2	TABLE OF CONTENTS
3	Table of Contents 1
4 5	Table of Motions 3
6 7	Call to Order and Roll Call
8 9	
10	New Members Oath4
11 12	Moment of Silence in Memory of Carlos Ramos
13	Election of Officers
14 15	Adoption of Agenda9
16 17	Consideration of 174 th Council Meeting Verbatim Transcriptions . 9
18	
19 20	Executive Director's Report9
21 22	SSC Report
23	SEFSC Update 13
24 25	Island-Based Fishery Management Plans Status Update 26
26 27	Generic Amendment to the Fishery Management Plans for Puerto Rico,
28	St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix: Modification to the Buoy
29	Gear Definition: Potential Final Action to Submit to the Secretary
30 31	of Commerce 33
32	Final Action to Submit the Generic Framework Amendment to the
33	Puerto Rico, St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix Fishery
34	Management Plans: Spiny Lobster Reference Points to the Secretary
35 36	of Commerce
37	SEAMAP Caribbean Gold Copy
38 39	Outreach and Education Report 72
40 41	Nassau Grouper Discussion84
42 43	
44	Spiny Lobster Discussion
45 46	Exempted Fishing Permit Update
47 48	Other Business

1 Next Meeting	ТТ Р
2	110
3 Adjournment	118

2	
3	PAGE 55: Motion to approve the Generic Framework Amendment to the
4	Fishery Management Plans for Puerto Rico, St. Thomas and St. John,
5	and St. Croix: Modification of Spiny Lobster Management Reference
6	Points with the selected preferred alternatives and to submit the
7	framework amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for
8	implementation. The motion carried on page 57.
9	
10	PAGE 58: Motion that the council moves to allow staff to make
11	editorial, non-substantive changes to the Spiny Lobster Generic
12	Framework Amendment. Any changes will be reviewed by the Council
13	Chair. The motion carried on page 59.
14	
15	PAGE 60: Motion to deem the codified text presented by the staff
16	as necessary and appropriate for implementing the Spiny Lobster
17	Generic Framework Amendment. The motion carried on page 60.
18	
19	PAGE 104: Motion that the council instructs the staff to examine
20	alternative times when AMs could be applied to the spiny lobster
21	under Puerto Rico's FMP and report back to the council with the
22	appropriate documentation. The motion carried on page 108.
23	
24	— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —

TABLE OF MOTIONS

CARIBBEAN FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL 175TH REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING Webinar

AUGUST 11, 2021

The Caribbean Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Wednesday morning, August 11, 2021, and was called to order at 9:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Marcos Hanke.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL NEW MEMBERS OATH

MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, everyone. It's 9:09, and we are ready to start the meeting. This is the 175^{th} CFMC Virtual Meeting, and today is August 11, 2021. The first part will be the oath for the new members, the appointed members, and we are going to pass first to opening the meeting, and who is going to --

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, the oath is done by the Regional Office, and Mr. Andy Strelcheck already sent the documents to Carlos Farchette and Vanessa Ramirez, and they have to read it for the record.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and let's do that. I was a little confused with how it was going to be. Thank you. Let's start with Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Good morning. I, Vanessa Ramirez-Perez, as a duly appointed member of a regional fishery 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 marine fisheries resources, being careful to balance competing private or regional interests and always aware and protective of the public interests in those resources. I commit myself to uphold the provisions, standards, and requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and other applicable laws and shall conduct myself at all times according to the rules of conduct prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce. This oath is freely given and without mental reservation or purpose of evasion. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vanessa. Carlos Farchette.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I am looking for my file. I guess I just can't say ditto, but let me try and bring it up, and I will read it off, when I get a chance. I'm looking for the email with the letter in it. Give me a minute, and I will let you know when I have it, and I will read it off.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay.

MIGUEL ROLON: Carlos and Marcos, maybe we can go to the roll call while he looks for the document.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Let's do the roll call. Christina, are you going to be the one helping me, or Liajay?

MIGUEL ROLON: Liajay is going to read it, for the record.

LIAJAY RIVERA: Okay. We're starting the roll call with myself, Liajay Rivera, Christina Olan, Graciela Garcia-Moliner, Miguel Rolon, Luiz --, Andy Strelcheck, Alida Ortiz, Angie de los Irizarry, Carlos Farchette, Damaris Delgado, Diana Martino, Edward Schuster, Julian Magras, Jack McGovern, Jesus Rivera, Jocelyn D'Ambrosio, Jose Rivera, Katie McCarthy, Lauren Remsberg, Manny Antonaras, Marcos Hanke, Maria Lopez, Matt Walia, Maldonado, Michelle Scharer, Miguel Borges, Nelson Crespo, Nicole Angeli, Nicole Rio, Orian Tzadik, Rich Appeldoorn, Robert Copeland, Sarah Stephenson, Tony Blanchard, Vanessa Ramirez, Virginia Shervette, Wilson Santiago.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Liajay. Was anybody missed on that first roll call? Was there anybody else that just arrived? Seeing none, we will keep going. Carlos, do you have your document?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, I've got it. I, Carlos Farchette, a duly appointed member of a regional fishery 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 marine fisheries resources, being careful to balance competing private or regional interests and always aware and protective of the public interests in those resources. I commit myself to uphold the provisions, standards, and requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and other applicable laws and shall conduct myself at all times according to the rules of conduct prescribed by the

Secretary of Commerce. This oath is freely given and without mental reservation or purpose of evasion.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. Andy Strelcheck, good morning.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Good morning, Marcos. I would just briefly make a comment, if I can speak, and then I will turn it back to you, and so I wanted to thank Carlos and Vanessa. They, obviously, read the oath of office for participation on the council and the fishery management process, and I want to thank them for their willingness and interest to continue serving on the council, and I look forward to their continued service and work as we tackle many challenging issues in the Caribbean, and so thank you for your service.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, two things. One, we would like to have a moment of silence before we adopt the agenda and do the election of officers, and, also, we would like to welcome Andy Strelcheck. He has been appointed as the Regional Administrator, starting on the 15th of this month, and Andy has been a friend of the Caribbean for many, many years, in many positions, and so I really -- I believe, personally, that they have elected the best person for the job, and so welcome, as now the Regional Administrator of the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Region.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thank you, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Then the Election of Officers. Last week, I sent you an email about the record that you set last year, and you said that were going to rotate, now that the island-based FMPs have been approved in September of last year, and they will be implemented this year.

In addition, a council member asked me to put in the record that he would like to consider the possibility of a three-year term for each officer. Then I sent a note to you, and I included the last say, any final say, in any of this is the council prerogative, and the staff doesn't have anything to do with it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF CARLOS RAMOS

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Miguel. Let's follow one minute of silence in remembering and respecting Carlos Ramos.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was held in memory of Carlos Ramos.)

