separate one?

MS. GUYAS: I'm fine with that, but things get hairy sometimes.

1 2

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Staff may not be.

MS. GUYAS: As I said, things get hairy sometimes when we try to work together. It gets, sometimes, counterproductive, and so I am willing to do whatever staff thinks is the right method for that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mr. Anson and then I will get to Doug Gregory and Mr. Rindone.

MR. ANSON: I thought John had officially declared us divorced. I'm sorry. Martha, that was one of my questions. You brought up a piece of information that most of these fishermen who are harvesting the fish on the Atlantic side also have Gulf permits, and so I can understand that it might be a little closer, maybe, and they might be a little more familiar with the grounds on the Atlantic side, but is that the reason, is that they just prefer —— It's economically better for them to land those fish over in the Atlantic versus going over into the Gulf, if they already have the permits?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: If I may, the bulk of the yellowtail fishery is on the Atlantic side. Wherever we have reefs on the Gulf side, like particularly in the Tortugas, they will harvest. Most of the Gulf landings will come from the Tortugas. Some fishermen go out to the Towers in the Gulf, and maybe, with climate change, yellowtail are coming more and more into the Gulf, but not to a great extent. It's still largely confined to south Florida.

The problem we're going to have is the South Atlantic Council has their ABC and ACL divided by sector, commercial versus recreational. They've got the same situation that we were just talking about with king mackerel, that their recreational ACL is not met, but the commercial is, and they want to share with us rather than share among themselves, and we do not have commercial and recreational ACLs, and so we would have to subdivide ours into commercial and recreational ACLs, and so that could be a sticky point for us.

I would say let's go with -- I would prefer to go with a separate amendment and flesh this out as much as we can, and, if NMFS requires a joint amendment or somehow to bring this together, then we can do that later on, but we have some issues in the different ways the two councils have approached this fishery that we probably need to work out within ourselves.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Ms. Levy.

 MS. LEVY: Just to that point, you can do them separately or together, but they're not going to get implemented as a single ABC and ACL that's going to be managed unless they're exactly the same, meaning you might have some issues working back and forth, but this is one case where the documents are going to have to have the exact same preferred alternatives, because you're basically saying that you're going to manage it under one catch level. I am not sure that it's super helpful to have two separate documents when, if it's going to move forward, you're going to have to agree on a single preferred.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sue.

MS. GERHART: I have the South Atlantic document in front of me, and their alternatives are -- There is an alternative to do it their way, with allocations between the sectors, and there is another alternative to go with the Gulf method, where it's a stock ACL, and so they already have this developed with actions and alternatives already, and, in fact, they have taken it out for public hearings as well.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We would look at the same options, clearly.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had Mr. Rindone. Do you still have a comment, or have we hit your points, Mr. Rindone?

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Quite well, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. Mr. Atran.

MR. STEVEN ATRAN: It's probably a minor point, but there is a single ABC. The two SSCs agree on an ABC, and then that gets partitioned out.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Simmons, did you have a comment?

DR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was just wondering -My first point was the one that Steven just mentioned. The
second one is would it be worthwhile to just revisit the
apportionments, or is the goal to look at it this way, because I
do see the issues, with our accountability measures being
different and those types of things, that both councils would
have to agree on the management, even if it a stock ACL.

We may want to put in different accountability measures. I

guess, is that something you would also like us to look it? If we feel the apportionment wasn't correct between the two councils to begin with, maybe that's where we should start, and it might be easier to look at it that way.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That's kind of why I asked the question that I did at the beginning of how did we decide on these original apportionments between the Gulf and South Atlantic? If there was a reason for that, if the landings were more so over here before, or not even more so, but, if we had that portion of the landings before, and, for some reason or another, that shifted over there, in order to let them have some ours, then we get into having to split between commercial and recreational and actually do a separate quota for each one of them, which we haven't done in the past.

We don't have a lot of issues here, and I guess that's why I was saying that could we not just let them borrow a certain portion of ours? Then they can do whatever they want it over there and we don't have to do all these different things to our side. We just say that we will let you borrow it for now, but, if we start using it, you have to give it back. Now, you do with it what you will and divide it however you want when you get it over there, but, otherwise, leave us out of it. It's a good thing that our South Atlantic guy has already gone, huh? All right. John.

MR. SANCHEZ: Did you just say quota share?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, but everybody might be able to get onboard with it this time, because we're all on the same side. Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just general information for you guys to think about is the Gulf landings for yellowtail are typically about 98 percent commercial and about 2 percent recreational. The Gulf typically lands within about 10 percent of its ACL on an annual basis, and so they're usually landing about 90 percent or so of our stock apportionment every year, and so I don't know how much you would want to share.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Mr. Rindone. That is very insightful. We have a motion on the board. Martha, what's your feeling now at this point? What do you think that we should do?

MS. GUYAS: I think that we should vote on it.

48 CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. You want to keep it that narrow?

You want to keep your motion that narrow, where that's essentially all the document can address?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Excuse me, but we'll be addressing all those aspects of it that Ms. Gerhart mentioned and the things that we discussed in the south Florida document. We will bring the whole package to you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Any further discussion on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, signify by raising your hand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: Seventeen. **The motion passes** unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Martha, did you have anything else under that? All right. Dr. Stunz said he has about thirty seconds of Other Business, and so we're going to let him weigh in real quickly.

DR. STUNZ: This will be very brief. Several have brought to my attention that, through the RESTORE process, particularly the NRDA, there is going to be substantial dollars available coming up, and particularly for open Gulf restoration, which obviously would be important to maybe some initiatives that we have or research needs or data and that sort of thing.

 I don't know if it's appropriate, and maybe it just would be a letter, and I don't know how much time there would be a presentation maybe at our next meeting or even the next, depending upon how the timelines came out, to have someone from this group talk about what the options would be. That way, we would have an ability to weigh in and at least get our thoughts on the table in the process about how the Gulf Council feels that some of that money could be spent.

 I will leave that to you, Madam Chairwoman, or Doug. Dr. Simmons is aware of this as well, but I just wanted to kind of throw it out there, maybe just as a quick, brief opportunity that we get our say in.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY: We are going to meet with Mr. Constant immediately after this meeting and include something like that as one of his liaison reports, either in April or June, and talk about the timing of when such a letter might be appropriate.

MR. GLENN CONSTANT: I think the groups involved in determining

what the appropriate types of restorations are for each of those resource categories are in evolution now, and so probably, by the time the next council meeting comes around, there will be a little bit more clarity on answering some of those questions, and so it might be a good time to get into that, but I will, again, work with Doug to kind of inform the council.

DR. STUNZ: If there's time.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. If nobody else has anything else under Other Business, I believe we have finished our agenda. Meeting adjourned. Thank you for all of your hard work, guys.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on February 2, 2017.)

16 - -