	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
Τa	able of Contents	. 1
Τa	able of Motions	<u>. 3</u>
Ca	all to Order and Roll Call	. 4
Ct.	wearing in of New Council Members	C
3]	ection of Officers	<u>.</u> 9
Αc	doption of Agenda	Ç
Cc	onsideration of the 169 th Meeting Verbatim Transcription	12
Ε>	xecutive Director's Report	12
Qι	meen Conch Model Presentation	<u> </u>
SS	SC Report	22
F. c	cosystem Technical Advisory Panel Member Discussion	20
Εc	cosystem-Based Fishery Management Technical AP Report	34
Sc	outheast Fisheries Science Center Update	37
J ∈	ear Discussion - Allowable Gear Types	36
Вє	est Fishing Practices Presentation	86
Ar	nchoring Discussion - Grammanik Bank	96
Pι	ablic Comment Period1	11
Ιs	sland-Based Fishery Management Plans Update	18
Or	otions Paper for Updating Spiny Lobster Annual Catch Limit	or
	sland-Based Fishery Management Plans Based on SEDAR 571	
	scussion of Yellowtail Snapper Recreational Bag Limit Under St. Croix Fishery Management Plan	
Οι	treach and Education Advisory Panel Report	52
Er	nforcement Reports1	56
	Duranta Dica DNED	

1	USVI DPNR
2	U.S. Coast Guard
3	NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement
4	
5	Other Business
6	
7	Adjournment
8	
9	
10	

1 2	TABLE OF MOTIONS
3 4 5	$\underline{\text{PAGE 30}}$: Motion to nominate Dr. Edwin Cruz-Rivera as a member of the TAP. $\underline{\text{The motion carried on page 31}}$.
6 7 8	<pre>PAGE 33: Motion to nominate Dr. Michelle Scharer as a member of the SSC. The motion carried on page 33.</pre>
9 10 11 12 13	PAGE 76: Motion that the council requests staff begins work on an amendment to the island-based FMPs that would allow for the use of the deep-water snapper buoy gear with no more than twenty-five hooks per line. The motion carried on page 78.
14 15 16 17 18	PAGE 81: Motion that the council request staff to begin work on an amendment to each of the IBFMPs to consider whether gill and trammel nets or any other applicable gear should be authorized gears when fishing for managed species. The motion carried on page 86.
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	PAGE 138: Motion that the council request the SSC to coordinate with the Science Center to provide a constant ABC for spiny lobster for each island group based on SEDAR 57 and based on the first three years of the ABC projection from 2021 to 2023. It is the council intent to request an interim assessment to be conducted in 2023 to set catch levels for 2024 and beyond. The motion carried on page 140.
28	PAGE 151: Motion to instruct the staff prepare an options paper

for the yellowtail recreational fishery of St. Croix that would

be considered at the spring meeting of the CFMC meeting 2021.

The motion carried on page 151.

1	CARIBBEAN FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	170 TH REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
3	Webinar
4	
5	AUGUST 11-12, 2020
6	
7	The Caribbean Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on
8	Tuesday morning, August 11, 2020, and was called to order at
9	9:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Marcos Hanke.
10	
11	CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
12	
13	MARCOS HANKE: Today is August 11, and it's 9:02 a.m., and we're
14	going to start the meeting. Natalia, can you start with the
15	roll call first?
16	1011 0011 11100
17	NATALIA PERDOMO: Yes. First, I have Graciela Garcia-Moliner.
18	
19	GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Graciela Garcia-Moliner, council
20	staff. Good morning.
21	55421
22	NATALIA PERDOMO: Liajay Rivera.
23	
24	LIAJAY RIVERA: Liajay Rivera, council staff. Buenos dias.
25	dialitical diality desired bears.
26	NATALIA PERDOMO: Miguel Rolon.
27	William Parono. Inguer Roson.
28	MIGUEL ROLON: Miguel Rolon, council staff, present.
29	MICOLI ROLON. Higael Rolon, council Scall, present.
30	NATALIA PERDOMO: Jack McGovern.
31	WAIRDIN IDIOONO. Odek Medovein.
32	JACK MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries. Good afternoon.
33	OACH MOGOVERN. Dack Modovern, North Fisheries. Good arternoon.
34	NATALIA PERDOMO: Roy Crabtree.
35	WAIRDIN TERDORO: Noy craberee.
36	ROY CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.
37	NOT CRADITUDE. Roy Clabelee, North Fisheries.
38	NATALIA PERDOMO: Alida Ortiz.
39	MATALIA ILIMONO. MITAA OTEIZ.
40	ALIDA ORTIZ: Alida Ortiz, Outreach and Education Advisory
41	Panel. Buenos dias.
42	raner. Duenos dras.
43	NATALIA PERDOMO: Bill Cordero.
44	MAIALIA I LIDONO. DITI COLUETO.
45	BILL CORDERO: Bill Cordero, language interpreter
46	extraordinaire. Good morning.
47	extraorarmatic. Good morning.
48	NATALIA PERDOMO: Carlos Farchette.
<u> </u>	

```
1 2
```

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carlos Farchette, council member, present.

3

NATALIA PERDOMO: Carlos Velazquez.

5

6 **CARLOS VELAZQUEZ:** Good morning. Carlos Velazquez, commercial fishermen, President of the Fishermen's Incorporation in Naguabo.

9

9

10 NATALIA PERDOMO: Chelsea. Christina Olan. Damaris Delgado.

11

12 **DAMARIS DELGADO:** Damaris Delgado, Puerto Rico DNER, Good 13 morning.

14

15 NATALIA PERDOMO: Edward Schuster.

16 17

EDWARD SCHUSTER: Edward Schuster. Good morning. DAP Chair.

18

19 NATALIA PERDOMO: Thank you. Jocelyn D'Ambrosio.

20

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Jocelyn D'Ambrosio, NOAA Office of General Counsel.

23

24 NATALIA PERDOMO: Jorge Torez. Julian Magras.

25 26

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, DAP Chair, St. Thomas/St. John. Good morning.

2728

29 NATALIA PERDOMO: Loren Remsberg.

30

31 **LOREN REMSBERG:** Loren Remsberg, NOAA Office of General Counsel. 32 Good morning.

33

34 NATALIA PERDOMO: Manny Antonaras.

35

36 **MANNY ANTONARAS:** Good morning. Manny Antonaras, NOAA Office of 37 Law Enforcement.

38

39 NATALIA PERDOMO: Marcos Hanke.

40

41 MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke, present.

42

43 NATALIA PERDOMO: María de los Irizarry.

44

45 MARIA DE LOS IRIZARRY: Good morning. María de los Irizarry, 46 council staff.

47

48 NATALIA PERDOMO: Maria Lopez.

```
1
```

2 MARIA LOPEZ: Good morning. Maria Lopez, NOAA Fisheries.

3

4 NATALIA PERDOMO: Matthew Wailea.

5

MATTHEW WAILEA: Good morning. Matt Wailea, NOAA Office of Law Enforcement.

7

9 NATALIA PERDOMO: Michelle Scharer.

10

11 MICHELLE SCHARER: Buenos dias. Michelle Scharer, independent contractor.

13

14 NATALIA PERDOMO: Morgan Corey. Nelson Crespo.

15

16 **NELSON CRESPO:** Good morning, everyone. Nelson Crespo, DAP Chair, Puerto Rico.

18

19 NATALIA PERDOMO: Nelson Earhart.

20

NELSON EHRHARDT: Nelson Ehrhardt, University of Miami and independent contractor. Good morning.

23

24 NATALIA PERDOMO: Nicole Angeli.

25

26 **NICOLE ANGELI:** Nicole Angeli, USVI, Division of Fish and 27 Wildlife, here.

28

29 NATALIA PERDOMO: Orian Tzadik.

30

31 ORIAN TZADIK: Orian Tzadik, the Pew Charitable Trusts.

32

33 NATALIA PERDOMO: Ricardo Lopez.

34

35 **RICARDO LOPEZ:** Ricardo Lopez, Puerto Rico DNER Fisheries 36 Research Lab.

37

38 NATALIA PERDOMO: Richard Appeldoorn.

39

40 RICHARD APPELDOORN: Rich Appeldoorn, SSC Chair.

41

42 NATALIA PERDOMO: Robert Copeland.

43

44 ROBERT COPELAND: Lieutenant Robert Copeland, U.S. Coast Guard, 45 District 7, present.

46

47 NATALIA PERDOMO: Sarah Stephenson.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Good morning. Sarah Stephenson, NOAA 2 Fisheries.

NATALIA PERDOMO: Shannon Calay.

SHANNON CALAY: Good morning. Shannon Calay, NOAA Fisheries, 7 Miami.

NATALIA PERDOMO: Vanessa Ramirez.

11 VANESSA RAMIREZ: Good morning. Vanessa Ramirez, council 12 member, commercial fisherman, Puerto Rico.

NATALIA PERDOMO: I have a Caller 2, but I don't know if it's somebody that already stated their name, if Caller Number 2 can say their name.

18 MIGUEL BORGES: It's maybe myself. This is Miguel Borges, NOAA 19 Office of Law Enforcement.

21 NATALIA PERDOMO: Thank you. That's it.

IRIS OLIVERAS: Excuse me. Iris Oliveras, council staff.

TONY BLANCHARD: Good morning. Tony Blanchard, CFMC, Vice Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Natalia. I want to recognize that Tony Blanchard is together with Julian Magras in St. Thomas, and thank you for very for both of you to connect that way, which last time was very efficient, and, like I mentioned, on this 170th CFMC virtual meeting, again, it's 9:08 a.m.

The meeting rules for participation are you have to state your name every time you participate, that you ask for participation. Use this chat to ask for your turn, turn to speak, and use the little emoji with the hand up. All votes are going to be made by roll call, and state your full name and yes or no or abstain.

 Public comments will have five minutes on the end of the meeting for participation, and the meeting will be recorded at all times, and simultaneous translation is available, like we stated at the beginning of this meeting. The next item on the agenda is the swearing-in of new council members.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, before you go into that, the roll call is when you are going to submit something to the Secretary, but, in this case, you may have a motion, and, if there is no opposition, then you can declare the motion approved. That way, you will save some time. For the swearing-in, we have you and Dr. Roy Crabtree, and I believe that you received your documents, and so you may read it for the record.

SWEARING-IN OF NEW COUNCIL MEMBERS

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, I have it here. Thank you, again, for the opportunity to serve on the council. I, Marcos Hanke, as a duly appointed member of the regional fishery management council established under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, hereby promise to conserve and manage the living marine resources of the United States of America by carrying out the business of the council for the greatest overall benefit of the nation.

I recognize my responsibility to serve as a knowledgeable and experienced trustee of the nation's fisheries marine resources, being careful to balance competing private or regional interests and always aware and protective of the public interest in those resources. I commit myself to uphold the provisions, standards, and requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and other applicable law.

I shall conduct myself at all times according to the rules of the conduct prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce. This oath is freely given and without mental reservation or purpose of evasion. That's it, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Welcome back, Mr. Marcos Hanke, for another three-year term. If this were in-person, there would be applause for you, but I believe Roy may have something to say.

ROY CRABTREE: Congratulations, Marcos, and it's great to have you back on the council, and I appreciate your willingness to serve for so many terms. I think this is the first time we have ever sworn in a council member virtually, or at least for me it is, and so hopefully we'll see you in-person next time.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Roy. Thank you to all, and I hope to do my job as a council member and, like always, I will be considering all the opinions and all the input and all the information provided to us to the best of my expertise and capabilities to support the sustainable fisheries for the nation, and for our region, especially. Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, we were joined by Yvonne Sadovy, Diana Martino, and Laura --.

1 2 MARCOS HANKE:

Officers.

Thank you. Now, Miguel, the Election of

MIGUEL ROLON: The gentleman from the Coast Guard, can you take the chair of the meeting for this part of the election of officers? Because this is a virtual meeting -- Usually, when we have a meeting like this, for election of officers, the Coast Guard chairs the meeting, because council members will be involved in the election of officers, but, at this time, we can open the floor for election of officers. Any volunteers?

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I move to nominate Marcos Hanke as Chair and Tony Blanchard as Vice Chair.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Second.

MIGUEL ROLON: Any other candidate for Chair or Vice Chair? Hearing none, I believe that Mr. Marcos Hanke and Mr. Tony Blanchard will be with us for Chair and Vice Chair for another one-year term. Mr. Chairman, you are back in the saddle, and, Mr. Vice Chair, you are also back in the saddle, and the staff is here to help you any way we can, and so go ahead with the rest of the meeting, please.

Tony, while we wait for Marcos to fix his audio problem, can you take the agenda and the next item? The next item on the agenda is Adoption of the Agenda.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

TONY BLANCHARD: Okay. We'll forward to the Adoption of Agenda. I believe we're going to have to do this by vote.

MIGUEL ROLON: At this time, we will open the agenda for any changes or comments or additions.

MARCOS HANKE: Can you hear me?

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, and Tony has put the agenda on the screen, and so we are in that process now, and so go ahead.

MARCOS HANKE: Because I didn't hear anything of what happened with the election of officers, which part of the agenda are we in now? I just reconnected.

MIGUEL ROLON: We are not in the adoption of the agenda itself, and I have to announce that David Ortiz joined us. For the record, David Ortiz is present from the Pew Charitable Trusts.

MARCOS HANKE: We will go to Adoption of the Agenda.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Marcos, your voice is breaking up, but I move to adopt the agenda as written.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: I have a couple of annotated things in our agenda, and so we will have a presentation from Kim Iverson from the South Atlantic on Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29, an overview of best fishing practices. I think that that should be under the section on gears.

We do have the -- I didn't see Sennai Habtes on the list of participants, but we do have someone to be considered for the TAP position, and so I don't know where you want to put that in the agenda. Do you want to do it under the Ecosystem-Based Technical Advisory Panel Report, or do you want to do it under another section?

MIGUEL ROLON: Other Business.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: So, under Other Business, consideration of a TAP member.

NATALIA PERDOMO: Other Business is before or after the public comment section?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Miguel, there wasn't an Other Business section, and so maybe we should put it right before the public comment period or right after the public comment period.

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, and this is the time to do it. Just ask Marcos.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Okay, and the last thing that I have in my notes is that we have a request from Rene Esteves from Sea Grant to talk about -- The other business would be the consideration of a new TAP member to fulfill the vacancy.

MIGUEL ROLON: Then the other one is Rene Esteves, Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Yes, and he wants to present to the council on the safety of commercial fisher divers.

48 MARCOS HANKE: That's all, Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: So that would be during the public comment period or under other business, and so public comment period -- I think that's where we can put it.

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, put it in the public comment period, Rene Esteves' presentation.

 GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Perfect. I don't know if Alida is going to cover this, but there is a set of workshops that CARICOOS has put forth for commercial fishers, and so, if she's not covering that under the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel --

MIGUEL ROLON: Graciela, it will be in the Outreach and Education Panel, and so you may help Alida if something is missing from the CARICOOS workshops.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Okay, so, Mr. Chair and Miguel, three other things that I have under -- I put them on the annotated agenda under Other Business for the second day, and it would be compatible regulations for St. Croix for lobster, specifically speaking of traps, and so I don't know if you want to cover that in the next day or treat it under the gear section today.

MIGUEL ROLON: It probably should be in Other Business on the next day.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Okay, and to address the generation gap in commercial fisheries.

MIGUEL ROLON: The generation gap could be done today, also.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: So in Other Business today.

MIGUEL ROLON: That will be covered by Alida Ortiz, but, since tomorrow is only a half-day, it's better to advance as much as we can this afternoon.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Okay, and I believe now that this is really my last thing, and that would be the consideration of the Executive Order 13921.

44 MIGUEL ROLON: That's for tomorrow's Other Business.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Perfect.

48 MIGUEL ROLON: It's the Executive Order for the Seafood Industry

1 2 3	of the U.S. It has a long title, but, anyway, it's the Executive Order for the Seafood Industry of the U.S.
3 4	GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Miquel, if I may, Marcos just sent me
5	a text message that he's having problems listening to what we're
6	saying.
7	buying.
8	MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos will probably have to leave and come back
9	again.
10	
11	GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: I believe that's all I have in my
12	notes.
13	
14	MIGUEL ROLON: We need a motion to approve the agenda as
15	amended.
16	
17	CARLOS FARCHETTE: I move to accept the agenda as amended.
18	
19	TONY BLANCHARD: Second.
20	
21	MIGUEL ROLON: Thank you, Tony. Can you run the meeting? Can
22	you just say any opposition and then the motion carries?
23	
24	TONY BLANCHARD: Any opposition or refusals? Hearing none, the
25	motion carries.
26	
27	MIGUEL ROLON: Thank you. The next thing in the agenda, Mr.
28	Vice Chair, is the Consideration of the 169 th Council Meeting
29	Verbatim Transcription.
30	CONCERNIA OF A COTH CONTROL OF THE C
31	CONSIDERATION OF 169 TH COUNCIL MEETING VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION
32	MONY DIAMONADA Obasa Malas masika famanak ta tha
33	TONY BLANCHARD: Okay. We're moving forward to the transcriptions. Any changes? Any opposition to the
34 35	transcriptions? Any changes? Any opposition to the transcriptions?
36	cranscriptions:
37	CARLOS FARCHETTE: I move to accept the verbatim minutes as
38	written, the 169 th verbatim minutes.
39	wilden, the 105 verbatim minates.
40	TONY BLANCHARD: Do we have a second?
41	Tone Designation of the second
42	VANESSA RAMIREZ: Second.
43	
44	TONY BLANCHARD: Any opposition? Any refusals? Hearing none,
45	the motion carries.
46	

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. Marcos is trying to get back using his phone. The next item in the agenda, Mr. Vice Chair, is the Executive Director's Report. I have a couple of topics to discuss with you.

The first one, Natalia, if you could please share the screen with the photograph. As you all know, and I sent it to everybody, but Dr. Roy Crabtree is retiring this year, on December 31, 2020. We wanted to take a few minutes to recognize Dr. Crabtree.

I met Dr. Crabtree a long time ago, when he came as a scientist to give us a detailed explanation of why the council must consider acceptable biological catch and overfishing definitions and everything that he explained to the council, and he probably doesn't even remember that, but that's the first time.

He explained the very complex formulas and process in a way that everybody understood it, and I was able to understand it, and, since that time, we have crossed paths through the years, and Dr. Joe Kimmel never thought that the person that he was supervising was going to become his boss in a few years, and then Dr. Roy Crabtree became the Regional Administrator for the Southeast Regional Office.

I could spend the whole morning talking about Dr. Roy Crabtree, but let's say that he is, aside from a good scientist, an excellent scientist, he's a musician, and he has his own group, and he knows the fisheries, because he was a charter boat operator for many years, taking people out to the flats to fish, and he has been able to manage to be patient with the three councils, and he's the only Regional Administrator with three councils to manage to work with.

In our case, Dr. Roy Crabtree was instrumental, for the last several years, to help us in our development of management plans. He created the three branches, and one of them is the Caribbean Branch, and he has been adding staff members to the council to help Graciela and myself, and mostly Graciela, and she's our technical person, to develop the management plans and everything.

 Bill Arnold, he hired Bill Arnold, and, as you all know, Bill helped us a lot with our management plans and everything that the council has to do to move forward under the Magnuson Act. He hired Maria Lopez and Sarah Stephenson, and they are working with us now, and, of course, Jack McGovern, his right hand, is in charge of that branch, and I believe that, if it wasn't

because of that branch, we wouldn't be able to move the way that we needed today.

Diana and went to the office yesterday, and we sent this FedEx, and this is a reef in a bottle that we give to people that we believe deserve it, and Roy Crabtree is probably one of the best persons to deserve this award from the council, or not an award, but a recognition of all the work that he has done with us.

For that, we are very grateful, and, at this time, a round of applause, virtual round of applause, to Dr. Roy Crabtree, and, if he wants to say something, please do so. If anybody else wants to say something, but, Roy.

ROY CRABTREE: Thank you, Miguel. I appreciate those kind words, and I have been very fortunate to have the career that I've had. I think I have been coming to Caribbean Council meetings since the -- Well, I think I went to my first one back in the late 1990s, and so it's been a long time, and I have gotten to know a lot of great people and made some good friends.

I think we have made a great deal of progress in the Caribbean, and I am confident that you all will continue to make great strides next year, and you have a very strong branch with Maria and Sarah, and I know Jack is committed to continuing to emphasize work in the Caribbean and get things done.

I do intend to be with you for our December meeting. I wish we could have an in-person meeting later this year, but I think that's unlikely to occur, but it's been a real privilege getting to know all of you and working with you, and I wish all of you the best and great things in your futures, and so thank you, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Tony wants to say something.

TONY BLANCHARD: Good morning, Roy. Congrats on your retirement. Now, seeing that you're a musician, you will have a lot of time to play some music and have Tony Iarocci as your back-up singer, but I know we've butted heads through the years, and I think we've come to a place where we could agree to disagree, but congrats on your retirement, and have a good one.

ROY CRABTREE: Thank you, Tony, and I look forward to you next year booking me some gigs at the Frenchman's Reef, and I will come down.

TONY BLANCHARD: There you go.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Miguel, if I may, I would like to say something, also.

MIGUEL ROLON: Go ahead.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Congratulations, Roy, on your retirement. It's been a pleasure working with you over the last fifteen-and-a-half years, and I know we started off butting heads and not in a good area, but I think that we are leaving in a good area right now, and, you know, you've been there, and you listened to our concerns and our complaints, and we were able to always find a middle ground to work with the fishers, and I am really appreciative for that, and I look forward for us to continue being friends. Enjoy your retirement and do all the fun things that you want to do. Thanks.

ROY CRABTREE: Thanks, Julian, and I do want to say that I'm really proud of the St. Thomas Fishermen's Association and how that organization has grown and matured and is still going strong, and so I think you guys should be proud of all you have achieved.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Thank you to all, and I have in the chat many congratulations, and so you can pass your words directly to Dr. Roy Crabtree later.

 The other thing that I have is that, first, I would like to welcome Nikita Charles. Nikita will be the liaison officer between the Department of Planning and Natural Resources and the council and the fishers in the St. Croix area, and so Dr. Angeli gave us the notes, and Nikita will be the liaison officer, and we really would like to welcome her to the council family.

The other thing I have is that the five-year strategic plan has been modified, the way that we approach it, and Dr. Duval is now a member of the Mid-Atlantic Council, and that's why she is not with us at this meeting, but she will be at the DAP meeting in August, August 24, 25, 26, and 27 of this year.

The five-year strategic plan survey was stopped in order for us to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act, and we discussed the ways to continue the work with Jocelyn D'Ambrosio, the NOAA legal counsel, and Michelle Duval and myself, and, happily, we came up with a strategy that will call for having meetings with the DAPs, and the council itself may have a one-day meeting to

go over all the topics that will be included in the strategic plan.

We also discussed it with the three chairs of the DAPs, and that's why it is in the agenda for the next meeting of the DAPs, and we will also join efforts with the Fishery Advisory Committees of the U.S. Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico, and we will continue with the work until the end of this year, and, by 2021, Dr. Duval may present to the council, hopefully in person, and, if not, then virtually, the draft five-year strategic plan for you to consider. Mr. Chairman, Marcos, this will relieve some time for the agenda, and you can use it as you please.

The other two things that I have is that, as you know, the CFMC is working with NOAA Fisheries and the International Fishery Affairs and Seafood Inspection Office in Washington on the work for the working groups of the queen conch spawning aggregation and other projects through the years that the CFMC has collaborated with WECAFC, the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission, the Caribbean Regional Fishery Mechanism and the OSPESCA.

Those two organizations encompass almost all of the states, countries, that belong to the Western Central Atlantic Commission area, and they go from Brazil to Bermuda, and, as part of those efforts, we have two projects that -- By the way, we saved a lot of money in the first half of 2021, because, as you know, we don't travel, and so that money will be also used for outreach and education and international projects like this.

We also received \$50,000 from the Regional Office, or not the Regional Office, but the Office of Protected Resources, to help us to secure some funding for the spawning aggregation working group for next year and all these other working groups that we have with WECAFC.

At this time, we present to you that we are going to finish the three videos that were put together by the company that were presented to you some time ago, and these videos are for promoting the management of fishing areas, or fishing seasons, for the protection of those species that aggregate to spawn, and we have a video that was examined by professionals, and they gave us the go-ahead.

They were well-done and well-conceived, and they follow what the WECAFC and the rest of the international groups and the United States are after, which is the promotion of best practices for the protection of these aggregating species, especially the

Nassau grouper that, as you know, is part of the important species protected by the United States.

Also, we have other species, like snapper grouper and those species that aggregate, like mutton snapper, and we prepared a management plan that is for the management of these species, and we will have our next meeting on November 9 and 10 of this year for the spawning aggregation working group.

The other one is the queen conch. As you know, the council has been working since the 1980s on the promotion of Pan-Caribbean management of the species, or, actually, since the beginning of the council, and one of the key species is the queen conch. As you will see tomorrow, the queen conch has changed three times their name for the genus.

We were lucky also to have Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt work with us in the preparation of first a manual for the queen conch, but now we have three models for the -- The three models are to treat scientists from the management areas of the Caribbean Sea the best practices for collecting and analyzing the data and doing surveys at-sea and in a way that will allow them to assess the stocks of each country, and also to comply with the requirements of the FAO.

Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt had a long, long career, and he retired from the University of Miami, and he was working with stock assessments, and he spent ten years of his life working with the FAO, and he hasn't stopped working, and he called me one day and said, Miguel, we need to do this, and we need to continue the work that we started, and he prepared the first model.

 I asked Dr. Ehrhardt to give us a presentation of these models, and we have the funding to cover these projects from the monies that we have saved and from the monies that we are receiving from NOAA Fisheries. At this time, I would like for Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt to address the group and give us a brief presentation of what these models are. Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt, please. You have the floor.

QUEEN CONCH MODEL PRESENTATION

 NELSON EHRHARDT: Thank you, Miguel, and good morning. Thank you so much for the opportunity of expressing some ideas that we are trying to develop, in terms of training those people that are responsible to report to CITES and to our working groups, in terms of how to estimate a catch quota for conch.

In the working group, we have discussed, for a long time already, that the CITES doesn't have sustainability criteria officially in their regulations, and, up until now, the problem is that the CITES is actually leaving it up to the parties on how they define these criteria.

Obviously, we have a problem with this, in terms of how then we estimate catch quotas that are really in place for, first of all, framing the sustainability criteria and, secondly, that it's useful for the defining of the non-detrimental findings for the species.

Here, in the first slide, I just wrote very compressed, in a summarized way, which of the main points that we are addressing in the working group that will lead into the criteria that we all need to agree, so that we, in the meetings, can discuss matters on quota definitions under the same frame of thoughts and concepts, et cetera.

Basically, the definition of the quota, in this particular case, is a population biomass, which is what is in red there, and this is a standing stock estimate, and, as you can see in the formula on how we estimate, or we should estimate, the population biomass, it's based on an average density of the stock, the habitat range, and an average individual weight, and all of these terms are to be estimated from surveys.

In the region, we have plenty of surveys all around the place, and, when we review these results, we can see immediately that every survey will have its own design and different statistical assumptions, et cetera, and we thought, in our conversations both in the working group as well as with Miguel, that perhaps it's an opportunity right now to try to standardize and harmonize all the procedures, so that all the countries are aware of the ways that they should develop their surveys, why the surveys will have a continuity, and we have great discontinuity in the surveys, by the way, and, therefore, have some sort of a frame that everyone can refer to when they are trying to estimate this population biomass.

 This is the easy part, because the real critical part is the fishing mortality reference point that we need to have, and the reason of the difficulty here is what is at the bottom of the slide, the fundamental issues on how to link the catch to reproductive population density and how to obtain then the information that is statistically unbiased to do this.

The reason then is as follows. If these animals require a

minimum density to encounter and have a successful mating rate, then what will be the amount of catch that we can retrieve from the stock and still allow these animals to have sufficient density, population density, as to encounter each other and then to secure recruitment for the future.

This fishing mortality rate, obviously, we can set these mortalities, and some people are using 8 percent, et cetera, but, indeed, what should be this value, such that the quota that we generate with this fishing mortality rate will leave in the ocean, will leave in the place, enough population density, and not biomass, but population density.

This brings all sorts of statistical problems, in the sense that we need to assess not the whole queen conch stocks, but the amount of animals that are mature and that they are mating at a given time in a given place, and this brings then the very difficult issue that queen conch should be assessed by fishing banks and not by the stock, and, obviously, all these things will have an implication on the assumptions on how you design the survey.

The training modules that we are developing right now concentrate on concepts on these non-detrimental findings, the assumption on the statistical procedures that are needed to estimate these non-detrimental findings, and then the protocols in how we carry this out, and then, in these modules, we have a frame where we ask what is the problem, why there is a need to solve the problem, and how to resolve the problem. In the how are all the methodologies and all the basic assumptions that we need to comply with to have unbiased estimators.

These are the three modules that we are proposing here, and it's an integrated training concept. The Training Module 1 has been already completed, and this is how to estimate the landings and the fishing effort, both from artisanal fisheries in the region, the small-scale fisheries, as well as the big industrial fisheries.

Each one of these fisheries will have complexities, and the module already has a document, which is more than sixty pages, where we have developed new statistical ideas on how to estimate conversion factors without the need of investing any more money on this, as well as surveys to estimate landings on the artisanal fisheries and how to provide estimates of fishing effort in the industrial fisheries that are all operating in the offshore banks, in the Nicaragua and Honduras areas, et cetera.

Then this particular Module 1 was completed in July of this year, and it estimates the fraction of the density that was actually retrieved from the stock, and this information will feed into the Training Module 3 that you have there, and we will estimate -- We will develop a new formula to estimate these annual quotas based on the information of the given density that has been retrieved from the stocks, coming from Module 1.

4 5

Very importantly, we are, right now, developing a Training Module 2, where we have a huge amount of experience and time atsea on how things can go very wrong when you are trying to assess population density for these particular species.

We have a real problem that, in most of the countries in the shallow areas of the conch stock distribution sites, where there is a very significant level of exploitation, it has created an artificial stratification of the stocks, and we know very little about what is going on in the deeper regions of the conch distribution.

New technologies are available, which are really inexpensive, that can be established, and we have already implemented some of these technologies in some of the countries in deeper waters, and we have had success on this, and it requires lots of calibrations, et cetera, and we hope to establish a well-developed set of rules on how to use these technologies, so we can avoid deepwater diving and, obviously, saving the money, because of the time that is required by diving rather than using technologies.

The proposed training is for distance training, and the idea is to have these modules on the website of the council. The FAO is very much interested in translating these documents to the French language, so we will have them in English, Spanish, and French, and then addressing this training through let us say several months or a year or so, by an organized way, where, by long-distance training, we could truly install a standardization procedure on how countries should do all this work.

 In the working groups, and especially in the scientific and statistical and technical supporting group for the conch working group, we have been discussing on how we can integrate all this data and what will be then the final outcome on the recommendations on how countries can report to the CITES what are the non-detrimental findings, because, up until now, each country is in fact reporting their what is supposed to be non-detrimental findings, in terms of the catch quotas to the CITES, but the statistics and science behind the quotas dimension is

still to be studied. That is what I have for today, and I thank you again for the opportunity to present.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Nelson. That was a great presentation, and I hope that everybody is able to hear me, and I am back, after some technical issues. Miguel, can you continue with the Executive Director's Report?

MIGUEL ROLON: That's it, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Dr. Ehrhardt, and the data are suggested here, but just to let you know that we are going to embark on these models, and we will report back to you in December and also provide you copies of the models. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: If you have any questions for Dr. Ehrhardt, this 18 is the time.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and this is what I was going to ask, if there is any questions or comments about the presentation.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: If I may, Mr. Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Nelson, hi. Thank you for the presentation. What's the deep water -- What do you consider deep water? What is the depth, and, secondly, what are the technologies that are being used for harvesting conch from that deeper water? Thanks.

NELSON EHRHARDT: Thank you for the question. Here, the standard is what is below ten meters and what is in shallower than ten meters, because, if it's shallower than ten meters, usually those are the artisanal fisheries. For deepwater, we are thinking in terms of the sixty to 130 feet, and that is basically what Nicaragua and Honduras are practicing so dangerously.

What we have developed for some of the deepwater surveys are vehicles that you tow with cameras and lasers and a transducer, and the transducer will give you the position of the device that we tow, and the high-resolution cameras that collect the data, obviously, is attached to this vehicle.

There are several problems associated with a huge number of empty shells that are left on the bottom, and this, by itself,

is a very interesting question. In some of the calibrations that have been carried out with divers and the video recordings, there is pretty strong statistical evidence that the estimates of the live conch and dead conch can be discriminated with from the cameras, and so this will improve not only the quality of the survey, in the sense that you can repeat the counting of the animals several times and obtain a variance for it, but also have a pretty good record of the type of bottom and what is left on the bottom, given the thousands and thousands of empty shells that we see in San Juan Bay. I hope that I answered your question.

4 5

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Thank you. The issue that we're having, and someone is presenting, on the safety of divers, because, here, we also have that some problem of deepwater diving, especially with the EEZ closed west of Puerto Rico, and so there are a number of issues that we have also to deal with in the region, and so thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Anybody else that wants to make a comment? Hearing none, I just want to say thank you again to Nelson Ehrhardt. That was a great presentation, like always, and I want to express the gratitude of him to being available for this, and I can testify how much the whole region of the Caribbean, all the islands and the countries that participate in this effort and in this fishery, respect Dr. Ehrhardt. Thank you very much for being available to support this effort.

NELSON EHRHARDT: Thank you, Marcos.

 MARCOS HANKE: The next item on the agenda is we have a break, which we are very early in the process here, and I have a question to the next presenter, the Scientific and Statistical Committee, and, Richard, do you want to make a break now and start, or are you prepared to start now?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I'm prepared to start now, if you want.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Let's do it. Go ahead.

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE (SSC) REPORT

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you, everybody. This is the report of the SSC, and what we've been active on, and you've seen this slide before, is our ecosystem conceptual model, and so we're plodding through that, and we've made really good progress.

Recall that the model has eight sub-models, and these sub-models have a varying number of components, anywhere from five in the habitat component to sixteen in the socioeconomic and cultural drivers component.

This produces over 64,000 potential connections between the various components, and this is why it's taking a while to go through this, and what we have focused on to date is looking at the connections within each of the sub-models.

The issues we addressed at the last meeting was to, first of all, finish making the component connections within the submodels, and so that's particularly looking at the competing uses of resources sub-model, which is the second-largest sub-model, and so that took us quite a bit of time, and then we had to revisit all the sub-models, to look at some remaining issues.

Some of these were making sure that we had appropriate definitions for the components, did we want to add, delete, or move any of those components around, and we had put in some zeroes, or placeholders, in some of the boxes in the matrix that we had to go back and decide what we wanted to do with that. One of the issues leading to that was the question of either non-linear or variable responses between components, and I will give some examples of that later on.

Then there is -- Obviously, we need to do the connections between the sub-models, and we had a homework assignment that we set up in the last meeting to try to move that forward, and I will give a brief background on that as well.

This is just one example, and this is the marine ecosystem components model, and this was done back in May, and so it's one of the ones that was pretty much in shape when we met last time. In this diagram, the blue arrows represent correlations, and that is to say, if you increase one thing, you will cause an increase in another thing, and the red, brownish, arrows are negative interactions, and so, if you increase one thing, you will cause a negative response in the other component.

 One of the things that I mentioned was having proper definitions for components, and so probably the poster-child, or most easily understandable one, was highly migratory species, and this is in there because highly migratory species is one of the things that NMFS and the councils have to deal with.

However, that category, as defined by National Marine Fisheries

Service, is -- At the moment, it consists of truly highly-migratory species, like the tunas, and things that don't move around very much, like nurse sharks and rays, and so we had to decide whether we're going with that larger definition or we needed something more ecologically intact, and we decided we wanted something more ecologically intact, and so, here, those species that don't move around much, like nurse sharks, would not be included in the highly migratory species component definition, and it's just the species that are really moving, like the tunas, and so this fine-tuning of definitions is one of the things that we had to do.