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, everyone. We are going to pass now to Election of Officers. I will give a word to Miguel to follow-up on the process. Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. The minute of silence of Carlos Ramos was after the Election of Officers, but that's okay. Carlos Ramos, for those of you that don't know him, he was our third fiscal officer, and he served for many years. He passed recently, a couple of days ago, and we are really grateful for his service to the council. He was always minding the budget and making sure that we used the money according to the applicable laws and regulations, the same way that Angie de los Irizarry is doing now, and so we wanted to convey this message, and I will send it to the family.

He was a good friend, and he had spent a lot of years with the council, serving as the fiscal officer. He came when we were needing somebody to take the position for three months, and there were no guarantees that that person would stay in work, because our fiscal officer resigned, and we had three years to close, and he came and did the work, and, after he was elected as the fiscal officer, he continued the work for all these years.

He resigned from the council because of diabetes, and he was legally blind, and still he was able to work with us for a while, until the doctor told him not to do it anymore, and, for that, we are really in debt to Carlos Ramos, from 1949 to 2021, and so we are dedicating this meeting in his loving memory. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Election of Officers, I believe we are going to pass the chairmanship to the Coast Guard, like we usually do, and who is representing the Coast Guard at this time?

DIANA MARTINO: Robert Copeland.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Good morning, everyone. I am part of the Coast Guard here, and I don't know if any other Coast Guard members are on, but I'm unaware of assuming any other roles and responsibilities at this time, and would you be able to further discuss that, please?

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. It's just to preside over the election of officers. You open the floor for any nominations, and you don't need a second for the nominations, and then, if you have only one nomination, we proceed to vote. You call for the vote, and then,

for the Vice Chair, we do the same, the nomination for the Vice Chair, and no seconds are needed. We follow Roberts Rules, and then you open the floor for voting. Then, once the Chair is elected, you pass the meeting again to the Chair. At this time, you can open the meeting for nominations.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Sorry, Marcos, and this has kind of caught me off guard, and I was not still not aware that I was supposed to be doing anything of the such, and are you asking me to be the Chair, or are you asking me to open up for nominations for someone else to assume the Chair?

MIGUEL ROLON: You will be the chair of the meeting for the election of officers. The only thing you have to do is to open the floor for nominations. Once you have a nomination, if there is only one, then the council will vote on the nomination for Chair. The second will be the nomination for Vice Chair. If there is only one, then you open the floor for voting for the Vice Chair. If we have more than one, then the council will have to vote, and they will be tallied up. Usually, when we have more than one, the vote is on paper, but, here, we can't do it by paper.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Miguel, it sounds like you have a firm understanding of how this process is supposed to roll, and would I be able to listen in on how this is supposed to go?

MIGUEL ROLON: Technically, I can just say it on your behalf, and so I will just do it.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Okay.

MIGUEL ROLON: On behalf of Robert Copeland, we open the floor for nominations for Chair.

TONY BLANCHARD: Marcos Hanke.

MIGUEL ROLON: Any other nominations? All those in favor, say aye. It's unanimous. Do we have any opposition or abstentions? Marcos is the Chair of the council. Now we will open for Vice Chair. Any nominations?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I am nominating Tony Blanchard.

MIGUEL ROLON: Any further nominations? Hearing none, all in favor, say aye. Welcome back, Mr. Chairman, Marcos Hanke, and Mr. Vice Chair, Tony Blanchard. Now Marcos will continue with the meeting. Thank you, Mr. Copeland.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Thank you, Miguel. I appreciate it.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the Coast Guard to help us on this part of the meeting. Thank you, everyone, for the support, and we're going to keep conducting to the best of our capacities and protect the resource and to balance all the discussion on this meeting. Thank you very much, again. We're going to adopt the agenda now. Any comments on the agenda from the council members? We need a motion to adopt the agenda, please.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Motion to adopt the agenda.

MARCOS HANKE: I have a motion from Andy Strelcheck to adopt the agenda. Is there a second?

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Second.

CONSIDERATION OF 174TH COUNCIL MEETING VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION

MARCOS HANKE: Second by Vanessa Ramirez to adopt the agenda. Any opposition? Hearing none, the agenda is adopted. Next is Consideration of the $174^{\rm th}$ Verbatim Transcription from the council, and is there any comment on it? Hearing none, I need a motion.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Move for consideration.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vanessa, and thank you for the motion. Is there a second?

NICOLE ANGELI: Second.

DAMARIS DELGADO: Second.

 MARCOS HANKE: We had two persons speaking, and I just heard the name of Nicole Angeli to second the motion. Any opposition? Hearing none, the verbatim transcription for the $174^{\rm th}$ Council Meeting is approved. The next item on the agenda is the Executive Director's Report. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

MIGUEL ROLON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first thing is, as you know, on the $21^{\rm st}$, we saw a presentation by Dr. Michelle Duval on the five-year plan, and now we are going to have a plan for people to comment, and we have -- On our webpage, we will have the documentation for people to comment and the draft five-year plan.

Once this is finished, by September 3 of this year, we will be able to then finalize the document, and Dr. Duval will present the final version at the December meeting, and, there, we will take some action on the recommendations, for example the sub-committees who are going to be dealing with the implantation for the five-year strategic plan, and the sub-committees will be one for science and another one for outreach and education and the other one for management.

We will have more information at the December meeting, which, by the way, will be a hybrid meeting on the $7^{\rm th}$ and $8^{\rm th}$ of December at the Marriott Courtyard in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Already, Diana is polling who is going to be traveling to Puerto Rico and who is going to be working from home and participating virtually at our meeting.

Now, with the Delta variant of the COVID-19, as you know, there is a question for the participation will be in December, and we were told that we have to wait until probably the fall to hear from NOAA any news about the procedure for allowing participation of employees to meetings outside of their home office.

I believe, that at this stage, that they are in a Level 0, and a Level 0 is more precautious, and people that are not essential do not go to the office, but you are still teleworking, and so we are hoping that, by December, we will have a better atmosphere for the COVID-19. So far, only eight people have expressed that they will attend the meeting in person.

Any of you who haven't been able to contact Diana Martino, please do so and indicate whether you are going to participate at the meeting virtually or you are planning to travel to San Juan, because the hotel gave us a cutoff date, and we need to comply with that, in order to avoid penalties.

The other thing that is happening is, as you know, we are collaborating with the NOAA Fisheries Seafood Inspection and International Fisheries and the Office of Protected Resources, and we are working with the WECAFC, the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission, on several projects, working groups, and we will continue to do so, and the active campaign is to promote Pan-Caribbean management of the species, especially Nassau grouper and the mutton snapper. At the December meeting, we will get you more information on the development of these meetings, these working groups.