For each one of these diagrams, there is a matrix where this information is filled in, and this is just the example for the one from ecosystem components, where you can see where we think there are connections, whether they're positive or negative, and the red color just indicates edits that we had made from a previous version.

A more complicated one, and the most complicated one, actually, is the socioeconomic and cultural drivers sub-model, and this is a picture of that from an earlier meeting, and there were some questions here about the nature of interactions, and so I will talk about one, in particular, and that's going to be imports and exports.

Imports and exports. For example, will affect market demand, but how they affect market demand depends on whether you are importing or exporting. Imports will lower market demand for fishery products, whereas exports creates a new market for those products, and so you could either have a positive or a negative relationship, and we had discussions of whether we wanted to split out imports and exports into separate components in this sub-model, and then we realized, when we did that, there is also some non-linearities in there, and we were advised by some of the people who really do modeling that much more important than the direction of the interaction is the strength of the interaction.

 One of the things we did was, when we had these non-linear relationships, where responses could actually be positive or negative, depending on the situation, we just entered an absolute value, rather than a positive or negative, to make sure we captured the magnitude of those interactions. This is just the matrix that results from that sub-model connections that you just saw. Again, it's fairly complicated, and it took us a while to go through all the rows of this.

We went through all the sub-models and cleaned those up, and we think we're in pretty good shape, subject to the constraint of we haven't connected them together, and we may find that, when we start connecting things, we will identify more problems.

This was the full conceptual model as it looked in 2019, and you can see, at this time, we had already talked about making connections, and you can see arrows that go from small boxes, or components, of one sub-model to the components of another. Some other ones just go to the heading of a particular sub-model, and like, in fishing, you can see several arrows coming in and out of the fishing heading, but it still remains to be seen how those would be linked into the specific components, and so we were already thinking ahead at that time, but this was not a comprehensive view of that, and so we need to really kind of look at how we're going to do that next.

This is the full conceptual model matrix, and, across the diagonal, you will see the matrices for each sub-model, and that is to say the connections within each sub-model, and so, where you see this kind of peachy color, that's where there is an interaction being identified, and I know you can't read the numbers in there, but that's not the point.

The green areas indicate connections that were made in that previous diagram, and you can see, as I said, that there is potentially over 64,000 connections here, and we have looked at just a few of them, and this is where we're going to be going next, and we have come up with a way we think that we can both focus and speed up this process and get our thinking really in line, so that, when we meet again, we can rapidly go through this in something other than a box-by-box-64,000-connection mode.

We came up with a homework assignment, and that is to identify the priority connections between components within each pair of sub-models, and remember there are eight sub-models, and so it's a fair number of pairs, and we're asking each member to identify the three-most important connections, their direction, and their strength, and these connections, and I will give some examples, but they could be -- You could use one component that connects three times to another model, or three different components to connect to three different components of another model, or to one component in another model, and there's a lot of flexibility about what you think the three most important ones are.

This is a way to start and to focus the SSC as it starts to evaluate all these potential component-to-component connections.

The individual results will be compiled and reviewed at the next SSC meeting, and then those results, and that is to say after that meeting where we discuss these things, will be presented to the council and its EBFM TAP as an interim result, so that people can start looking at this while we're still struggling through the rest of it, but we wanted to have an interim product that people can start using.

4 5

In addition to the TAP, we think the results should also be made available to other interested user groups, such as the Lenfest project and the Science Center's ecosystem status report working group.

What does this look like? This is the form we're actually asking each SSC member to fill out. Again, along the diagonal are the inter sub-model connections, and so we're not dealing with those, and each one of these boxes, if you will, going across has three rows, and those are the three connections that we're asking each member of the committee to identify, and so we want to have what's the driver component from one sub-model, what's the response component in another sub-model, is that direction positive or negative or absolute value, and what is the strength of that, high, medium, or low. We're going to get this filled out by each committee member, and then those results will be summarized and brought back to the committee, and then we will discuss those further.

reason for that is because committee members differential expertise, and certainly we expect our economists and sociologists to have a greater perspective on how things might move through say the socioeconomics box rather than some of the biologists, and, in the same way, the biologists have perhaps a better way of thinking of how things connect in the ecosystem components or the habitat than the economists would. talk about these and be able to get everybody's perspective on that, but we'll clearly be focused on that when we do that.

To give an example, and this is really an arbitrary example, and please don't put any weight into it but you might say the three most important component connections, from the socioeconomic and cultural drivers sub-model affecting the fishing sub-model, could be seafood imports and exports affecting commercial fishing catch, market demand affecting commercial fishing catch, and tourism affecting recreational fishing catch.

In this case, two of the driver components affect the same target component, and the picture of this is -- What we're

saying is that here are all the components within each submodel, and we're saying, okay, seafood imports and exports is going to be targeting commercial fishing catch, and market demand will target commercial catch, and tourism will affect recreational fishing catch.

To put that graphically, the red ovals indicate the driving components in the socioeconomic and cultural drivers model, and the blue ovals indicate the targets in the fishing sub-model, and this is -- What we're asking the SSC to do is conceptually visualize these connections, and I would point out right now, since this is an arbitrary selection, that something like seafood imports and exports, which here we have it saying it's going to affect commercial fishing, actually probably would not connect directly to commercial fishing. Seafood imports and exports probably would go through market demand, and then market demand would affect commercial fishing, and so it's a fairly complex way we have to view about how these connections run.

In that matrix that I showed that we have to fill out, we would have connections for things that would look like this. The seafood imports and exports affecting commercial fishing, that gets a zero, because it could go positive or negative, as I explained before, and so zero indicates an absolute value entry, and then the strength, and, in this case, we said it's medium, whereas market demand has a positive effect on commercial fishing, and that strength is very high, and tourism has a high impact, positive impact, on recreational fishing, and so that's the kind of thing that we're asking the SSC members to do. That's the presentation, and, if there's questions, I will try to answer them.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard. We're open for questions. I would like to make a question. Can you go back to the previous slide, please, just to clarify? Thank you. Once you talk about the absolute direction, the one you put the zero there, it means that it could go either way with a strength of medium, or there is a differentiation, or a possible differentiation, of one way being high and one way being medium?

 RICHARD APPELDOORN: Some of these components are very complex in what's embedded in their title, and certainly seafood imports and exports, things like market demand, are complex, and it's difficult, without doing a whole huge model, to tease these things out, and so we decided that it would be easier, at this point, to kind of just deal with the complexity as we have it and not make things so complex that they are not really useful.

That means we're going to retain a lot of these kind of questions that you're bringing up, and so what we're saying, first of all, is that absolute value could go either way, depending on the particular situation that you're talking about, but the strength is going to be, okay, generally -- Yes, you will have things that are probably lower connections to things that are higher connections, but we would say, and, again, this is just a made-up example, that -- In this example, we're saying, okay, it's a medium strength of connection, on average.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Does that answer your question?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, it answered it, but I just want to make sure that every council member understands what it means, because it's important. Thank you very much, Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: These things are really highly complex, and I think anybody who is in the business understands that, and so trying to simplify it at this stage, with something that's already a very complex conceptual model, is perhaps going too far at this stage.

MARCOS HANKE: I agree, and I think it's a great way to solve the problem and to be practical on the design, and so thank you very much. Any other questions?

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have Tony asking for a turn to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Tony.

TONY BLANCHARD: Good morning, Rich. How are you doing?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Good morning, Tony. I'm doing good.

TONY BLANCHARD: Can you bring it back to the full 2019 -- Okay. Now, sitting here watching this, it looks like a ball of confusion, for lack of a different description, and I think sometimes we overthink certain things, and we make it more complicated than it needs to be, and I will give you a prime example.

I think like we all agree that whatever happens from the shoreline and the shore ends up in the water, and I think, at the local government, which I know we can't force them to do anything, but the way I see it is the local government -- I want to give you a prime example.

4 5

In the waste management agency, if the waste management agency was to uphold to all of their guidelines, then a lot of this problem, or some of this problem, would be eliminated, and I am not picking on them, per se, because all the agencies, I believe, if they stand up to their commitment and their guidelines that they're supposed to stay with and enforce, a lot of this complication, or a lot of this problem, what we see as a problem, would be eliminated.

I think, in order for this to even consider working, it needs to start from the shore to the ocean, because, no matter how much regulation you put on the user groups, it will not fix the problem if the problem is not addressed properly, and I think the only way you could address that properly is by having the local government, the territorial governments, do their part and enforce their own regulations that they have set. So that's just my take on it, but I think sometimes we overthink, and we take on other people's responsibility, when it's really their responsibility to take care of that problem.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Tony. Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Tony, it just may be the first time that I totally, fully agree with everything you said and second it to whatever degree I can.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard. We have the comment on the chat that Vanessa Ramirez agrees with Tony too, and I want to take the opportunity to agree with Tony too, and is there anybody else that wants to make a comment? Hearing none, thank you very much, Richard, for your presentation.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I asked Graciela to move a couple of things, because Dr. Sennai has to go back to teach, and so, Graciela, can you tell us about the SSC membership and all that, and also with the TAP?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: We have a vacancy, a recent vacancy, on the SSC, and Joe Kimmel tended his resignation a week ago or so, and so we are in search of an SSC member, and we were thinking of people with background in stock assessment, and so we are telling the council members and the people who are in the council meeting to be aware that there is a search for an SSC member to fulfill that vacancy.

We also have the vacancy of Bill Arnold in the TAP, and so, for that one, we have someone from the Virgin Islands who is willing

and able to participate in the TAP, and I don't know if you want me to go on into specifically the person that we have and tell you about it, or do you want to wait for Sennai to talk about him?

MIGUEL ROLON: Either of the two, but just do it, and then the council can vote yea or nay for appointing that person to the TAP.

SENNAI HABTES: Graciela, I'm on, if you want me to talk about the vacancy and the member.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Thank you, Sennai. Yes, please.

ECOSYSTEM TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL MEMBER DISCUSSION

SENNAI HABTES: I think a person can talk about the reality here in the Virgin Islands, and it's a little difficult, given the universities status and rebuilding since the hurricanes, as well as a lot of the members in the fishing community and the Department of Planning and Natural Resources, and the inability to participate, due to the many things already on their plate.

I was able to get conformation from Dr. Edwin Cruz-Rivera at UVI, and he is able and willing to participate as a member on the TAP, to fill Bill Arnold's seat. A little bit about Dr. Rivera is he is a marine ecologist, and his research focused on plant herbivore and predator-prey interactions, and with an emphasis on the feeding behavior, chemical ecology, and nutrition of marine invertebrates. His major focus is marine ecological and evolutionary processes at various levels of organization, and he has studied organisms ranging from microalgae to fishes.

He has used a variety of techniques in the field and the lab to include natural history observations and field surveys, manipulative experiments on feeding behavior and fitness, quantification of prey and nutritional and chemical and structural properties, molecular barcoding and biogenetic techniques, ethograms and taxonomy and morphology.

 He has worked in a variety of diverse ecosystems, ranging from the Caribbean and North Atlantic to Chesapeake Bay and the Mediterranean Sea, the tropical Pacific, south Australia, the Red Sea, brackish lakes in Egypt and in the South African intertidal area.

His background is he received his bachelor's from the University

of Puerto Rico Mayaguez in 1990 and a PhD in marine science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill under his advisory, Mark Hay.

I think Edwin will bring a variety of expertise and information to the TAP, and he is presently at the University of the Virgin Islands, on the St. Thomas campus, and he has a big interest, and I would say his major interest, in joining the TAP is his interest in connecting with the fisheries community to help in outreach towards some of the new research that he is conducting on the ecosystem effects and impacts on fisheries resources associated with an influx of sargassum in recent years.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sennai. For the council members, would anybody like to make a motion to nominate the person described, Edwin.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Edwin Cruz-Rivera.

MARCOS HANKE: As a TAP member.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I move to accept the nominee as a TAP member.

MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

NICOLE ANGELI: I second the motion.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. All in favor; any opposition; any abstentions.

TONY BLANCHARD: I would like to abstain from the vote, because I need a little more information, and so I will abstain from the vote.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Tony. I have your abstention recorded, and, Natalia, you are the one making the notes, and --

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, don't worry about it. We will take a note here, and so you have one abstention, and then you had no opposition from the rest.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Welcome, Dr. Edwin Rivera, as a new TAP member. We will keep going. Graciela, did you have something else to address?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: No, and just the SSC membership, and so that one is open, and it depends on what the council -- What direction the council is following, and so, if you're going in

direction of doing more work with ecosystem-based approaches, it's one thing.

2 3 4

> 5 6

> 7

8

1

If we're thinking more in terms of the ABC control rule and tiers and stock assessment, then that would be the person, and so it really will depend. We are open to receive names of people to be part of the SSC, and I don't know if Richard has any other comments regarding membership on the SSC as it stands right now.

9 10 11

MARCOS HANKE: Richard.

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Well, I had mentioned to Graciela that, given the area of expertise that Joe Kimmel represented, which was a mix of biology and management expertise, from all his years in Puerto Rico and at National Marine Fisheries, that someone with some similar cross between the biology management applications might be good, and I suggested that somebody like Michelle Scharer would be a good person for that, but, as she pointed out, that depends on where the council would like to see expertise added to the SSC.

21 22 23

24

25

26

27

28 29 One of the things that I had this debate with Joe about with his retiring is he was feeling a little lost in the current discussions on ecosystem components, and I made the point that this really varies, and the SSC, at this point, is working on this, but, before that, it was working on tier rules, and, before that, it was working on what the application of those tier rules would be, and so whatever we're doing varies dramatically.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36 37 Before, we had a lot of demand for biological expertise. Right now, we're really glad that we have sociologists and economists on, because they're really driving a lot of the discussion for the ecosystem component work that we've been doing lately, and so the expertise of an individual will vary depending on what's in front of the SSC at any given time, but it really tends to be fairly varied and fairly dynamic.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44

45 46

47

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I believe that, if the council wants, we can go ahead and substitute Dr. Joe Kimmel with somebody with similar qualifications, as Richard mentioned, and the issue about stock assessment is because you, several months ago, mentioned, as a council, that we were lacking the true stock assessment people. However, that's not really a big issue nowadays, and we can always get the stock assessment that we need and ask questions to Adyan and others in the Southeast Fisheries Science Center about this.

At this time, you will have a couple of other meetings of the SSC between here and the middle of 2021 that you should have that position filled, and my proposal is -- I talked to Graciela, and I trust Richard's judgement on this, but Dr. Michelle Scharer is willing and able to participate, and she is well known by many of you, and, actually, Mr. Chairman, you have worked with her in different capacities, collaborating with the project that she has been working on for several years with Nassau grouper and other species, and I propose that the council consider her for filling that vacancy today.

MARCOS HANKE: I want to make a comment on that. I have good communication with Michelle, and, besides her knowledge of multiple things that address the council concerns, she is very open to take the time to explain and to have made that connection with the fishermen and with the people, once she is approached, and I think she will be an excellent member of the SSC, and that's my position. I would like to hear the rest of the council members and if they have anybody else or what they think, but I am strongly suggesting to include or to consider Michelle Scharer as an SSC member.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have Richard Appeldoorn and Tony that want to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I just wanted to comment about what Miguel had mentioned about having stock assessment expertise on the SSC, and recall that you added Jason Cope to the committee, and he is really good in that area, and he's one of the top people, and, also, Doug, when he was brought on, also has experience with the other council, the Gulf Council, and he also has a lot of experience in that area, and so, to some degree, we have got that capacity within the SSC, and, as Miguel also mentioned, we have had no problem in communicating with people like Shannon and Adyan to help fill in places where we have questions, and so I guess, if the council feels that's sufficient expertise, then that's where I was going with my recommendation.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard. Tony.

TONY BLANCHARD: I say we move to put Michelle Scharer on the SSC.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: We have a motion from Tony Blanchard to nominate Michelle Scharer as an SSC member, and it's seconded by Carlos Farchette. Any opposition? Any abstain? Hearing none, Graciela and Miguel, we will have to do the due process to inform Dr. Scharer of this new determination.

MIGUEL ROLON: We will send a letter to both, but Graciela wants to say something before.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, I believe Michelle is online, but the other thing that Michelle has that will contribute greatly to the SSC is that she has a really close relationship with the U.S. Virgin Islands and the work that is being done in the MCD and Grammanik Bank, et cetera, and so it will bring that additional missing information that we have directly to the SSC, and so thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Thank you, Graciela. It's already been approved, and so we can move on. We will send letters to Edwin Rivera and Michelle Scharer both, informing them of their appointments to the TAP and the SSC, respectively.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you, Miguel. I would ask Michelle if she wants to make any comment.

MICHELLE SCHARER: Good morning. Thank you very much. For me, it's an honor to be nominated. I will have to think it over, and, right now, I'm driving, and so I can't really express all the thoughts that are going through my head, but I will definitely consider it. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Michelle. We will move on then, and I think it's time for a break, Miguel, or is there anything quick that you guys want to address?

MIGUEL ROLON: It's 10:35, and you are way ahead of the agenda, and so you can have a ten-minute break now and then come back and decide what you're going to do with the rest of the agenda. You can move up some of the items that you have, and you have the authority to do that, as we published in the Federal Register, and so you can have the ten-minute break now and then continue with the agenda.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's do the ten-minute break, and we will be back at 10:45.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MARCOS HANKE: We are back. The next item on the agenda is -- Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Before we continue, we have a note from Ricardo Lopez that Damaris Delgado was called for an urgent meeting with the Secretary, and so she will join us whenever that is finished. In the meantime, Ricardo and Danielle are here to take notes for her.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Graciela, you mentioned that we maybe could move some presentations, or will we keep with the same items on the agenda the way it is?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: You will have a brief report from Sennai Habtes on the EBFM TAP first and then then Southeast Fisheries Science Center update.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's proceed then with the Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management Technical Advisory Panel Report and Sennai Habtes.

ECOSYSTEM-BASED FISHERY MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL REPORT

SENNAI HABTES: Good morning, everyone. First, I would like to say thank you for approving Edwin Cruz-Rivera to sit on the TAP. As I said, I think his experience and background will help, and I'm glad that we got the vacancy filled. Second up, I want to say that this will be just a brief report, and I expect that we'll have more for you in the meeting later this year.

At present, in terms of our ecosystem-based modeling advisory work, we are waiting for the ECM, for the ecosystem model, from the SSC, and we will work with them to use it to inform and include it with all of the other work that we're trying to coordinate related to ecosystem-based fisheries modeling within the U.S. Caribbean.

As we get the outcomes from their testing and building of the model, we will provide the council with an understanding of the ECM and how it can be incorporated into the work with the TAP and the development of the fishery ecosystem plans for the different regions within the U.S. Caribbean.

I would like to say that we listened to a lot of the members on the DAP and their request for more understanding and involvement, and, so, coming up, and the dates have been posted for those DAP meetings, going on for the St. Thomas/St. John, St. Croix, and Puerto Rico regions later this month, and Graciela will be giving a short presentation in those on a lot of the ecosystem issues, and I will make myself present at all the DAP meetings and available to answer any questions and to coordinate ways in which more information from the TAP on our ecosystem-based fisheries model can be provided to the DAPs and so that we can get information from them, from their communities, to inform our advisory panel work towards the council.

4 5

A large part of the work that we're doing is to coordinate a lot of the ongoing ecosystem-based fishery modeling work in the territory, and that includes the work from the Lenfest grant that is being done, and the SSC and the ecosystem modeling work that's being done, as well as some of the work across the different universities, such as the SEAMAP program and the ecosystems-based modeling work that will be done with UVI as part of its newly-funded five-year grant.

Then, last, but not least, I would like to remind the council and other members that we presented a set of goals and objectives that are to guide the EBFM Technical Advisory Panel, and we would like some input back from you guys, if possible, and I think there are a lot of things that have questions as to how we can proceed, in terms of informing the council, and so we want to make sure that we are able to record your questions and concerns and directions regarding these objectives and goals that we have presented.

Then, finally, the staff has been working on a charter, which will incorporate these goals and objectives that inform how the TAP will operate, and we are -- The CFMC administration is working on that, in conjunction with the members of the TAP, and we hope, once we've received input from the DAP and the council on those goals and objectives, that we can complete that and present it to you at the later meeting.

 Finally, as always, we are just continuing the ongoing literature review, which is compiling a lot of the spread-out data across the region that can be used for ecosystems-based fisheries management, and one of the things that we hope will come out of the fisheries ecosystems plans and the EBFM plans will be incorporating all of that knowledge and data into a repository with descriptions in the plans, and so that's pretty much all I have, and I would be happy to answer any questions, and I'm sure we'll have more for you in the later-year meeting.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sennai. A question to Graciela. Do you have the goals and objectives slide, in case the council members want to talk about that right now?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Yes, and you saw it at the last council meeting, and we sent them around. Do you want me to -- We can bring them up on the screen, and I don't know if Natalia has them from the last time.

MIGUEL ROLON: But we already discussed that.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Yes, and the main thing is if you see anything in those that we presented last time, and we sent them to you, to please contact us and let us have your feedback, because this is an ongoing process.

Right now, we are comparing the goals and objectives from the different efforts that Sennai just mentioned, to see where the interactions -- Where these efforts connect, so that we don't duplicate effort, and to see where each of those efforts is heading and how they can feed into the fishery ecosystem plan and the council process, and so we are working on that, and we're just requesting, as we did with the island-based FMP goals and objectives, that the council members look at them and take them into consideration and comment on them in the ongoing process.

For the next council meeting, we should have an update for you, and so, if we have received any comments on those, we will be presenting those to you.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay.

MIGUEL ROLON: Graciela, please resend, to every council member, that document, so they will be able to review it again and send us their comments.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel, for that.

41 GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Perfect. Will do.

MARCOS HANKE: Any questions for Sennai? Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Update.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Okay. We are having a little bit of a technical issue. Give me a second, and I'm going to make Kevin

McCarthy the presenter.

SOUTHEAST FISHERIES SCIENCE CENTER UPDATE

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Okay. Thank you to the council for giving the Science Center this opportunity to bring you up to speed on some of the work that we've been doing in the region. I have a couple of disclaimers.

First of all, I see you're well ahead of schedule, but that's okay. I will get you back on schedule, because we can make this as long as need be, and, also, although I am the presenter, I am, in no way, shape, or form, the person who is heading up all of these projects. I am involved in a number of them, but these other names that you see here are folks that have provided me with information about their projects, including slides, and, anybody from the Science Center who is listening in, if you see a slide or a picture or some text that looks familiar to you, that's because I have taken it and added it to this presentation.

The other thing that I would say is I'm going to be very quickly going over an awful lot of information. I am happy to take questions at the end, and I will put in the disclaimer that I am no expert on all of these projects, because, as I say, I'm not involved in every one of them, and so, if I misrepresent something, or misstate something, that's on me. That is my fault and not the fault of the people who are doing the work.

With that being said, let's go ahead and get started, and so this just gives you a little taste of the resources that the Science Center is putting into the Caribbean these days, here is a list of names of the folks who are at the Science Center who are involved in Caribbean research.

 This list I don't claim is to be comprehensive, and I think it's pretty close to including everyone, but I may have missed some folks, and, if I have, I apologize. This also represents people from throughout the Science Center, and so the Science Center is not just the Miami Lab. There is a lab in Galveston, and there's a lab in Louisiana, and there's a lab in Mississippi, and there's a lab in the Panhandle of Florida, and there's a lab in North Carolina, and folks on this are at all of those places, and so there are a lot of labs and a lot of personnel, both federal employees as well as contractors, who are involved in U.S. Caribbean work.

What types of data are we collecting, and why are we collecting

them? As many of you are aware, data have been collected in the U.S. Caribbean for a long time. We've got a long time series of landings, and a long time series of size composition data, and there have been other projects going on throughout the last many decades, but there have been a number of really recent events that have refocused and sort of directed our efforts in the Caribbean in recent years.

One of them was SEDAR 46, and this was a data-limited stock assessment where we looked at six species, two species from each of the island groups, and so two in Puerto Rico, two in St. Thomas/St. John, and two others in St. Croix.

We learned a number of things in going through this process, one of which is it became very clear that we have, for some species, and not all species, but for some species, we are lacking life history data, and so this is particularly true, and I hope you can see my cursor here, but this is particularly true of the parrotfish and triggerfish, and we're also, in some cases, and not for every species, but for some, we're missing landings data, and we don't have very much.

For things like hogfish, we don't have a long time series of landings information, because hogfish, for some of the islands, were never on the reporting forms. In addition, for all of the species in the Virgin Islands, and for spiny lobster in both the Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico, we don't have -- We don't have recreational landings. We have got some recreational landings in Puerto Rico for a number of years, but we're no longer collecting those data. Following the hurricanes, that program essentially ceased, and they never collected landings information for spiny lobster or for conch.

 We also, for a number of species, are lacking some size composition data, and we've got a lot of size composition data for some species, and not much for others, and so that became very clear in the SEDAR 46 effort.

SEDAR 57 also was a big success, as you all have seen and reviewed, and, for the spiny lobster assessment, one of the things we realized is that we need to know more about gear selectivity, and I'll talk about that a little bit more later on

 We also were lacking a catch per unit effort time series, and so that would have been a very nice additional piece of information to include in spiny lobster, and so that's another area that we need more information. 4 5

Another initiative, begun by you, the council, that has refocused our attention and where we want to put some resources has been ecosystem-based fishery management, and so that has got us thinking about ways to collect the kind of data that would inform that initiative.

We have also had, as you well know, natural disasters and pandemics, hurricanes and COVID-19, and that has resulted in, particularly for the social science group, a lot of work in the U.S. Caribbean.

I am going to start with the stuff that I know best, which is data collection in support of stock assessments, and so we've got a number of kinds of data, kinds of information rather, that we're concerned with in a stock assessment, and there is status determination criteria, all the MSY and the OY and that sort of thing, are they overfished, is there overfishing going on, providing catch advice. If it is overfished, we're concerned about a recovery plan. That is all under the law right now, under Magnuson-Stevens. We need that kind of information.

As you all know, in the Caribbean, we're now island-based management, and nearly all of the ACLs that we have on the books right now are from recent landings history alone, except for spiny lobster, which we now have a stock assessment, which can provide updated information on what ACLs should be, and so we're really in the business now of trying to move -- To collect enough information to move species out of those landings history alone, that Tier 4 in the tiered control rule, move it out of just the landings history as the only information we have and at least into a data-limited stock assessment.

In the case of some of the stocks, we may be able to move them into maybe a data-moderate kind of assessment, but that is where our efforts are, in terms of getting data for stock assessments. Let's get out of this landings history tier and into a stock assessment tier.

We need landings, and we need size composition, and this is just a slide to illustrate that, and this happens to be spiny lobster. Spiny lobster is one of those where we've got a long landings history, and we've got a lot of size composition information, and we don't have recreational landings. We don't have recreational size composition, and so that's a hole in the data, but we have a lot of commercial information.

We at the Science Center hired a consultant in Puerto Rico to

collect the information that would be required to design a survey, a survey of commercial landings and size composition, and so we completed seventeen months of sampling, and this work actually began before the hurricane, I think about a month, or maybe three weeks, before the hurricane, and then, of course, as we all know, life was not the same after that, and so we had a long pause and then began again the following August and got seventeen continuous months of sampling.

4 5

We now have additional funding to really dig into those data and do some more statistical analyses, and we also have some money for additional sampling, so that we can fine-tune that survey. Where were we lacking information, and let's get some sampling in there to help us better design the survey.

What this will allow us to do, when we have these numbers, when we have estimates of landings, is to make direct comparisons to the work that DRNA is already doing with their landings corrections and the sampling that they've already got going on, and I have to point out that DRNA was great, and there was lots of support, and it was very much a collaboration with them in getting this work done.

We're beginning a similar program in the Virgin Islands, and I think we would already be underway, except for COVID-19. The money is in place, and this is to design a port sampling survey. Again, we want to get landings and size composition data within a statistically-designed survey, and we want to include commercial vessels and recreational vessels, including the forhire sector, because that's an area that hasn't been sampled on a consistent basis in the Virgin Islands.

 The initial work, once we're able to get people in the field, and this is all through DPNR, and their staff is running this, the port sampling, completely. We're going to supply some of the -- At the Science Center, we'll be supplying some of the statistical analyses side of the picture, and so the initial work will focus on identifying usage patterns, where are the landing sites, when are people coming and going, where are they coming and going, which boat ramps, when should we sample, that kind of thing, and so that's the initial step, and then, once we have figured that out, we'll run a pilot survey.

 Some of this work was done several years ago, but we need to update that information, and we've got several years of funding to do this, to design this survey, and so we've got that kind of work going on in both Puerto Rico and soon in the Virgin Islands. Soon we hope, COVID notwithstanding, we'll have it

going in the Virgin Islands.

4 5

We also noticed that we were lacking, in some cases, life history data, and so, for life history data, we're looking at things like how big do the animals get, how big do they get at certain ages, what is the size distribution of males versus females? Are females bigger or are males bigger?

We want to know things like natural mortality, and we want to know things like how big do they get before they become reproductively viable, when they start to produce eggs, how many eggs they produce at different sizes, and, if they are released, if they're caught and then released, how many of those things are surviving after they are being discarded?

To get at some of that, we're partnering with DRNA, the life history lab there, and they're the experts in the region, and so we're going to analyze their existing data and identify future sampling needs, and so they are sitting on a whole bunch of data, and what we want to do is be able to get at things like what is the size at maturity, what's the conversion between total length and fork length, but the main thing we want to get at, that will help DRNA in the future, is where should they prioritize their sampling?

If they've already got enough triggerfish to have a robust sample, then maybe they don't need to sample a bunch more triggerfish and they can direct their time and effort at some other species, and that's just an example. That is how we're going to partner with them, so that we can utilize the limited resources that everybody has more efficiently.

We have also identified some species that just don't have any information at all, or there are cases where we don't have any of the big animals, or we don't have any of the small animals, and so we're going to start another project, again once we can get people in the field, to target those size classes of animals where we're really lacking information, and so we particularly want to look at parrotfish and triggerfish, and so this is on hold. We've got the money, but we're just on hold until we can get people in the field.

 Another project that is ongoing, and this is Kate Overly, who is at the Panama City Laboratory, and she has partnered with Virginia Shervette and Will Patterson, and Virginia, of course, is in South Carolina, and Will is at the University of Florida, and they've been looking at age and growth of some of the deepwater snappers, in particular queen snapper, and this photo

here is an otolith, and you use that to age the fish, sort of like the rings on a tree.

They have been collecting these data -- Well, Kate hasn't, but there are samples from as far back as 2005, and they're ongoing in their sample collection, and they've got over 600 samples in the U.S. Caribbean, and they've got a method I think that came out of Will's lab, but maybe Virginia as well, where they can validate the accuracy of the age estimation that they're getting from reading the otoliths, and they are looking at validating that age composition.

They will have size distributions in the U.S. Caribbean, but they're also doing this work in the Gulf of Mexico, and they want to get some estimates of longevity and some growth function data and estimates of natural mortality.

Another area that we're actively pursuing some research projects is with the idea of gear selectivity, and this came up in the spiny lobster assessment, and the idea is what does the gear catch, and what does it tell us about the size of the animals in the wild, and so are we catching absolutely everything above a certain size, this sort of asymptotic or logistic kind of curve, where, once they reach a certain size, the gear catches everything that's out there, and that's what we're seeing, or is it more of this dome-shaped kind of selectivity, where there is a range of sizes that the gear catches or the fishermen choose to bring into market, and so the idea of a plate-sized fish. Are there other larger animals out there that we're just not seeing in the catch that comes to the dock?

In order to get at that, we've got a number of gear selectivity studies, again partnering with DPNR in the Virgin Islands to do these kind of gear selectivity studies. The DFW scientists will use traps specifically to target lobster size composition, and this will be done across all of the islands in the Virgin Islands.

 While DFW scientists get the size composition from animals caught in traps, we're also partnering with Park Service personnel and the University of the Virgin Islands scientists to do a parallel study using divers, and so we'll have divers go out and collect and measure lobsters from both shallow and deep sites, as deep as 150 feet, and that will allow us to compare the size composition that the divers are seeing in the wild, in the field, versus what the DFW scientists are seeing that are coming up in traps, and so do we see big lobsters, either deep or shallow, that are not showing up in the traps, and therefore

not showing up in the landings? Then we can get at the kind of selectivity that is actually occurring.

We've got a similar study that will be happening in Puerto Rico, and we've got the money for this. Again, we're kind of on hold, because of COVID, and this will focus on trap selectivity in the lobster fishery specifically, but they will collect size composition data from additional species, and so, if they see some other species in the traps, they're going to measure those too, and it won't just be limited to lobster, but the primary focus is lobster.

 We've got -- I don't expect you to pay any attention to these numbers, but this is just to remind me that there has been other work. In this case, this was Ron Hill and Jennifer Doerr, and they're both at the Galveston Laboratory of the Science Center, although Ron has since moved on to Panama City.

They looked at the kinds of species that were being caught in fish traps versus lobster traps, and are a lot of lobster caught in fish traps as well as in lobster traps? There have been other kinds of gear selectivity studies that have been ongoing, and, in this case, sort of species composition within a particular gear.

There are a number of fishery-independent surveys that are ongoing, and these surveys are trying to get at things like abundance and size composition and also collect samples for life history studies, and so, again, Ron and Jennifer have done an awful lot of conch work, primarily in the Virgin Islands, St. John and St. Croix, and they've done some acoustic tracking of conch, what sort of habitat is conch using, where are they moving, when are they moving, and they have looked at sort of population growth, recruitment, mortality, those kinds of issues, through mark-and-recapture studies.

In St. Croix, they were looking at sort of density studies, how many conch are out there, and in what habitats, and they've also looked at environmental contaminants in the Salt River in St. Croix, and so they're looking at ecological effects, how is this impacting the environment, as well as any human health effects, and they have published a few papers on those.

 Another fishery-independent study that's been going on for a while is a reef fish survey using divers, and Laura Jay Grove at the Miami Lab is heading up those efforts, and this is part of the National Coral Reef Monitoring Program, and so it's a fishery-independent scuba survey, and they use a stratified

random sample design looking at hard bottom and coral habitats.

4 5

They are limited to a hundred feet or shallower, and so they're getting size composition of all the species that they're seeing, and they go out and they survey everything within a fifteenmeter cylinder, diameter cylinder, and they are getting, again, size composition, and they're getting abundance and density within a particular habitat.

They are sampling every other year in the Caribbean, and on the off years I think they're sampling in the Florida Keys, and they've got funding for 2021, and then to look at ways to best utilize this in stock assessments, as well as to get at the idea of how can we better inform those Tier 4 ACL estimates, or ACL designations, and will this inform that process in any way, and so they've got some money to do that.

In 2019, they sampled over 300 sites in St. Thomas/St. John and over 300 additional sites in St. Croix, and, also in 2019, they sampled over 200 sites in Puerto Rico.

This was a similar project, but deeper, looking at mesophotic reefs, and it's the same kind of survey, as I understand it, and only, here, they are sampling from thirty to sixty meters, and so over a hundred feet, and the sampling is meant to happen in 2020, and I think they have done some sampling, but I think right now they're on hiatus, and then sampling again in 2022.

They did over fifty sites so far in 2020, which compares to thirty-eight sites in 2018, and so getting the same kind of data as in the shallow study. They are getting counts and sizes within particular habitats, and they are comparing that to the shallow sampling. How many species are they seeing in their shallow sampling that they're also seeing in this deeper sampling?

What can they say by the shallow sampling alone? There may be some species that are very well sampled, if they just stick to that shallow sampling, where there may be other species that are also found deeper that would require that additional deep sampling to fully get a handle on.

 Then a third project they have going is really to calibrate their method, which is the cylinders, where they will randomly select these cylinders within these areas of habitat, and sample everything within this fifteen-meter cylinder.

In the past, a number of studies have used the belt transects,

where they will swim down a line twenty-five meters and count and measure fish on -- Well, they really estimate the sizes of fish two meters on either side of that line as they swim, and so they want to be able to calibrate those old data into the same kind of density metrics that they get with their new method, and so it's really just a way to be able to mine the old datasets and put them in a common currency.