As you know, we announced that we are going to have a February 9,

2022 meeting to discuss marine reserves, and now it's area-based management, and that's the words that they use now, and the CCC, the group that encompasses the councils, all the councils, and National Marine Fisheries Service are going to meet in October, and part of the discussion will include the response to the Executive Order 14008 that calls for closure of 30 percent of the land and water by 2030 of the areas that we have under management, by different laws and regulations, for the protection of those areas.

A report will be given at the meeting, and we will provide you the outcome of that report at the December meeting, but it will be discussed thoroughly at the February 9 meeting. At that meeting, we will have all the council members and DAP chairs, the same people that are here now, as participants discussing the U.S. Caribbean status on marine reserves across boundaries, from the shoreline to the edge of the EEZ.

We also are going to continue the work by Dr. Aldana, and remember that she gave us a presentation not long ago about the microplastics that are incorporating into the food chain and reaching the consumers, and that could affect the future of the fisheries in the Caribbean, and so we are going to continue that work, and, right now, during the time of the pandemic, a lot of plastics have been accumulated, and there is a lot of concern about how this might affect the fisheries of the Caribbean, including, of course, the U.S. Caribbean, the Gulf, and the South Atlantic. That work probably will be conducted this year, and we will provide reports and updates as the project comes along.

The budget situation that we have is okay, and we received the funding that were allocated to us for this year, and so we don't have any problems with the monies at this time. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman, unless they have any questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Any questions for the Executive Director? Go ahead, Carlos.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miguel, I saw in the local news here yesterday, and I want to validate this, that Puerto Rico hotels are now mandating that any guests be vaccinated, or PCR tests are still valid?

 MIGUEL ROLON: The Governor is proposing that any commercial institution can request vaccination certificates from people attending meetings or participating or guests of the council, if you are going to stay at the hotel, and so, for the December meeting, anybody coming to Puerto Rico has to show the validation

of certificate of being vaccinated or a no-less-than-seventy-two-hour certificate of COVID free, but the vaccination is probably going to be required by the hotel, and so that's a good point.

I forgot to mention that, but, as the Governor said, and this is the situation now, and he will inform the public -- He will update the public on the new developments. According to the news, the Delta is capable of breaking those people who are vaccinated by using Pfizer or Johnson & Johnson or Moderna. We encourage everybody to do it, and, as the council, we are going to require facemasks for everybody, and I don't care if you're vaccinated or not. Facemasks will be required.

The other thing that the hotel told us to do is they are going to have space, and so we will have probably one person per table, rather than three, or two, but they will advise the council on these measures, and, as I said before, in the case of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the Regional Office, Dr. Paul Doremus told us that they will play it by ear, in order to allow NOAA Fisheries personnel to travel to meetings.

The next meeting that we are going to have that will require National Marine Fisheries Service people to attend is the CCC meeting in October, and, right now, there are members of other councils that are indicating that they are not going to travel. In my case, probably I won't travel, because I will take that risk, and so Tony and Marcos have to decide whether they are going to travel or not. If they are going to travel, then they have to make their reservations accordingly. Any other questions?

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. We have Andy Strelcheck.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Miguel. A comment and then a question. With regard to council meetings, NOAA Fisheries has created a blanket travel approval waiver, and it's considered mission essential activity, and so we can participate in council meetings, and so our intent would be to be at the December council meeting.

One thing, I guess, or a question, is can you have that email resent with regarding participation at the council meeting? We're finding that a number of the Caribbean Council emails are getting caught up in our spam filters, when they are emailed to us, and so we have not seen that, and we want to make sure that we meet your deadline, obviously, for informing decision about the council meeting.

MIGUEL ROLON: Excellent. We will send it to everybody today. Diana will do that.

2 3 4

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Any other questions? none, the next item on the agenda is the first presentation, Island-Based Fishery Management Plans, a status update.

5 6

7

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, the first thing on the agenda is the SSC Report and the SEFSC Update. You have Richard Appeldoorn and then followed by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Update.

8 9

10

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Am I good to go?

11 12

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

13 14

SSC REPORT

15 16

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Okay. The SSC did not meet between the last council meeting and now, and so there is no update to report.

17 18 19

MIGUEL ROLON: Then we have the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Update.

20 21

SEFSC UPDATE

22 23 24

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Good morning. I do have a presentation, and I can just share my screen, if that's all right.

25 26 27

MIGUEL ROLON: Please go ahead.

28 29

30

I would like to start by congratulating Marcos KEVIN MCCARTHY: and Tony for their being elected to office on the council, and also congratulate Andy Strelcheck on his new job at the Regional Office, and so congratulations to all of you.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

I just have a fairly brief, or I hope it's fairly brief, presentation to update you all on some of the work that we're doing at the Science Center. I gave you a fairly lengthy presentation last year, and I think it was the August meeting last year, about a lot of the projects that we were doing in the region, and those mainly concern things like projects to look at landings and size composition, life history data, abundance data, gear selectivity data, ecosystem data, socioeconomic data, but, today, I'm going to talk about database development and automation, and this is an aspect of the work that we do that doesn't get a lot of attention.

43 44 45

46 47

48

It sort of goes on in the background, but it's really critical. I mean, when you consider that you've got landings data and size composition data and all these other data endeavors and projects to collect those data, where are you going to put them?

Where are you going to store them, and how are you going to get access to them, and so that's what this database development and automation is all about, and we've got several projects that we're working on in the U.S. Virgin Islands. We've got a project with data entry and data extraction application upgrades, and I will talk about that in a moment.

In Puerto Rico, there is the electronic reporting that I think most all of you are aware of, and what we want to develop there is a secure system of data flow and storage, and, in Puerto Rico also, there are the commercial landing correction factors.

We want to develop some efficient methods to calculate those correction factors, reduce the burden on DNER staff, and it's a real endeavor every year to develop those correction factors, and it can be really burdensome of the staff to try and get that done quickly, and so we're going to try and have some assistance from the Science Center, to see if we can improve the efficiency and reduce the burden on the staff.

In the Virgin Islands, this is a collaboration between the Division of Fish and Wildlife and Artech, and Artech is a developer that we've got contracted through the Science Center, and so they do a lot of database development and application software development, and then the Science Center, and so the three entities are working together on these projects.

What we're doing is upgrading the data entry system to accommodate changes to the catch forms, the commercial catch forms, that have changed over time, including changes in the species listed on the forms. As you go back in time, the forms have changed, of course, and, as DFW staff have been entering the data, they will notice things about the data entry system that we have in place that could be improved, or that could be made easier or more efficient, and so we're trying to accommodate those changes that are brought to our attention by DFW staff.

We have also spent some time working with our partners at DFW to develop some standard reports and so these are sort of hypothetical, and I don't know that they've asked for this in particular, but, when I was putting together the presentation, I just came up with a couple of hypothetical examples.