4 5

In another fishery-independent survey, and this is in really deep water in Puerto Rico's deepwater fishery, and this is Kate Overly, again, in Panama City, along with Andy David, and he's also in Panama City.

What they have done, over the course of a two-year project -- I am not sure if they are going to be able to finish up fall of 2020. I am not clear on that, but they're using a camera system as well as hook-and-line to get size composition, which they can divert to weights, and they will -- Because they're going to collect some samples with the hook-and-line for age and growth and reproductive studies, and this is where she's getting many of her samples for the otolith study that I mentioned earlier.

They will look at habitat utilization of queen snapper from their video data, as well as their hook-and-line fishing, and they have provided us with some video. This is at 280 meters, which is about 919 feet, at one of their stations off the west coast of Puerto Rico, and so it's always kind of fun to look at fish, and especially it's interesting knowing that they're over 900 feet deep here.

Another study, again with Kate and Andy, but also with a couple of other folks, Ryan Caillouet, who is at the Mississippi Lab, and Steve Smith, who is at the Miami Lab. This is sort of a continuation of the project I mentioned, and, again, they're using video and hook-and-line to sample the deep snapper grouper complex in Puerto Rico.

 Here, they are focusing on the 100 to 650-meter depth range with stereo-video, and so that allows them to get size estimates of the fish. They will get size and abundance data, and they will also use hook-and-line gear to collect the biological samples. Once they pull the video out of the water, they will drop the hook-and-line down to catch some fish for otoliths and other biological samples, and they will be able to get relative abundance and size information for both fished species as well as species that are not exploited in the fishery, and this is all centered on the west coast of Puerto Rico.

Another study that Miami staff are working on is we're working with a consulting firm in Puerto Rico to look at recruitment of lobsters to the fishery, and this is a direct -- This is coming directly out of an initiative that the Puerto Rico lobster fishers began themselves. They wanted to collect better data, and they wanted to get data that would better inform stock assessments, and so they began that program, and, out of that, we developed this program, and so this is a cooperative research program.

The data collection will include Puerto Rico fishers that will be involved in the project to take scientists out in the field to collect this lobster size composition data, and so this hasn't begun yet. Again, everything is on hold because of COVID-19, but we have the consulting firm, and we have the money. We'll be in contact with fishers, and there are certain requirements that have to be met so that the fisher's boat can be insured to be able to take the scientists out on the water, but our goal is to quantify those lobsters that are smaller than legal harvest size.

The idea is to get at constructing an index of recruitment, and so, rather than looking at larvae coming in, where between a larval lobster settling out and then growing up to be caught in the fishery, there are a number of years going on, and there's a lot of stuff that can happen, and we're interested in those sizes that are just below legal size, and so, the next time they molt, they will be large enough to be caught in the fishery, legally. Those are the ones that we're targeting, and that's where we want to build an index of recruitment, on data from lobsters of that size.

Another survey that's gone on for a number of years is the larval fish survey, and this involves a lot of different species and a lot of different laboratories and a lot of different people. They're out on the big NOAA ships, and they are sampling in this area in the Virgin Islands, down including the British Virgin Islands, down to Saba Bank and beyond, and also eastern Puerto Rico.

 What they're interested in is using larval fish as a tool to study the ecosystem, and so they want to identify nursery areas. They want to look at things like how are the different populations connected and where are the recruits potentially coming from, and all of this would feed into stock assessments. The project has gone on since 2007, and there was a little bit of a break in sampling from 2011 to 2015, and then it continued in 2015 to 2018, and a cruise was planned this past spring, but

that has been put on hold, because of, again -- Everything is on hold, as we all know, because of COVID, and, again, it's multiagency, and it involves the University of the Virgin Islands, DPNR, the University of Miami, and NOAA staff as well.

They are using these plankton nets to collect the larvae, and they're collecting a whole array of physical oceanographic data, like information on currents and temperature and salinity and those sorts of thing, and they are also recording sargassum events. They are interested in a number of different families, wrasses, parrotfish, snapper, dolphinfish, tuna, reef fish, as well as the pelagic fish.

They have done nine surveys and collected oceanographic data during those cruises as well as the plankton tows. These data have been provided both to you all, the council, as well as the University of the Virgin Islands, DPNR, to NOAA, to other academic partners, and that has resulted in a number of scientific publications, and the results of these surveys have also been presented at both national and international conferences.

Again, the other initiative, begun by the council, that has focused our energies a bit has been EBFM work, and so, at the Miami Lab, Mandy Karnauskas has hired a contractor, and she is looking at producing an ecosystem status report, and this involves identifying a suite of indicators, and those can provide an overview of the current state of the ecosystem, and this can also provide guidance on whether ecosystem-level objectives are being met, and so here's a process for the Caribbean, and some of you may have seen this already, but this is just sort of a flow chart of where ecosystem status reports fit into ecosystem-based management.

 So far in the project, they have completed compiling this list of fisheries objectives, and they are ongoing in scoring conceptual models, and then, in the future, it will be to actually calculate the indicators and put together the status report. I am grossly oversimplifying this, and so my apologies. I think Mandy might be on the line, and so, if you've got questions about this, by all means, please ask, and I will turn the mic over to her.

Some other activities, and, again, this is work by Ron Hill and Jennifer Doerr that fit in pretty well with ecosystem-level activities, and they are looking at some things like restoration of Acroporid hybrids, and there have been two projects there, and both were in the northern Virgin Islands, and they have also

looked at -- I mentioned this earlier, but this queen conch contaminant study in Salt River Bay, and they have looked at -- They have done some passive acoustic monitoring of spawning grouper aggregations, looking at the effectiveness of MPAs and seasonal closures, and that's been in partnership with the University of Puerto Rico.

4 5

There has also been a lot of socioeconomic studies, and this is in Puerto Rico, and this has been driven -- Again, this is sort of the pandemic and natural-disaster-driven work, and the National COVID-19 Impact Assessment, and this is an ongoing project by the social science research group in Miami. They are collecting data in Puerto Rico that they think they will have completed by the end of this month, or early September, and they are trying to get 300 respondents, and these include commercial fishers, for-hire operators, and others involved in fishing businesses.

They have already had a number of, I think -- Well, quite a few very brief and very qualitative interviews with some of these stakeholders, and so they have interviewed eighteen processors, 233 commercial fishers, and eleven charter operators. The social scientists have asked me to request that the Puerto Rican for-hire operators please respond to their survey. They would like to increase this eleven to a much higher number.

There were also some surveys completed on the impacts to fishermen on the Hurricane Maria impact. There is a publication that is currently available, and it will be coming out in Coastal Management as a peer-reviewed article, and I think that's in review, or perhaps in press.

There's another project involved with the SSRG, the social science research group, where they're doing a census of commercial fishers. That's ongoing, and they think that will be completed in January of 2021.

 There are similar projects in the U.S. Virgin Islands, again by the social science group in Miami, and, again, the COVID-19 impact assessment, and also hurricane impact assessment, and this work has, of course, been completed, and there was a follow-on in 2019, and those results are currently being drafted for publication, and so there were two surveys, the initial one immediately following the hurricanes and then another one last year.

There is also a creel survey, and these data were collected in 2016 and 2017, and that is currently under review as a NOAA tech

memo, and they anticipate will be out later in the year.

There is other work that Science Center staff is involved with. One, as I mentioned earlier, in Puerto Rico, there was the MRIP, or the Marine Recreational Information Program, that had been sampling recreational fishers for a number of years, and that came to an end during 2017, and there is now a planning committee on getting that renewed and restarted, and Science Center staff are involved in that, in that effort.

We also have, ongoing as part of a broader NOAA initiative, benthic mapping in the Caribbean, and so the NOAA ships will go down and map the bottom of the ocean around the islands, using a variety of instruments, and Science Center staff are serving on planning teams to prioritize where that mapping should happen, and this mapping is important for designing fishery-independent surveys like those in Puerto Rico that we saw the video of and some of the other slides.

Science Center staff also serve on SEAMAP-C planning committees, and so they're working with scientists in the region, in Puerto Rico and in the Virgin Islands, on planning for how best to utilize SEAMAP-C monies, and so there's a lot of stuff going on.

This is not complete, and what we reviewed is -- I am probably missing a few folks who are doing work down there, and my apologies to them, if they ever find out that I forgot them, but I tried to be as inclusive as possible, and so, again, there are a number of projects. There is landings and size composition projects in Puerto Rico and in the Virgin Islands, and there is life history projects, and there are ecosystem kinds of projects, and there is gear selectivity projects, and there is fishery-independent surveys, a number of them. There is socioeconomic studies, and so there's a lot going on, a lot of balls in the air, a lot of folks doing work down there, and so this amount of work -- It was not lost on us that we need to have a little coordination.

 I will wrap this up with talking about our strategic planning initiative, and I know that you all have one as well, and, over the next several years, our goal is to develop a strategic plan for data collection in the U.S. Caribbean.

 Initially, that will involve Science Center staff that are involved in U.S. Caribbean work, many of the names you saw at the beginning, and the planning process will continue by including SERO Regional Office staff, council staff, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands scientists, academics in the region,

academics who are working in the region, and other stakeholders.

4 5

I am very interested to learn what all is going on with the strategic planning that you all have initiated and how that might tie into what we're doing. We recognize that we don't operate in a vacuum, and we don't want to operate in a vacuum. We want everybody involved, so that we can come up with the best way forward to get the kinds of data that will inform the management decisions that you all have to make.

I probably ran very long, but you guys were way ahead, and so I don't feel too badly about that, and I'm happy to take any questions. Again, I am not the lead on many of these studies, and I'm more familiar with others, but I will try and answer questions as best I can, and so thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin. That was a great presentation, and that's a good way to see all the work that has been done in the Caribbean, and I would like to start the questions as an example of things that, for me, is very important, like on the selectivity.

22 23

You mentioned the national coral reef monitoring, that they do the transects, and, for sure, some of those overlap with trap fishing areas, areas where traps are used, and that's a question, and that can be used to get some selectivity information out of that? That's the first question.

 KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yes, absolutely, and so, if you've got divers in the water, they are going to see -- They may see some sizes of fish that are not caught by the gear, and so selectivity -- A lot of things can operate on selectivity, of course, and so there is not only what is captured by the gear, but there is what is retained by the fishermen, and so, if they have a particular size range that gets them a better price, if it's a commercial fisher, or, if it's a recreational fisher and there's a minimum size, they're affected by that.

They may have a bag limit, and so they may catch them and have to release them, because they've got too many, and so there may be some decisions about which sizes to keep based on that, and so there's a lot going on with what's captured by the gear and what makes it to the dock, but that's not affecting the divers in the same way.

They are going to see different sizes that maybe you don't see caught by gear, and so that's one of the reasons why, in the lobster gear selectivity, we're very interested in having that complementary diver survey, and the reef fish diver survey can serve a similar purpose, especially because they have got that deepwater component, where maybe there are bigger fish deeper, and so, yes, it very much can inform selectivity and what we know about selectivity.

5 6 7

8 9

2 3

4

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, and one last question, and I will have a follow-up on the selectivity later on with you, and I have another question, but the survey for the charter will be done via email or telephone?

10 11 12

The survey for the charters for which one, the KEVIN MCCARTHY: one with the social scientists?

13 14 15

MARCOS HANKE: Correct.

16 17

18

19

KEVIN MCCARTHY: I am not sure, but what I can do is I can have them get in touch with you directly, and they can -- I think that it is -- I honestly don't know, Marcos, and I don't want to

20 21 22

MARCOS HANKE: No, I don't want to put you on the spot, and don't worry.

23 24 25

26 27

28

KEVIN MCCARTHY: They will get in touch with you and figure out -- I think that they perhaps mailed out surveys, and these are the return rate, but I'm just guessing at that, and I will have them get in touch with you, so that you guys can figure that out.

29 30 31

MARCOS HANKE: I am willing to help too, and thank you.

32 33

KEVIN MCCARTHY: They would love to hear that.

34 35

MARCOS HANKE: Does anybody else want to make any questions?

36 37

MIGUEL ROLON: You have Edward Schuster that has a question.

38 39

40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

EDWARD SCHUSTER: Hi, Kevin. You mentioned that you're going to do several dives in St. Croix, and are you -- Do you plan on incorporating fishermen to do these dives, because, some of the depths that you're talking about, the fishers won't be -- The depths that you're going to pick, 150 feet, especially looking for lobster, I don't think some of the divers are going to qualify to do this, and so are you going to -- Are you going to have an outside contractor, because you're going to need the fishermen's participation, so not to have this kind of pushback

48 from fishers. 1 2

4 5

KEVIN MCCARTHY: That project, particularly for the lobsters, there is -- That diving component of that project is, because it's that deep dive and it's more technical, and it's not what most people do, that's going to be with some of the technical divers from the National Park Service, as well as the University of the Virgin Islands, and so those are the folks that are going to be doing that diving.

The trap side of things, it's Nicole Angeli's staff, and so they're going to be doing the trap side of that, and so they are -- We haven't really worked out all the details, because we're kind of on hold, because of COVID, but they're going to head up that trap side of things, and so I think what we're going to discuss anyway, is what is the effective way to get the fishers involved in this project, so that we get some buy-in, because I agree with you completely.

We want to do this in a way that everybody knows what's going on and everybody understands the why we're doing it and how it's beneficial, and so that diving side is -- You're right that that's beyond the limits of what most people do, and so that's going to be these technical divers, but the trap side of things is something that we'll be working with the staff, the DFW staff down there, to make sure that fishers are informed, because you guys -- We're going to need your expertise to say this is a good place to catch lobster, or, if you want big lobsters, go over here. If you want a different size, go over there.

I want to have input from everybody, and so, yes, this is --Again, there is no sense really getting started until we see how the COVID-19 situation is going to pan out, and so we've got some extensions on the money, so that we have all of next year to spend it on this project, and so we can't put people out in the field, and we can't have meetings with fishers until we've got all that sorted out, so we know what the pandemic is going to do, and I definitely want to get your input.

EDWARD SCHUSTER: Right, but this is the question. I mean, you said you're using DPNR's expertise on the trap side of it. Who in there, in DFW, has the expertise of setting traps, for lobster especially? I mean, you have people that have more than a decade, or two or three, in fishing for lobsters, that should be utilized to have accurate and correct data.

There is places that you go during certain times of the year, because they have done this for decades, tracking the lobsters

of when they move, and so, if DFW goes, and they just randomly pick spots using -- I know what's going to be said, is using the CFR, the commercial catch report forms, and that is not -- That is not what you want to use. You want to use the fishers' expertise in doing something like this.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right, and I agree completely. I mean, that was just a bullet to remind me to acknowledge who is doing which side of the project, and so we haven't made any decisions about how the fishers will be involved. We know that we need that expertise in designing this study, and we know that it's not good enough to just have the information from the catch forms, because those areas are too big to be able to say just put the trap out here in this two-and-a-half-by-two-and-a-half-square-mile grid.

We know that, and we know that we need to have you all more involved, to get your expertise, but that hasn't been figured out yet, because we're on hold because of COVID, and so, no, we absolutely plan on getting you all involved to get the information about how best to do this.

We understand the statistical side of things, but you guys are the experts in the actual doing it, getting out there and where do you put the traps and what kinds of traps. You know, there are lots of different traps used in the fishery, and we want to make sure that we're getting a representative sample of those different kinds of traps. There's a lot that we need to talk about.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, Nicole Angeli would like to answer to those questions, and that should be followed by Julian and Graciela.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Nicole.

 NICOLE ANGELI: Thank you. Kevin really just explained what I was going to say, that we haven't started those conversations with where and how we'll be doing the studies, but we'll be working with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, to make sure that we have a robust sampling design, and we've been very explicit that that needs to include fisher input, because we know that the CCRs are not representative, and that's part of this project and why it's so exciting and we're so grateful and thankful for the opportunity, and so thank you so much, everyone.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Julian.

1 2

4 5

JULIAN MAGRAS: Just to piggyback on what Ed Schuster had to say there earlier, and it's something that the fishers have preached for a very, very long time, but, without the participation of the fishermen, this study is not going anywhere. It might go somewhere for you guys, but, when it comes to give a report, it's going to be an inaccurate report, because, number one, right now, Fish and Wildlife is not in no position, staff-wise or equipment-wise, to set traps that the fishers are actually using, because they don't even know the different types of traps that fishermen use for fishing for lobster and to target fish.

I am very excited to see, Kevin, this presentation, because it's going to help us to close a lot of the loopholes that are out there, but you must ensure that the fishers have full involvement in this project, or else we're going to fight to shut it down with the reports.

The Fishermen's Association for St. Thomas and St. John, in its group, we have a lot of divers, and we have a lot of trap fishers, and we have a lot of lobster fishers, everything, and we are versed in all different areas, and we will be more than happy to sit down to the table and discuss being part of this study, and, first, like how everyone else will be paid to be part of this project, and the fishers would also like to be paid to be part of this project, since we're the ones that are always affected with the outcomes. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Julian, you're absolutely right that, because it's a gear selectivity study, if we don't have the gear that is used in the fishery, it won't matter, and it won't provide us information, and so we have to be putting out the kinds of traps that are used in the fishery, and I get it. There are lots of different designs, but we need to -- That's one of the reasons why we need to meet with the fishers and figure out those kinds of details.

Which gears are being used, and, I mean, down to the dimensions and all of the details of the trap itself, and, again, I know there are lots of different kinds, but we've got to come up with a suite of the different kinds of traps that are used, and we've got to know where to put them, so that we're doing this in a way where we get back meaningful information. Those details are not lost on us, and we absolutely look forward to working with the fishers on this project.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin, and thank you, Julian. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Kevin, thank you very much for that presentation, and thank you to the Science Center for all the work that you are doing. We are also collaborating, the council is, through the Coral Reef Conservation Program grant, with the commercial fishers, and so we have already started going out with commercial fishers to look at deepwater snapper fish communities and turning the fishers knowledge into scientific language.

I think that we are all on the same page, and, more importantly, all this work will serve a lot for the ecosystem-based approach that we are trying to implement, and so we'll be touch, and we have been in touch, with most of the PIs that Kevin mentioned, and we have learned about new ones that we didn't know about, and so we'll be making sure that all of this information is included, and I was going to request from the council that this presentation be also given to the TAP and to the SSC at some point, because I think it's extremely pertinent. Thank you.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks, Graciela. Just a couple of comments on that, if I may. One, you are absolutely right that everything that I showed here, the data from those studies, can, in one way or another, fit into EBFM, and the other thing that I would say is that you are talking with the fishers and doing deepwater snapper work and that sort of thing, and that just points right back to the need for this sort of all-inclusive strategic planning, when it comes to how do we best collect data in the region, and making sure that we're doing complementary work rather than reinventing the wheel every time someone goes out there, because Researcher A hasn't referred to what Researcher B is doing, and they end up both spending money to do the same thing, which isn't always bad, but, in a world of limited resources, collaboration is going to be the key.

That's why we're really pushing forward with this strategic planning initiative and that, over time, that will involve scientists in the region and stakeholders and everybody else who we can get to the table.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Kevin. We are getting to lunchtime, and I wanted to just make a comment along the same lines, attesting that we are moving more to include the fishermen in the scientific work in many ways.

If you guys remember, we presented an initiative made by the

lobster fishermen that made a report to the council, and that report was just the beginning of it, and we have very valuable information, and I would invite the St. Thomas Fishing Association to explore a similar initiative that will be helpful for them to have more accurate information and engage in those processes a little more effectively and in a very productive manner, and I'm available to help, with all the materials we created in Puerto Rico, if it's useful. Thank you to all. Thank you, Kevin, for your great presentation, and we are ready for lunch. It's 12:00 sharp. Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Just for the record, Graciela will coordinate with the chairs of the DAPs and the SSC to include this presentation at the next meeting of those two bodies.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. We are ready for lunchtime, and the lunchtime is -- We will be back at 1:00, and it's 12:00 sharp. Thank you to all, and I will see you guys at 1:00. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on August 11, 2020.)

August 11, 2020

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

The Caribbean Fishery Management Council reconvened via webinar on Tuesday afternoon, August 11, 2020, and was called to order at 1:00 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Marcos Hanke.

MARCOS HANKE: Good afternoon, everyone. We're going to restart the meeting. It's 1:00 p.m. on August 11. This is the $170^{\rm th}$ CFMC Council Meeting. Vanessa, whenever you have something in the chat that is important to say, please say it on the record, for the benefit of everybody and to be part of the record.

She has a comment on the previous discussion, after the presentation of Kevin McCarthy, and she stated to ensure that the way to contact fishermen for participation comes from someone that they trust by area. For the fishermen's association, we will be available to work with you. Thanks. This is what she said on the chat. The next item on the agenda is --

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: One more comment. I don't know if Kevin is back, but if you can tell the people at the Science Center that the DNER has provided us with communication, and to the general public, so that scientific work can begin following certain restrictions that they have, and you need a COVID plan, et cetera, but we already have scientists on the water working with fishers, thanks to Damaris and the Secretary, that put together the communication. We wrote a letter, and they are able to get the boats out in the water and actually be working. Thank you.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Graciela. The next item on the agenda is already covered by Miguel in his ED's Report, and we - I am a little lost here. Then the next item will be the five-year strategic plan, and it was already covered by Miguel Rolon in the ED Report, and we're going to pass to the gear discussion of allowable gear types.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, do you want to begin with Jocelyn's presentation or Pauco. Is he online?

MIGUEL ROLON: Let's hear from Jocelyn first, and then we will follow with Marcos and Pauco, Mr. Font.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Jocelyn.

GEAR DISCUSSION: ALLOWABLE GEAR TYPES

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Okay. Thank you. I was going to give a brief presentation just on the authorized gears, and I know this has come up a couple of different times, where folks have been asking which gears they can use, and so I'm just going to go over that for one specific area.

We're going to look at the gears that can be used when fishing for the managed reef fish commercially, using longline and hook-and-line. Then, at the end, we'll also talk about some prohibited gears and methods and then note the gear and anchoring restrictions that exist by area.

 These are just for context, and these are the reef fish species that would be managed under the Puerto Rico FMP, and then I also have slides on the reef fish species that would be managed under the St. Thomas/St. John FMP and the St. Croix FMP, and so that's the gears that we're talking about when you're fishing for these species in the hook-and-line fisheries. I have also noted the species that would be new to management, and so these would be the managed species if these FMPs are approved by the Secretary,

and they are pending before the Secretary right now.

4 5

The next slide shows St. Thomas and St. John, and then the next slide shows St. Croix, and so that's just for context, and then, if you go to the next slide, there is a table in the regulations that lists the gears that are authorized for the fisheries, and, right now, the way that the fishery is defined is the Caribbean Reef Fish FMP fishery, and then they have the different components of the fishery.

For the longline and hook-and-line fishery, those are the gears that are authorized when fishing for those managed reef fish. The Fisheries Service is in the process of preparing a proposed rule to implement the island-based FMPs, and so this table is going to get updated, and it will look a little bit different. It will have the Puerto Rico fishery, the St. Thomas/St. John fishery, and the St. Croix fishery, and then we'll note when it's fishing for reef fish, and we'll make the appropriate adjustments.

Right now, if you were to look in the table, and I have provided the citation, it would say the longline and hook-and-line fishery for the managed reef fish, and so those are the gears that we're going to be talking about.

These have specific definitions for these fisheries, and I have just provided those on the next slide. First, with longline, longline is a line that is deployed horizontally, and we have bottom longlines and pelagic longlines, and we've been speaking about bottom longlines, and this is the definition in the regulations.

It's a line that is deployed or capable of being deployed to maintain contact with the ocean bottom, and so that's what is important there. Something might -- You might think you have a particular gear, but, if it's capable of maintaining that contact with the bottom, it actually could be considered a bottom longline, and that's important, because, as we know, we have some limits on where bottom longlines can be used, and then pelagic longlines are in the water column. At the bottom there, I have just provided citations for where you find those definitions.

On the next slide, we have a definition of hook-and-line, and so the regulations actually list a number of different types of gears as hook-and-line, and so, again, on that earlier slide, the gears that are allowed in this particular fishery are the longline and hook-and-line, and then hook-and-line is more specifically stated, and so it's automatic reel, bandit gear, buoy gear, handline, longline, and rod-and-reel.

Here, I have put the definition of buoy gear from the regulations, and, in bold, I have put a number of the specific requirements for buoy gear. It is pretty specific, as you can see, and so it has to be fished vertically, and there's a single drop line descended from a float, no more than ten hooks, and the weight has a limit, and so it's no more than ten pounds, and it has to be free-floating and not connected to other gear or the vessel, and then there's a requirements for the length of the drop line, and so it's no greater than two-times the depth of the water being fished, and then there's a limit as to where the hooks can be placed, and so the hooks attached to the drop line no more than thirty feet from the weighted terminal end.

Those are just the ones that I was kind of highlighting, but, obviously, if you were reading along, you can see there's requirements for the type of material that it can be made out of, and so, when we've been discussing some specific gear issues, we've been looking at whether it meets the definition of buoy gear or whether the gear would be on the bottom and can be considered bottom longline, and those are the ones that we have primarily been talking about in various conversations we've had, but, for completeness, I have provided the definition of the other hook-and-line gears.

On the next slide, we have a definition of automatic reel and bandit gear, and so, for automatic reel, the reel remains attached to the vessel, and, for bandit gear, the rod-and-reel remain attached to the vessel. Otherwise, it seems that they are pretty similar. Then, finally, on the next slide, we have the remaining hook-and-line gears defined, and so we have handline and rod-and-reel.

 The gear table operates to say which gears can be used, and so we're talking, again, about commercially fishing for the managed reef fish in the longline and hook-and-line fishery, and so, if you're not using any of those types of longline or hook-and-line gear, then that gear would be prohibited, and so, in that instance, the regulations set forth a specific process, if you wanted to use a different gear.

 There is a fisher notification process, where the fisher notifies the council of the intent to use the gear, and there is specific requirements for that notice, and then the council will refer that notice to the Regional Administrator within the National Marine Fisheries Service that can take action to either

allow or prohibit the gear, or, after ninety days, if no action is taken to prohibit the use of that gear, the fisher can use that gear.

If someone is interested in using a gear that is not one of the gears that we have just discussed within that specific component of the fishery, the council could amend the FMP to allow the use of those gears, or you could amend the definition of the gears, if you thought of a different definition that more appropriately meant the way that the gear is being fished in the fishery.

On the next page, I am just noting some general prohibitions, again for completeness, because that gear table -- If the gear is not listed there, it's prohibited, but that gear table doesn't change the FMP-specific regulations, and so, if there's any additional prohibitions, we need to check there, so that we have some specific prohibitions in the regulations implementing the FMP. We can't use explosives, and that's for all target species, and we can't use poisons or drugs or other chemicals when fishing for reef fish, and we can't use powerheads when fishing for reef fish, and we can't use gillnets and trammel nets when fishing for the managed reef fish.

Then, finally, we have some area prohibitions, and so these are the ones that we have talked about before as well, that fishing with pots, traps, bottom longlines, gillnets, or trammel nets is not allowed year-round in these specific areas, and we have the mutton snapper spawning aggregation area, which is defined in the regulations, some red hind spawning aggregation areas off of St. Croix and off of Puerto Rico, no Grammanik Bank off of St. Thomas, and Bajo de Sico off of Puerto Rico.

Then we also have anchoring prohibitions by fishing vessels in Bajo de Sico and the Hind Bank Marine Conservation District, and so that's just kind of a gear overview, just to inform as background for some of the discussion on what gears are being used, and so, when we learn more about the gears that the fishers are using, we can see if it's authorized right now for the particular fishery, and, if not, what would need to be done, either modifying the gear so it fits one of these definitions or pursuing some of those other processes, if the fisher wants to notify the council of an intent to use a different gear or if the council needs to consider any modifications to the table or the description of gear that's used in the fishery. If anyone has any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for an excellent presentation, Jocelyn. Go ahead, Miguel.

1 2

4 5

MIGUEL ROLON: I propose that you go ahead with the discussion with Mr. Font, and then we can go back to the options that Jocelyn just presented to you. That way, you will save time, rather than going into questions and answers, and so we can have the question-and-answer after you decide what is it that you would like to do, and then we can go back to the slide of the actions that the council can take.

MARCOS HANKE: I understand. Mr. Font, are you there? For the rest of the participants, the letter sent by Edwin Font, and we know him as Pauco, and he's a fisherman that has collaborated with the council for many years, and it's in English, and it's available on the internet. Go ahead, Pauco.

EDWIN FONT: (Mr. Font's comments are in Spanish and were not transcribed.)

MARCOS HANKE: If you see the two pink buoys on the top, there is a small -- This is the drawing made by Pauco, and it was revised by Nelson Crespo and by Luiz Ramon and myself, and, basically, it includes all the actual elements of the gear used by the deepwater snapper.

We have the little buoy with the spool or the other line that is used by the fishermen that is detached from the boat, and it's connected to a main buoy that goes straight down on the main line, but some fishermen use sometimes one buoy, but this is the most used one, that one is expressed on the drawing.

 The buoy is from twenty-five to sixty inches around, and Pauco uses mostly the twenty-five-inch, and the little buoy is a small trap buoy, like a bullet shape, and the line is braided line, and some fishermen use other line, but mostly braided line, around 300 pounds, and there is a swivel that connects to the tackle.

If you see it, the line is vertically deployed, and it's connected to -- The mainline is contacted to the terminal tackle with a barrel swivel that has a light on it of different colors, depending on the desire of the fisherman, and, subsequent to that, there is a sequence of hooks, and a standard in the fishery is hooks around the Number 9 hook, circle hook, and the circle hook is the hook used by those fishermen, for many reasons, but one of them is that the fish get unhooked less on the way up, and it's the most effective hook to be used.

The mainline that connects each individual sequence of hooks is

about twenty feet long, and that varies a little bit, and with between fifteen to twenty hooks. The connection to the mainline is called, on the west coast of Puerto Rico, that line is -- Pauco used hundred-pound monofilament, and some fishermen use a little heavier line. Like I said, the mainline, the connected hooks are around 300 pounds too, and here is something that is very important and shows the evolution of this gear over time.

4 5

For your benefit, in the letter sent by Pauco, he described the historical use of the previous gears that are not used anymore, and I invite you to read the letter that he sent that is on the record already, on the internet, but, anyway on the terminal tackle on the end, we have another 300-pound swivel, and you have a weaker line that allows for the -- If the weight gets stuck, it will break, and some fishermen, nowadays a lot of them, use the line connected on the other end of the weight, and with a little piece of string or a degradable piece of line to the top, because it's an extra protection, in case the weights get stuck, and that weak line breaks away, and the weight inverts itself and is not free.

This is extremely efficient, and be mindful that the fishermen just -- They are protecting the bottom habitat, but the intention is to go fishing and not to lose so many hooks and so many terminal tackle and all the fishes that was connected to it, and this is very effective on protecting the bottom and making the gear effective for the fishermen.

 The weight, it's very common to use steel rods, or construction bars, attached together and to be a long weight of twelve or fourteen inches, and twelve inches is what Pauco described in this drawing, and between eight pounds is what Pauco uses, and eight to ten pounds is what some other fishermen use, and that is the description and the drawing that we have in front of you. Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, in order to organize the discussion, the first question to Pauco is how many fishers does he know that fish this gear, and, second, a question to Jocelyn whether this gear at this time is allowed with present regulations.

Let me repeat again. There are two questions that we should address to go ahead with the discussion, and the number one question is how many fishers, Pauco, or anybody on the line, knows that fish this gear. Number two, the question to Jocelyn is whether this gear is allowed under the present set of regulations that she just mentioned before, and then the third question would be what the council would like to do, and I have

here that Nelson Crespo would like to address some part of the presentation by Mr. Font.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Just to follow-up on your guidance, Pauco.

PAUCO FONT: (Mr. Font's response was in Spanish and was not transcribed.)

MARCOS HANKE: Nelson, did you have a comment?

NELSON CRESPO: First, to Miguel's question, I've got to tell you that we have much more fishermen that use this type of fishing gear than the ones that are old with the special permit. Contrary to other fishing gears that crowd along the bottom, plucking coral fans and getting stuck on the bottom, when we combine it with the buoys, this gear acts as a spring that lifts the weight and moves the line to another place, with the current and with the weights, and that's what we call hopping.

For this reason, this equipment losses due to getting stuck on the bottom are minimal, and the possible damage to the seabed is almost zero, and I have seen the pollution since I was a kid, and I started fishing deepwater snapper since I was twelve years old, and I have got to tell you that it is the least harmful fishing gear for the deepwater snapper group.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson. The other question, Miguel, was for Jocelyn, correct?

MIGUEL ROLON: You have Vanessa and you have Graciela that want to ask a question to Pauco.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Vanessa, go ahead.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Marcos. First, I want to give Pauco my support. I have been looking at this since 2016, when I had the -- We worked together on the MREP, and so I think that, in these three questions, we have something important. First, for how many fishermen we have, at least in Cabo Rojo, I can say that I have twelve of them, but, as Pauco says, I think that the best person in here that can say that is the one that works in the lab and gets the statistics of them.

Also, when I use to work with Russell's Fish Market, we have the line in Rincon and Anasco, and we have like seven or ten fishermen from that area, and so I think that, as Pauco says, in the west, this is the one that they are using, all of the

fishermen that go for the deep snappers.

4 5

The second, if this is permitted or not, I think that we have already seen the presentation of the gears, but, as we already know, some things that work in the Gulf don't necessarily work in the Caribbean, and so I suggest that we take the information and this great presentation and this letter that Pauco made for us, to be sure that the commercial fishermen are here about the problem that they are having, and we should analyze it, and, to the other council members, read the letter and support our commercial fishermen. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vanessa. Next is Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One of the things that the staff has been doing has been looking around to see if we can find information on the description of the gears that are used in the local fisheries, and, in speaking to the people who actually conducted some of these surveys back in the 1980s, there hasn't been an update on the description of fishing gear at least for twenty years.

One of the things that would need to be done is to actually have a description of all the gears that are being used, because, when they come to the landings, they all could get tangled together, and everything is reported under line gear or something like that, and so it's really difficult to document the changes in the gears and how they make it more efficient and less damaging to the habitat when we don't have that information at hand.

Having heard from the Science Center earlier today, and having heard from Pauco and Vanessa on the issues with the gear, I think it would be timely to be thinking about some research or some report on the description of these gears from both Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Graciela.

 MIGUEL ROLON: Now is where you need to have the key discussion. If you look at the regulations that we have now, all this gear is illegal, because you have more than ten hooks and all that, and so this is when we need to ask Jocelyn that, if the council decides to modify the present regulations in any way or form, first, can we do it, and, second, how long will it take for the council to make the change?

If we have a regulatory framework that allows us to do that,

it's kind of easy. If we have to amend the present management plans, you can do so, but we also will encounter, hopefully, the approval of the island-based FMPs in 2021, and so my two questions to Jocelyn, for the sake of the discussion, is, one, is this gear allowable, and, second, if not, what are the chances of the council being able to modify the present regulations to make this a legal gear for this type of fishery?

4 5

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thanks, Miguel. Would it be possible to show the gear as well as the eighth slide in the presentation, which is the definition of buoy gear, so we could see them at the same time?

NATALIA PERDOMO: I don't have Jocelyn's presentation. Liajay was the one who was projecting it.

MIGUEL ROLON: Liajay or Graciela, can you do it?

19 LIAJAY RIVERA: Which slide would it be?

MIGUEL ROLON: It's the one that Jocelyn presented with the definitions. Liajay, can you put the drawing next to it?

LIAJAY RIVERA: I will need a second, because I don't have the picture right now on hand, but I have it --

NATALIA PERDOMO: I will send it to you.

LIAJAY RIVERA: Please do. Thank you.

 MIGUEL ROLON: In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, this is the crux of the discussion, and there is also the part about anchoring that we can also discuss in the same way, and so, when we finish, you will have a clear indication of what we can be done regarding the gear and what can be done, if anything, regarding the anchoring in the Grammanik Bank and any other place.

 The other thing that will be a corollary to this is the compatible regulations, because, in the case of Puerto Rico, we have Bajo de Sico with one regulation from the local government and another one from the federal government, and the fishermen are always asking when can you fix this, so we have only one regulation, set of regulations, for Bajo de Sico, and it creates confusion, and Mr. Font, for example, has been intervened a couple of times, and other fishers, while they were in the EEZ.

PAUCO FONT: (Mr. Font's comment was in Spanish and was not transcribed.)

1 2

MIGUEL ROLON: We would like for Jocelyn to continue her answer to the question, now that we have both the drawing and the narrative on the screen.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for putting those together, and I think this just allows us to see the regulatory definition of buoy gear and then the gear that is being used. As Miguel noted, one of the limits for something to be considered buoy gear is that it can't have more than ten hooks, and so that would be a limiting factor, and, from the drawing and the discussion, it seems like fishers are using between fifteen and twenty hooks, and so that's more than the number of hooks to be considered buoy gear, and so, on that alone, it wouldn't meet the definition of buoy gear.

There is some other requirements here that I think are met, that it's a single drop line descended from the float, and the weight is the correct size, no more than ten pounds, and it looks like this is not constructed of cable or wire, and then there's the limit on the length of the line, and so we haven't really heard much about that, but it says a drop line can't be greater than two-times the depth of the water being fished, and then the hooks must be attached to the drop line no more than thirty feet from the terminal end, and so it looks like the hooks are close to the terminal end, but those two requirements, the length of the line and the placement of the hooks, they're getting at trying to avoid this gear from dragging on the bottom.

 When we've talked about this gear before, a lot of the conversation was about whether it was a bottom longline, and I know Nelson mentioned that the gear doesn't drag on the bottom and it bounces, and it's important to make sure that the gear doesn't drag on the bottom, because then it becomes bottom longline gear, because, on the previous slide, where I had the definition of bottom longline gear, it says that it's deployed, or capable of being deployed, to maintain contact with the bottom, and so we don't want the gear dragging along the bottom.

If it's not bottom longline gear, then it might qualify as buoy gear, but, here, it looks like we have that hook limit that we're running into, and then, if the fishers could speak to the length of the line, that would be important to know. Does it meet that requirement that the line is not greater than two-times the depth of the water being fished?

MARCOS HANKE: I will give the opportunity to Edwin and Nelson to comment on this, but I want to make a comment that is very important. The gear interaction with the bottom with the bottom longline pretty much is the hooks and the setting of the terminal tackle to fish on the bottom.

Those hooks, the way it's described on the buoy gear, the deepwater snapper buoy gear, there is one hook that has proximity with the bottom, but it's not in direct interaction with the bottom, and it's not designed for that, and it's closer to the bottom, but it's not on the bottom, and that's important, and the amount of line -- I have fished for deepwater snapper before, a long time ago, and, if it's 1,000 feet, we put a few feet of line extra, depending on the current, to balance the gear in the current, but, for sure, it complies with that requirement that you stated. I would like to hear from Edwin and Nelson. Edwin, go ahead.

EDWIN FONT: (Mr. Font's comment was in Spanish and was not transcribed.)

MIGUEL ROLON: The other thing that you have to modify, if you agree, is the number of hooks, and so there are three items in the present regulation for buoy gear that you have to address, and so please spend your time addressing this part, because that's the key to the whole discussion.

 In essence, you have the depth of the lines, or the length of the lines, that comply with the depths required. The weight, so far, Mr. Font's weight is only eight pounds, and so it's okay, but you have to also ask whether this would be twelve pounds rather than ten, and then the number of hooks, from ten, if you look at the drawing on the left, you have fifteen to twenty hooks, and so you need to also address this part. Thank you, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. We have Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Regarding the amount of hooks, it's very important that we are modifying this gear. Since the beginning, we started using between forty and fifty hooks, and now we are going down to twenty, and it's very important, that number of hooks, because the type of fishing we do is only for a few hours, and we have to fight with the currents and the water conditions, and sometimes we only have one hour or two hours during the day to do our work. The rest of the day, we are just waiting to fish, and that's the importance of the hooks.

Thinking about this, if there's one way, and I am asking Jocelyn, to assign another type of gear on the regulatory amendment or something that can deal with this issue.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: I think in terms of, if you want to have a change, you're going to have to change the definition of buoy gear as it applies in the U.S. Caribbean, and so this gear definition actually is in the section of the regulations that defines the gear for the Gulf of Mexico, the South Atlantic, and the Caribbean.

You could say, in the U.S. Caribbean, buoy gear means, and then change the definition in a way that fits the way the gear is used, and, right now, it looks like it's just that hook requirement, or you could define a new gear, and so you could define deepwater snapper buoy gear, and you could set forth a definition there. I just would encourage you to consider putting in some of these specifics that make sure that it's not used as a bottom longline, because that was motivating the requirements here.

Then Miguel had asked about process, if the council wanted to go the amendment route, and so we're in the position now where we have island-based FMPs that the council has submitted for approval by the Secretary of Commerce. Those FMPs are before the Secretary, and the decision needs to be made in September, by the end of September, and so, at that point in time, those FMPs likely will be approved, but they haven't been yet, and so, if they are approved, we could amend the definitions in the island-based FMPs.

 We probably don't want to begin a process to try to amend the regulations that are implementing the Reef Fish FMP, because we have less than eight weeks, probably, where those are going to be in place, and, again, we don't know if the plans are going to be approved, but, if they are, then then would replace the Reef Fish FMP, and so, in terms of the process for that amendment, there is different types of amendments that the council would pursue, and this would be just a regular plan amendment to redefine the gears for the fishery, and, again, you could modify that definition of buoy gear, or you could come up with another type of gear and name for it and define it that way.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, you have Maria Lopez and Richard Appeldoorn waiting for a turn to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Maria.

MARIA LOPEZ: I just have a question regarding if this gear is also used in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and, if it is, and if they are interested in also making these changes, because now, as Jocelyn mentioned, this is going to be an amendment to the island-based FMPs, and we need to decide if this is something that would apply to them as well. Thank you.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos or Julian or Tony?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: We would definitely want to jump on that bandwagon for our St. Croix FMP, and that's the same gear that the St. Croix fishers use for deepwater snapper, queen snapper and silk snapper. The only difference there is that we use a single twenty-five-inch or sixty-inch buoy, but we use twenty-two hooks, or twenty hooks, and it's the same type of gear. It's bouncing on the bottom, and it doesn't drag, because they don't want it to snag and lose their gear, and so they don't allow it to drag, and so we would like to amend the FMP whenever it's signed, so that we can get it to be compatible to what the fishers use presently, in our FMP also.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have Julian and then Richard.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Good afternoon. I agree with what Carlos Farchette just said and the recommendation from the fishers of Puerto Rico, and I think it's a great opportunity, and, from listening to the lawyer, I think the best way to go about it is to create a new name for this type of fishing, to make it a lot easier, and then just add in the basic requirements and language, and that would be the way to go.

I see this as being a more practical way for the deepwater fishers, even though we have very few here in St. Thomas, but it's a fishery that is exploitable, and so I think it's a great idea for us to move forward with this.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian.

41 MIGUEL ROLON: You have Dr. Richard Appeldoorn.

MARCOS HANKE: Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you. I am a little concerned about the weight bouncing along the bottom and how this fits into your definitions relative to prohibitions on bottom fishing. That is targeting that you don't want to catch fish on the bottom, and

maybe that's okay, if the regulations are trying to protect habitat, and I don't know how this fits in, but I think it's a question that, when you define it, and you have prohibitions on the use of bottom gear, whether this would fit in or not fit in, and so I think you have to work that into your definition.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, if I may.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. The easiest way to do this is just to change the number of hooks, because you won't surprise anybody with a new name. The buoy gear is already -- It went through the whole process of being defined and everything, and, if you look at the drawing that you have here, the only change that you need is the number of hooks, and so it will be easier to make the amendment, and you, from the record, will be amending the three island-based FMPs at the same time, simultaneously, and this is important that, when you finish today, you allow the people -- That you will know what it -- Then I have Jocelyn has asked for a turn to speak.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you. If the fishers were using ten hooks or fewer, then it would be buoy gear, and that would be an authorized gear. If there's a need to use more hooks, and that's what the council would like to pursue, then it could amend the definitions.

To Richard's point, the last slide, the thirteenth slide, notes the areas where fishing with pots, traps, bottom longlines, gillnets or trammel nets, is prohibited, and we can look at the reasons for putting those in place, but I think that's a good point, that, if those were to protect the bottom, the council should consider that any gear that bounces off the bottom could have similar impacts and whether you would want to expand the types of gears that can't be used in that area.

You could say that -- If you were calling this like a deepwater snapper buoy gear, you could add that to the list of gear that you might limit in those areas, if that was something that the record supported.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Jocelyn. It's a low-footprint gear compared to others, and that was the point that Pauco and Nelson brought to the table, but I agree with the observation of Richard, which is very important. Maria del Mar.

MARIA LOPEZ: I just wanted to make a comment. Like, if the

fishers make a decision to change the number of hooks, then that would also have to be considered like in terms of enforcement, if there are differences between the regulations in territorial waters and federal waters, and so that's just something to keep in mind, and that's something that we can definitely explore when we pursue that amendment, if that's what the council would like to do.

7 8 9

1

2

4 5

6

MIGUEL ROLON: You have Graciela, Marcos.

10 11

MARCOS HANKE: Graciela, go ahead.

12 13

14

1516

17

18

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: From Kevin's presentation earlier today, you saw a video of the silk snapper muddy and sandy bottom type of place, and so we are deploying video cameras in and around the areas of the silk and the queen snappers over the next year or so, and it will be recorded for Puerto Rico and St. Thomas and St. Croix, working with the local fishers and their gear.

19 20 21

22

2324

25

26

27

That information on the habitats where they are fished and the actual way that it is being fished, because that was part of what Kevin presented today, is part of the information that is being gathered, in terms of the fishing gears, and the final thing is that there are slight differences in the way that these gears are fished among the islands, and that's part of the reason why the need for the documentation that we're going to be hopefully doing in the near future. Thank you.

282930

MIGUEL ROLON: You have Jocelyn, Marcos.

31 32

MARCOS HANKE: Jocelyn, go ahead.

33 34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you. One final question about the gear is, for buoy gear, it has to be not connected to other gear or the vessel, and so it has to be free floating, and I don't know if it's ever connected to the vessel, and I know there is the reel there, and the definition of "automatic reel" would be a reel that remains attached to the vessel when in use and from which a line is paid out, and I don't know if they are ever used buoy gear and if that would be an appropriate definition of automatic interpretation of the reel, automatic reel is an authorized gear in the fishery, and so that's something else to consider, and it's sort of a factual question for persons, if they think it would be appropriate to consider a reel and the buoy attached to the vessel as automatic reel.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, Jocelyn, and, on that, that reel that you see on the drawing is the spool that goes to the electric reel on the moment of retrieval. The reel itself, the electric reel, obviously doesn't go in the water, and this gear is designed to be detached from the boat. What Pauco was explaining before, is, if they are dropping, and the weight gets to the bottom, and they have a very aggressive bite in that moment, they will operate the gear -- They could operate the gear from the boat in that moment on very special occasions, but the gear is designed to be released on the water and detached from the boat.

4 5

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, the point that Jocelyn is bringing is that, if you are going to change the island-based definition of this, you have two avenues. One is you leave the buoy gear asis and change the number of hooks, and then you need to add another gear definition, and, as Nelson is proposing, call it fishing gear for deepwater, and they you define the possibility of having this line attached to any equipment on the boat.

The question to Pauco and Nelson is do you have this gear attached to your boat by any means, in any form, aside from using the buoy? That's to Nelson and Pauco.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: How Marcos said, and the only moment when that gear is connected to the buoy is when we lift it up, and it's only special moments that, if we feel the fish biting at the moment the weight hits the bottom, we put it up right away, because we don't know the -- 99 percent of the time, that gear is drifting in the water alone.

MIGUEL ROLON: That qualifies for a retrieval of the buoy and not the actual fishing from the buoy, doesn't it, Nelson?

NELSON CRESPO: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: That's correct, Miguel. Pauco and then Carlos.

PAUCO FONT: (Mr. Font's comment was in Spanish and was not transcribed.)

MARCOS HANKE: Marcos, you have Carlos and then Roy Crabtree.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I agree with what Nelson was saying. Over on St. Croix, the fishermen don't keep that line tied to the boat or to the electric reel. They do the same thing. They pick it up and hook it on and reel it up and deploy. They deploy about

three or four of those buoys, and so, by the time they deploy the fourth one, they go back to the first one and start pulling. The only people that use electric gear and it bounces off the bottom at 1,800 feet are those fishermen that are fishing for swordfish. I also believe that all we really need to do is just change the amount of hooks in the amendment, and ten hooks is just too little.

4 5

 ${\bf MARCOS\ HANKE:}$ Okay. I have a question for Jocelyn. I am in agreement with --

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, a point of order. You have to let Roy Crabtree talk first.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. I didn't see it in the chat. Roy.

ROY CRABTREE: Well, I just was going to say that, assuming that you want to change the number of hooks to some higher number, you could do that, but the problem I see that you have is a timing one. I mean, this gear is not currently legal, and so they really need to be fishing with ten hooks or less in order to be legal, and my guess is, to do a plan amendment and change this, you're looking at next summer before it would be effective, and so that's just the reality, because you're going to have to get the island plans implemented, and then staff will have to prepare a plan amendment, and I'm not really sure that you would be able to vote that up until next spring some time, and then it has to go through a rulemaking and public comment and all, and so I don't have an opinion one way or another about the gear, but it does seem that it's going to take a good while to change this.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Roy. I have a question for Jocelyn. On the slide that you have with the possibilities of how to address this, I saw the fisher notification, and to include on the island-based FMPs as part of our development of the authorized gears under the island-based FMPs.

My question is, is it possible to look for the inclusion of the island-based FMPs of that gear, and, in the meantime, each individual fisherman that desires to submit the fisher notification, those two processes together, with the intention of allowing -- I mean, to do this faster for the fishermen, to be able to comply and to follow with a process that is quicker.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you, Marcos. On the presentation, that's Slide 11, if you could move to that. Yes, there is a

process where the fishers can notify the council of the intent to use a gear that's not listed on the gear table, and so the table lists longline and hook-and-line, and then we follow all those definitions to get to buoy gear, and, because it has more hooks than the definition of buoy gear, it's not considered buoy gear, and so the fishers could individually notify the council that they would like to use this gear, and there is a specific process set forth in the regulations, and, after ninety days, that individual could use the gear, unless action has been taken to prohibit it.

That could also spark a process to have NMFS amend the regulations to allow the use of the gear, and so you could pursue that immediately, and the fishers could submit those notices, and then those individuals might be able to use the gear sooner, and we could also be pursuing an amendment process simultaneously.

The other thing is Roy is correct that, if it's not an authorized gear, then it's unlawful fishing, and so, to remedy that, you would need to reduce the number of hooks they are using to ten for it to be considered a lawful buoy gear. Otherwise, there are other gears that the persons could use, and they could use automatic reel attached to the vessel, or some of the other hook-and-line gear, but, as it's drawn out, it's unlawful gear.

MARCOS HANKE: I understand. Let me see if I understand. If Edwin Font, which was the original fisherman that requested this, sent the -- If he notified the council about his intent of using this gear, and if we as a council requested for this gear to be included in the island-based FMPs, it's two parallel processes running.

In the meantime, Pauco, Edwin Font, receives his letter, or the determination, after the ninety days and so on, like you explained, and he will need, before that time, that authorization, to use ten hooks on the buoy until the answer arrives, and do I understand correctly?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Yes, that's correct.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. I would like to hear from Pauco and from Nelson, and you guys are the experts on this, and what I just stated is what I recommend to do, and I want to hear from you guys.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have Roy before that wants to speak

again.

MARCOS HANKE: Roy Crabtree, go ahead.

5 ROY CRABTREE: Well, I didn't have anything more.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Roy.

MIGUEL ROLON: The other thing that I was going to mention to you is that you have to be careful what you put on the record, because, right now, the gear has been illegal since the get-go, and this is not something that was invented yesterday. Actually, by Pauco's testimony here, over 90 percent of all the deepwater snappers and groupers that you get are caught with this gear.

I believe that what the council should do is to start the process of amending the process of the three-island-based FMPs, and it will take some time, as has been stated before, and that the staff will need to start working on this. From the council point of view, we need to instruct the staff to go ahead and modify what is needed to be modified.

The only thing that we need to do is to increase the number of hooks for this gear, and then so be it, and you have to tell us how many hooks you would like to have here from the drawing that you have. On the gear that you have here, on the drawing, you have fifteen to twenty hooks, and so, if that's the top, then you can say that the council would move forward to amend the three island-based FMPs to include twenty-five hooks, or no more than twenty-five hooks, per buoy.

Then you have to also reaffirm that the weight at the bottom is ten pounds or less, and you don't have to say anything else. Then the buoy gear will be modified accordingly, but you have to decide this today via a motion of some sort.

MARCOS HANKE: Nelson.

 NELSON CRESPO: I totally agree with Miguel. This gear was being used before all the regulations started, and I agree with Miguel that no more than twenty-five hooks, and that's more than enough, and it's safer for all the parts, from the environmental and from the fishermen, and so, regarding the request for an option for fishers to use other gears, well, if we have to do it, we are going through that, because we don't want to be out of business.

MARCOS HANKE: Miguel, you need a motion from any of the council members?

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, from the council members.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Pauco.

EDWIN FONT: (Mr. Font's comments were in Spanish and were not transcribed.)

MIGUEL ROLON: What the council is trying to do here with the discussion and everything that we heard is to speed up the process, and, from Roy Crabtree and Maria del Mar and others, it will take an amendment to the island-based FMPs that will be in place hopefully for the first half of 2021, next year, and then Jocelyn suggested that, for the fishers, for the time being, that the fishers should use ten hooks per gear, if this is what you're going to use.

I know that people go around thinking that I'm going to do this, and I'm going to keep using twenty-five, and, if I see somebody approaching the boat, I will detach it to the bottom and say I'm not using the gear and use a new one.

A new definition for gear is like reinventing the wheel, and so, Mr. Chairman, we need to hear from the rest of the council members and see if you have a motion to keep the discussion and then close the discussion at 2:30, or you can close it later, because you have ample time.

 MARCOS HANKE: Miguel, this has been for the fishermen of Puerto Rico, and we are ready to discuss fishermen of the other regions, and the USVI is an important issue. I'm speaking for myself, and I am not really clear on the timing, and this question is for Jocelyn. Jocelyn, I am willing to make a motion to move this forward, but I am not really clear which is the most efficient way to address this, and can you guide me on this? Is it like Miguel said, to just change it to ten hooks, and that can be done by a motion today, or we have to -- Would it be better to include it in the island-based FMPs or a new gear, or what is the most efficient way to address this, which is the intention of the council?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thanks, Marcos. I think you could ask staff to begin work on an amendment that would address this gear issue, to evaluate authorizing the gear that's been presented here, and then you could allow staff to think about which way is the best way forward, whether it would be an amendment to

increase the number of hooks in the definition of buoy gear, as it applies in the Caribbean, or whether we want to define a new gear.

One of the things a new gear definition might allow you to do, for example, would be to account for the fact that sometimes this gear might be attached to the vessel, and sometimes it's free floating, and so, rather than maybe prescribing the pathway, the motion could say something like the council requests staff to begin work on an amendment to the island-based FMPs to evaluate ways for the gear that's been presented at this meeting to be authorized in the fishery.

 I think, in that amendment, you would want to evaluate the effect of that gear change, and so, if you're allowing for a number more hooks, how that might affect bycatch and things of that nature, and so I think you would want to be able to have that amendment process that would give that full effects analysis.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So moved.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, Carlos Farchette made a motion, and so probably what we should do is to allow Jocelyn to just dictate that to the Natalia, and then you will see it, and you can modify the language accordingly.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. This is what my request was.

MIGUEL ROLON: Are we ready with the whiteboard? There you go. Jocelyn, can you just dictate slowly to Natalia the possible language that can be put in the motion?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I will make a motion for the -- I make a motion to have staff amend the buoy gear definition for each island-based FMP by adding no more than twenty hooks per strand of buoy gear.

MIGUEL ROLON: Carlos, let Natalia get the -- Can you say that to Natalia slowly, please?

NATALIA PERDOMO: This is what Jocelyn wrote in the chat.

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, and does that agree with the intent of your motion, Carlos?

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, except I don't know if we want to put the maximum number of hooks that would be allowed, or that could come later.

MIGUEL ROLON: You can do it now if you wish to, and that will give an indication to the staff of how to proceed.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I was saying to change the definition of the hooks to more than twenty-five hooks per strand. I don't know where in there you might want to slip that in.

12 MIGUEL ROLON: You could have it after "gear".

14 CARLOS FARCHETTE: After "gear". Right.

MIGUEL ROLON: After "gear", with no more than twenty-five hooks 17 per line.

19 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Right.

21 MIGUEL ROLON: Then, Natalia, the "as presented" and say the 22 motion was by Carlos, and we need a second.

24 TONY BLANCHARD: Second.

MIGUEL ROLON: Second by Tony Blanchard.

MARCOS HANKE: The motion was made by Carlos Farchette and seconded by Tony Blanchard. The motion reads: The council requests that staff begin work on an amendment to the island-based FMPs that would allow for the use of the deepwater snapper buoy gear with no more than twenty-five hooks per line.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, you have Roy Crabtree who wants to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Roy.

ROY CRABTREE: Thanks, Marcos. It seems to me, and, Jocelyn, help me out here, but there seems to me that there are some other issues with some of the lists of authorized gears that we probably ought to try to address. As I recall, there was an issue with gillnets not being prohibited for some of the new pelagics, but they are prohibited for others, and I'm wondering if this would be a good place to review some of these other discrepancies and try to straighten it all out in this amendment.

 1 MIGUEL ROLON: Roy, can we do that in a second motion, so this 2 one will not lose the impact?

ROY CRABTREE: Yes, that would be fine.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Roy.

 MIGUEL ROLON: Because I had that in my list of topics after we discuss this one. Then, during the discussion, Mr. Chairman, Graciela just pointed out that, after this meeting, probably we need to send a bulletin to all fishers about the purse seine gear limitation, as to the number of hooks, but, right now, we need to have any further discussion and a final vote.

MARCOS HANKE: If there is no more discussion, let's vote on the motion that I just read.

18 MIGUEL ROLON: This should be a roll call.

MARCOS HANKE: A roll call? Carlos Farchette.

22 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Tony Blanchard.

TONY BLANCHARD: Yes.

28 MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa Ramirez.

30 VANESSA RAMIREZ: Yes.

32 MARCOS HANKE: Damaris.

34 DAMARIS DELGADO: Yes.

36 MARCOS HANKE: Roy Crabtree.

38 ROY CRABTREE: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Nicole Angeli.

NICOLE ANGELI: Yes.

44 MARCOS HANKE: Yes. All in favor, and the motion carries.

46 MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that was Roy that brought 47 it up, but I have a list here of other topics related to gear,

48 and the nets is the next one, and so probably we should allow

Roy to restate what he said about the nets, and he can start the discussion.

ROY CRABTREE: Well, Jocelyn and Maria can explain it better than me, but, as I understand it, we have added some new species in, and so some of the issues we have with gillnets and other gears may not be consistent, and so what I would suggest we do in this amendment is review some of those and add some options in there make changes to other types of gears, as might be required, and I would say that Jocelyn and Maria can explain it better.

MARCOS HANKE: Maria, can you explain a little more detail?

MARIA LOPEZ: Jocelyn is going to explain it from the legal perspective, and I am going to be available to provide additional comment. Jocelyn, if you may.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you. The regulations right now are — They are implemented in the Reef Fish FMP, and they are going to be included in the regulations implementing the island-based FMPs, and this was in the island-based FMPs, and they were carried over, and they prohibit the use of gillnets and trammel nets when fishing for the managed reef fish, and we confirmed at the meeting that the council intended that prohibition to be the reef fish as they would be managed under the island-based FMPs, and so the new species that were added.

Then there's also the prohibition on the use of gillnets and trammel nets when fishing for spiny lobster, but there is no specific prohibition on the use of those gears, the gillnet and the trammel nets, when fishing for the pelagic species. That gear table that we've been speaking about lists a pelagic non-FMP fishery, and it indicates that gillnets are an authorized gear there, and so, if the council wanted to prohibit those gears when used to fish for pelagics, it could do this in a gear amendment.

There are, of course, the area restrictions that were in the presentation, and so fishing with gillnets, irrespective of the target, is prohibited year-round in some of those specific areas, including Bajo de Sico and the Grammanik Bank and the red hind spawning aggregation areas and the mutton spawning aggregation areas, but, if the council wanted to prohibit it more broadly, then it could consider doing that when fishing for all of the managed pelagic species.

arr or one managed peragre species.

1 2

4 5

One other factual question is, in these gear tables, we're trying to note the gears that are used in the fishery, and so a question that we could explore, in putting together that amendment, is whether gillnets and trammel nets are used to fish for the pelagic species that the council is now managing, and there are different pelagic species managed in the different island-based FMPs.

For St. Thomas/St. John and St. Croix, I think it's just dolphin and wahoo, and, for Puerto Rico, it's dolphin and wahoo and then some mackerels and tunas as well, and barracuda, I believe, also.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. That was my question, on the pelagics at least, of the species that we manage, dolphin and wahoo, cero mackerel, king mackerel, blackfin tuna, little tunny, and is there anything else that I'm missing?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Give me a second, and I can pull up the FMP.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, in the meantime, while she looks for the species, what we need to do at this time is to hear what the council would like to proceed with with the issue of the nets and the other species, and perhaps what we need to do is to instruct the staff to look at this in detail for the three island-based FMPs, because, in some cases, one regulation may not apply to another area. Then, by the December meeting, or whenever applicable, you will be able to have more information.

MARCOS HANKE: I understand that, and the reason I made the question is exactly to create a situation in which the council could participate efficiently, knowing the species that we are talking about, or the fishery that we are talking about, and I'm going to give an opportunity for the rest of the council to speak, and I am going to end with my comments. From the Virgin Islands, Carlos, or anybody from the Virgin Islands, do you have something to say about this?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, I do.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, again. You have Sarah Stephenson who asked for a turn to speak before Carlos.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I'm sorry. I'm having trouble seeing my chat. Thank you for the help, Miguel. Sarah Stephenson.

 SARAH STEPHENSON: I just wanted to read you the list of pelagic species for Puerto Rico. It's tripletail, dolphin, pompano dolphin, little tunny, blackfin tuna, king mackerel, cero mackerel, wahoo, and great barracuda. For both St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, the only pelagic species are dolphin and wahoo. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Sarah. That was very helpful. Carlos.

11 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Actually, I don't have much discussion, and I'm just ready with a motion, but I will let somebody else talk if they have some discussion, or should I make the motion and then we discuss?

MIGUEL ROLON: Well, you can have the motion now and discuss it, 17 if we follow Roberts Rules, and so go ahead and make your 18 motion, and then you will have the discussion.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. I move to request staff to begin work on prohibiting the use of gill and trammel nets for all managed species in each IBFMP.

24 TONY BLANCHARD: Second.

26 MIGUEL ROLON: So Carlos and Tony.

_ _

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Then I have a question. Can I go ahead and 29 ask the question?

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, but let's allow Marcos to read it and ask 32 for the discussion.

MARCOS HANKE: The motion reads to request staff to begin work on prohibiting the use of gill and trammel nets for all managed species in each IBFMP.

MIGUEL ROLON: Then, Marcos, you have Carlos, Edwin Font, 39 Graciela, and Maria Lopez.

41 MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I just wanted to figure out how, for the St. 44 Croix FMP, how we can include the tunas and mackerels and all that stuff, and so basically any coastal pelagic or HMS species.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, Maria wants to modify the motion, and so perhaps we should allow her to speak first, with the permission

of the other speakers.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Maria.

4 5

MARIA LOPEZ: I just wanted to suggest additional text, or different text, for the motion, maybe for some clarity, if possible. I would like to say that the council requests staff to begin work on an amendment to each of the island-based FMPs to consider whether gillnets and trammel nets should be authorized gears when fishing for managed pelagic species. Then you can delete the rest of the --

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos Farchette, you are the owner of the motion. Do you agree with the change in the language?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Absolutely.

MARCOS HANKE: Tony Blanchard, do you agree with the change in the language?

MARIA LOPEZ: I apologize, but, thinking about it a little bit more, maybe we should make it more broad, because, if there are other gears that we need to devise, or maybe you can add something else to this motion to request the council look into other gears, to make it clear, because, during the conversation, I think it was Graciela that was mentioning something about revising the gears that are traditionally used in all the fisheries, and that we haven't done that in a long time, and so maybe the council is interested in adding something like that as well.

MIGUEL ROLON: You can add "or any applicable gears", plus the nets, and so any other applicable gears, and that would satisfy what Graciela and Maria are talking about.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Applicable or allowable?

MIGUEL ROLON: Applicable. Anyway, Maria is -- Is this acceptable, or would you like to modify it?

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

43 MARIA LOPEZ: Excuse me, but I want to clarify that we should be 44 able to do all of this in the same amendment. It's two motions, 45 but it's two related actions, and so we should be able to 46 address all of this in the same amendment.

MIGUEL ROLON: That's fine, because that's the mechanics of

doing it, and so the important part is that the intent of the council is in these two motions. Then, Mr. Chair, I don't know if you see the chat, but we can continue with the other people who wanted to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: We have Edwin Font in the queue.

EDWIN FONT: (Mr. Font's comments were in Spanish and were not transcribed.)

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Next is Tony Blanchard.

TONY BLANCHARD: I think this should be even a little wider than just including the pelagic species. I think we should include the reef fish and the lobsters as well.

MIGUEL ROLON: If you do that, just drop pelagics, and, if you say "species" after "managed", it will include everything, but I believe the intent, the original intent, was to address the pelagics, but, if the council wishes to do so, you can drop the "pelagics".

TONY BLANCHARD: I move to drop the pelagic.

25 CARLOS FARCHETTE: I have a question.

27 MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I thought that, in the EEZ, gill and trammel nets are already prohibited for the harvest of reef fish. Can somebody clarify that for me?

MIGUEL ROLON: Carlos, that's true, but, if you would follow the discussion, and we don't have that much time, but, if you took out "pelagics", it incorporates everything, and then the staff will look at everything that has to be done. For example, Graciela told me that you have to make an inventory of the way that we operate to fish for this species, and so, if you follow Tony's idea and drop "pelagics", then that would include all the possible species you can think of.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Right, which my original had that for all species. Okay.

45 MARCOS HANKE: Do you agree with the change in the motion, 46 Carlos?

48 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, and I agree with Maria's changes and

Blanchard's changes.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Miguel, I am going to put it for a vote if there is no further discussion. Let me see in the chat here. There is nobody else.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Edward Schuster has a question.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Ed.

 EDWARD SCHUSTER: There is certain types of fisheries that has been used here, and it has always been a problem with the definition of a gillnet. For example, the fishers that set a net to catch flyingfish, and there is another method where they use to catch the ocean gar, and, if these fishers, during the dolphin season, the mahi-mahi season, are caught with this type of gear onboard, would they be penalized, although it's a net that's used for catching flyingfish and ocean gar?

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the question. This is a question for Jocelyn, and it's just a comment, either the ocean gar and the flyingfish and the gear are baitfish gear, or not designed to catch bigger pelagics, like mahi. Go ahead, Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you. This would be something that we could explore, in terms of how the prohibition works. When gillnets and trammel nets were listed as a prohibited gear when fishing for reef fish in the spiny lobster, there was a note that it was for those species and this didn't effect when fishing for non-managed species, and so for some of those baitfish, but the regulations also say that, if you have a gillnet and trammel net onboard, and a reef fish, then that will be evidence of a violation.

You can still use it to catch -- You can still currently use those gears to catch those baitfish, but, if you also have a reef fish onboard, they will assume, perhaps, that you were using that gear to fish for the reef fish, and that will be a violation, and so it does give some leeway to use the gear to fish for the non-managed species, but you have to be careful of what else you're catching, because of the presumption that possession of the gear, plus the managed reef fish, in my example, is a violation.

That's a long way of saying that, in any amendment, we could talk about the consequences of that, given how the gear is used, but, for enforcement purposes, you probably would want to have a similar language that says, if you were going with a prohibition, that gillnets and trammel nets can't be used to fish for pelagic species and possession of that gear plus the pelagic species is evidence of a violation, which would mean, in your example, if you were fishing for the baitfish with the gear, that's allowed, but, if you also caught a dolphin and kept it, and you were boarded, enforcement could say that's a violation, and so there is some leeway to allow the use of the gear for non-managed species, but the enforcement concerns shape the regulations.

4 5

EDWARD SCHUSTER: Okay, and so isn't there any way that we could put into the language, because I could understand if you catch one fish, or say, for example, maybe one to five fish is an incidental, but, if you have anything exceeding five, or whatever number we pick, and I just chose five off the top of my head, because, if you have like twenty or twenty-five fish, or even ten fish, then it's no longer an incidental.

I mean, if you have one fish that may, for whatever crazy reason, and I don't know, if it was just being nosy and wanted to swim up to the net or whatever and get caught, and it's a targeted species, and I think it should have an incidental leeway someplace, if the fish can't be relieved safely.

 MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, if I may, all you're doing in this motion is to look at all those issues, and so we need to allow the staff to work on these issues and bring it to the table the next time that you meet, or whenever is appropriate, and, on these comments, Eddie and the others, it will be part of the record, so they can make a note and look into this matter, but, right now, we are not intending to have the regulations written in one motion at this time, but I believe what Eddie said is very important, that we consider that the staff look at the gear and the species and the areas that it will apply. Mr. Chairman, we have Carlos and then Maria Lopez asking for a turn to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: That point that Schuster brought up was a good one, and so I think that, somewhere in the future, we are going to come up -- I think that we're going to come up with a forage fish management plan, and we'll have to take a look at those next that are going to be allowed to harvest that, because the mesh size is kind of small, and I would assume that, if you're going to fish for mahi or tuna or wahoo, or any of the big pelagics, it's going to have to be a pretty big net.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. I agree with you also on the

length of the net, the size of the mesh, and how high the net is, and everything is different for those species. We have somebody else in the queue, which is Maria Lopez.

MARIA LOPEZ: I just wanted to add that, so that when we begin work with this amendment, as requested by the council, we will be requesting your input, council members, and, also, if the council is interested, we can also request information from the District Advisory Panels, because I believe that the information — You are the guys that know what's going on in your waters and what are the gears that you use and all the descriptions, and we're definitely looking forward to working with all of you to do this. I just want to put that on the table, because we will need that fisher collaboration with you when we start working on this plan. Thanks.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I believe that you are ready to vote.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and we need to speed up a little bit. We are ready for voting. Is there anybody in opposition to the motion? Hearing none, the motion carries. Is there any other motions or any other issues on gear? I think there is the anchoring.

MIGUEL ROLON: You should move now to either the anchoring issue or Kim's presentation.

MARCOS HANKE: How about to do Kim's presentation, which is going to be refresher in our minds, and something a little lighter, and we can go back to the anchoring discussion. That's a suggestion to the council. Are we all in agreement? Any opposition to doing that?

MIGUEL ROLON: Well, if you say so, there's no opposition.

MARCOS HANKE: I would like to see the presentation, Kim's presentation, about descending devices.

BEST FISHING PRACTICES PRESENTATION

41 KIM IVERSON: I'm here, and I think Christina is here as well.

CHRISTINA WIEGAND: I am here. I will go ahead and start us off, if you're all right with that, Kim.

KIM IVERSON: That sounds good. Thank you.

48 CHRISTINA WIEGAND: Excellent. Good afternoon, everyone. I

want to thank you for giving us some time to talk about best fishing practices. Since I don't know many of you, my name is Christina Wiegand, and I was the staff lead on Snapper Grouper Amendment 29, which implemented regulations here in the South Atlantic related to best fishing practices, and so I'm going to give you just a very brief overview on what is now required in the South Atlantic and why our council pursued these regulations.