For example, if Fish and Wildlife was interested in monthly landings by species by island, and they wanted to have this on a regular basis, we would work with the developers to put together a report-out, basically, that is sort of automated to fulfill this

data request.

They would go into the software, and select perhaps from a drop-down menu, or some sort of radio button or something, that I want this report, and it will give me these monthly landings by species and by island. You click the button, and you have it just download automatically for them, rather than going in and extracting the raw data and then spending some time collating the data by month and by species and by island. It just makes life a little easier for the staff if there's a dataset that they want time after time after time, on some regular basis, and we're developing those.

Another example is perhaps they're interested in the number of vessels and trips by month and island, and that's something else that we could have the developers produce, and so it just becomes a button, or a flip of the switch, basically, to download those data, and so it makes life a little bit easier and saves staff time from these sort of repetitive tasks, if these are datasets that they're interested on a regular basis.

In Puerto Rico, the collaborators are a little bit different. We've got DNR, and ShellCatch, of course, you know is the contractors who developed the electronic logbook system. ACCSP, which is an acronym that you may not be familiar with, but ACCSP is the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program, and their role in this is to be the data warehouse for this electronic book data, and then the Science Center.

 There is a lot going on here, but, on the left, where you see stage details, these are sort of the steps that we have to go through to enable the data that ShellCatch has, those electronic logbook data that are uploaded to the ShellCatch server, and, in order to move it from ShellCatch to ACCSP, which is where the Science Center can access the data, we've got a bunch of steps we have to go through.

There are a lot of terms up there that you may not be familiar with, and I don't want to dive too much into the details of all of that, but you see this word "schema", and a schema is really just the organization of the data within the database, and you can kind of think of it as a blueprint, and so what we have to make sure — It seems straightforward, and, okay, why can't we just shift the data from ShellCatch to ACCSP and no problem, and how hard can this be, until you get into the details, and so you have to make sure that the ACCSP database is set up in a way that it can accept the ShellCatch data.

For example, dates are always a problem. Is today's date listed in the data as August 11, 2021, or is it 08/11/2021, or is it

11/08/2021, and so you have to just make sure that things line up, that the database on the one end is ready to accept the data that's coming from ShellCatch.

Then this API is application programming interface, and so this is just software that allows two applications to talk to each other, and so, for example, if you use the weather app on your phone, there's an API involved in that process. You don't see it, and it's all going on in the background, but it's critical for you to be able to run those applications.

The main think that I want to point out here is we've got seven steps mapped out here, and four of them are done, and one is in progress, and this has all happened in June and July. I am not directly involved in this project, and so I haven't gotten the latest update, but I suspect that this "in progress" has proceeded along pretty well, and may have actually moved to being done, and some of these last two steps, the pending, may either be in progress or is done, because I think, fairly soon, we should be able to get the data from ACCSP, and that's the goal.

Upon completion, the Science Center will have secure access to the Puerto Rico landings data for an analysis in stock assessments and responding to council requests and that sort of thing, and so it has come along really well. It was a really nice collaboration between DNER, ShellCatch, ACCSP, and the Science Center.

The next, and last, thing that I want to talk about is the Puerto Rico correction factors. Again, it's a collaboration between DNER and the Science Center. Artech, again, is the software developers that are contracted to the Science Center, and just a quick reminder, and I suspect you all are well aware of this, but, for those who aren't, correction factors are used in Puerto Rico to estimate the total landings from the reported landings, and there is —— If there is underreporting, this is a way to expand the landings to have a better estimate of the total landings. This is all in the commercial sector, but, to get to those correction factors is a really burdensome task for DNER staff, and I don't know that that's always fully realized.

We're always in a hurry to get the data, but we don't often recognize how much work goes into getting those correction factors, and it is necessary for ACL monitoring, and it's necessary for stock assessments. Landings data, and accurate landings data, are just critical for those activities, and so there are a few steps to get those final correction factors.

The first one is DNER staff go out and do some port sampling, and

this is port sampling specific to the correction factors. It's not the port sampling that you see where they're getting lengths of fish and that sort of thing. This is a different port sampling, and it goes on for short periods during the year, specifically to get at the correction factor issue.

Once they get the data, they have to enter it into a database. Right now, that's in an Excel file. They then enter the CCL reports, and so the logbook forms that the fishers submit, and those are also entered into that same Excel file. There is a process to match the survey data with the CCL reports, and that is how they get at underreporting and how much underreporting there might be, and then they calculate the correction factors.

It's a long process, and it takes -- It's a big burden, and what we think we could do is either improve the efficiency or completely automate these final four steps. That port sampling is still going to require people going out in the field and looking at catches, but the entering the data -- We think we can improve that. We're starting with calculating the correction factors, and we're doing this by hand. We want to make sure that the numbers that the Science Center gets matches the numbers that Puerto Rico staff get.

Once we do that, we're going to work with Artech, with our developers, to modify an existing data entry system that will greatly improve, we think, the data entry part for the survey data, make life a little bit easier for the DNER staff.

Because we already have CCL data in another database, we don't need to -- We want to make sure that we're not double-entering that. That's time that we don't need to spend, and so we think that we might be able to eliminate that step. When we then match the CCL reports, that will be automated, and so we'll have a database with the survey data, a database with the CCL report, that we can merge.

Now that we have the electronic logbook data, we're basically merging three datasets, because we still have people reporting on the paper forms, and so those are being entered, and those data go to a server in Miami. The survey data will go to the same server in Miami, but in a different database, and then the electronic logbook is all off to ACCSP, and so that will all get merged.

We'll do that in a way that doesn't require a lot of -- It will all be on the computer, and so we'll automate it, and then we will -- Once we get all that done, we'll automate the calculating the correction factors, and so we think that this automation and

improved efficiency and handling the data will reduce the amount of time that it takes to get to these correction factors and that, once we have the correction factors, we can then get to a better estimate of the landings, and that's the goal.

We want to reduce the burden on the DNER staff, and we want to reduce the time to calculate the correction factors, and we want to reduce that from months that it now takes, because it is burdensome, down to weeks, and we have weeks in here because the port sampling is still going to take time.

 The data entry will still take time, and all of these other steps will be automated, and so we won't be adding to those few weeks of time that it takes to do the survey and to enter the data, and so we think it's going to be a big plus for getting the correction factors a lot more quickly and to allow DNER staff to work on other projects, rather than spending a lot of time on these correction factors every year.

Just to recap, we've done some upgrades to the Virgin Islands data entry and data reports applications. We're moving pretty quickly on getting the electronic logbook data to ACCSP, and that will allow the Science Center direct access, in a safe and secure way, and then we're automating the process for calculating the commercial landings correction factors. That's all I've got for today. If there are any questions, I'm happy to take those.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin. I have a question, just to start. On the last part, the correction factors, this will address the difference between let's say trap fishermen, in general, the way they report, and the correction factor related to that versus deepwater snapper fishermen or something like that, just as an example?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right, and so we're not tackling that just yet. What we want to do -- This is simply the existing process that we're going to automate, but I agree with you that, as we move forward, we need to start looking at the different sectors, because you're right.