4 5

Then I'm going to turn it over to Kim, who is going to give you all an update on the fantastic outreach efforts related to best fishing practices that our outreach team has been working on.

The South Atlantic Council originally decided to take action on best fishing practices based on input that they received during their snapper grouper visioning process, which happened way back in the early 2010s, and it was a series of stakeholder-driven meetings to help identify strategies and objectives for managing the snapper grouper fishery, and, during those meetings, stakeholders continually expressed concern over released fish that don't survive, due to bowel hooking, barotrauma, or other injuries, and so the council really wanted to find an effective way to improve survivorship of these fish that had to be released due to size limits or reaching the bag limit or other regulatory reasons.

To that end, descending devices are now required to be onboard vessels fishing for or possessing species in the snapper grouper fishery management unit, and this covers all sectors, and so commercial vessels, for-hire vessels, and private recreational vessels all have to have descending devices onboard.

One of the things that the South Atlantic Council really struggled with was how they wanted to define a descending device, and the full definition they came up with is on the screen, and I know this presentation was provided in your briefing book, and so, in the interest of time, I'm not going to go over the entire thing, but I did want to draw your attention to a few key parts.

First, the descending device is required to be attached to a minimum of sixteen ounces of weight and sixty feet of line, and then, additionally, the descending device must be readily available for use while engaged in fishing.

The descending device regulation was put in place because research shows that the use of descending devices is an effective way to improve the survivorship of released fish, and

it decreases release mortality. As for the specifics of the definition, the sixteen-ounce weight requirement was chosen because it's easily available, and it's appropriate for most snapper grouper species, though it was acknowledged that some of the larger species may require more weight.

Additionally, the sixty feet of line was chosen because fifty feet is the standard minimum depth that you see on commercially-available descending devices, and so a minimum of sixty feet of line ensures that a fish can get down to fifty feet, taking into account the gunnel of a boat.

 The council, with the definition, they really wanted to allow for the creation of homemade descending devices while still finding a way to ensure that the homemade devices were effective, because they felt that fishermen are innovative, and they know what's going to work best for their specific vessel and situation.

It was acknowledged that allowing these homemade devices may be a challenge for law enforcement, which is one of the reasons we're working on an extensive outreach campaign that Kim is going to talk about in a minute, but we also worked closely with our law enforcement representatives, to ensure that the definition was going to work for them.

We also got a lot of feedback from law enforcement that had experience enforcing similar regulations out on the west coast of the United States, and they indicated that enforcement hadn't really been a problem out there, and most fishermen were either in compliance, and, if they were out of compliance, they typically didn't have a descending device onboard at all.

The next regulation was a requirement for non-offset non-stainless-steel circle hooks when fishing for snapper grouper species north of 28 degrees North latitude, which, for us, is just a little bit south of Cape Canaveral, Florida. Additionally, the council now requires that all hooks are made out of non-stainless-steel when fishing for snapper grouper species throughout the entire South Atlantic region.

 A general circle hook regulation has been on the books in the snapper grouper fishery for some time now, but the council wanted to require non-offset circle hooks specifically, because research shows that non-offset hooks reduce the occurrence of hooking-related mortalities, when compared to those hooks that are offset.

The reason they are only required north of that 28-degree line is because that, south of that area, the requirement would have resulted in some negative social and economic effects to the for-hire industry in that area, as well as the commercial yellowtail fishery in south Florida. Then, lastly, non-stainless-steel hooks are now required throughout the South Atlantic for snapper grouper because they degrade faster, and, thus, fish that are gut-hooked, or end up with a hook in them, they have a greater chance of survival.

The circle hook and the descending device regulations were the big ones, and I am going to let Kim take over now and talk about all of the outreach that we've been doing to get the word out about these new regulations.

KIM IVERSON: Thank you, Christina, and thank you for that quick overview of Regulatory Amendment 29. When Marcos and Miguel contacted me a few weeks ago and asked for us to review how we got to where we are with our best fishing practices, I reached out to Christina, and she was gracious enough, as the lead person on our tech staff, to go through that amendment, and, at the end of our presentation, we'll have our contact information, and so, if you have specific questions about the amendment, please feel free to reach out.

Again, I know we're a little short on time, but one of the key elements in the discussion of best fishing practices and making the descending devices mandatory for fishermen that are targeting snapper grouper species and the hook regulations was outreach, and you know that you can make all the regulations in the world, but, if people aren't aware of the regulations, or understand why they are in place, then it's for naught.

 We have had great partnerships with our outreach efforts, and the outreach component of the amendment was included in the research and monitoring program, and that's how important the council felt that outreach was to this effort. We have worked with our community leaders, and we have reached out and used our partnerships with our advisory panel members, including our Outreach & Communications Advisory Panel.

We have developed some wallet cards that we distributed in conjunction with implementation of the new requirements, and let me note that our red snapper fishery this year, recreational fishery, was four days.

It lasted for four days in July, and the new regulations requiring the descending device use and the hook modifications

came out just between those four days. There was a three-day weekend, and then the regulations were implemented on July 15, and then, that following Friday, the red snapper recreational season opened again for one day.

We had an opportunity and a challenge, at the same time, to make fishermen aware. We did press releases, and we sent out lots of social media postings, and, when I say "we", it's a team effort here, and I want to start by giving Cameron Rhodes, who is our Outreach Program Manager, full credit for this. She led this effort in every way, and we work together as a team, and so I wanted to briefly give the council just an overview of our outreach efforts.

One of those is -- I mentioned the wallet cards, which we developed, and Cameron was instrumental in getting those printed and getting those out in the hands of law enforcement personnel and the states within our region, as well as Sea Grant and other agencies, and we were told that our boarding officers were using those to educate, and it wasn't an issue of writing tickets at the time, or citations, but it was educating the fishermen about the new requirements and also how to use them, why to use them and how to best prevent fishing mortality or the floaters, the fish that are suffering from barotrauma.

I just really quickly wanted to make you aware of the council's new website, and it is a new site that was developed a few months ago with input from our advisory panels, and also working closely with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and many of you know Emily Muehlstein from the Gulf Council, and they had put together a best fishing practices page, in conjunction with their outreach campaign.

 They do not require descending devices be onboard, but they do have hook modifications in place, or regulations in place, but we went to Emily, and we went to the Gulf Council and looked at some of their web postings, and we came back and Cameron, again, working with our advisory panels and staff, put together this webpage that you see there that shows —— It has video demonstrating the effectiveness of descending devices, and, if you click on the state resources there, you will see that we have a map that is interactive that provides information from various state agencies. You can click on whichever state you care for there, and it will provide you with the state resources. The one good thing about that is that that will be updated as the states update their information that's available.

If you have a few minutes, I think that was included as part of

the presentation, or the email, and that is to go to our council's website and look at those resources that would be available.

Now we'll go back to the main page, and you also see, at the bottom of that best fishing practices page there, is a series of tabs, and those tabs allow you quick access to additional information. We are using icons, which is helpful to kind of guide folks in what they're looking for.

If you look, there is the very specific language that we included in the presentation on the requirements. If you click on "recognizing barotrauma", the tab at the top, there are pictures on how to identify fish that are experiencing barotrauma, and not all fish should -- You should not use a descending device on all fish, which some fishermen think that that's mandatory, and it's not. If the fish is okay, you simply use best fishing practices and then release the fish, but, if it is showing signs of barotrauma, then you can use those descending devices, and you should have them readily available.

If you have questions, we'll be glad to help answer them, and I know that Marcos has some video that he wanted to share on his work with descending devices, and, again, we wanted to provide you an overview, quickly, of what's been done at our council, in hopes that maybe it will help elicit some discussion at your end. Are there any questions?

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Kim. That was a great presentation from both of you. Does the council have any questions? We're going to show a little video in a little bit, and, Natalia, can you have the two videos ready in a moment? Are there any questions?

In the meantime, if you think of questions, what you are seeing is a private initiative to explore the best method of releasing the fish, red hind being released at thirty-three feet, which is one atmosphere, and a silk snapper with barotrauma, both of them, released in two atmospheres, and we have been hearing a lot that it is impossible for a silk snapper, after coming to the surface from so deep, to swim away, and let's see what happens. Go ahead, Natalia.

This red hind was in 137 feet, and had the stomach out of the mouth and the eyes a little popped. This is not the descending device, but this is a tool to film or to record the image, and it's an inverted hook that can be attached to a weight, and here he goes. Instead of a frigate bird eating a species that you

guys catch every day, and imagine if it's a closed season, and you can make your release count. Now is the silk snapper. It's the same situation.

MIGUEL ROLON: How deep, Marcos?

MARCOS HANKE: It was from 400 feet, and it was released at sixty-six feet on my dataset that we are building slowly, and it's a 787 fishing research project, which is a private project. We release the fish at sixty-six and thirty-three feet, and we are compiling the data that we're going to donate to a student to do his master's degree, once he is accepted. I would like to hear comments from the council. In my opinion, this is a big step forward, that making the release count goes a long way. Any of the rest of the council members have any comment?

MIGUEL ROLON: I don't have anybody here. Marcos, a question to the council members is that, number one, do you think this is something that could be adopted in the U.S. Caribbean, and, number two, how would you like to do it, on a voluntary basis, or do you want to amend any section of the management plan to incorporate what you already have, and I also would like to thank Christina and Kim for this initiative, and it's really nice that you were able to present this to us.

If the Caribbean Council wants to do something regarding this item in the agenda, we would copy everything that we can get from the Gulf and the South Atlantic, because they already did all this work, and it will be a matter of tailoring the needs of the U.S. Caribbean and adjust what they have here.

 There is a lot of work underneath these webpages that we have here, and so, again, thank you to Kim and Christina, and then, Mr. Chairman, you have about thirteen minutes to decide on this one.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Vanessa, let's go quick about it.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you for the presentation, and I had the opportunity to see the webinar when you presented this webinar for the commercial fishermen in the Southeast, and I think it's a great idea to try to bring this to the Caribbean, but we need a lot of education, and especially bringing this information in the language of our commercial fishermen, especially many of them that don't like to read too much, and so we need a visual that they can see, like the YouTube channels that you have. I have seen some of the videos in there, and so I think we should start with that, to teach our commercial fishermen the

efficiency of these programs and how to use it. Thanks.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, you have Kim Iverson.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, I have Kim now. Go ahead, Kim.

KIM IVERSON: Thank you for those comments, and I just wanted to reiterate, really quickly, that these regulations apply to our private recreational anglers as well as commercial and charter, federally-permitted fishermen, and so it's across-the-board for the South Atlantic, and, also, one of the reasons that the council started to address these issues is because we have regulatory discards.

We have red snapper season, as I mentioned, and the recreational season is four days now, and so a lot of red snapper are out there, and a lot of fish are being released, and the same with our shallow-water grouper spawning season closure from January through March, and for red grouper through April, and so fishermen were the ones that came to the council and said we're having a problem here, and we don't want to see these fish floating away, and we want the fish to survive.

There has been recent work on the effectiveness of these descending devices and other best fishing practices, and so it was initiated from the fishermen themselves, and one of the items that is in the Regulatory Amendment 29 is that research and monitoring plan, and that helps gauge the effectiveness of these actions as well.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kim. Thank you very much again. We have Graciela and Carlos.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Kim, I have a couple of questions about the depth of the areas where most of this fishing takes place. In fact, if the devices have been -- I mean, is someone monitoring the discards and showing that they actually significantly improve or decrease the number of discards?

KIM IVERSON: They improve survivability. As far as reducing the number of discards, Graciela, the best fishing practices, we encourage fishermen to move off of a spot. If you're in an area where you're catching a lot of red snapper, or other species that you legally can't retain, we encourage people to move away, and it sounds very simple, but we have fishermen that will talk about that I threw back twenty-two red snapper today in one spot, and I'm thinking, well, maybe you should move before you have to throw back twenty-two red snapper, and so it seems

intuitive, but sometimes not so much.

4 5

Then, as far as the depths fished, and Christina may be able to help add to that, the South Atlantic -- Our region is so broad, from North Carolina down to the Florida Keys, that you are going to have reef fisheries in shallower water and in deeper water. Off of south Florida, it's very easily accessible, and the depths may not be quite so great as close to shore, but you can get into deepwater species, like the tilefishes and the snowy grouper, et cetera, where it's not that uncommon to fish at depths of 400 or 500 feet.

It has been assumed that those fish always suffer from barotrauma, and the majority of those don't survive, but the use of descending devices, as Marcos illustrated -- You can descend those fish, and there is the ability to document survivability. Christina, did you want to add anything?

CHRISTINA WIEGAND: Kim, I think you pretty much nailed it. If you're in the South Atlantic, between North Carolina and Florida, there are a lot of different depths that you can be fishing at, but, in terms of the effectiveness of descending devices, this is something -- There's been a lot of research done in the South Atlantic, particularly out of North Carolina State University.

One of the videos that we have on the best fishing practices website is of a red grouper that's being descended and was caught in 200-plus feet of water, if I'm remembering correctly, and we brought a lot of the available research and presented it to our council's SSC, and they concurred with the idea that descending devices were in fact effective at reducing release mortality and improving survivorship.

In terms of determining how successful fishermen are at using these descending devices, now that this regulation has been implemented, that's something that has been talked about quite a bit. We don't currently have any required ways to report that, and the South Atlantic Council does have a number of voluntary ways, and they allow fishermen to report their catch and whether or not they are using the descending device and whether it's effective.

The council did request that NMFS look into possibly requiring fishermen to report information on descending devices and their use, but that's something that is just now being talked about, and so we'll see where that goes, but the research does show that descending devices are effective.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. I agree with that. Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree that we need to maybe look at this a little further sometime, maybe in December, or have a meeting before December about this, but I do agree with what Vanessa said. There has to be a big education push for the fishermen to use this device.

I remember, more than ten years ago, Sea Grant distributed barotrauma kits for the fishermen here, but that was just a needle to puncture the bladder and let the air out, and then they release it from the surface, but I think this is something that we need to look further into, maybe on a volunteer basis for now, and work our way up to regulations, if it's needed. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. We are a little tight on time. Miguel, I think we didn't hear anything against it, to discuss a little more about this issue, and I think it's worth it to explore, based on my experience with it, especially because a descending device costs two-dollars, the ones that I distributed to my friends and we make in thirty seconds with an inverted hook and a weight. I think -- Do we need to say anything else for the staff to include this in the next meeting, or how do we do it?

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, we don't need to do anything at this time, but Alida is taking notes, and probably the best thing to do is, like Vanessa mentioned, and Carlos, and we could start with an education project, and then, once we have the education project, we may be able to -- Let's say for six months to a year, and then we'll be able to come back and see if there is a need for a regulation.

 This is something that was not created overnight by the South Atlantic and the Gulf, and it took some time for them, and so we can -- As I said, not copy, but adopt their study, and the first thing will be to have a good education and outreach program, project, and so I'm sure that Alida and I will discuss it a little bit more, and she can include it in her presentation as something for the next steps to take by the O&E AP.

ALIDA ORTIZ: I have taken notes for everything.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I have a comment from Kim, but I would

like her to just say what she just wrote.

4 5

KIM IVERSON: On behalf of Christina and myself and the staff and the council at the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, we appreciate the opportunity to share, and we always say, in our outreach and education efforts, that you are welcome to copy and share anything that you want.

Plagiarism is the greatest form of flattery, and so please. We stole things from the Gulf Council, and please feel free to reach out to us with any questions that you may have, and thank you, Marcos, for contacting us and sharing. Marcos has been very gracious in sharing some of his examples of how to make your own descending device, and we have shared that with our council and our AP members, and so it's a two-way street, and we just thank you for the opportunity.

MIGUEL ROLON: Thanks to you, Kim.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kim. Thank you very much. We are ready for the anchoring discussion on the Grammanik Bank.

MIGUEL ROLON: Before we go into that, we want to allow Graciela to say something for the record.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: After contemplating the motions that you just put forth regarding gear, there is a need for an inventory and a description and a description of the use of these gears. They have not been revised since 1988 or 1989 or so, even after all the studies that have taken place since then, and they tell you what the gears are, but there is no actual description of these and how they have changed over time.

This, in fact, will be impacting the landings information that is collected from the fishers by gear, because, right now, most of the gears are not really explained in the landings, in the catch reports, and, most likely, this will also be associated with all of the other things that we need to look at regarding compatibility of regulations, in terms of not only the gears that you have mentioned, but also all of the other gears, the traps, et cetera.

 It opens up a very big review of all gear issues that we need to look at, and so I just wanted to put that on the record, so that we know that it's going to be snowballing into many other aspects of the fishery.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. With those great words, what I would like

to propose, Mr. Chairman, is you would allow the staff --Graciela can have a virtual meeting with Daniel and the U.S. Virgin Islands counterpart, Dr. Angeli, to start looking at this, and, probably by the December meeting, she will be able to have a report as to what can be done regarding these issues and what Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are willing and able to do.

4 5

The way that they collect the information, if they modify it that way, it will have some impact to the budget and so forth, and so Graciela will be in charge of that, and, of course, I will be working, and so we will have a report to you by the December meeting of any short meeting that we will have with the local authorities.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. I totally agree, and, just to put it in perspective, when I was working with the commercial fishermen that fish for lobster, this was one of the requests that they had, that, for example, the definition of the trap fishing, the traps, had to be revised, for many different reasons, and I know that the council will include the fishermen with the expertise to support these healthy discussions. Thank you very much. We are ready now for the anchoring, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. We are going to address now the anchoring discussion in the Grammanik Bank. Who is going to -- Go ahead, Maria.

ANCHORING DISCUSSION - GRAMMANIK BANK

MARIA LOPEZ: Thank you. I am going to be presenting to you some discussion points that we put together related to revising the anchoring regulations in the Grammanik Bank in St. Thomas, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, per request of the council at the past council meeting in June.

 The way that I am going to present this is, first, I'm going to do a very quick overview of what the Grammanik Bank is and where it is. I'm also going to talk about historical information about federal management in the area, talk about the current management and current use of the area and then some questions that I believe the council should continue to explore, in order to consider this action.

The Grammanik Bank lies on the southern edge of the Puerto Rico shelf, fourteen miles south of St. Thomas, USVI, and it is a

deep coral bank that includes mesophotic reefs that are dominated by Orbicella species, and it's separated by a sand channel with a drop-off on the south edge of approximately sixty-seven meters, which is dominated by an Agaricia reef.

It is also four kilometers east of the Hind Bank Marine Conservation District, which is a big area that was closed to all fishing and anchoring in 1999. After the closure of this area in 1999, some of that fishing pressure that was in that area shifted towards the Grammanik Bank area.

the historical information Talking about about federal management in the area, the Grammanik Bank is a multispecies aggregation area, where reef fish, such as snappers and groupers, aggregate to reproduce at specific times and places on the reef, and it has historically been an important spawning aggregation area for the yellowfin grouper, which aggregates to spawn on the bank from February to April each year, principally. The yellowfin grouper is a long-lived, slow-growing species, and it has a higher susceptibility to overfishing.

The Grammanik Bank is also a very important aggregation site for the Nassau grouper, which is another long-lived, slow-growing species which has been reestablishing an aggregation in the area. The species is an overfished species, which is currently under a rebuilding plan, and harvest has been prohibited for this species since the 1990s.

Although the Nassau grouper already have harvest provisions applicable throughout the EEZ, including the Grammanik Bank, the fishing pressure for the yellowfin back in the day may have been resulting in bycatch mortality of the Nassau, and so then, prompted by research from Nemeth and colleagues from the U.S. Virgin Islands showing the importance of the bank for the yellowfin, NMFS implemented an interim rule in 2004 that closed the Grammanik Bank area from February 1 through April 30 in 2005.

 This species, at the time, based on the preferred alternatives for stock status criteria that were contained in the council draft amendment to the fishery management plan to address the required provision of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and this is, in other words, the Sustainable Fisheries Act amendment of 2005, the yellowfin grouper was considered to be undergoing overfishing, and the stock would be considered to be overfished.

The intended effect of that interim proposed rule at the time

was to protect the yellowfin grouper spawning aggregation and to reduce overfishing during that specific year, because long-term protection of the spawning aggregation was being addressed at the time in the 2005 SFA amendment, which was under development at that time. That interim rule prohibited the harvest and possession of any species of fish, except highly migratory species, within the closed area during that year.

4 5

In addition, the 2005 Caribbean SFA amendment implemented a seasonal closure for all species in Grouper Unit 4, including the black, red, tiger, yellowedge, and, of course, the yellowfin grouper, and that was also during February 1 to April 30, which is the entire yellowfin grouper spawning period, and so that closure in the Grammanik Bank would further protect and conserve the yellowfin grouper when it was determined to be overfished. This grouper and the other groupers were then put in a rebuilding plan that ended in 2015.

The amendment also established regulations to minimize adverse effects to essential fish habitat, which is defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Act as those waters and substrates necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity, and it established — To do this, it established modifications to anchoring techniques. For example, it required an anchor retrieval system, to prevent the anchor from dragging along the bottom during recovery, which was applicable to all commercial and recreational fishing vessels that fished for or possessed Caribbean reef fish in or from the EEZ. The 2005 SFA amendment also banned the use of bottom-tending gear in seasonally-closed areas, such as the Grammanik Bank.

This is the management in the Grammanik Bank that has been in place since 2005, and the Grammanik Bank seasonally-closed area is one-and-a-half square kilometers of area, and, within that area, all fishing and possession of any species of fish, except for highly migratory species, in or from the Grammanik Bank is prohibited from February 1 to April 30 of each year.

 The anchor retrieval system that I mentioned in my previous slide is required when fishing for reef fish species, and the use of pots, traps, gillnets, trammel nets, and bottom longlines is prohibited.

This closure protects other spawning species, such as the Nassau grouper that I mentioned earlier, and it also provides benefits to protected resources in the closed area, such as corals, which are considered essential fish habitat for reef fish. Now, I want to point out all that all of these measures will be carried

into the St. Thomas/St. John fishery management plan when this plan is implemented.

There are a couple of things that I want to include into this discussion, and these are from the discussion of the 2005 Caribbean SFA amendment, and so the area closed was -- The area that was implemented by regulations in this amendment was the smallest in size, when compared to other alternatives presented in the amendment.

At the time, it was noted, in the alternatives analysis, that the area selected may not provide enough of a buffer around the Grammanik Bank and the spawning aggregations, in turn potentially complicating enforcement, and this is talking about the buffer. I mean, even if it was including, at the time, all of the spawning aggregation.

Comments during the council meetings indicated that, if the larger closed area was selected, there would have been significant economic impact to other fisheries, for example the yellowtail snapper fishery that was conducted near the Grammanik Bank. Yellowtail snapper fishers anchor to fish, and they requested to continue to be able to anchor, but using the anchor retrieval system that was implemented, to fish during the open season in the Grammanik Bank.

Also, the discussion at the council meeting considered how close it was, this bank, to the Marine Conservation District, which was closed to all fishing and anchoring year-round since 1999.

This brings us to the issue discussed here, which is the effect of anchors to the deep coral reef and the bank. From a presentation that the council got during the past council meeting in June by Elizabeth Kadison and colleagues on the spawning aggregation of Nassau that was occurring in the bank, and as well as has been documented by the U.S. Virgin Islands Coral Reef Monitoring Program report from 2015, there appears to be anchoring damage to area of the shelf edge in the deep reef, which is presumed to be from fishing activities within the area that may indirectly harming fishing by impacting corals and other essential fish habitat.

 The next things that I am going to mention are based on testimony from past council meetings, particularly from the June 2020 meeting, where it was indicated that there was minimal commercial fishing activity occurring in the bank, and it was mostly for yellowtail fishing at shallower depths, such as the 120 feet and shallower.

1 2

4 5

There was also mention of some recreational fishing in the form of a headboat, and it is our understanding that there is no recreational diving, given the depths of the bank. However, we still have some questions that we should be looking to, so the council has all the information they need to make an informed decision about the particular issue that we're discussing, which is the anchoring damage that was documented in the Grammanik Bank.

If you look at this slide, I noted in here that we have information, some information, about commercial fishing activity and some information about recreational fishing, but there's also other questions, such as, for example, what species are targeted and how reef fish, if it's reef fish, if it's pelagics, if it's HMS, lobster, what gear types, do you anchor, do you need to anchor, what part of the bank is used for fishing activities and how deep, and how many fishers use the area, for example, and these are questions that I believe that we still need to explore.

Then what about other uses in the area? For example, it was mentioned that there was illegal fishing occurring, and illegal fishing could be fishing during the closed season, or it could be illegal fishing, and it could be also fishing for people that are not supposed to be fishing in there or using gears that are not allowed. It was also mentioned that foreign fishing boats, and I am putting in here "illegal", because this is the EEZ, and fishers, for example, that have a commercial license from Puerto Rico and other places could be illegally fishing in the EEZ as well.

There is also research and survey activities in the bank that have been going on for several years, which have been documenting the spawning aggregations. Researchers, as well as fishers, have emphasized how important the coral reef habitat is to support spawning aggregations, and, when these areas are protected and have a good design and monitoring program, you should be able to see increases in fish size and number of fish and an increase in landings.

 The research that has been presented to the Caribbean Fishery Management Council has shown an initial recovery of spawning stocks of yellowfin and Nassau groupers in the bank, and, as I mentioned in the previous slide, during the past council meeting, the council was shown the extension of anchoring damage in the Agaricia deep reef and a decline of coral cover, and it was mentioned at the meeting that the USVI commercial fishers

were not responsible for this damage, but that there was some activity from other boats in there, but it was also noted that that particular vessel that was pointed out during that meeting may not be in operation anymore.

It was also mentioned that foreign fishers have been observed in the area, although it was not clear if they anchored or if they were just fishing, and so, the same as in the previous slide, we have some questions about commercial and recreational fishing use. There are other questions that we would like to have more information, with respect to anchoring damage done in the area, and these are the questions that -- I posted some of those questions here in the slide.

For example, how much anchoring damage has been documented, what is the depth, is it recent damage, is the anchoring damage in areas that are not included in the reserve, or is it in both? What area research is recommended to be added to the closed area to protect spawning habitat? For example, what is the depth and what is the extension?

We saw that in the presentation during the last council meeting, that some of that habitat used by Nassau for spawning may fall outside the closed area and that areas adjacent to the Marine Conservation District are also used by individuals to travel to spawning grounds, and so another question would be if the area coordinates should be modified to encompass the whole habitat supporting the aggregations and to what level any additional protection should be done.

Then, from the discussion at the June council meeting, these are some of the suggestions of how to address the issue that came either from council members or participants or researchers, and this slide is not dictating, by any means, what we should or should not be done, but its purpose is to serve as the starting point for a white paper or a discussion paper on this topic, if the council wants to pursue that.

One of the questions is should anchoring by fishing vessels be prohibited within the bank to protect spawning habitat? Should the closed area boundaries be modified to encompass all habitat supporting the aggregations and to what level any additional protections should be done, but, to answer those two questions, we still have other questions to respond to.

46 For example, what are the expected effects on USVI commercial 47 fishers? What are the expected effects on USVI recreational 48 fishers that use the area? What are the expected effects on spawning fish and habitat? Will this action protect the habitat from other non-fishing uses? Is enforcing an anchoring regulation feasible with current enforcement capacity? Are there any other issues that need to be explored?

There are also other ways of dealing with this too that could be explored by themselves, or in combination, and one of them is to develop an outreach and education program specific to the Grammanik Bank that would inform stakeholders about what is allowed and what is prohibited in there.

Another question could be if a special management area could be established within the bank to protect specific habitat from anchoring damage, and, if so, will this be enforceable, given that this is such a small area?

Another thing that comes to mind, when discussing this topic, is that this could make the case for the development of federal permits, for the further development of federal permits, and that would allow us to gain a better understanding of the population of fishers and their harvest patterns in the EEZ, and that will potentially allow for some sort of controlled entry and effort management, if that was desired.

This would also be an opportunity that could be used to evaluate the performance of the seasonally-closed area with respect to these management objectives and its goals. It can be any combination of these, and maybe the council has other recommendations.

Lastly, I would like to ask the council if they have interest in staff drafting a discussion paper that would address these and any other questions that they may have, and, with this, I conclude, and, if you have any questions or comments, I am ready for those now.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Maria. I would like to defer this and give priority to the people from St. Thomas and the Virgin Islands to start the participation. I have Julian Magras.

JULIAN MAGRAS: This is one of my biggest issues that I have, and I was one of the very instrumental people back in 2004 that fought very hard on this Grammanik Bank closure. We got it to the size of what it is now, and we taught the scientists how to find where the fish were spawning, and so we don't want to see no increase in the size of the bank.

The activity that took place by one big recreational charter

boat that caused us this havor that we're here to this issue today is no longer fishing, and one of the biggest problems that we always have is enforcement out there not doing their job. We are the enforcers actually for our fishery right now, because we don't see no one out there, and it's a serious problem.

We have a yellowtail fishery that takes place inside of that closed area, and we don't fish in the depths of the water where the damage was done, and that was done by that one recreational boat, and so the presentation that was given was requested by the fishers to be given to the council and not for it to turn around and become something negative against the fishers, and that's how we are taking it right now, and so I have a serious issue with the direction and where we are going, because one boat decided to anchor in deep water.

I understand the whole protection, and these species would not be protected if it wasn't for the commercial fishers, and not only did we decide to go along with the protection of seasonal closures for the groupers, but we did it for the snappers, and we did both deep and shallow-water snappers, and we did it for several other species, and here it is that we are sixteen years later, and not one stock assessment has been done, and so we know, with closures, that they can do more damage if not done correctly, and so the real question here is when is the council going to get the people to do the stock assessments?

Right now, the fishers feel that all seasonal closures be opened. A rebuilding stock, how long are you going to rebuild a stock? Are we going to continue talking about this for the next twenty-five years? The stock is already rebuilt, and the yellowfin grouper are out there by the millions, but they are not concerned with the yellowfin grouper. The only thing you guys are concerned with is the Nassau grouper, and these big predators are going to take over the entire fishery if something is not done soon, so we can start to harvest them.

They are out there eating all the juvenile fish, and we worry about the lionfish, and the lionfish don't have nothing over these big groupers, and the big groupers are eating the lionfish, and they're eating all the juvenile fish.

Sometimes we need to slow down, and I am so disappointed to see this presentation before me here today over a nice presentation on how healthy the Nassau grouper aggregation has become, because of the fishers working with the college and everybody, and the council, to get these measures in place, and it's the same thing as the MCD. It was supposed to open up in five years

for the fishers to be able to fish again, and it's been twentyone years. How much more protection do you want to put on the fishers?

You guys can pay me a million dollars a year, and I could stay home, like everybody else, and have a paycheck, but, when I have to fish, the more you close, you're squeezing everybody into a little box to cause us to create overfishing in the areas that we are still able to fish, and this needs to stop. Now Tony Blanchard has something to say.

MARCOS HANKE: Tony.

TONY BLANCHARD: Let me echo what Mr. Magras just said, and let me make it very clear to you guys, so we don't have any misunderstanding as to where I sit. I am not in favor of extending the bank any bigger than it is.

Once again, this problem that was noted on the destruction of this piece of coral reef was not done by a commercial fisher. That boat is currently out of business and out of the Virgin Islands, but here we are being confronted about whether or not this bank needs more protection and looking over how we anchor on the bank when this was discussed and agreed on years ago.

The thing is that, in my opinion, and I will be quite blunt about it, most of that activity that goes on in that bank, and I'm saying that the anchoring is with the scientists going inside there to study the grouper on the Grammanik and not the guys going inside there to go fish the yellowtail.

We already can't go in there with any gear, any kind of bottom gear, and the only one who really uses that bank would be the guys that would be charter fishing or fishing for the pelagics, but we seem to have a target on our backs every time we turn around, and this was supposed to be a good thing, showing the groupers on the Grammanik flourishing, and here it goes that this is turned around and a blade in our backs, and that's what it seems to be.

 My opinion is this, that, with the regulations that we have on this bank and on the boat for every other bank, if they were enforced, we wouldn't be sitting here discussing about the damage that was done, because this damage probably wouldn't have happened, and so I am not in for penalizing people for the let's say actions of a few.

What we need to do is enforcement needs to do their job and

enforce the regulations that we already have, and there is no other needed regulations to be put on the Grammanik Bank, or the Hind Bank, or any other bank, because I'm going to be honest with you, and I'm sitting here as the Vice Chair of the council, and I am going to tell you that we ain't doing a good enough job monitoring these MCDs, what we have in place, for how many years now, and I'm talking about the Grammanik Bank, but, for the most part, the Hind Bank that is a fourteen-mile stretch that we only know what's going on in a very small portion of the bank, because of the divers that has gone inside there for the college to do a survey.

4 5

Don't tell me that we're doing a good job of managing, because I am telling you that we ain't doing a good job of managing these banks, and so we ain't doing our part. Every time we turn around, it seems like we have to put regulations on the commercial guys, because we don't have no recreational fishery.

There is no information out there, and so anybody could go out there and throw a line overboard and catch what they want, but, when it comes down to the end of the day, we know these guys is commercial guys, and they have to file -- They have to send in their catch reports, and we are the only ones that are really being monitored.

MIGUEL ROLON: Hold on a second. Marcos, I have Roy, but, before Roy says something, I just want to thank Maria del Mar for a thorough presentation, and please don't kill the messenger. She is just bringing a presentation to you of all the issues involved.

The last slide, if you do the outreach and education and evaluate the seasonal closed areas, you are doing what Julian and Tony are saying, without getting into more issues with this, but we need to hear from Roy and the rest of the council members about the next steps for 2021.

MARCOS HANKE: Roy Crabtree.

 ROY CRABTREE: Well, I think that's why the presentation was set up, is to hear what you guys want to do and get the council's comments on it, and, as you can see, one of the options there is to develop an outreach and education plan, and it looks to me -- I am starting to remember 2004 a little bit, after hearing this conversation.

It looks to me like that's where we are. As Maria pointed out, we really don't have a lot of information on this, and so what

I'm hearing from Tony and Julian is that probably we need to, first, try education and outreach, and then maybe see if we can't do a better evaluation of what's going on, and maybe that's the way to improve the situation right now.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Roy. We have a follow-up from Tony.

TONY BLANCHARD: There are some greats, Roy, and I agree with you and Maria, but let me just -- I shouldn't say educate you, but let me just put this point on the table. All of you see how I'm sitting down here with Mr. Magras, because he's got a computer, and the majority of us don't have no computer, and we've got a cellphone, and we are limited in the ways in which we can talk with the council, especially now when everything is a virtual meeting here, or a virtual meeting there, or however you want to put it, and everything is virtual now.

We don't operate like that, and I am being straightforward, because, if it wasn't for him that asked me to come over, because he's got a computer, I would be sitting down in front of the cellphone watching a phone number, and I ain't afraid to say so, and the majority of us think the same way. We do not operate the way that government officials or scientists operate, and we are not on a computer all the time, and this is not what we do.

 We are hands-on people, and we get out there, and we do what we need to do, and so this virtual thing, at this point in time, ain't working for no outreach and education, and I personally think it's a waste of time, and I think the approach to this problem is you have enforcement have the regulations enforced, and then there will be no need for all of this. The guys have to go to register every year, and they get the handbook for the regulations, and most of them know the regulations, and they probably know it by heart, better than the officers.

 Now, some of them probably ain't too sharp on some of the regulations, depending on where they usually fish, but the majority of guys that are going to go out and fish in that area already know the regulations, but my thing is that, here, this was supposed to be a good thing, and this is like a slap in the face, where Mr. Magras asked Elizabeth Kadison to come and give this presentation, and, because there was some destruction found outside the bank, that we didn't have nothing to do with, we is the one that they're pointing the finger at again.

There comes a point in time, and, like someone has said, because

at this point in time, I am, because I feel that we, once again, are being attacked, and so this what is going to come out of it. Make sure that, when you point the finger, that you point the finger at the right people, and, like I told you, this destruction was by one individual, and that boat is no longer in the Virgin Islands, and so we don't need no more regulations.

4 5

We don't need to explore expanding this bank any bigger than it is, because, to be honest with you, I think that the commercial guys, the people of the Virgin Islands, have given up enough grounds to protect the Virgin Islands, and so we need to explore a different alternative.

MARCOS HANKE: Tony, thank you very much.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I agree with everything that Tony said, but the thing is that you have to put some perspective and do the thing that you need to do, and I believe that, hearing from Roy, the thing that you can do right here, following Julian's and Tony's presentation, is that we could go ahead with an aggressive outreach and education activities, and, by the way, outreach and education is not virtual meetings. It's a little bit more than that.

Then Alida, as always, is taking notes, and we can work on that part, and the other one, the other thing that I believe is important, is to evaluate the performance of the seasonal closures, and that can be done without any more regulations, and I believe that we should make a point of sending a letter from the council to the Chair -- I mean, the Chair of the council, excuse me, to the local authorities and federal authorities regarding the issue of enforcement and the need to enforce these areas, as Tony has mentioned.

 With those three actions, you will honor your commitment to protect the resources without getting to more unnecessary regulations at this time, and so I believe, Mr. Chairman, that probably -- You don't need a motion for this, but you can have a motion anyway to instruct the staff to follow the suggestions by Maria and the SERO staff to have an outreach and look at the possibility of evaluating the performance of seasonal closed areas as something that we need to do, and, also, to write a note, letter, request, any document, that will raise the point of enforcement needed in these particular areas, and that can be sent to the Coast Guard, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the local authorities.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Let's speed up on the

discussion. I have Roy and Julian, and then I want to make a comment.

ROY CRABTREE: I appreciate your comments, Tony, and that's why it's so important that we have people like you and Vanessa on the council, who are fishermen and fisherwomen and know how these things go and understand what it's like in your area.

I agree with you that none of this virtual meeting situation is ideal, and I don't like it either, but it's what we're stuck with for the moment, but this is a temporary thing, and I think we will get back to something more normal next year some time, and it sounds to me like maybe some of the outreach and education that we need to do is to our law enforcement folks, to make sure -- Just to remind them that we do have these rules, and they are important to us, and ask them to put a little more emphasis on it, and I know -- I think Manny Antonaras is on the meeting, and so he's hearing this discussion.

It makes sense to me that we, maybe like Miguel said, send a letter to enforcement, encouraging enforcement to try to put more emphasis on this, and then we do the best we can with outreach and education, just reminding folks about this, and maybe that will be difficult until we're able to travel and meet in-person again, but, in the meantime, we just do the best we can, but, I mean, that's why we need you on the council, Tony, to make sure we understand these things.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Roy. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Just one follow-up. You know, right now, with the MCD being closed for twenty-one years, do you know how much millions of dollars in studies have been put into that bank? A lot. I wouldn't even be able to comprehend the amount of money that is put into that bank, and, like Tony said, it's very small areas being studied, and a chosen few have been chosen to be part of that study, and where are the fishers' involvement? Little to none.

 The same with the Grammanik Bank. It's been studied from 2005, and here we are fifteen years later, and thousands and millions of dollars have been spent, and how much time are we going to spend looking at the same species year after year after year after year after year, where we have so many other things to be looking at, and you continue giving -- Every time a new group comes up, you guys give them thousands, hundreds of thousands, of dollars to study the same things over and over.

You know they have gotten so good at doing this that they have even gone and bought their own boats, so they don't have to use the fishing boats anymore, and they get to keep all the money in their pockets, and that's why, when these grants are written, the council and NMFS and NOAA and everybody should make it part of the grant that fisher involvement is there.

4 5

You know, I just heard today, and it's so disturbing to hear, that they're not using the fishing boats anymore to do some of the studies and that these people went out and bought their own boats, so they could make the money, and that's unfair to the fishers, the little bit that a few fishers were making, and now they can't make it anymore.

This needs to stop, and we're making our own money fishing, and now they're taking money from us, and they're the only ones able to go in the bank and catch the fish, and some of them are allowed to bring in the fish after they catch them, and others have got to release them, and it's unfair to the fishers, and this needs to change. The way we think about the commercial fishers, who are the users and the persons with the most knowledge of what's going on out there in the ocean needs to change, and you need to include us, and I've been saying so for years.

You guys have the power to do it, and all of the grants that were written this past year just came back, and not one grant was given for studies for the reef fish in the different management plans in the Caribbean, and everything was given to the Gulf and every place else, and the Caribbean, I guess, wasn't important this time, but all of these other people find us to be important, because they are getting their regular turnaround of the money every year to do five-year studies and ten-year studies, but what are the fishers getting? More and more stress every year.

We have been quiet for a long time, and it seems like we need to start to make noise again, and we don't want to do that, because I find that the way we've been working together as a team has been very helpful, and it's not only with the council, but we have the same problem right now with the local government, and it's the first time in sixteen years that I have to fight my own people because they don't support the commercial fishers, and so we have to fight for ourselves.

We are fighting for ourselves, and, up until now, we can't get our disaster money, and only those who got \$2,500 and \$5,000 got the money, but all the real fishers who took the big loss of gear and boats and everything have not gotten a penny, three years later. The process needs to change. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Tony, and thank you, Julian. Manny Antonaras. Please be very brief, and I'm going to make a comment to close the discussion. Manny. I am not hearing you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, while Manny gets his audio back, Vanessa is in agreement with Tony's and Julian's comments, and she believes that what is happening regarding enforcement and outreach and education is also true for around Puerto Rico.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and thank you for putting that on the record. The comment that I want to make is that -- Manny, are you ready?

MANNY ANTONARAS: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Go ahead.

MANNY ANTONARAS: I just wanted to thank Julian and Tony for the comments, and I just wanted to note, for the council, that our folks have followed-up on specific information with regard to illegal fishing in these areas, but I just want to emphasize that it's important that we do -- When folks are making these sort of general statements of lack of enforcement, that we do have some specifics.

I do recall, from the last meeting, there was discussion about a charter boat that was illegally operating in the area, and I understand that that boat is no longer operating in the USVI, but, if there are specifics with regard to illegal fishing or anything involving those areas, please let our folks now. We do have, as you all know, Miguel in Puerto Rico, and I will offer my contact information as well for specific information.

I can also tell you that we have targeted patrol activity in those areas in the past, and we're more than willing to work with the U.S. Coast Guard to pursue future patrols in those areas. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. One last comment from myself is that I liked the presentation, because, the way I see the presentation, it really covered the discussion in the previous meetings, and it had all the options there, including the options that fit on what Julian and Tony are requesting, and this already serves, in the way I see it, as a pathway to strengthen the need of outreach and education to the law

enforcement to engage them on the interest and the things that we need to fix or to address a little more direct.

I think the presentation was great on that matter, and I thank you, Maria, for making a good presentation to us that put us in the right perspective with the feedback from the people of St. Thomas, in this case Julian and Tony, and thank you very much.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, after all the thanking, what is it that you want us to do? Do you want to do the develop more outreach and send a letter to enforcement and evaluate the -- Start working on the evaluation of the performance of the seasonal closures, like Julian requested?

MARCOS HANKE: That's correct, those three items, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay, and so we don't need a motion for that, and we have it in the notes, and so Graciela and Maria will work after the meeting on the next steps for 2021, as Maria del Mar asked, and I also would like to relay my thanks to Maria, and this is a presentation of several slides, but it took a lot of work, going back to all the minutes, et cetera, and so I'm really grateful for what she did, and it's very well organized, et cetera.

The next thing that we have in the agenda, Mr. Chairman, is the public comment period, and I believe that you have some people that may want to talk.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: You have Rene Esteves online.

MIGUEL ROLON: If we don't have anybody else, we have Rene Esteves as the next one.

MARCOS HANKE: Rene, are you available to start?

RENE ESTEVES: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

RENE ESTEVES: First, let me say hello to everybody, and thanks for the opportunity. I do recognize some of the voices, and I miss seeing you all, and I just wanted to quickly give an update on -- I am Rene Esteves from Puerto Rico Sea Grant, the Marine Outreach Program, and I wanted to talk about addressing the decompression sickness crisis in commercial fishermen in Puerto

Rico.

Some time ago, we got a call from the head doctor at the decompression chamber in San Juan, because they were really concerned about the increased number of fishermen divers arriving at the chamber and the number of times that each diver would show up, one again and again and again. They wanted to talk to us about what could be done about it, and so a little bit about what we've been doing to address that issue.

We met with the doctors, and we asked them what is it that's going on over there, and they said that the fishermen show up with very little information about how deep and how long have they been down there, which is key for them to select what kind of treatment they receive, or the doctors prescribe, what protocols, and the resources that they have at the decompression chamber, in terms of staff, were being stretched thin, and they wanted to be more specific, more effective, in the treatment that they could offer to these fishermen.

We came up with the idea of buying some computers, diving computers, that we could program for them, just to record the dive profiles, and we handed them to six fishermen, two from Cabo Rojo, two from Vieques, one from Guanica, and one from Humacao. This, based on the information from the chamber doctors -- Most of the patients they received were from the southwest and southeast of Puerto Rico.

After a couple of months of the fishermen wearing the computers, we retrieved the computers and analyzed, with the idea of, for the first time, getting some empirical information of what were the fishermen actually doing, in terms of their diving patterns, so that the hyperbaric chamber doctors had a better idea of what treatment to prescribe.

 What came out was no surprise, and none of the divers were consistently within the recreational dive safety tables. In collaboration with the council, we did some video interviews of fishermen from throughout the island, and many of you saw some of that work on your previous meeting, and we also then decided to go around with a chart and ask a subset of the fishermen about the particular areas where they would go diving, just to inform and educate the doctors on the time it would actually take for them to head back to land, because all of this is taken into account when prescribing the protocol that they put the fishermen through in the chamber.

In addition to that, we met with a Cabo Rojo mayor, who, at the

time, was the only municipality official who incentivized this economically and incentivized the commercial fishermen sector, and they asked if we could sort of make an incentivized program for diving safety, where, if these fishermen were to continue to receive these incentives, they had to go through at least a basic diving course.

4 5

They agreed, and we're in the process of making that happen, and, obviously, everything has been held back, because of what we're going through, and we also brought in other mayors from throughout the south and east municipalities to the Cabo Rojo mayor's office, for them to get an idea, literally get how Cabo Rojo was doing it and what they get out of it from an elected official perspective and how they incentivize the economics through this help they give out to their commercial fishermen, and one of the mayors saw the light and hopped in, and this was Humacao, which is now, obviously, a part of our team, and they have agreed to separate a budget of about \$10,000 each for providing this education on basic diving techniques.

We are currently putting together educational curricula for first responders in some of these municipalities, for them to be able to identify the symptoms and treat and immediately refer the patients to the chamber, through the correct transportation options, and, based on what we're doing, we just wanted to let everybody in the council, since you're experts in the subject, know that this has been --

This is our current and latest initiative regarding fishermen safety, in terms of education, and we are more than happy to collaborate with any existing group or agency that has a similar initiative, in order to leverage, enhance, or expand this important activity. Thank you so much, again, for the time, and I'm happy to hear you all.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. For the council members, do you have any comments? Hearing none, it's very helpful information, and we are going to keep in touch, for sure, with you on future ways we can collaborate to increase the safety of the divers in the water.

Any other people on the public comment? Hearing none, we are ready to adjourn the meeting, and thank you very much, all, for your attention and for being there and a very productive meeting, again, and thank you very much. We are ready to adjourn, if there is nothing else, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: No, Mr. Chairman. For tomorrow, remember you

only have a half-day, and so please keep that in mind for the discussions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much to all.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on August 11, 2020.)

- - -

August 12, 2020

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Caribbean Fishery Management Council reconvened via webinar on Wednesday morning, August 12, 2020, and was called to order at 1:00 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Marcos Hanke.

MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, everyone. Today is Wednesday, August 12, 2020, the 170th CFMC meeting. we are going to start the meeting. Just a reminder that, every time you participate, state your name, on every participation. Use the chat to ask for a turn to speak, or the emoji with the little hand. All votes will be by roll call with full name, yes, no, or abstain. Public comments will have five minutes at the end of the meeting. the meeting will be recorded, and simultaneous translation is available, like yesterday, and we can start the roll call. Natalia.

NATALIA PERDOMO: Good morning, everyone. I am going to start with Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Buenos dias, Graciela Garcia-Moliner, council staff.

38 NATALIA PERDOMO: Liajay Rivera.

LIAJAY RIVERA: Liajay Rivera, council staff, buenos dias.

42 NATALIA PERDOMO: Miguel Rolon.

44 MIGUEL ROLON: Good morning. Miguel Rolon, council staff.

NATALIA PERDOMO: Jack McGovern.

48 JACK MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries. Good morning.

```
1
```

2 NATALIA PERDOMO: Alexis Sabine.

3

ALEXIS SABINE: Alexis Sabine.

5

NATALIA PERDOMO: Alida Ortiz.

7

8 ALIDA ORTIZ: Alida Ortiz, present.

9

10 NATALIA PERDOMO: Bill Cordero.

11

12 BILL CORDERO: Bill Cordero, present.

13

14 NATALIA PERDOMO: Carlos Farchette. Christina Olan.

15

16 CHRISTINA OLAN: Buenos dias. Christina Olan, council staff.

17

18 NATALIA PERDOMO: Diana Martino.

19

20 DIANA MARTINO: Buenos dias. Diana Martino, council staff.

21

22 NATALIA PERDOMO: Edward Schuster.

23

24 EDWARD SCHUSTER: Edward Schuster, DAP Chair, St. Croix. Good

25 morning.

26

27 NATALIA PERDOMO: Iris Oliveras. Jocelyn D'Ambrosio.

28

29 **JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO:** Good morning. Jocelyn D'Ambrosio, NOAA 30 Office of General Counsel.

31

32

NATALIA PERDOMO: John Walter. Julian Magras.

33

34 **JULIAN MAGRAS:** Julian Magras, DAP Chair, St. Thomas/St. John.

35

36 TONY BLANCHARD: Buenos dias. Tony Blanchard, Vice Chair.

37

38 NATALIA PERDOMO: Thank you, Tony. Katie Siegfried.

39

40 KATIE SIEGFRIED: Good morning. Katie Siegfried, Southeast

41 Fisheries Science Center.

42 43

NATALIA PERDOMO: Loren Remsberg.

44

45 LOREN REMSBERG: Loren Remsberg, NOAA Office of General Counsel.

46 Good morning.

47

48 NATALIA PERDOMO: Michelle Scharer.

```
1
```

MICHELLE SCHARER: Buenos dias. Michelle Scharer, independent contractor.

NATALIA PERDOMO: Marcos Hanke.

MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, everyone. Marcos Hanke, present.

9 NATALIA PERDOMO: María de los Irizarry.

11 MARIA DE LOS IRIZARRY: Good morning. María de los Irizarry, 12 council staff.

14 NATALIA PERDOMO: Good morning. Maria Lopez.

16 MARIA LOPEZ: Buenos dias. Maria Lopez, NOAA Fisheries.

18 NATALIA PERDOMO: Matthew Wailea.

20 MATTHEW WAILEA: Good morning. Matt Wailea, NOAA Office of Law 21 Enforcement.

23 NATALIA PERDOMO: Miguel Borges.

MIGUEL BORGES: Miguel Borges, NOAA Office of Law Enforcement.

Good morning.

_ /

28 NATALIA PERDOMO: Nelson Crespo.

NELSON CRESPO: Good morning, everyone. Nelson Crespo, DAP 31 Chair, Puerto Rico.

33 NATALIA PERDOMO: Nicole Angeli.

NICOLE ANGELI: Good morning. Nicole Angeli, USVI Department of Planning and Natural Resources.

38 NATALIA PERDOMO: Orian Tzadik.

ORIAN TZADIK: Good morning, everyone. Orian Tzadik, Pew 41 Charitable Trusts.

NATALIA PERDOMO: Ricardo Lopez.

45 RICARDO LOPEZ: Good morning. Ricardo Lopez, Puerto Rico DNER.

47 NATALIA PERDOMO: Richard Appeldoorn.

1 RICHARD APPELDOORN: Good morning. Rich Appeldoorn, SSC Chair.

2 3

NATALIA PERDOMO: Robert Copeland.

4

5 ROBERT COPELAND: Good morning. Lieutenant Robert Copeland, 6 U.S. Coast Guard, District 7.

7

8 NATALIA PERDOMO: Sarah Stephenson.

9

10 SARAH STEPHENSON: Good morning. Sarah Stephenson, NOAA 11 Fisheries.

12

13 NATALIA PERDOMO: Skyler Sagarese.

14

15 **SKYLER SAGARESE:** Skyler Sagarese, NOAA Fisheries.

16

17 NATALIA PERDOMO: Tauna Rankin.

18

19 TAUNA RANKIN: Good morning. Tauna Rankin, NOAA Fisheries.

20

21 NATALIA PERDOMO: Vanessa Ramirez.

22

23 VANESSA RAMIREZ: Good morning. Vanessa Ramirez, council 24 member.

25

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Good morning. I had audio problems. Carlos 26 27 Farchette, present, council member.

28

29 NATALIA PERDOMO: Thank you, Carlos. If I missed anybody --30 That's all I have in my list.

31

32 DAMARIS DELGADO: Good morning. Damaris Delgado, Puerto Rico 33 DNER.

34

35 NATALIA PERDOMO: Thank you, Damaris.

36 37

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Natalia.

38

39 IRIS OLIVERAS: Good morning. Iris Oliveras, council staff.

40

41 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Iris. Anybody else? Just write in the chat if there is anybody that is having any trouble with the 42 43 audio, and we have to keep on with the meeting. highlight today that our meeting is a half-day, and I need the 44 45 cooperation of everybody in order to finish with this agenda, 46 and there are many important issues that we're going to address.

Speaking with Miguel Rolon this morning, we have, under Other 47

48 Business, some items to cover, which is -- Miguel, do you want to explain that, or do you want me to just to give the titles?

4 5

MIGUEL ROLON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have two topics that will be covered by Carlos Farchette, the lobster fishery in St. Croix and the island-based FMP for St. Croix and then the generation gap and how do we get young fishers into the fishery, and I believe that that will be shared with Julian and Ruth, if she joins in, for a possible project. Then that will be followed by the Executive Order of the President for the seafood of the United States industry, and I will explain a little bit about it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Miguel. Let's start today again, and I need the cooperation of everybody being very precise and objective in your participation, in order to follow the agenda, a half-day agenda, that we have.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, David Ortiz is present, and Carlos Farchette wants to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. David Ortiz, we recognize your presence. Carlos Farchette, go ahead.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Yesterday, when we were discussing the gill and trammel net for pelagics, it kind of slipped me, and I was wondering how -- Maybe Roy can tell me how can we get to include trawling nets in that discussion.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos, just for clarity, and I couldn't hear, but which kind of net?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Trawling. You know you've got those big trawlers that put out those humungous nets.

MIGUEL ROLON: Carlos, just sent an email to Graciela, and she will take care of it for the staff.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. The first item on the agenda is Island-Based Fishery Management Plans Update by Maria del Mar Lopez.

ISLAND-BASED FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS UPDATE

MARIA LOPEZ: Good morning. This is going to be a short update. In the slide on your screen, you're going to see what I am going to be -- This is a summary of what I'm going to be talking

about, and so this island-based fishery management plans and the progress to date.

From the last meeting, we mentioned, for those of you that participated, that the notice of availability of the fishery management was published, and it's still open for comment until August 25, 2020, and, if you follow that link that is on the screen, or if you go to the council's website, you can see the Fishery Bulletin, or you can get access directly to where this document is on the internet, and then you can make your comments. Also, you can send your comments through the mail. If you have any questions on how to provide any more comments, please send me an email or call me, and I will provide that information for you.

The other thing that's coming up is, as Jocelyn mentioned yesterday, is the decision date on the island-based FMPs, which is the Secretary of Commerce makes a determination as to approve, disapprove, or partially approve the plans, and this is going to happen -- The deadline for this is September 24, 2020, and so this is the date where the plans should be approved.

Next, after that, we are going to continue developing the proposed rule and associated documents, and we're already working on that, and, once that is ready, we are going to publish a Fishery Bulletin that is going to indicate how to make comments on that proposed rule, and that proposed rule is going to be open for comments for thirty days. This information is going to be published by the council, and you're going to receive also this information in Fishery Bulletins.

All the comments that are received are going to be addressed in the final rule, and that final rule, when it's published, after it is published, there is a letter that the fishery management plans are going to be implemented.

As I have mentioned in the past, our goal is to have the plans applicable in the 2021 fishing season, and so that's the goal, and we're working hard to get there, and, in the meantime, the council would continue to discuss actions for potential amendments to each one of the island-based FMPs, as desired.

Again, just to reiterate, the fishery management plans are still open for comment for another week, August 25. So far, we have received two comments, and you can take a look at all of that if you visit the website. That's all I have, in case anybody has any other questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Maria. I don't see anybody on the chat for now. Let's go for the next item on the agenda, hearing no questions, which is the Options Paper for Updating the Spiny Lobster Annual Catch Limit.

1 2

OPTIONS PAPER FOR UPDATING THE SPINY LOBSTER ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT

SARAH STEPHENSON: Good morning. There was an options document that was given to the council and is up on their webpage, and this is what you're seeing now, and, if we need to, we can refer to this document at the end with questions, but, for now, if you will go to the presentation.

I am just going to go through this presentation kind of quickly, because it is a lot of information, and I will take questions at the end. This presentation will just provide an overview of the options for updating management reference points for spiny lobster following the accepted SEDAR 57 stock assessment. The modifications to the management reference points would be included in an amendment to each of the island-based fishery management plans.

The first few slides is a presentation just provided for you for an overview, or a review, of actions that have already happened. The three island-based FMPs were voted up at the December 2019 council meeting for review, approval, and implementation. The comment period, as Maria just said, for the notice of availability for the plans is open through August 25, and so there's still time to make comments on the notice.

island-based FMP includes the council's acceptable biological catch control rule, which was used to determine management reference points for each stock and stock complex included in each of the three FMPS. All stock and stock complexes in those FMPs were under Tier 4 of the ABC control rule, which was considered to be data-limited with no expected available. assessment The management reference determined under Tier 4 for each stock or stock complex would remain in place until such time that they were amended.

 The island-based FMPs updated the management reference points for spiny lobster from those that were determined through amendments to the Spiny Lobster FMP, and the acceptable biological catch and annual catch limits for spiny lobster under each island-based FMP are shown in this table, and we can come back to those, if need be.

This is just a quick look at Tier 4a of the control rule, which

was used to determine management reference points for spiny lobster under each island-based FMP, and Tier 4a stocks are data-limited, with no accepted assessment, but with a relatively low vulnerability to fishing pressure.

For each island, the spiny lobster stock was considered to be highly productive with a low to moderate level of susceptibility to the fishery, and the council considered the long history of management and compatible regulations for spiny lobster and set the ACL for each island at 95 percent of the ABC that was resultant from the control rule.

The Southeast Data Assessment and Review, which is what SEDAR stands for, the SEDAR stock assessments for spiny lobster were completed in August of 2019, and they were initially reviewed by the SSC at their October 2019 meeting. The SEDAR 57 stock assessments estimated numerical values for the maximum sustainable yield proxy, which is the largest long-term yield that can be taken from a stock under current conditions; the maximum fishing mortality threshold, which is used to determine if a stock is undergoing overfishing; and a minimum stock size threshold, which is used to determine if a stock is overfished.

The Tier 4 of the control rule had those determinations, but it wasn't able to assign a numerical value to it. The SEDAR 57 stock assessment was able to do that.

The stock assessments also projected overfishing limits for 2019 to 2022, but, following a council request at the December meeting, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center updated those model projections, using more recent landings data, and projected overfishing limits for the years 2021 through 2026, which were presented to the council at the June 2020 meeting.

At the May 2020 meeting, the SSC determined that the SEDAR 57 stock assessments are suitable for management advice, and the SSC Chair reported that out at the June 2020 council meeting.

Having an accepted assessment shifts the spiny lobster stock for each island from Tier 4a to Tier 3 of the ABC control rule, which would require an amendment to update the management reference points. Tier 3 stocks are still considered to be data limited, but with an accepted assessment, and so that's the big difference.

Discussions at the December 2019 and the June 2020 council meetings focused on procedures for determining the ABC from the projected OFLs, including the council's acceptable level of risk

for the probability of overfishing for the spiny lobster, and that was the P* that a lot of the discussions centered around.

Following the accepted assessments, an amendment will be needed for each island-based FMP, to update the management reference points for the stock. At the June meeting, the council requested staff bring options for updating the spiny lobster ACLs to this meeting that could be considered in a joint amendment to the three FMPs.

Under the amendment, the MSY, MFMT, MSST, and OFL management reference points would be updated automatically, based on the SEDAR 57 determinations. For updates to the spiny lobster ABC, the council would provide input to the SSC on its acceptable probability of overfishing, or P*. Based on that P*, the SSC would then recommend ABCs, as reduced from the OFLs, for 2021 through 2026.

The council provided their selected P* at the June meeting, and that decision and resulting discussion was captured and included as Action 1 of the options paper. For updates to the spiny lobster ACL, the council would first need to determine how they would use the ABCs recommended by the SSC, either using the annual ABCs recommended for each year, which would result in ACLs that change every year, or using a multiyear ABC that would result in an ACL that is set at a constant value.

The council would then need to set the ACL from the ABC, accounting for their level of management uncertainty and their ability to constrain catch to the ACL. These steps are included in Action 2 of the options paper.

Depending on the processes used and the outcomes of updating the ACLs, the accountability measures for spiny lobster included in the island-based FMPs may need to be revised. Since those ACL outcomes are unknown at this time, the revision of the accountability measure was not included in the options paper, but it will be discussed briefly at the end of the presentation.

Following the request at the June council meeting, staff drafted an options paper that could be considered in a joint amendment to the island-based FMPs that would modify the spiny lobster management reference points based on the SEDAR 57 stock assessments. The option paper simply provides examples that the council could consider for updating these management reference points. The council could accept, modify, reject, or add to the options that are provided in the paper.

The options paper is available on the council's webpage, and it includes two actions. Action 1 provides options for updating the ABCs, which were based on discussions at the December 2019 meeting and the P* decision made at the June 2020 meeting, and Action 2 provides options for updating the spiny lobster ACL for each island.

4 5

Under Action 1, the council would select their P* for spiny lobster for each island group and accept the SSC's recommendation associated with that P*, and so the council considered a range of P* values and selected an acceptable P* of 0.45. Action 1 records the council's decisions and rationale in the document for the options that were considered.

Seven options were included in the options paper, and Option 1 is the no action, which would retain the ABC for spiny lobster specified in each island-based FMP, but this option would not allow for updates to the ABC, but it would be based on the best scientific information available, AKA the SEDAR stock assessments, and this is required for analysis purposes, this option.

Options 2 through 7 correspond to the range of P^* values selected by the council at the December meeting, with Option 2 corresponding to a P^* of 0.4 and so on, until Option 7, which corresponds to the P^* of 0.45. At the June meeting, the council discussed the range of P^* values considered and selected a P^* of 0.45, and that reflected the level of uncertainty in the SEDAR 57 stock assessments that they were comfortable with to ensure that overfishing does not occur.

In the options paper, Option 7 is listed as the preliminary preferred option for Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/St. John, and St. Croix. Tables are included in the options paper for each island or island group that lists the resulting ABCs for spiny lobster for each option, and the tables are just too big to include in the presentation, and so, if people would like, at the end, we can switch over to the document and look at those. A high-level comparative analysis of the options was also included.

Under Action 2, the council would select the process for determining the ACL and optimum yield for spiny lobster in each island or island group from the ABCs that were recommended by the SSC. That reflects the council's level of management uncertainty.

Per the Magnuson-Stevens Act and regulations, the ACL set by the council cannot exceed the ABC recommended by the SSC. It can be

equal to the recommended ABC, but it cannot exceed the ABC. This legal requirement guided the options that were considered in the options paper.

Three options were included under Action 2, and, as I mentioned previously, the options can be modified, per council guidance. Option 1 is the no action, which would retain the ACL for spiny lobster specified in each island-based FMP. Similar to the previous action, this option would not allow for updates to the ACL based on the best scientific information available, but it's required for analysis purposes.

At this time, only two options were considered, based on the ABCs that were recommended by the SSC. Option 2 would set the ACL and the optimum yield equal to the ABC recommended by the SSC for each year from 2021 to 2026, as reduced by a management uncertainty buffer in one of the sub-options.

Under this option, the ACLs would change from year-to-year during the six-year period, because the ABCs change every year. Sub-Options 2a through 2c use a range of management uncertainty buffers from zero to 10 percent, which were selected as options just based on historical actions. Sub-Option 2a would set the ACL equal to the ABC recommended by the SSC in each year, and Sub-Option 2b would set the ACL at 95 percent of the recommended ABC each year, and Sub-Option 2c would set the ACL at 90 percent of the recommended ABC each year.

Option 3 would set the ACL and optimum yield equal to the minimum ABC recommended by the SSC for the 2021 to 2026 time period, again, as reduced by the management uncertainty buffer in one of the sub-options. Under this option, the ACL for spiny lobster in each island or island group would be set at a constant value during the six-year period. The minimum ABC was used in order to keep the ACL each year under the recommended ABC, and I will show you how this works in just a moment and why we selected this option.

 Sub-Options 3a through 3c use the same range of management uncertainty buffers as Option 2, and, again, those could be modified or added to, if so requested by the council. Tables for Action 2 are included in the options paper for each island or island group that list the resulting ACLs for spiny lobster for each option and so sub-option and corresponding to each P* value from Action 1, so you can kind of get the whole suite of what the ACLs could be.

Other options may be possible for setting ACLs from the

recommended ABCs, but only these two options were included in the options paper, in order to provide a complete document with comparative analysis in time for this August meeting.

This is just a quick look at pros and cons to be considered when comparing the options for Action 2. As mentioned, Option 1, the no action, would not update the management reference points for spiny lobster based on the SEDAR 57 stock assessments, and so it wouldn't be based on the best scientific information available.

Option 2, which sets the ACL equal to the ABC each year, as reduced by some level of management uncertainty, would set ACLs at a higher level than the Option 3 sub-options, but it would result in ACLs that change every year, and that would prompt an action to be included in the amendment to revise the accountability measures, which are currently compared to a set value ACL.

Also, considering the two-year data lag in available commercial landings, having ACLs that change from year to year could prevent a timely evaluation of whether the ACL that was in effect during a given year was exceeded, and this complicates efforts to ensure accountability with the ACL.

Option 3, which would set a constant value ACL from the recommended ABCs, would be similar to the current process, in which landings are compared to a constant-value ACL, and that would be easier and less confusing for monitoring purposes. Under this action, the AM would not necessarily need to be revised, although it may be updated to reflect different years of landings data.

However, due to legal requirements that state that the ACL cannot exceed the recommended ABC, the ACL would need to be set equal to the minimum value of the ABCs recommended during the six-year period. For St. Thomas/St. John and St. Croix, in which the ABCs increase in the first year, 2021, and then decrease in time, to converge on the level of the MSY proxy, and those are the graphs that Adyan showed us at the June meeting, and this option would not allow for that increase in catch initially observed in the first year. Therefore, over the six-year period, a portion of the acceptable catch recommended by the SSC could be foregone with Option 3.

Staff realized that setting the ACL from the minimum ABC may not be desirable, especially in light of that foregone yield, and they considered other options for setting ACLs from the ABCs that were recommended by the SSC.

1 2

4 5

Here are some of those options that were considered using the average ABC from the six-year period, using the median ABC value, or using that maximum ABC value. However, all three of those options failed the requirement that the ACL not exceed the ABC in one or more of the six years.

The table to the right highlights the example of using the average ABC calculated from the 2021 through 2026 ABCs that were recommended by the SSC to set the ACL over the same range of management uncertainty buffers used in Option 2, and so no management uncertainty buffer, 0.95, or 0.9.

The red numbers in the table represent years in which the ACL exceeded the ABC recommended for that year, and so you can see that the ACLs in the last column, which represent a management uncertainty buffer of 0.9, applied to the average ABC, only violates the legal requirement in the last year. This example helps illustrate the point that, based on the ABCs that were recommended by the SSC, only by setting the ACL equal to the minimum value during that time period would result in an ACL value that is less than the ABC. If you set it at any other value, you're going to violate that requirement in at least the last year, in at least the year with the lowest ABC.

Similar results happen when using the median ABC or the maximum ABC to set the ACLs. Some years would have an ACL that is greater than the recommended ABC, which would violate the Magnuson-Stevens Act and regulations.

What are the next steps? The spiny lobster interdisciplinary planning team, or IPT, which is comprised of council and NMFS staff, will work with the Science Center to evaluate other options, based on the ABCs that were recommended, which change over year, to see if there is something that we could do based on what the SSC has already recommended.

The council could request the SSC recommend an acceptable constant catch ABC for each island or island group in addition to the moving catch that they have already recommended. This would provide the council with more options for setting a constant catch ACL that could allow for more harvest over the six-year period when compared to Option 3, which was using the minimum value of the ABCs already recommended.

Then, following council input and guidance from this meeting, the IPT will develop the spiny lobster amendment to the islandbased FMPs for consideration at the December council meeting. 1 2

4 5

Depending on that input and guidance that we get, the draft amendment may include a third action to revise the accountability measures for spiny lobster. Under the island-based FMPs, the accountability measure for lobster uses a spin-up process to compare landings data to the spiny lobster ACL, and, again, that's a set value ACL.

In the spin-up process, a single year, followed by a two-year average, followed by a three-year average of landings, would be compared to that spiny lobster ACL, and that would remain constant through time, until so amended.

If an AM is triggered, the length of the spiny lobster fishing season would be reduced the following year by the amount necessary to ensure that landings do not again exceed the ACL in the year of the application. This application of the AM would be less straightforward if the ACL changed every year, and so that's why it would probably need to be revised.

If the council considers options that result in ACLs that change from year to year, the AM would need to be revised. For example, the trigger for that AM could compare a single year of landings to a single-year ACL, or it could compare average landings over multiple years to the average ACL for those years. If needed, options for an accountability measure revision would be included and analyzed as a third option in the amendment. With that, I will take any questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sarah. That was a great presentation, and there was a lot of things to digest and to understand. Any questions for Sarah? I have nothing in the chat yet. Damaris, did you have a question?

DAMARIS DELGADO: Yes. Thank you. From my understanding, the lobster populations in Puerto Rico are doing fine, and why are you considering an option to make more strict measures?

 SARAH STEPHENSON: Thank you. That is because of the new stock assessment that was done and that was accepted by both the SSC and the council, and so, based on the determinations that were made in that stock assessment, it shifted the tiers that spiny lobster was listed in, which is what those original ACLs were set on, into a new tier, and so they all need to be redone, and, based on the values that came out of the stock assessment, that's why this is happening.

They are more restrictive than what would be included in the

island-based FMPs, but, if you compare them to the current ACLs from the Spiny Lobster FMP, they actually could potentially increase, depending on which management uncertainty buffer was selected, and so all of this was triggered by the stock assessment.

DAMARIS DELGADO: All right. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Richard. Then, after Richard, Vanessa.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you. Just a couple of comments. When the council is considering these things, they should be aware that we're putting together our experience with the lobster fishery over time with what the model is saying about the lobster fishery over time, and, when we were back in Tier 4, we were going, okay, our experience is pretty good, and let's up this, and we actually upped it quite a bit.

The model is telling us that maybe we shouldn't do it that way, and so our history of success was based on the old ACL, and we didn't have any information to know what the new ACL would have been under Tier 4, whether it would have been good or not, but the model was telling us that, no, that's not where we want to be.

As it was pointed out, that's the best information we have at the moment, and it is a data-limited model, and there might be some aspects of it that will change as we get information, especially on the selectivity information, that studies now underway, or starting to get underway, will answer, and so we're hoping that maybe there will be some updates that will improve the scenario, but please keep in mind that the analysis that was done under the SEDAR process did show that populations exceeded the overfishing level in two of the three platforms, but there is a peak period, and so it is possible, under the current fishing levels, or levels that have historically occurred, to exceed the levels where we should be, and so we have to be a bit more cautious.