The way different sectors of the fishery report could be very different, and so having a single correction factor, say for the east coast of Puerto Rico, might not be the best way to expand the landings, to get a more accurate understanding of the total landings. It could very well be that we need to do it by gear, or there could be -- We might need to do it by species, and there are a couple of different ways, but that will be a big project, and our first step is to automate what already exists.

That will free up staff time, quite honestly, that can be used on other projects, and one of those projects could very well be let's design a better survey, so that we have more accurate correction factors and we get the best estimate of the total landings that we could get, but, for now, we just want to automate it, because we're going to want to have it automated anyway.

No matter what the survey looks like in the future, we want this end of it, this whole correction factor calculation, to be automated, because it's just -- We don't want to spend -- Well, they're not my staff, certainly, but I suspect that DNER staff don't want to spend time doing something that could be automated, and so that's what we're getting at here, and so I hope that answers the question, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, it answered the question, and I just want to put out there, and it's something that probably we're going to hear from you guys in the future, but I think it's very important. Council members, any more questions?

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have Richard Appeldoorn waiting for two questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Richard.

 RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you. Kevin, that's really great news about the work you guys are doing, and so this is maybe an extension on that. We have, for example, in Puerto Rico, the work that Todd Gedamke's group has been doing on really trying to get down to a statistical basis of port sampling done, and that seems, to me, that it would feed in much -- A lot of information that would be critical toward looking at these questions of what's the best way to do conversion factors.

The first question is are you looking ahead toward that work in guiding your approach to not so much automating, but the design of the port sampling, or can that approach that's being used now just be substituted, if it was to be put in place on a permanent basis? That's question one.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Great question. I mean, we specifically contract -- The Science Center specifically contracted with MER Consultants, Todd's company, to start to develop the -- To get the data and start developing those survey designs. That would be -- I mean, it could -- The way I see it is it might eventually replace the current system. If we get a good survey design, we would, of course, have to consult with DNER, and how do they want to move

forward.

 I think, for a time, we would want to run both. Even if the decision was eventually to replace the current system with the correction factors, I think we would want to overlap for several years, say three years or five years or something like that, where we run both, so that we have a better understanding of how they differ.

It's going to take a few years. Even if we came up with a design tomorrow for a full port sampling, it would take a few years to really get that optimized. There is always going to be things that we can improve, but, in the meantime, we would want to run both. I think that would be a big change, and so that would probably be a negotiation above my paygrade between the Science Center and DNER, but we're certainly looking towards that as a possible way to go in the future, that port sampling.

That would not eliminate the reporting, the CCL reports. There is still -- Those are still useful for a lot of different kinds of analyses, but, for just getting at the landings, it's possible that we head in that direction, but, again, that's a negotiation between the DNER and the Science Center.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: All right. Thanks, Kevin. The second question is a little bit further afield. We have the SEAMAP program that operates in Puerto Rico, and in the Gulf and South Atlantic, for that matter, and I know you're dealing, right now, with the issues of the landings data, as the first priority, but is there going to be, looking down the road, an effort to make these kind of datasets compatible, so the Center has, eventually, immediate access to all these sorts of data?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: I would love that. I would love to have access, ready access, to all the work that's gone on over the years with SEAMAP-C. I think we're going to hear a presentation, later today, about SEAMAP-C, and so I'm just starting to learn about that. I mean, I was aware of it, but I don't know a lot of the details, and so I'm going to start sitting in on some of those SEAMAP-C meetings, just as an observer, and try and take in what all is being done, but, yes, I think SEAMAP-C is really important as a fishery-independent source of data, and that is another piece in the assessment puzzle.

The landings are one, those kind of fishery-independent surveys, especially if they're getting at things like abundance and size composition, and those are also very critical, and so having easy access to those data, and having a place for those data to live

that everybody who needs access, or would like access, to those data is going to an important project.

I am not quite sure where that stands, and maybe I will learn more today, in the presentation, but I think there's a huge role for SEAMAP-C to play, but we do have to solve the data warehousing question.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you very much, Kevin.

11 MARCOS HANKE: Any other questions?

13 ANDY STRELCHECK: Marcos, I have a question.

15 MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Kevin, great presentation, and I'm really excited to hear about all the improvements that are being made. You may have mentioned this, but, for my clarity -- My understanding is we are waiting, I guess, on annual landings for 2020 right now for Puerto Rico, and a large part of that is either because of reports still coming in or the correction factors.

In your presentation, you mentioned speeding up the correction factors from months to weeks. In your view, do we get to a point where we could have landings data from the prior year ready and available sometime by the middle of the following year, going forward?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: That is certainly a goal, absolutely. These correction factors, as soon as the sampling surveys are complete, and I think they're done a couple of times during the year. As soon as those are done, those data can be entered, and this whole process can begin, and, because it will be much more automated, it should go quickly, and so it's really these first two steps.

The port sampling survey, of course, you have to have people out in the field, and that's going to take some time, and then the data entry is also going to take some time, but those two are really the hands-on part. Now, data are entered -- Where I've got this crossed out, data are entered into another database with the CCL anyway, and that's happening throughout the year, and so there is a -- The delays will be -- Well, not really delays, but the time that it takes to get this done is really dependent upon these first three steps.

This third step here that is crossed out is also dependent upon any delays in reporting, and so, if you've got -- If you're running

your survey in April, but you still have reports coming in two months later, which is common with logbooks, and, I mean, it's common everywhere. It happens in the Gulf, and it happens in the South Atlantic, and it happens in the Caribbean.

If you've got those delayed reportings, that -- You want to make sure that you've got -- Everybody is going to report has reported, because that directly affects the correction factor, and you don't want to have a constantly shifting correction factor, and so you have to make some decision on when do we decide that everybody is going to report has reported, and that's when you can calculate your correction factor.

 The trick is, if say the survey runs in April, and again in August or October, or something like that, you would -- I would imagine that, by the beginning of the year, January or February, every logbook report that's going to come in has come in, and, as long as those are entered quickly, and they are in the U.S. Caribbean, and I think the data come in and are entered more quickly in the Caribbean than they are say in the Gulf, oftentimes.

Once that happens, yes, we can run this, run the programs that will calculate the correction factors, and I think mid-year of the following year is an entirely reasonable thing to shoot for. Maybe a little bit earlier, but certainly by June, I would think that we could have this.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Andy, do you have any other follow-up questions?

ANDY STRELCHECK: No, I don't. Thanks, Kevin.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Graciela has her hand up, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Graciela.

 GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Kevin, thank you for the presentation. I have two questions. One is regarding the accessibility of the archived data for everyday use, and two is if, in both the archived and the new setup for data reporting, if it will have both the reported and the corrected landings, because sometimes we like to look at the reported landings before we do any thinking about those correction factors. When would we have -- Not we, or, well, we the general public, when will we have access to the archived data that's already available at the Science Center from the commercial

48 landings?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: I remember this conversation we had, what, a week or so ago, and so there had been public access to the non-confidential data, and that is no longer the case, and is that correct?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Yes

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Okay, and so I have to investigate why that feature disappeared. I am just making a note here.

MARCOS HANKE: Graciela, do you have any other questions?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: My question would be to have both. If we can get access to that feature of the archived datasets, to have both the reported and the corrected landings.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right, and so we can -- What we can do is -- I will have to talk to the developers and to my old group in the statistics division, because they are really the folks that deal with this, and they will be the ones to address this issue, but I would think that we would make a variety of reports that are non-confidential that could be more open to general access.

For example, if you were interested in the number of trips, or the number of vessels, and not the vessels themselves, but just a count of them, as long as it's non-confidential, the data can be accessed, but definitely the landings, as reported, and as expanded, are going to be of interest to people.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Exactly, so that we can have access to, for example, the amount of fish landed for a number of species over the many months of whatever year, so that this goes along with all the life history work that's being conducted, and so everything is kind of moving on a chain, and that information would also give us an idea of the changes in the landings over time, so that we can concentrate on those species that will have enough landing information available for us to do something about it. Thank you very much, and I will keep this conversation updated.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yes, and I think I saw that Virginia is on this meeting, and I know that I owe her some non-confidential data as well, and so I haven't forgotten about you, Virginia.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: If that's it, thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin. We have the next presentation, and the next presentation will be the presentation on -- It will be a status upon on the island-based fishery management plans.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Marcos, this is a question for Kevin.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you, Carlos. Go ahead.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Kevin, I'm wondering, and is this a correction factor thing for everything, because I remember -- It's been about ten years, and I thought that improving CCRs and all that was supposed to take care of that, and then the buffer for uncertainty and all that, and I'm not really sure why they're still working on correction factors, to have correction factors.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right, and so good question, Carlos. The correction factors are necessary until we get near-universal reporting, and so, if 97 percent of the fishing trips were reported on CCL, then the correction factors would likely not be necessary, and I just made up that number, and that may not be sufficient, but certainly, if you had near-universal reporting, but, if you've got 75 percent reporting, then you want to have those correction factors still, and I think that is the situation we're in, and it varies across the island.

We've got a correction factor for each of the four coasts, and they are not always the same number. In fact, they are almost never the same number, and so different regions of the island have greater or lesser reporting, based upon the survey, and so, if the DNER staff were to go out on one of their surveys, say this year, and they got a near-perfect match between the number of trips that they interviewed at a particular spot on a particular day, and then the logbook reports coming in match those for that spot on that day, then you don't really need a correction factor, because it's one. Everybody reported.

 Until you see that, and until you can demonstrate that with the surveys, we're going to keep having a need for those correction factors, and so it's really a reporting question and how complete the reporting is.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin. Kevin, I have a -- It's more an observation than a question, based on the life history, and I don't want to forget that. I know that there is a good connection with personnel of the Fishery Lab, especially Noemi Pena, that have been creating capacity building and connections with the fishing

community to collect data over the years.

My understanding is that they have experts that support her and data and information in there that needs support to be processed, and I please invite you to contact her and to coordinate those efforts, because I would hate to see starting any other project that is not needed and knowing that there is already some samples that could help to speed up the process on getting life history and other important data that they might already have, but not processed and put in the right form. That's just an observation.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Marcos, that's a great observation, and, in fact, we have been working with Noemi and her lab now for about -- Well, we started right before COVID, and then we couldn't go and meet with her, and she couldn't come up and meet with us, but we've been working with her lab. There's a statistician out of the Science Center who has been working with her and looking at sample sizes and where the collection efforts should be to maximize the sampling effort.

We have started sort of a working group, for lack of a better term, that several of the Science Center folks are involved with, and Noemi is involved with, and Virginia is involved with, and so everybody is starting to talk together now, and so we're doing exactly what you're suggesting, and I think it's a great idea, and I think it's going to be really helpful.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, are you monitoring the hands of the people?

MARCOS HANKE: No, and I'm just going to the chat. Is there anybody else that I'm missing?

MIGUEL ROLON: Not right now, but, anyway, the correction factor is the key for the statistics that we have, and, when we started the correction factor in Puerto Rico, the whole thing was because the University of Miami, who was the father of our statistical program, found out that the port agents were collecting about 20 percent of what a person that was assigned for fifteen days at the docks in Puerto Rico was collecting from the fishers. However, the tables that were sent with the information to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center did not have that correction factor.

There are two things. Now, after Kevin's presentation, an excellent one, by the way, we are working statistically at the correction factor, and we need to do that also across the U.S. Caribbean and not only for Puerto Rico, and so probably we need to

talk to -- Well, continue the talk with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, the U.S. Virgin Islands authorities, and the people collecting the information of Puerto Rico.

We need to close that gap between what the fishers report and the realities out there, and it's more important now, especially with the ACLs, and you will see, during the discussion today, what is happening to the spiny lobster and other species that are under management, and so hopefully this correction factor issue will not be an issue in the future, and it will be supported with the best data available and the best scientific methodology. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. I don't see anybody else, and I think it's now time to pass to the next agenda on the agenda, the island-based fishery management plans. Thank you.

ISLAND-BASED FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS (IBFMPs) STATUS UPDATE

MARIA LOPEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Maria Lopez with the Southeast Regional Office, Caribbean Branch, and I just wanted to give you a quick update of where we are with respect to the proposed rule for the island-based fishery management plans that were approved by the Secretary of Commerce back in September.

Right now, the proposed rule for the plans is under legal review. Our expectation is that we would be able to have that ready soon for publication in the -- We are aiming for the end of the month, or next month, but hopefully soon you will have that published, and we'll be able to have that comment period available for you to comment, and so that's the information that we have right now with respect to the island-based FMPs. Any questions?

MARCOS HANKE: Are there questions? Thank you, Maria. There are no questions for you.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, if I may, Maria, we had many questions the other day regarding the publication of the regulations for the island-based FMPs, and so the public has a period of time where they can comment. Usually, there is a significant comment that you receive, and what's the process to deal with that? Does it have to come back to the council, or the Regional Office deals with the comments?

MARIA LOPEZ: Graciela, thank you for the question. All of the comments that we receive on the proposed rule are going to be addressed by the agency, and you are going to be looking at the answers to those comments in the final rule.