 This may not be what's actually happening in the population, because, as I said, this is a data-limited model, and things may be more robust than we think, but the actions are driven by the model and not by what we otherwise think, and so that's the reason for having some caution, so we don't trigger an overfishing determination. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: I have some comments. We already know that the data in Puerto Rico is not the best, and this is based on the number of commercial fishermen that have licenses, and practically 50 percent of the real commercial fishermen don't have licenses, some because they lose them between the time of 2017, after Maria, and they don't complete the process for the renovation, and they have to start again, practically, in 2018 and 2019, and so, if we -- It's just a question.

4 5

If we are taking the numbers based on 2017 and 2018, how will this affect our commercial fishermen that now that they are taking out their license again and putting again the numbers, the real numbers, in the statistics? Basically, with this number, just one town, or the west side of the island, we will make that quota, and so I think that we should think on that, because, if we consider this for the next five years, we are trying — In the fish markets, we are trying, in here, to make them put the real numbers and tell them that it doesn't affect the government benefits, and that is the most common thing that they use, to just don't put the real numbers.

Also, we are trying, after this, they are now looking for their license again, and many of the fishers that we have are now having their provisional license, and how will this affect for the next years, if we already know that the data is not correct and that practically I could say, day by day, that what I see in here, that just one town, my town, will make practically more than the 70 percent of this quota. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah.

SARAH STEPHENSON: I think that's more a question for the Science Center. Is there someone on that could maybe address how the data that's going to be coming out in the next few years — How that could maybe play into the levels that are set from SEDAR?

MARCOS HANKE: Is there anybody from the Science Center?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Is Adyan on the call?

JOHN WALTER: Good morning, everyone. As the landings data come in, they will be accounted for in the progress towards the annual catch limit, and we noted that landings have been down, due to the hurricanes and a lot of the effects on the fishers due to that, and so we would expect them to come up, and most of these options are substantial increases from what recent years have been, because of that, and so, presumably, those increased

catches, as fishermen recover, would be possible under any of these ABCs and ACLs.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. We have Julian and then Roy.

TONY BLANCHARD: It's Tony Blanchard. Could you bring back up the slide with the chart on it? Right there. I've got a question. Why is it taking on a six-year -- Why does the track go through six years, instead of a shorter or a longer term?

SARAH STEPHENSON: The six years are based on the period that the SEDAR assessment projected OFLs, and so OFLs were projected for the years 2021 through 2026, and so the SSC set, and the council together set, the ABCs for those same six years, and so we don't have any projections past the year 2026, and, when I mentioned that, in the next steps slide, how the IPT could get together with the Science Center, we could get together and try to determine if there are any other options that maybe we could use that would get a higher level of catch over the six-year time period but that wouldn't violate the requirement that the ACL be equal to or less than the ABC.

There may be other options out there, but that's why we're only looking at the six-year period, and so the first question, I guess, to the council is do you want an ACL that changes from year to year, even if the first three years is one value and the second three years, or if they change every two years, and is that okay?

Is that something that you would consider, knowing that it means that you have to revise the accountability measures and how things are triggered and how things are compared to the ACL, or do you just want a constant value through time? Do you want one number that you have to know and that you have to compare your landings to? That's kind of the first question, but that's why we only used the six years. Does that answer your question?

TONY BLANCHARD: This is how I'm looking at it. We're looking at projections going through a six-year period, right?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes.

TONY BLANCHARD: Right now, we can't even project what will happen in the next six months with this pandemic, as an example, or the hurricane season, which we're getting up into the height of it, but we are here speculating and projecting what things are going to look like in the next six years.

The point I'm trying to make here is, the longer we look ahead, the more inaccurate this will become, and so what I am looking at is a shorter timeframe that we would be able to work with and that is probably more realistic in the grand scheme of things. Do you understand what I'm saying?

How I see it is, the longer ahead we look at this, the -- It's like looking at the hurricanes and the weatherman, and they're projecting what's going to happen in a week's time. The projections will tell you that, the farther out it is, the farther away it is, the harder it is to make an accurate projection. The point here is, the farther out we look, it's harder to project an accurate number.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I just want to add on to what Tony said, and I think it should be a shorter time period, and then you're watching these projections and the numbers keep going down. Before, we ran the ACLs off of one set number, and you had three years that you collect information, and it would give you an overrun or an underrun, something to work with, but, here, you're projecting that the numbers are continually going to decline, and, actually, right now, the numbers are down, because the lobster fishery has taken one of the biggest hits, due to the fact of the pandemic and the hotels being closed.

Those numbers are really down, but we don't know what's going to happen six months to a year from now, and I don't think the pandemic is going away anytime soon. Right here in St. Thomas, right now, our cases are almost forty new cases a day, and so we are on the rise, and so I think we're looking at a longer time period, and different numbers is a problem. I think it needs to be a shorter time period and stick with one number for at least three years, and let's see what happens over that three-year period.

TONY BLANCHARD: I agree with Mr. Magras.

MARCOS HANKE: Tony, Richard Appeldoorn wants to follow-up on your observation, and so finish, and then I will pass to Richard and then Roy on the queue. Go ahead.

 TONY BLANCHARD: Okay. What was wrong with keeping it at three years and how we have it currently, looking at it for three years, and, if we overrun, then we deal with it, on a three-year average? The question is why can't we stick to the three-year average scenario?

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah.

1 2

4 5

SARAH STEPHENSON: You could do that, but the reason why it was set up this way in the options paper and the document was because this was the information that came out of the SEDAR assessment and set down through the SSC, and so, if the projections -- If the SSC says that it would be acceptable to just do something using the first three years, then we could follow that. We didn't want to make that assumption, and so we used the information that came out of the assessment.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's give the opportunity for Richard to weighin and then Roy Crabtree after that.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you. The reason -- I'm not sure which island this is for, but the reason the numbers would go down in this projection is because the catch rates that were used to set this clearly indicated that fishing had been much lower, and therefore there is an excess amount of lobsters that are available to be harvested, and then, gradually, that's reduced down to where the ABC value would be, and, therefore, it's allowing you to take this extra.

The SSC had recommended that you may want to do periodic updates to this, and it's not changing the model, but it's changing the model, what Tony had said.

If you find out that you are underharvesting, because of storms and pandemics or whatever, you just ask for a recalculation, and the excess amount of stock that was made available by not being harvested, due to those impacts, would then be recalculated into the ABC automatically, and you would have to somehow update the plan to accept those changes, but those changes can be made very quickly, and it was our recommendation, in fact, that you do that. His point about those projections being less realistic the further you go out is absolutely true, and that was my comment.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard. Roy Crabtree.

ROY CRABTREE: I think I agree with a lot of what Tony is saying. Projecting out six years is a long time, and, typically, with a number of SSCs, they will only give projections out for three years, and sometimes five years, but even that's a long way to go, and it seems to me, in this case, what we ought to do is schedule an update of the assessment to be done let's say in 2023, and this would just be an update, and so it would pull in the landings and the kind of information, and then we could probably look at setting the ABCs based on

three years, and then we get the new update done in 2023 and put in place new catch levels from 2024 out.

 I believe that John Walter is on, and I don't know if there is a schedule, or if you all thought about when we ought to do an update, but, certainly, given all the things going on with uncertainty about effort and how much effort there is going to be, there is a lot of reasons for why we might want to ensure that we have an update assessment in three years, and I would be interested in hearing John's thought on what he would think about us setting it based on three years of the projection and then schedule an update and reset things there and if that's something the Science Center feels like would be workable.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Roy. A response with John Walter, and I agree with what you said. Go ahead, John,

JOHN WALTER: The SEDAR Steering Committee is the committee who plans and schedules assessments. Right now, on the books for the Caribbean, next up in the queue is queen trigger on all three island platforms, and then that is scheduled for 2021, and we start then queen snapper in 2022, redtail parrotfish at the same time, and then, in 2024, it's lane snapper.

Right now, we don't have lobster on the planning schedule, that I can see, but lobster is clearly one of the most important species, and so surely that could be taken up and so reprioritization happen.

Now, as an update, or kind of an interim assessment, it's probably something that, as long as the data were available, and the data collection streams work fairly well, it wouldn't be that hard to do.

 What I'm hearing is that it could potentially be different or affected by differential reporting, and that could challenge conducting the assessment, but, as long as the data comes in, I think it's something that we could bring to the SEDAR Steering Committee to get in the queue earlier. That would allow for setting an ABC for three years under the assumption that, in 2023, an assessment would occur that would allow for an update of the status. Thanks.

 ROY CRABTREE: If I could, Mr. Chairman, that's helpful, John, and that seems like, to me, a good course of action, and then I don't think any of us want to set different ACL values for each year and have to do all of that and change the accountability mechanisms.

1 2

4 5

Maybe what we could do is kind of direction to staff that we want to look at setting a constant ACL, and so we need a constant ABC, and we would like to focus on three years, and then, at the next SEDAR Steering Committee meeting, which I believe there is already one scheduled in the fall, we try to get an update for spiny lobster scheduled for 2023, and we make adjustments in the assessment schedule, as needed, and we go with that.

Then staff could kind of pull all of this together for us to review next time around, along those lines, if we think that's workable. I don't know if that would mean that we would need to have the SSC look at this again or not, and I guess we would need some input about that.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Roy. I think we are going the right route here. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: I will defer to Richard, who wants to respond to Roy, and you have other people in the queue.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and we have a lot of people in the queue, and it's a little confusing. Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Two points. As I said, one of the reasons these values go down is we're looking at a -- We're dealing with excess stock, and we're allowing the fishery to catch that and gradually getting down to where the OFL and ABC would occur. It's taking -- This projection is taking six years to get down to that level. If you want to change it to three years, you're going to get down to that level in three years, I think is how that would be mandated, but that's probably more a question for Jocelyn.

The thing that the SSC was recommending was that the most recent landings data be used to recalculate what the ABCs would be, and this could be done pretty much with the click of a button, because the model is already set up to do that, and all you're introducing is the new landings information, and, while that would require some administrative change to accept the new ABCs, this is not a new SEDAR assessment, and it doesn't need to be put on the SEDAR schedule or anything like that.

 If we finally get information, say on gear selectivity, that's different, and that would change the model, and that would probably require some form of SEDAR assessment, and I'm not sure if it's a full review or some kind of partial change, but

there's two things going on here. Just changing the landings data information to actually implement and accept what the real situation is in the fishery relative to landings, that's very simple to do, and it doesn't require a big analysis.

It just requires whatever process needs to have the ABC set from whatever the old value was to the new value, but, if we actually wanted to drive this to a three-year time period, I think you're going to drive it from that 164,000 to the 120,000 in that three-year period.

As I said, there might be some clarification on that on what is legally acceptable, but the point of the analysis is to get to what the ABC would be if we were fishing at maximum sustainable yield all the time, and so, if you want to say it takes longer to get there, maybe there will be a different allocation of the resources, and, if you want to say I want to get there in a shorter period of time, there's going to be a different allocation of the resources, but that's why you have this sixyear thing, is to gradually get you to where the ABC would be if your fishery was on a --

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I think we should allow Jocelyn to say something, and maybe we need to reconsider the legalities of anything that we are doing.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Jocelyn and then Graciela and then Tony. Go ahead.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you. One of the things that I was going to note is that, if the council is thinking about setting a constant ABC and wants to base that on a -- Sorry. A constant ACL, and wants to base that on a constant ABC, I would recommend that the council ask its SSC to revise that ABC recommendation, and, right now, as it's shown here, we have ABC recommendations that change over the year, and so we would want to get a different ABC recommendation from the SSC, and the council could ask for that constant ABC.

Given some of the discussion here about the appropriate timeframe, the council could ask for the SSC to look over a three-year time period, and that could require coordination with the Science Center, because they have provided, based on the assessment, those OFL projections over a different time series, and so I would just recommend going back to the SSC, if we want a different ABC recommendation that looks at a shorter time period, and also if we want that constant ABC recommendation.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: I would defer to John Walter, who is wanting to respond, and then you also have Tony in the queue.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. John Walter and then Tony.

 JOHN WALTER: Thank you. Thank you, Graciela. One of the new jobs that I've got in my position is trying to better coordinate the communications and the requests from the council to the Science Center, and so, Miguel and Graciela, you will be getting a letter about how to better do that, so that we can respond to things.

One of these responses and a request could be for an interim assessment, and, as Rich well put, that would not need to go through the SEDAR process, and so, if the council requested an interim update assessment of spiny lobster, to give 2024 advice, to request that for 2023, it would be through that process, where you would send a letter and we would go through the process of trying to make that happen, and that seems very doable.

If there is substantially more information, like the selectivity experiments come through, it might need to expand beyond just an interim approach, but that process is going to be put into place to make those requests happen. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Tony and then Roy.

TONY BLANCHARD: I am going back to the statement that Jocelyn made a little while ago. I agree with what Jocelyn said, and I agree that we need to look at this in a three-year time period, and so I would follow Jocelyn's recommendations, and we will go on the three-year average, like we agreed on, and let's look at the numbers and let the SSC, or whoever needs to recalculate, do their job.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Tony. Next in the queue is John Walter and then Roy Crabtree.

42 MIGUEL ROLON: John Walter already talked, and it's Roy Crabtree 43 now.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Roy.

ROY CRABTREE: I think that's the way to go, and I guess we do need to consult with the SSC again, and I'm not really following

what Richard said about needing to get down to the 120,000 faster if we just go with three. It seems to me that, with the projection, there is a certain biomass and a certain level of harvest that they can sustain, and, if we set things for three years and then update it, it doesn't -- I am not following why it would decline any faster just because of that, but that's neither here nor there, and they can sort that out with the Science Center, but I guess our question to the SSC would be that we want to set a constant ACL, based on three years, and then we're going to schedule a new assessment.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Richard, do you want to respond to that?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yes, and I don't have any problem with what's being requested, and the reason I had suggested that we would need to get down to that 120,000 in that earlier timeframe is because what happens if nothing happens in 2023 and it does not go through an update, and it can't be done? Are we now stuck with some higher level that's going to go on for a longer period of time, or does the fishery close, because there is no ACL set or whatever, or should it be set at the level of what the long-term ABC would be?

That's something that I think would be -- The answer to that can be discussed and brought to the SSC, so we're fully aware of what the options are and how to do this, so we don't get ourselves in a jam, should we not get the update on schedule. That's really my concern.

MARCOS HANKE: Roy, did you want to respond?

ROY CRABTREE: What we would do would be set in the regulations an ABC based on those three years, or the ACL, and it would be the ACL until changed, but, if we got to 2023 and, for whatever reason, there wasn't going to be a new assessment, then I think we would have to readdress the ACL and change it based on the projections that we have, and so I suppose, if that was the way it played out, we could be looking at some real reductions in 2024, but I think that just underscores that we need to get the interim assessment done to deal with that.

We do this a lot of times with all the councils, where we'll set an ABC based on three years, and that's what is in the regulations until changed, but the ABC here -- We would still have to deal with the fact that, in 2024, we don't have a new assessment, and we're potentially harvesting too many lobster, and we would have to look at it, but I really don't see what would prevent us from getting the interim assessment done.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. I have Julian Magras.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I listened to Richard stating that we're going to be harvesting this higher number, and I can see, with all that is going on here in St. Thomas and St. John, of us getting to any higher number and that we need to get to that 120,000 pounds faster.

Presently, with the pandemic and the hotels closed, and there are no cruise ships, and our biggest hotel, which is Frenchmen's Reef, has not even started back the renovations since the pandemic has kicked in, and they're talking about maybe June of 2021 to start back to finish their project of rebuilding, and no one knows when the cruise ships are going to be coming back.

There is no way that we will be able to harvest the quantity of lobsters that we were able to harvest a year ago, and we're still recovering from the hurricanes, and so let's say, for instance, were to use that 164,000 pounds for 2021 and come down to the average of 127,000 pounds, like what it shows there, because these numbers reflect St. Thomas/St. John.

We're never going to get close to those numbers with what's going on right now. Lobsters is one of the hardest things to sell during this time, and, like I said, we don't know what's going to happen, and so I think we need to let the three years play out, and we're going to continue looking at it every year.

Maybe, every time we have a council meeting, maybe some kind of update is given on what's going on in the islands, and has things improved, or have things gotten better, and the DAP chairs and the council members that represent each platform can give an update on that, because we're the ones with the hands-on experience and know what's going on in our area, and so I think we need to stick with the three-year plan and don't rush to get into something that's' going to, in the long run, hurt the fishermen. Thank you.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian, and I want just to highlight that the restaurants and the hotels -- In many cases, they are not in the recovery process, and they are already closed, and that's just to support the lines that Julian put on the record. Roy, the next turn is for you, and I need maybe help from Roy, to see if I need a motion or a specific instruction to the staff to proceed with what is being discussed. Roy.

ROY CRABTREE: Thanks, Marcos. To the extent that Julian is

right and all these lobster aren't caught and the catches are lower than these values in the projections, then, all things equal, that likely means that we're going to be leaving biomass in the water, which we could catch down the road, and so, if the catches are lower, it's quite likely that we would be able to have higher ABCs down the road.

4 5

The best way to get at that is through the update of the assessment, but that will be taken into account, and so I think, in terms of a motion, and I'm asking folks to help me out on staff with that at the moment, but I think what we do is we go back to the SSC and ask them to look at giving us a constant ABC based on the first three years of the projection, and the SSC can work out this issue of how much the projections need to decline with the Science Center at that time, but we ask for a new constant ABC for 2021 to 2023.

Then, generally, at SEDAR Steering Committees, the chair of the council and Miguel and Graciela would usually be there, and we would then work with John Walter and the Science Center and get an interim assessment scheduled for 2023. I will make a motion, Marcos, that we ask the SSC to provide us with a new constant ABC for 2021 to 2023.

MARCOS HANKE: Roy, can you hold on for a second, for Natalia to be ready to write down the motion? Thank you. Natalia, are you ready, or Liajay?

NATALIA PERDOMO: I'm ready.

MIGUEL ROLON: Just dictate the motion to Natalia slowly.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Go ahead, Roy.

ROY CRABTREE: The council requests the SSC coordinate with the Science Center to provide a constant ABC for spiny lobster in each of the three island-based FMPs based on the first three years of the projections --

MARCOS HANKE: Roy, it's too fast. The council requests the SSC to coordinate --

ROY CRABTREE: Coordinate with the Science Center to provide a constant ABC for spiny lobster for each island group, based on SEDAR 57, and based on the first three years of the OFL projections, and that would be 2021 to 2023. It is the council's intent to request an interim assessment be conducted in 2023 to set catch levels for 2024 and beyond.

TONY BLANCHARD: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: I will give you a little time for you to read the motion. I am going to read it for the record. The council requests the SSC to coordinate with the Science Center to provide a constant ABC for spiny lobster for each island group, based on SEDAR 57, and based on the first three years of the OFL projections, from 2021 to 2023. It is the council's intent to request an interim assessment to be conducted in 2023 to set catch levels for 2024 and beyond. The motion was presented by Roy Crabtree and seconded by Tony Blanchard. Is there discussion now?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, Richard has a question or a clarification on the motion.

18 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I have a question whether "OFL" should read "ABC".

MARCOS HANKE: Roy, it's your motion, and is it acceptable, the change?

ROY CRABTREE: Yes, that's fine.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Anybody else for discussion? Hearing none, I think we are ready to vote. Did I see somebody coming in? Carlos Farchette, before we vote.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I just wanted to say that I agree with what was said by Tony, Roy, and Jocelyn, and I agree with Roy that we need to keep it constant. This thing of going up or down every year, or down every year, it would be very difficult for Schuster and I to tell the fishermen that you've got 10,000 pounds less this year, or 5,000 pounds less that year, and that's very confusing, and so I think we're going in the right direction. I know, if we have to go to these fishers and keep telling them that you're up or down, him and I would probably be wearing cement shoes shortly.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. Let me see if I have anybody else here to speak.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, this should be a roll call and so call everybody for a yea or nay.

```
1 MARCOS HANKE: Is there anybody in opposition?
```

MIGUEL ROLON: No. Do a roll call and get a yea or nay.

5 MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Let me see here. Carlos Farchette.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

9 MARCOS HANKE: Tony Blanchard.

11 TONY BLANCHARD: Yes.

13 MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa Ramirez.

15 VANESSA RAMIREZ: Yes.

17 MARCOS HANKE: Nicole Angeli.

NICOLE ANGELI: Yes.

21 MARCOS HANKE: Damaris Delgado.

DAMARIS DELGADO: Yes.

25 MARCOS HANKE: Rov.

27 ROY CRABTREE: Yes.

29 MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

31 MIGUEL ROLON: It's unanimous.

MARCOS HANKE: It's unanimous, and the motion carries. We can go back to the presentation and the discussion, I believe.

MIGUEL ROLON: Is there anything else in the presentation that we need to discuss? If not, you can go ahead and go to the other ones, and so let's ask the presenter whether she needs to have any other things for the presentation or whether we need something from the council to continue the work on the spiny lobster.

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah, are we missing anything else that is super 44 important?

SARAH STEPHENSON: I think, at this time, no. Eventually, you will need to make that decision on the management uncertainty buffer, but that can probably wait until we come back with a new

document with new numbers for you to look at.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you very much, Sarah. Then we are ready to move on in the agenda, and thank you very much, everybody. The next item on the agenda is the yellowtail snapper -- Go ahead, Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Sorry to interrupt, but you have Maria with a turn to speak regarding the spiny lobster.

MARCOS HANKE: Maria Lopez.

MARIA LOPEZ: Just for the spiny lobster, we would like to have some guidance from the council about what you would be expecting from staff for the December meeting. Like if you were wanting to take final action on this in December, then we will have to probably schedule a meeting or something, so that you can see the amendment this fall, after the SSC makes the recommendations and after new options are created for the amendment based on the discussions that we had today, and so if you can please give us some guidance on what you would like to do at this time, or if you would like to see that later, so that we know what to do. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Probably we could ask Maria what she recommends the council to do to follow the process, and that would be easier than reinventing the wheel by the councils. Maria, can you tell us more or less what you think we can follow as the staff for between here and the December meeting regarding this topic?

MARIA LOPEZ: That will depend on when you will have the SSC meeting to discuss this, because that means that, after that SSC meeting, the IPT will be meeting to take that information and put it together in a paper, and so that decision will be on the council, to decide that when that happens.

For example, if they have a meeting in September or October, and then are able to make some recommendations that we can use for this paper, then we will take that back and produce a document that you can see at a council meeting before the December meeting, so you can put it on the agenda for the December meeting. otherwise, if the meeting occurs later in the fall, then we will bring the recommendations for December, and then we can take final action later, if needed.

 MARCOS HANKE: Miguel, I have a question.

MIGUEL ROLON: Hold on a second. We have John Walter that would like to speak before I say something else.

MARCOS HANKE: This is what I was trying to say. John Walter, go ahead.

 JOHN WALTER: Thank you, everybody. I just wanted to get some clarity on what the request was and the motion, and it seems like the briefing book document, or the options paper, almost already has the information that we need to make this decision, and perhaps -- I don't want to speak for what the SSC request would be, except I think that it would be that the projections of the ABC at different buffers and then choosing the minimum or maximum -- Choosing the catch that would not lead to overfishing in any of the three-year periods, as opposed to what is currently used as a six-year period. That's the process that the SSC went through to determine a constant catch.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I suggest that you leave this to the staff and the Center and the people who are around the table, so we can bring whatever is needed to the meeting in December, be that final action or whatever, because you only have a few minutes more. That way, everybody will be clear on what is needed.

The next step will be for Graciela and Richard to coordinate with John and others, and Maria del Mar, about the next steps, and we will inform you, during the course of these several months, what will be expected at the December meeting. That way, today, what you have done is to shorten the number of years that you project from now on, and you have already accepted that, and so now what we need to do is to allow the staff to put together the roadmap for achieving the goals and objectives that you set today.

 MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Thank you. I think that's the right direction, and thank you, Miguel. We are ready to pass to the next item on the agenda, and we are a little tight on time. This is the discussion on the yellowtail snapper recreational bag limit.

DISCUSSION OF YELLOWTAIL SNAPPER RECREATIONAL BAG LIMIT

MARIA LOPEZ: I am going to be doing this presentation. Thank

you very much. At the last council meeting, the council requested staff to look into looking into discussing a potential recreational bag limit for the yellowtail snapper under the St. Croix fishery management plan, as requested by Carlos Farchette.

This is what you requested, to develop an amendment to the St. Croix FMP, once this amendment is implemented, to modify the current recreational bag limit for the snapper grouper and parrotfish aggregate that would allow the yellowtail snapper to be managed with a separate bag limit specific to the species.

First, I am going to provide a little bit of background, and this is going to be a short presentation, and then I'm going to talk about what are the current management measures that are applicable to yellowtail snapper and the rationale provided by the fishers and some examples of how this fishery is conducted in St. Croix. I want to thank Carlos Farchette and Marcos Hanke for providing the information that is going to be used for this presentation.

The yellowtail snapper is a very important component of the U.S. Caribbean fisheries for both commercial and recreational harvest. It was included for management in 1995, in the Reef Fish FMP, and since that time, it has been managed with a minimum size limit. In St. Croix, this species is managed under the snapper complex of the Reef Fish FMP for annual catch limits and monitoring, and this is what is going on right now, until the island-based FMPs are implemented.

Under the St. Croix FMP, once it's implemented, the species will be managed as an individual stock with a single ACL. The species was assessed in 2005, through SEDAR 8, and it was — That assessment did not provide stock status determination, because the data was deemed to be insufficient. It was also included in SEDAR 46, which is the SEDAR that assessed data—limited stocks, although it was only assessed for Puerto Rico.

As of March 31, 2020, the stock status determined by NOAA Fisheries for the Caribbean snappers as an aggregate, which includes the yellowtail snapper, is that the species is not undergoing overfishing, and its overfished status is unknown, and this is based on the stock status determinations that are included in the Reef Fish FMP.

In the St. Croix FMP, the species is considered to have a productivity of moderate to high, and the productivity is the capacity of the stock to produce maximum sustainable yield and to recover if the population is depleted. It also has

low/moderate susceptibility, and the susceptibility is the potential for the stock to be impacted by the fishery, which includes direct capture as well as indirect impacts to the fishery, such as loss of habitat quality.

These are the current management measures that are applicable to yellowtail snapper, and there is a recreational bag limit for groupers, snappers, and parrotfish combined, and it's five per person per day, or, if three or more persons are onboard, fifteen per vessel per day is the max, but not to exceed two parrotfish per person per day, or six parrotfish per vessel per day. This recreational bag limit was implemented through the 2010 Caribbean ACL amendment, the regulations that implemented that amendment, for species that, at the time, were undergoing overfishing.

There is no compatible bag limit regulations in territorial waters of Puerto Rico or the USVI. There is also a size limit applicable for all harvest of yellowtail in federal waters of twelve inches total length, and the USVI does not have a similar size limit, and Puerto Rico has a minimum size limit in the territorial waters of 10.5 inches fork length, which is almost equivalent to the same as in federal waters.

The species is managed, as I mentioned earlier, with an annual catch limit and accountability measures, and the species will be managed in the island-based FMPs, as I mentioned earlier, with individual stock ACLs in each one of the islands. There are no recreational landings collected for the species in the USVI, as of now, that are being used for the monitoring, but that may change in the future, and I just wanted to point out that all of these measures will be carried over to all the three island-based FMPs.

In this presentation, we're only focusing on St. Croix, because this is what was requested by the council, and I just wanted to show in here, and this is commercial landings, because we don't have recreational landings reported, but, based on commercial landings, if you look at the graph, the bottom graph, which is the one that has all the yellow, we have, in the dotted lines, the yellowtail snapper ACL that would be implemented under the St. Croix FMP, and you can see the level is a little less than 16,000 pounds.

The columns show the harvest that has been reported for the yellowtail snapper commercial, which is the only one that is monitored, and you can see that it would be under the proposed ACL.

1 2

4 5

If you look at the graph that is on the top, the blue represents other managed snappers, because remember that, with the snapper ACL that was included in the Reef Fish FMP, the yellowtail snapper was included in the snapper complex ACL, and so it was for all the species included in that, and the landings were also under, considerably under, the proposed ACL, and so I just wanted to point that out.

I want to thank Carlos for providing this information, and this is the rationale that was captured during the past council meeting and then in conversations with Carlos Farchette and Marcos and other fishers that fish for yellowtail snapper, and so the fishers are interested in a separate bag limit for the yellowtail snapper because the yellowtail snapper is fished differently than other reef fish species, with different techniques.

They mentioned that fishers can be selective, by using different chum strategies, choosing locations or distance from hardbottom, working with tides, hook sizes, or hook weights. They indicate that the current limit appears to be too restrictive and that it could support higher numbers of yellowtail.

This fishery produces minimum bycatch, and I will mention that in the next slide as well, and the fish are less likely to be affected by barotrauma, because they are hooked higher in the water column, where the chum attracts the school.

 If the species is abundant and desired by locals, this is an opportunity to move fishing away from classic bottom fishing, which is multispecies and less selective and has more interactions with the bottom, and the current limit that they are referring to, of course, is the recreational, and we're looking at making changes to the recreational harvest, and so they are asking for a bag limit that could allow for higher numbers of yellowtail to be harvested recreationally.

These are some of the characteristics of recreational fishing in St. Croix, and it was mentioned by the fishers that the recreational and commercial fishers use the same technique. They fish with yo-yo or rod-and-reel, and they don't use bottom-tending gear to fish for this species.

All fishing is done by anchoring approximately thirty meters deep and paying out scope on the anchor line until they drift off the shelf edge. They anchor using homemade grappling hooks that are made with rebar steel for easy retrieval, which also

minimizes damage to corals, and they don't use a lead weight. The fishers will play out the line when the current is pulling off the shelf edge so that they can float the bait in the area where the fish may be feeding on the chum line.

For bait, fishers in St. Croix use chum to raise fish from the bottom, and they also use natural bait, which is preferred, like sardines and anchovies, alive or dead.

As I mentioned earlier, there is no barotrauma, because the fish rise just to below the surface or the mid-water column, feeding on the chum line, and the bycatch in St. Croix of the species are mostly mutton snapper, and occasionally crevalle jack and blue runner.

In St. Croix, this is mostly a nighttime fishery, and there is a dependency on the right moon phase and the currents. There is a use of historical locations for yellowtail snapper fishing, and all of the locations are off the shelf edge. It was indicated that there are no headboats in St. Croix, and charters mostly specialize in pelagics, although there is the occasional personal fishing to bring out tourists, et cetera, that would harvest this species recreationally.

This brings us to what would be the potential action if the council is interested in pursuing this, and that would be to establish a separate bag limit for the yellowtail snapper under the St. Croix FMP, once it's implemented, and there are some options that were mentioned during the past council meeting, and we still have to evaluate other options and include other options, the council desires.

We would include a no action alternative, which would be to keep the yellowtail in the snapper grouper/parrotfish recreational bag limit, and the other option could be to recommend a separate recreational bag limit for the yellowtail snapper, and then there would be options, or there could be options, as to what the number should be. During the last meeting, it was mentioned fifteen per fisher, or thirty yellowtail max per boat, and, obviously, there are some details that would need to be decided in here.

 For example, how many fishers -- Do you want to put a limit on the number of fishers, for example? If you want to do a different number, or if you have any other suggestions that you would like to explore in here, so that they could be included in an options paper and evaluated.

 Now, there's a couple of things that maybe the council wants to consider when setting bag limits, and one of them is that there is no monitoring of recreational landings in the USVI at this time, although that may change, and so we have to keep in consideration that there may be overfishing concerns.

However, we hope that recreational landings stay the same, allowing maybe an increase, and, in here, we made a note about we need to evaluate what would be the effects on assumptions of the sustainable yield level that was included in the St. Croix FMP, and what that is, is it's the level of landings that can be sustained over the long-term that was intended to be used when the information of resources is needed to produce a quantitative stock assessment are not available to determine the maximum sustainable yield or corresponding points, such as the overfishing limit, and so, basically, the SYL in the island-based FMPs is used as an indicator of the sustainability of the fishery.

The SYL assumes that recreational landings will continue as in the past, and so we will have to evaluate how this may or may not change, and so this is something that would be included in a potential amendment.

Another thing to consider is the enforcement, particularly because it's a nighttime fishery, and there is also a lack of compatibility with territorial regulations. However, I understand that this is not necessarily different than how it is conducted right now, as the yellowtail snapper is already included in a bag limit, but that's something that needs to be considered as well.

The last point is, is there a potential for illegal sale of fish if higher limits are selected, and that was something that was mentioned during the past council meeting as a consideration to keep in mind for the council when setting a limit.

These are the next steps. The next step could be to develop an options paper for the December 2020 meeting or the April 2021 meeting, depending, of course, on workload, to amend the St. Croix fishery management plan. The other decision that the council may want to evaluate is if Puerto Rico and/or St. Thomas and St. John were interested in pursuing a similar action.

Now, the last part of the presentation is some examples of information that would be included in a potential amendment. Staff would review any information available for the species, and that could come from several sources, and SEAMAP, for

example, and the evaluations that have been done in the past from SEDAR, research conducted, et cetera.

We would also be using information about the yellowtail snapper fishery for both recreational and commercial fishing, for example how many fishers, how much fishing is in federal waters, so we can capture how this fishery is being conducted in federal waters. The other information that could be collected from the USVI recreational fishing license are market information, for example price per pound and the demand for the species, and the reason we would include that is because it would be interesting to know if, for any reason, the price of the yellowtail influences recreational harvest, and this is just an example of information that could be looked at. Then any other information that could be useful to make this determination.

This is all that I have for now. If the council would like to have any questions, if you have any questions on any of this and how to proceed, just let me know.

MARCOS HANKE: Do you have another slide, Maria?

MARIA LOPEZ: No, and it's just a slide that says questions, and so it's perfectly fine to stay here.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Carlos, just to speed up the process, because we are a little behind schedule, I will give you a turn to comment, and I have a comment, too.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. First, I want to thank Maria for such an excellent presentation. I mean, it covered everything. I just want to clear up some things here, any misconception, because this was brought to my attention by a district advisory member who represents the recreational fishing sector, and that was brought to his attention by constituents. I am a recreational fisher, but I will be honest with you that I don't eat yellowtail.

 I really don't like the texture of the fish, but, when we discuss that later on, for that white paper -- You know, here on St. Croix, like I said before, that fishery is a nighttime fishery. However, I would not doubt that, at some time in the future, it may become a daytime fishery. We do not have headboats on St. Croix, and maybe that's something that we need to also manage in the future.

When it comes to fishing for yellowtail recreationally, it's normally two people per boat, and no more than three, and one

thing that I did not ask, when I was out there speaking to fishermen and the DAP member, was would the commercial fishers have any objection to this increase in bag limit or separating for recreational fishing.

I know in territorial waters, which we're hoping to have compatible regulations in the near future, right now, there is no harvest limit for yellowtail in territorial waters, and so a recreational guy can, in two hours, catch 150 pounds of yellowtail, and he would be okay. That creates a market for a recreational user, and that should not be allowed. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. Tony Blanchard.

TONY BLANCHARD: The yellowtail can be caught in the daytime. My concern is, although you don't have any headboats now, in the future, it could become a problem, and so I'm willing to support what Carlos is looking for in the separation of the yellowtail from the other species and the bag limit, but what I think we need to be concerned about is the amount per boat per person, because it may not be a problem now, but a lot of these guys are probably starting to get into the chartering, especially down here in St. Thomas, and you have a lot of smaller boats that go out and take people on charter. That needs to be something that I think you should look at, and that's my comment.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Tony. Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I am looking at this and going, from a stock point of view, why are we even considering this, and this is a regulation that would only apply for recreational fishing out in Lang Bank, and the issue seems to be one of, if tourism ever gets back to where I think everybody would like it to be, then is there a potential for that to start driving say a black market for the fish coming out of the recreational side instead of the commercial side, and so that's the issue, and that seems to be mostly a local issue, rather than a council issue, but, if the council wants to be preemptive here and maybe drive the local regulations to be compatible, that's their discretion.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and I have many comments addressing what you just said, Richard. Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you, Marcos. I just wanted to reiterate one of the points that Maria made about the sustainable yield level, that SYL, and how the council should consider any effect of the change in this bag limit on the SYL.