In terms of what can be done, if there can be changes to anything based on that, I am going to defer that question to Jocelyn, if she's available, and, Jocelyn, are you available?

MIGUEL ROLON: She is raising her hand.

MARIA LOPEZ: Thank you. Okay. Go ahead.

 JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you. We have sort of split the decision here, and so, as you know, the Secretary of Commerce approved the island-based FMPs, and that's the authority that's given to the Secretary of Commerce under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. You send over the FMPs, or any amendments, for approval, and the Secretary is limited in what they can do. They can approve or disapprove or partially approve, and so that decision has been made, and so the FMPs have been approved, but we are now at the stage of just trying to put in the regulations that would implement them.

That means that we're just trying to develop regulations that effectuate what the plan is. If there is any comments about any mechanisms undertaken in the FMPs, those have really already been approved, and we're just trying to have regulations that would go to it, and so there's not a chance here that any adverse comments would affect the Secretary's decision to approve or not, because that has already occurred.

In other instances, if there were negative comments, there couldn't necessarily be changes that NMFS would be able to implement, but it would just affect whether NMFS approved or disapproved the plan, and then they could say, well, we're disapproving because this negative comment raised questions about the council's authority to implement something, and, therefore, we're disapproving, if that were the case, and then they could send it back to the council to make changes, but, here, we already have that approval decision for the FMPs, and so the negative comments have a little bit of a different impact here.

 We're just trying to look for comments on whether or not the regulations are clear, things of that nature, but, even in general, there's very limited NMFS authority to do something different, because the Magnuson Act really just asks the agency to approve or disapprove what's been done and then, were any changes needed to be made, it would go back to the council, but, again, we're sort of in a position where we've got the thumbs-up for the overall process, and we're trying to just develop regulations that implement it, and so there shouldn't be anything that really affects the ability to move forward with the FMPs, but it's just

the way in which the regulations describe what's put in place in the FMPs.

2 3 4

I would expect comments that would be helpful to be about is it clear what we're saying, is there a better way to phrase things, and, if there's any questions about the management measures, NMFS would respond to those comments, and we could bring things back to the council to see if any changes would need to be made, but that would be a separate council process.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, if I may, a follow-up question?

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Jocelyn, the issue was raised regarding the sargassum, floating sargassum and the one that ends up on the beaches, and so we've been talking about these things, and, because it's EFH for six of the species that are new to management, that's where some of the comments might come in, because there was a workshop on sargassum the other day, and people were wondering what impact that would have, in terms of removing sargassum from the beach or removing floating sargassum before it gets to the beach, et cetera, and so that's where the question is coming from and where most likely we would have some input into the regulations that will be forthcoming. Thank you.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: I can speak to that for a second, and so, in the island-based FMPs, I believe sargassum might be listed, as you said, as essential fish habitat for some of the species, and that identification of EFH has been in the FMP, and so that's been approved, and so that is the EFH.

 EFH isn't specified in the regulations, and so there wouldn't be anything in this document that would specifically put into place regulations specifying sargassum as EFH, but, if the council is interested in understanding how to manage around this idea of sargassum as EFH, then it would be appropriate to have a discussion and figure out if there's any other management tools that you would want to use with respect to sargassum, to protect the EFH or if there's any other concerns with it, but, at this time, the regulations to implement the FMPs are sort of just effectuating those measures that need to be codified, that affect the public, and so it would be reorganizing the regulations to have the bag limits and the size limits and the catch limits and all of the different suite of management measures, and so that's what this rule is going to be doing.

Earlier, last year, NOAA Fisheries published the notice of availability of the FMPs and received comments on whether or not they should approve those FMPs, and comments raised there will also be addressed in this rulemaking, but, in terms of next steps on sargassum, that would be best pursued through another council action.

MARCOS HANKE: Graciela, any more questions?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: No, and thank you very much. That was very clear.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. I think I have Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had a question for Maria, but, before that, Jocelyn, did you just say that sargassum is listed as an EFH?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Yes, I believe it's listed as EFH for some species, but I would have to check with Graciela and Maria and Sarah, just to confirm the scope of that.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thanks. That's quite interesting. Maria, I've got a note here, and what about amendments to the IBFMPs? Is that after implementation that we would be looking at that, or is it afer approval, because then they're already approved?

MARIA LOPEZ: First, let me answer your question about the EFH. Sargassum has been identified as EFH for certain life stages for some of the pelagic species that are included as new for management under the island-based FMP, for example the wahoo, the dolphin, and for some life stages in tripletail, which is only managed in Puerto Rico.

Regarding your questions, for the amendments, we are currently working on two amendments, and these amendments are going to be to the island-based FMPs, and those amendments -- We are working on those, and we're doing everything, and, as you know, today, we're going to be discussing the spiny lobster amendment for the management reference points, with the expectation that the council can vote to take final action for submission to the Secretary of Commerce.

For the proposed rules for those amendments, they will have to happen after the island-based FMP regulations are in place, and so we're expecting to have that early in 2022. Does that answer your question? But we can continue working in those amendments, as we

have been doing all this time.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Yes, that answers my question, and I guess, in the future, any amendments that may come up, we'll bring it up to the council, right?

MARIA LOPEZ: Yes, and so any changes that you -- Any additions that the council would like to evaluate or make to the island-based FMPs, they could be done -- Any suggested changes can be done in an amendment to those FMPs, if the council wants.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Great. Thanks, because we're kind of working hard with our local fisheries committee, and some ideas may come up, and so I just wanted to know what step I could take after that, but, also, let me ask you about the sargassum, and so it's considered EFH while it's drifting, but, once it reaches land, it's no longer viable EFH, and is that being considered?

MARIA LOPEZ: I am not exactly sure right now, because I don't have it in front of me, what are the life stages that this applies to, but we're talking about -- Like, for example, like I do know that, for wahoo, the sargassum is listed as an EFH for its larvae, and so this will be oceanic sargassum, and so it will be for some of the life stages.

Maybe, with respect to the sargassum, maybe this is something that, now that you guys brought it up, if you have any other particular questions, we can definitely look it up and get to you some more concrete answers.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sure. Thanks, because there are a lot of species that are in the larval stage under there, and not just wahoo, but that's fine. That's good, and we'll keep in touch.

MARIA LOPEZ: Absolutely.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. For sure we will have to follow-up on that, and it is my interest of doing so too, and, Carlos, thank you for the participation. We have Tony Blanchard and then Graciela.

TONY BLANCHARD: Good morning. I have a question as to the sargassum and when it becomes non-fish habitat, because you remember, when it comes into the shallow waters, it becomes very destructive on the bottom and the ecosystem that is on the shoreline, and so where is the -- Let's say where is the line from when it moves from essential fish habitat to non-essential fish habitat? That's a question.