Currently, we don't have recreational landings, and so the commercial landings were used to set the sustainable yield level for the stock, and there was an assumption about what those recreational landings were relative to the commercial landings.

If you change the bag limit, that might affect that assumption, and so I think, if you move forward with this amendment process, I would recommend coordinating with the SSC and getting their advice on how any changes to the bag limit might affect some of those measures that we have for stock status and some of the ABC recommendations, for example.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. A comment on the slide, and Maria put ten yellowtail snapper per person, a maximum of twenty, a maximum of thirty, and, with that, I think we addressed the potential of creating somebody that is willing to go at night for that amount of fish, and it doesn't make it very profitable, and I think we can address it in that way, and I want the people to recognize that yellowtail fishing chumming —You have a very restricted area on behind the boat where you can accommodate the fishermen and drop the lines behind.

In that case, the way the fishing is performed for yellowtail for quantity, it's already limited by two people on the boat, fishing behind the boat, and that's a very important comment, in terms of how the fishing is performed. Carlos, did you want to make a motion, and we'll go from there?

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, before you make any motions, just decide what you're going to do. What Maria del Mar is asking you what will be the next steps, and my recommendation is to allow the staff to prepare -- Remember the staff has a lot of other things that you charged them to do, and so probably what we could propose is to let the staff work this out and prepare the options paper for the 2021 April meeting, and that will allow them time to discuss it with you and Carlos and whatever, and we'll start with St. Croix and see how it goes.

If the other areas -- By that time, hopefully, we will have the island-based FMPs approved, and then we can go ahead and have the appropriate action.

The other thing that was mentioned is that remember that the EEZ is a little bit of an area off of St. Croix, and so the local government has to really step in and decide what they want to do regarding the yellowtail and compatible regulations, and so, if you need a motion, the motion will be just to instruct the staff to pursue the St. Croix FMP regarding this item and prepare an

options paper that could be discussed at the April meeting in 2021, virtual or in-person or a mix of the two.

MARCOS HANKE: Can you help with that motion, suggest the language for Carlos to consider, Miguel, and --

 MIGUEL ROLON: If Carlos agrees, the motion will be to instruct the staff to prepare an options paper for the yellowtail recreational fishery off St. Croix that will be considered at the spring meeting of the CFMC in 2021. I would like to hear from Carlos if he agrees with that language or if he wants to modify it somehow.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

16 CARLOS FARCHETTE: I agree with the motion.

18 MIGUEL ROLON: Okay, and so you move that, and we need a second.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: So motion by Carlos Farchette and 21 second by --

MARCOS HANKE: Second.

MIGUEL ROLON: All in favor say aye or, if there's no opposition, the motion carries. Marcos, can you say something like that?

MARCOS HANKE: Is there any opposition on the motion? Hearing none, the motion carries. We are behind schedule, and let's make a short break of five minutes for people to go to the bathroom, and we can --

MIGUEL ROLON: Just say five minutes and let the people decide.

MARCOS HANKE: I cannot hear you, Miguel. Can you repeat it?

MIGUEL ROLON: Just give the five or ten-minute break and let people decide what they're going to do with those minutes.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. We will be back in five minutes.

MIGUEL ROLON: So 11:00.

MARCOS HANKE: 11:00.

47 MIGUEL ROLON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MARCOS HANKE: Let's restart the meeting. Alida, you are the next one for the presentation.

OUTREACH AND EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL REPORT

ALIDA ORTIZ: Good morning. I will have a very short presentation on an update of the activities that we have been developing with the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel and those that are for the next meeting.

The first thing that we have been talking about for a long time is the fishery ecosystem plan, especially with the Technical Advisory Panel. This is a project that is actually conducted with the stakeholders, with the Pew Charitable Trusts, that will conduct small group meetings to engage stakeholders and solicit their input. They are the people that are going to meet with the people and that will do the surveys. The CFMC will not conduct any kind of survey.

The Pew Charitable Trusts, what we are working with them, what we are collaborating, is that we have identified the NGOs that, in one way or another, may have something to do with fishing and with fisheries and that information would be valuable for the fishery ecosystem plan. We are also collaborating with the Lenfest project that you have heard about in the past meetings, and that is the same thing. They are going to be the people who are going to meet with the fishers, and they are going to meet with the stakeholders, and the council is only collaborating on if they have information that we have, in terms of outreach that we can do.

The other campaign that we have been working on, and we have talked about it a little bit, is the sustainable seafood consumption campaign, and what I want to update now is that we are working on the production of a sustainable seafood cookbook, a recipe book or cookbook, for Puerto Rico and the USVI, and a working group has been formed with chefs like Juan Carlos Vincens, Wanda Pantojas, Cedric Taquin, Cory Magras from St. Thomas, Nikole Greaux from St. Thomas, Carlos Farchette from St. Croix, and then Diana, Miguel, and myself are sort of coordinating the entire thing.

The idea is to have the consumer become familiar with the variety of fish that is available in our market, and we will

concentrate on sixteen of the species, the majority of which are not commonly known by the consumers, even though they are abundant in the catch. We will get information on biology and ecology and management status and availability of the species to be cooked, because the idea is that the consumer know about what they eat and where it comes from and what is the habitat that they occupy, and then they will obviously used in the cookbook, and so there is a lot of information on cooking methods, and we will be working on this project from August, even though we are already meeting very often with the group, and, by December, we will have the product to the council.

4 5

The other project that we presented and we discussed with the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel is this idea of putting some importance, or more importance, on the women's participation in fisheries in Puerto Rico and the USVI.

We already had a product in one of the newspapers in Puerto Rico that had a report on one of the women fishers in Cabo Rojo and how she works, where does she work, what is the importance and how does she feel about it, and the idea is to, besides that, work on a full book from different women from Puerto Rico and the USVI that are involved in fisheries, and, here, we have, as collaborators, Janette Ramos and Nicole Greaux from St. Thomas, and, also, Nikita Edwards will also help us with that. Then Carlos Farchette and Julian, and we need information to make these women visible and to have the public appreciate and respect the work they do.

There will be other reports of fisherwomen from different regions in Puerto Rico, and then we are working on contacting newspapers in St. Thomas and St. Croix, to make a similar report like the one that was done in Puerto Rico.

 One project that we will be working with, and I think that Miguel and Carlos are going to talk about this a little in the Other Business, but it's a pilot project in the USVI, with the collaboration of Carlos Farchette, Ruth Gomez, Julian Magras, and other well-known fishers, and the idea is to have some sort of activity, and now it has to be virtual, because there is no other way, but then probably we will change, change products, after we get out of this scenario of the pandemic.

It is the idea to invite youth to explore different aspects of fisheries opportunities, as fishers, as scientists, as educators, and then we will have presenters from the field, those well-known fishers that are in the USVI and Puerto Rico, and we will have the young people look at the field of fishing

and the field of understanding the marine environment and understanding the value of the fishers in our area, and so this is what I have now, but Miguel will give you a little bit more information, and Carlos, in a little while.

The other project that we completed is the book Marine Fisheries Ecosystem of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and it is both in English and in Spanish, and I think the council members have received it, and they have been sent to the DAPs.

Originally, the idea was that this book was going to be accompanied by workshops in the field, with the fishers and the fishing communities, but that is not possible right now, and so, right now, we are working on developing virtual material, let's say, like short videos and PowerPoints and games, anything that can be used in virtual workshops with fishers, fishing communities, and educators, and so we have the material, and we have to find and invent ways of getting the information to the people, but we are working on that.

The other project that is under development, and probably you have seen a long time ago this poster on the life cycle of the queen conch. Right now, we have to review the content of that poster and review the information and the illustrations, and the objective of this new poster is to include other Strombus species that are confused with the mature specimens of Aliger gigas, and that's Strombus gigas and Lobatus gigas, but the new name is Aliger gigas. We will have that done by August, and we are working on that already, and we have the artist, and, by December, we will have the product of this.

 With that, we will develop other products, like fact sheets and postcards, so that they have this information on the queen conch, so that they do not confuse other species, other genera, with the mature queen conch.

We also are working on the outreach and education aspect of the CFMC strategic plan that you already know, and our participation now is to take these six aspects of outreach and education that Michelle Duval presented to us in our meeting last week, and we have asked all the O&E AP members to study those aspects and prioritize them.

They are frequency of communication, variety of tools, educational resources, improving general public awareness, regular in-person outreach workshops, and clarity and simplicity of presentations. Then, within each one of those aspects, there are also alternatives, and so we should give our knowledge of

what do the consumers, what do the fishers, what does the public, prefer. Can they still work with radio, or what do they have for the facilities for visual, or do they go to the newspapers and this type of thing, and so that communication with the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel members and the people who participate in our meetings will be available, I hope, probably by next week, or very soon, and we will present it to the council in the December meeting.

With the social media, I am not going to go through how many people are visiting Facebook or YouTube, and that's the information that Christina Olan gives in our meetings, but we have products for Facebook and YouTube that are new, and we will have very short videos, based on the existing essential fish habitat videos, to emphasize the ecological aspects of fisheries, something like is climate change connected to fisheries and questions like that, and the importance of critical habitats within the essential fish habitats for those ecosystem-based management plans.

We will have videos on queen conch statistical methods of stock assessment, collaboration with CARICOOS, and CARICOOS is developing workshops for the fishers, and the council is supporting that action, and the workshops are being streamed on Facebook, so the participants can take it from there, and that has information from Puerto Rico and also from the Virgin Islands. That is my presentation, and do you have any questions?

MARCOS HANKE: Let's leave a space for two questions, very quick, please. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you. Alida, thanks for including all the questions that I had about the queen conch in your presentation. Just two things. I wish that, also, with the poster, because the poster is very useful in the fish markets, but we need something more handy for the fishermen, like a small card that they can have in their boats, so that they can find out the difference between one species and another.

Also, if we can work with the tool for the measure of the lips, because many of them don't know even that the measure of the lips is the one that they have to use to know the juveniles from the others.

 ALIDA ORTIZ: Okay. That is very good information, Vanessa. We will take it into account, and, as soon as possible, as soon as we can get out of these pandemic regulations, we are going to

Cabo Rojo and talk to you and talk to the people there, so you can see what we are doing, and we will take a lot of information for all the knowledge that you have.

Something that Graciela said yesterday to me is very important is to take the knowledge of the fishers and turn it into the scientific information that we have, and so we have to change the vocabulary and the way we address the issue. Vanessa, thank you so much for all your help, and I will talk to you also about the material for the schools, and I am still interested in the schools.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Alida. Also, I understand the --

MIGUEL ROLON: Alida and Vanessa, we already sent you the posters, and, also, we will send you a set of books, but what Vanessa is asking can be done now, and you don't have to meet with the fishers for that. We can work on the small decal, and so, once we have the books, we can send that to the fishers.

The other thing is the gizmo for measuring the conch, and we sent, through the Department of Natural Resources, a long time ago, something that we copied from the U.S. Virgin Islands, actually. They came with the idea, and, with that triangle, you can measure fish, queen conch, and whelk, and so it's a matter of finding somebody who can do that for us, and Natalia and I will work on finding that material, and, once we finish with the poster that Alida Ortiz is working on, we will make sure that we have the small decal and any other tool that we can use for allowing the fishermen to take this information.

The other thing is that all of this will be digital, and so anybody can download it from the internet, from our webpage, and use it as they see fit, plus we are not -- As soon as everybody has a vaccine, and they are going to go to Russia to get a vaccine, we can go back to the field, but, in the meantime, I cannot authorize anybody to go anywhere, using council funding, until probably the end of December of 2021, unless everybody has a vaccine and we know that the council is not responsible for your death or your relatives.

ALIDA ORTIZ: Okay, Miguel. Any other questions? I want to thank Nicole Greaux from St. Thomas and Carlos Farchette from St. Croix very, very much, because they have given us many, many, many ideas. Okay. For me, that's it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Alida. The next item on the agenda is enforcement. We can start with Puerto Rico DNER.

1 2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10 DAMARIS DELGADO: Good morning. There has not been significant interventions in federal waters for protected species during this time, in June, and this is mainly due to the pandemic, and the recreational fishing has been limited, or prohibited, by means of executive orders of the governor, because of COVID-19. Only commercial fishers are authorized to go fishing during this time.

ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

PUERTO RICO DNER

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18

Among the interventions that Rangers conducted, we had three crab cases, and these were captures in the Humacao region during crab closure. During this time, DNER passed

19 20

21

22

23 24 25

26 27

36 37 38

45 46 47

48

administrative order confirming that people or businesses that sell crabs have seven days after the crab closure to sell their already-acquired crab products, and this is what is stated in Regulation 79-49. That's pretty much our report. Thank you. MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Damaris. USVI.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, before we go into the next, Vanessa wanted to say something regarding enforcement, and this is the time, Vanessa, if you want to do that now, or you can wait for some other time.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Miguel. Well, particularly, we have been talking -- First, I have to appreciate and thank Damaris for all the work that she has been doing. Since day-one of this pandemic, practically, I have bothering her every day, and so we have been in contact during all this, but, especially, I want, for the record, to say that, now that we have the closure of the queen conch, we have a big problem in the west, especially not only because of some fishermen that are outside, but also because the stakeholders are making pressure to them.

We already know that some of the fishermen that are out, the commercial ones, usually, they have their work comprised with the fish market that helps them when they have they have engine or any problem with the boat, and so, right now, we are asking there is any way that we can start or give like orientation visit to these fish markets or these fishermen that we already have recognized that are not making the things as

they are supposed to. I am here every day, and it's really frustrating to see how they pass the queen conch, and I always make the orientation, and I

always tell them what you should do for this, but, practically, I think that we have already given education and orientation enough, especially in the west, and so I think that it's time that the Rangers take action.

We have fishermen that are ready to say names and to say the PRs of the boats that are doing this, and, also, we have some fish markets already that we have photos, and we have everything, but we don't have the legal to make the intervention with them, and so we need to talk about this more, and we need to take action now. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Damaris.

MIGUEL ROLON: That's just for Damaris to take note, and that's it, and then she can report back to the council in December of any activity that they have taken in answer to Vanessa's request.

DAMARIS DELGADO: Yes. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Damaris. I just wanted to make sure that you heard and took notes. Let's go for the USVI Department of Planning and Natural Resources.

USVI DPNR

 NICOLE ANGELI: I will be presenting for Howard Forbes from the Division of Environmental Enforcement. Currently, all staff, due to the COVID-19 state of emergency declaration, in enforcement have been called to the VIPD for assistance in enforcement of our state of emergency, and so there is no fisheries enforcement report at this time.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nicole. The other enforcement report is the U.S. Coast Guard.

U.S. COAST GUARD

ROBERT COPELAND: Good afternoon, all. The Coast Guard is continuing to conduct the mission sets. However, there is no significant LE boardings to report upon in the Caribbean area. I do want to take this time, if I could, to try to iron out something that came up yesterday from our USVI partners, and I believe Julian and Tony had some comments about law enforcement, and I wanted to turn it over to them to get some clarity in their comments from yesterday and a way that the Coast Guard could assist in their comments.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Can you be more specific for them to react?

ROBERT COPELAND: Sure. It appeared, yesterday, that they were frustrated with the law enforcement down in the Caribbean area, and I was a bit confused as to what they were frustrated with, and if they could help determine how the Coast Guard could help benefit, or assist, in that matter, to alleviate some of those frustrations.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, if I may, the enforcement issue that they brought to the attention of the council was related to the Grammanik Bank, and they are frustrated because there is no enforcement that prohibits people from anchoring there, jeopardizing the opportunities of the commercial fishers, and then other people are damaging the area, and they feel that they are being blamed for something that is not their fault, and Tony and Julian believe that, if we have more enforcement from the Coast Guard and the local authorities and the National Marine Fisheries Service, this could alleviate this problem.

We all believe that we need to have more outreach and education to the fishers and the general public, especially the recreational component, and to the tourist industry and other people that might use the area and anchor improperly in those places, and that's the main issue that they brought to the attention of the council regarding enforcement.

MARCOS HANKE: I have Jocelyn requesting to speak. Go ahead.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you, Marcos. I just wanted to clarify, regarding the anchoring, that there's nothing right now that prohibits anchoring by fishing vessels in the Grammanik Bank, and so the council was looking at whether that they wanted to something pursue, and so, in terms enforcement, that isn't necessarily the issue, because there is nothing prohibiting anchoring, but there is a closed season, and if someone was anchored and fishing during the closed season, that would be a violation of the laws as they exist now.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. I don't see anybody else. I have Nelson Crespo putting on the chat that he also has to bring attention to the high increment of deepwater snapper poachers, illegal fishermen, fishing for deepwater snapper, and I'm assuming that is on the west coast, from where he is. The next presentation is the NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement.

NOAA FISHERIES OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

1 2

MANNY ANTONARAS: Good afternoon, everybody. I am going to provide just a brief update, following our last report during the June meeting. At that time, we provided an update, enforcement update, with some recent cases, and we showed a presentation, and so, for this meeting, I have nothing formal to present, although I did want to update the council on a recent sentencing, as a follow-up to the coral smuggling case that I discussed during the June meeting.

Just a few weeks ago, Juan Pablo Castro-Torres from Puerto Rico pled guilty to two felony violations for the Lacey Act for collecting and falsely labeling marine species from Puerto Rico. Mr. Torres personally collected many of these species, which were actually Ricordea and other reef creatures that were sold off-island, and, because Ricordea are attached to the reef substrate, the defendant would utilize a chisel and break these things off of the reef, and so, in doing so, chunks of reef were also taken, causing habitat damage to the local area.

These products were sold to local aquarium stores operated by Mr. Sanchez, and Mr. Sanchez previously pleaded guilty to Lacey Act violations and is awaiting sentencing as well. Castro-Torres is also scheduled for sentencing, and fact that was included in the press release from the Department of Justice was regarding the value, and so, for the product that Mr. Torres admitted to harvesting, it was worth approximately \$15,000.

During the June meeting, again, I did talk about Ramon Torres-Ramos, who also pled before a U.S. District Court judge, and he is awaiting sentencing, which is scheduled for, I believe, November of 2020. I just wanted to highlight the collaborative effort between the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the Department of Justice in this investigation.

Then the only other item I had and wanted to bring up, which Lieutenant Copeland just brought up, was regarding yesterday's discussion. I have to admit that I left the meeting a bit confused, and the discussion started off with a discussion of potential coral damage in the Grammanik Bank, and, ultimately, it was determined to be an enforcement problem. I was going to ask for additional information, because of specifically what was brought up, with no prohibitions on anchoring, and I was wanting some help in assessing the problem.

We are definitely more than willing to do what we can, and I have already reached out to Mr. Forbes with the USVI DPNR, in

addition to communicating back and forth with Lieutenant Copeland from District 7 Coast Guard, and we will work towards addressing the problem, but I just, again, need to know a bit more on the specifics. Is this a habitat destruction problem, or is it poaching? What regulations are being violated? What prohibitions do we feel are not being enforced? With that, that concludes my brief. Thank you.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. I am not seeing the people from the Virgin Islands talking about this, but, for sure, we can make the connections and talk to Julian and -- I have Julian on the line. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I think one of the big problems is a lot of these recreational boats that are out there in federal waters fishing don't follow the guidelines to the recreational bag limits, and I think that would be a good place to start with these recreational vessels, because they go out there, and there are not many of them, but there are some of them, and they are out there, and they are catching more than what the recreational bag limits are with no commercial licenses.

They also are coming in and they are selling them into our markets, and so the big issue always falls back on enforcement. Now, I can say that I have seen the Coast Guard out on the waters over the past -- About three weeks ago, they were running the lines of the MCD, but I think, with some collaboration with myself and some other individuals, we can give some good direction on the days or the times of when would be good to look for this activity taking place, because, of course, they are not going to be out there in the rough waters. They wait until the weather is flat, like this Sunday and Monday coming, to take advantage of going out there in those areas when the waters are flat, and it's a quick in and out.

I will be contacting Miguel and Manny and having a conversation with this and seeing how we could also arrange it, and, also, while we're speaking on that, I've been getting a lot of complaints on undersized yellowfin tuna being harvested and landed at the different locations of where the charter vessels are going out, and so that's something that also needs to be looked into, and that would be the Red Hook area. I'm getting a lot of complaints of undersized yellowfin tuna coming in.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Marcos. I just wanted to make a comment on the same line of Julian. We have the same problem

here in Puerto Rico, and we already know that we have the recreational license in the papers, but we don't have that in the outside, and, with all this thing of the pandemic, I have seen, and I already know, that many recreational are getting out, but they are only stopping the small boats. The big ones, because they are big boats, or just because they have friends inside, no one gets interviewed, and so we need to work with that also in Puerto Rico. Thanks.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. I don't see any other persons on the line, and we are really tight on time. Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: I propose to allow Julian and Tony to send an email to us, so we can share it with Jocelyn and the enforcement officials, and so we could do this in a formal way, so we will be able to discuss it and be able to bring whatever comes out of this exercise, and we can bring you an update at the December meeting, but the thing will start with Julian and Tony to send us an email on the specific issues that they have, and also from Vanessa, so we can work on this, rather than keep talking about it, because already the enforcement officials are asking, from the Coast Guard and National Marine Fisheries Service, specifics, so they can address it and work on it.

MARCOS HANKE: I understand, and Julian already said that, yes, he would send an email, and I think they hear you loud and clear for the need for that email with the specifics. Thank you, Miguel. I think we can conclude the enforcement reports, and we are going now for Other Business. In Other Business, Miguel, you have --

OTHER BUSINESS

MIGUEL ROLON: Let me go very quick, because some of the other business we already have discussed. The young fishers, this is something that Carlos Farchette brought to my attention, and I discussed it with Julian and Ruth, and Ruth came up with the idea of having a workshop with fishers in St. Thomas, and the idea is to have fishermen like Julian and Winston Ledee and look at the different fishing sectors that you have in St. Thomas and have -- At this time, it has to be virtual of course, but have a meeting where we will have presentations by these fishers, and then we will have an exchange of information, a question-and-answer session, with the youngsters that will be interested in coming to this virtual meeting.

Everything will be run by the council, and I will be the facilitator, and it will be mostly fishermen talking to young

men and women that would like to join the fishery for some reason or the other, and Julian and Ruth and Carlos Farchette will be part of this exercise, and we need to recruit some fishers with experience, like Winston Ledee and Gregory Ledee and others that can give a brief presentation to them, and that will be a panel of veteran fishers that will be discussing these activities with the young people interested in the fishery.

4 5

If this project works well, then we envision that we can move it to St. Croix and other parts of Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico, they started this a long time ago, but then the administration changed, and nothing else happened, but the issue is that the generation gap is getting bigger. The average age of the fishermen is around fifty-seven now, and it jumped from forty-seven, and fishermen are getting out of the fishery for different reasons, and they are not being replaced by young people.

I talked about this with a fisher from St. Thomas, and everywhere, and they are all telling me the same, that, Miguel, we need to do something, because the youngsters are not coming into the fishery, and we need the industry to continue after the retirement of these fishers, and so that's what we are going to do, and we will probably inform to you -- I will be working with Julian and Ruth and the others, and Carlos, of course, and, as soon as we have something else, we can give you an update at the December meeting.

The other things that we have in Other Business are related to the spiny lobster fishery issue in St. Croix, and I believe that you already addressed that, in a way, and you also had the yellowtail addressed before, and so we can go to the EO 13921.

We sent a correspondence to you in May, to everybody, and, lately, I asked Diana to send -- I guess that we sent it to sixty-five people, but the EO 13921 from the President of the United States, which is an Executive Order on Promoting American Seafood Competition and Economics. Section 4 asks the councils, specifically the councils, within eighty days after May 7, 2020, to submit actions that you recommend on a priority list.

 This is going to be submitted by each council to Chris Oliver, the National Marine Fisheries Service Director, no later than the end of October, because he needs to submit the whole thing by November. We sent you all of this already, and, also, we sent you topics to consider that were submitted to us by Dave Whaley, our liaison with Congress, and we can present this to you again.

This includes marketing of underutilized species and ways to cook them, et cetera, and, by coincidence, that's exactly what we're doing now, and you have seen the presentation by Dr. Alida Ortiz that covered that part, but there are other things, like incentives to do secondary processing in the U.S., and processing in the U.S. Caribbean means something else, but processing, as you know, is from scaling and gutting a fish to having a huge plant to can the fish.

4 5

There are many things in the agenda that -- Not in the agenda, but in the possible topics that they are going to submit to Chris that are not really related to us. However, my request to everybody, when we sent this information, was for you to think about how you can tailor this to the needs of the U.S. Caribbean.

I received, from Marcos Hanke, and, by the way, he's the only one that I have received suggestions, that, for example, we can talk about new boat ramps and parking improvements to access the fishing grounds, develop regional fisheries support, et cetera. This has been sent to you.

Our proposal, Mr. Chairman, is that maybe have a one-day meeting, so everybody will come prepared to give you this information, or that people send you an email, or to me, with their reactions to the email that we sent before, and either way, but the point is that we need to submit all of this to Marcos, because he has to write a letter that will be sent to Chris Oliver no later than the end of probably October 15, so we can be on time for questions and answers that the Washington office may have.

 If you agree to have a one-day meeting, we also can have the five-year strategic plan, the same presentation that we are going to give to the DAPs on the $24^{\rm th}$ and $25^{\rm th}$ and $26^{\rm th}$ and $27^{\rm th}$ of August, and we can have a one-day meeting for those two topics and any other topic that you think will be appropriate before the December meeting.

The reason for doing the meeting, a special meeting, of the council is so that we have input from the council members and the chairs of the committees that advise the council is that we will be able to assist Dr. Michelle Duval on the prioritization of the issues and topics that are going to include in the five-year plan, and remember that, because of Paperwork Reduction Act concerns, we can no longer use the survey, and this is a way that we can analyze all the information that we need to supply to Dr. Duval for her to prepare the draft five-year plan that is

going to be submitted for council consideration in 2021. That's all we have, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. I am in agreement for the one-day meeting to address those two topics, and maybe a few others that are going to show up on the way during the planning time. We have Julian Magras and Vanessa Ramirez with a turn to speak. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: What Miguel was saying about us meeting and putting a plan together to have a virtual meeting with the young fishers, we are going to be working here in the very near future with Miguel and Ruth Gomez, so we can put something together for St. Thomas/St. John, and, of course, with Carlos for St. Croix, and we will have a presentation to give at the December meeting.

I spoke with Ruth this morning, and we will be working diligently over the next couple of months to put something together, so we can move forward and present to the council in December.

While I have the mic, also, I would like to request two items to be added to the December agenda, if possible, and that will be we want to give a presentation on the queen triggerfish, known as the olewife, and a presentation on the mutton snapper, lane snapper, and blackfin snapper from collections that were made through Virginia Shervette, and we will have those two presentations ready to be given at the December meeting, and so, if at all possible, if we could be added to the agenda with those presentations.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian. We will note that.

MIGUEL ROLON: Julian, please send me an email, so we won't miss anything, and certainly we will have to include those presentations at the December meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had the opportunity to read the email that we received and the recommendations that Marcos made, and he covered everything that we need to be in touch with this, and perhaps really a question. How will we connect this, or this proposition, to bring this to the Caribbean with the bureaucracy that we have in the government for permits and all that?

I think that we should talk about that in another session,

because, right now, it's very difficult to get permits, and it's hard. I have a company that has been a year trying, and they have already a company in New Jersey, and they have all the equipment, and they are just waiting, and, every time that they request a permit, it's something else and something else and something else, and so the people that want to come and work with this kind of business will think two times. Thanks.

4 5

MIGUEL ROLON: Vanessa, this doesn't have anything to do with that part, but we can -- After the meeting, you and I can talk and see if we can put together a special meeting with -- Remember that, if we have a meeting of the council, it has to go through the Federal Register and all those hoops, but, if have a meeting with -- That will be something that Damaris can help with, and we can bring those topics for discussion, because this is mostly related to the Puerto Rico system, and we can also join efforts with the federal government. If we have any information that you may need, then I can contact the Regional Office, and I'm sure that Maria del Mar can help us, and people at the Regional Office can help us with that.

My proposal is for -- Vanessa, you can send me an email as a reminder of the topic, and then we can take it from there, and send a copy, please, to Damaris Delgado, and Marcos, of course, so we can work on this part.

Mr. Chairman, if you agree to have the one-day meeting for these topics, from 9:00 to 12:00, that will be the five-year strategic plan, and so you would have maybe an hour or two in the afternoon, and we cannot have a lot of topics on that one-day meeting, because that will defeat the purpose of having a one-day meeting for specifics, and any other things should be moved to the December meeting.

 With virtual meetings, the advantage that we have is that we can have a meeting every other week, if we don't need to advertise it in the Federal Register. However, for the councils, we need to advertise it in the Federal Register, and so the fastest period of submitting will be every month, and I don't think that we need that, especially if we need to incorporate the federal government, and this area is the only one with three councils, and so the time they have is very short for attending all the three councils, and so our proposal, Mr. Chairman, if you agree, and then we can have that meeting and discuss it with Michelle for the possibility of having the meeting in September.

If we don't have any hurricanes or storms in the middle, we are proposing September 25, and that's when she will be available,

and Carlos and I, because we have the CCC meeting the same week, the 23rd and 24th, and so the proposal, Mr. Chairman, specific from our point of view, is to have a one-day meeting with two topics, the five-year strategic plan in the morning and then -- I would encourage everybody that are in the list of the sixty-five that we sent this EO document, to bring to the table your comments and suggestions, and you can use Marcos as an example to follow, because we -- The way that Dave Whaley told us is this is an opportunity for all the councils to throw everything against the wall and see what sticks.

4 5

There is already -- Whenever you have something in the public, you have people who oppose it, and so there is a bunch of NGOs that believe that this order will be favoring the high-rollers, the big industries, in detriment to the small shops, the ma-and-pa factories and fishing operations that we have all over the states, and so this is important that the local people involved in fisheries have a say-so, and we can submit that, through Marcos, on time for Chris Oliver to take it into consideration.

I believe that, if we can prove the case for the top -- Let's say the top-five issues that all of you believe are important, something will be done, and something will be able to help, and, just to give you an idea, because of the pandemic, the money is not that great all around the nation, but this executive order provides some funding, and it may provide some funding for the future, that will be given according to the needs that will be coming out -- The documented needs that will be coming out of this exercise by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

The time schedule, this is something that has to be submitted in November. In November, you may have a change of the whole government, as you all know, and it's election time, but, hopefully, all of this will survive to 2021 and 2022, and we hope that we can get some positive actions regarding the U.S. Caribbean on these topics. I need to hear from -- If there is no opposition to this plan, Mr. Chairman, to have a one-day meeting on September 25 with those two topics.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's do the meeting, and I am in agreement, and I didn't see any opposition on the chat, and let's plan for the meeting accordingly. Vanessa just wrote again that there is no objection, and that's the right way. Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: The other thing is just to reiterate that the next meeting of the council after the 25th of September will be December 9 and 10, also a virtual meeting. Just to give you an idea, the National Marine Fisheries Service -- They have a Phase

0, 1, 2, and 3, and, depending on the movement of COVID, the development of a COVID vaccine and all that, they move from one station to another.

Right now, most of the National Marine Fisheries Service is in Phase 0, and that means that almost everybody is working from home, and Phases 1 through 3 will allow the government to reopen again, and some of the issues they have, for example, needs to do with the surveys, and survey vessels cannot go out, because it's very difficult. Right now, the observer program is stopped, also.

We will inform you in December of any new developments in the National Marine Fisheries Service. The executive directors, we are meeting every month, and we receive an update from National Marine Fisheries Service, so we can work together to see if we can adjust to the COVID means. That's all we have, Mr. Chairman, and we have now the public comment period.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. We are going to start with the public comment period now. Is there anybody from the public that would like to speak? I don't hear anybody.

MIGUEL ROLON: They're all so happy with the meeting that they are happy with it.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and thank you very much, everybody. I think it was a productive meeting.

MIGUEL ROLON: Hold on a second. There was a letter, or not a letter, but there was some instructions sent by Jocelyn to Marcos, and, in the case that people would like to apply for the gear, to use the gear that we discussed yesterday, and this is not to rehash the whole meeting now, but what we are going to do is, anybody who wants to join in with that letter, we have received instructions from Jocelyn on how to do it, and we will post this on the council webpage, and I will send a copy of those instructions to everybody in this meeting via email.

Any fisherman from Puerto Rico or the U.S. Virgin Islands who wishes to be considered for using this gear, following the instructions that Jocelyn sent us, will be receiving that information.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, Miguel. Thank you very much. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thanks. Just to make a point on this. Since yesterday, practically, the fishermen started receiving the

envelopes, and they are very confused about it, because, first, most of them don't like to read, or don't even know how to read, and so I have, since yesterday, ten of them that were calling me, just to explain to them the envelopes, and so I think that maybe we can put something on Facebook, because many fishermen are on the pages of Facebook, and we can share it that way, so they understand why they are receiving these envelopes and the instructions that are inside, so they know for what and what they can do if they have anything to say about it. Thanks.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa, I'm a little confused. Which envelope are you talking about?

 VANESSA RAMIREZ: It's a yellow envelope from the Caribbean Fishery Management Council that has inside practically the instructions if they want to make any comment on the plans, and it also has the application for the fishery disaster, and it has a letter from NOAA about the comments that they are asking for the plans, and they have until the 25th to answer.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, that's the information that we sent to all fishers for the closed seasons and the closed areas, and it's any new bulletins that are sent by the Regional Office, and we distribute it to everybody.

MARCOS HANKE: I just want to clarify to Vanessa that what Miguel was mentioning was in regard to the deepwater snapper discussion yesterday and the instructions sent by Jocelyn on how the fishermen can apply.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, what I believe that Vanessa is saying is what we should follow, and all this information -- I will include it in the Facebook account that we have, and we will send it to any appropriate fishing village. I am resting on the help from Nelson Crespo and others to identify those fishers that might be willing to join in with Mr. Font and Nelson and others to request or send this letter that Jocelyn is talking about.

 Probably, by the time that we receive all of that -- Anyway, there are many other things to consider, but, at this time, the take-home that I have is that we will assist with Vanessa in all the ways possible to the fishers on how to get this information the best way possible and to help them put together the application for this gear.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Do you have anything else?

 MIGUEL ROLON: Maybe Graciela. Graciela, do you have anything else to add?

2 3 4

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Sarah has put together a list of everything that you have accomplished during these two days, and so we'll be looking at that and looking at the motions and the guidance that you have given the staff. I didn't have any other notes in my annotated agenda, and we received new guidance regarding the meeting with the SSC, and so one more item will be added to their next upcoming meeting, or, depending on what the Science Center has to say, it might be two separate meetings, the ecosystem conceptual model and then dealing with the spiny lobster. Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. Mr. Chairman, before we finish, I would like to thank people that have been helping us a lot, and I will just start with Natalia and Liajay and Graciela. Thanks to them. The meetings flow because of the three of them working together.

From the Regional Office, I have Maria del Mar, and the poor lady almost got bit up, just to be the messenger of a presentation, and it was well-done work. Then Sarah and the people from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Kevin's presentation was the first time that I have seen, and this is something that he took upon himself to do it, a presentation of all the projects that are being conducted in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. At some times, you have people that are doing studies here, and we don't know anything about those studies, and, for that, we thank him for that, and I wanted to take note of that.

Then Liajay and Natalia did a great job, notwithstanding the issues with the internet and audio and everything that we confronted, and so, for that, I am very grateful, and I just wanted to say that for the record. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel, and thank you to all for a great meeting again, and thank you for being kind to the Chairman, and thank you for all the support from all the staff and council members and fishermen and participants during all those times for those years and on this new opportunity to be a council member. I am very thankful and honored with the opportunity, and thank you very much. We are ready to adjourn the meeting. The meeting is ending now, and it's 12:01 p.m. Thank you very much to everybody. The meeting is over. Thank you.

 1 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 12, 2020.) 2 ---