MARIA LOPEZ: Thank you, Tony. Let me look in the document, to see exactly what -- I am going to look at the island-based FMPs.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Let me just answer a couple of question, Mr. Chair, if I may.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: The sargassum as EFH is different for the species that you have, because St. Croix has only dolphinfish and wahoo under new federal management, and St. Thomas is different, and Puerto Rico has more species that define EFH, and there are six species being part of the sargassum.

As Maria said, it depends on the life history stage, and the EFH is defined for sargassum in general, and so one of the issues that we might have to look at, and this is one of the problems that we are trying to gather more information from the local gobs of sargassum, because it is different, what we would have here, because it also brings invasive species, et cetera, to the region.

This is an issue that is ongoing right now, because of the amount of sargassum that is being beached. One of the things that we are trying to do is find out exactly what species are impacted by the amount of sargassum and the changes in the water quality that it creates when it comes into shallow water and onto the beach and the species that are being affected by the beaching of the sargassum.

 Tony, in terms of EFH, sargassum being essential fish habitat, in most case it's while it's floating. Once it comes to the beach, most of the organisms that are associated with those sargassum mats are in fact dead, and so, you know, it's an evolving issue right now, and one that we are looking into, because of the interest specifically of the DNER and the problem with the amount of sargassum on the beaches, and it's not only Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, but it's all around the wider Caribbean.

Sea Grant has been instrumental in looking into this matter, and that is happening as we speak, and so maybe we should put it in the agenda for the next council meeting, to bring the information that we have up-to-date on sargassum.

45 MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Jocelyn, and then we have Miguel and then 46 Andv.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Just to Graciela's point, I just wanted to

let you all know that, just taking a step back as to what essential fish habitat is, and I think Graciela did a good job describing it, but just to read you the definition from the Magnuson Act, it's the waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity, and so they're really looking at it's the habitat for the fish for these specific purposes, and so it's really when the sargassum is in the water and providing that habitat for the species that really is what is being protected as the EFH, and I think Maria might have more specific information about how sargassum was listed for various life stages, but we're interested in the sargassum and so when it's functioning as that habitat, and so in the water and providing for those necessary functions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Just a note, and, based on experience and some reading, triggerfish, blue runner, almaco, and other jack species that are present here, and some reef fishes, we see them related to the sargassum, which that's exactly what Jocelyn just mentioned, and, for sure, we need to discuss this a little better and to have a better understanding of what we can do on the council. The next one in the queue is Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Sargassum is not as easy as you may think. There is a whole management plan by the South Atlantic that was done in 2002 for the pelagic sargassum, the oceanic sargassum. The problem is when can you declare sargassum garbage, versus continuing calling it EFH, as they approach the shoreline, and that's the issue that the fishers and the public is wondering about, because, when you have EFH, you have laws and regulations to protect that EFH, and even the sargassum at the shoreline is a habitat for certain larvae and species of fish, and it complies with the laws and regulations, but I will stop here, and I would like to yield to what Andy has to say.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Miguel. A lot of great points have been made. One, to first speak to Graciela's comment, I think it would be helpful to have a conversation at our December meeting, and we can bring our habitat program to have that conversation specific about EFH requirements, and I think Protected Resources would also want to be involved, as sargassum, obviously, provides important habitat for many sea turtle species.

There was comments made earlier with regard to kind of where is the delineation between essential fish habitat and not becoming essential fish habitat, and I am trying to get confirmation of this, but, for EFH of the species, and Marcos mentioned, and potentially others, that would be state and federal waters out to the boundary of the EEZ.

Once it comes ashore and is above the mean high-water line, I believe it's no longer at least considered EFH, from our standpoint, and, obviously, the species wouldn't be able to survive on land. I don't know if there's other state laws or regulations that apply, in terms of removal of that sargassum, but I think the easiest delineation is kind of the sargassum in the water versus onshore, with regard to defining it as EFH.

MARCOS HANKE: I have still a hand up from Jocelyn. Did you want to add something, Jocelyn?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: I apologize. I will take my hand down.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Hearing none, I just want to make another note and observation from the field, and that is that there is a great amount of different species of parrotfish and different species of snapper that live in the sargassum, are associated with the sargassum close to the shoreline, in some areas that the water is not affected by the composition of the sargassum, and I assure you that it's a very important issue for us to discuss and to get ahold of. Thank you very much for the discussion. Let's go to -- If there is no other questions, we have the Generic Amendment for the Fishery Management Plans for Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/St. John, and St. Croix, Modification of the Buoy Gear. Maria.

GENERIC AMENDMENT TO THE FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR PUERTO RICO, ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX: MODIFICATION TO THE BUOY GEAR DEFINITION: POTENTIAL FINAL ACTION TO SUBMIT TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

 MARIA LOPEZ: Yes, that's me. In this presentation today, I am going to give you an update of where we are with the development of the draft generic amendment to each of the fishery management plans for Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/St. John, and St. Croix to address the modification of the buoy gear definition that we have discussed during past meetings.

 Just a quick recap, and the issue is that small-scale commercial fishermen harvesting deepwater snappers and groupers in Puerto Rico and in the U.S. Virgin Islands would like to use more than ten hooks in the buoy gear. Buoy gear, as defined in 50 CFR 622.2, which are the federal regulations, cannot contain more than ten hooks connected between the buoy and the terminal end.

There are no specification of the number of hooks that can be used in state -- In Puerto Rico waters, and so, to be able to address

this issue -- As you all know, and as we have talked in the past, the use of any gear that is not listed as authorized for the fishery is prohibited, and a configuration of this buoy gear that has more than ten hooks between the buoy gear and the terminal end, which is what we have discussed that some fishers prefer to use, does not meet the legal definition and is not considered an authorized buoy gear.

Basically, what this means is that this gear cannot be used by those that are fishing commercially for reef fish that is managed under the island-based FMPs, unless that gear type is added as an allowable gear type under the plans or that definition of the buoy gear is amended to include that gear type.

In this amendment, the council is proposing to modify the definition of buoy gear that is included in federal regulations at 50 CFR 622.2 to address the use of additional hooks that are preferred by some commercial fishermen in Puerto Rico and St. Thomas/St. John that are harvesting deepwater snappers and groupers.

This is the draft purpose and need that is included in the document, in the draft document, that is included in the briefing book. The version that is included in the briefing book is Version 2. Last time, during the April meeting, we presented to you Version 1, and I'm just making that clarification. We made some changes to the document, and we added the information that was provided by the DAP chairs during the past council meeting, and that provides a better description of the fisheries.

Anyway, this is the draft purpose and need. I would just mention that the purpose is to modify the definition of that gear included in federal regulations to allow for a larger number of hooks when fishing commercially for deepwater snappers and groupers in the Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/St. John, and St. Croix FMPs.

The need, which is the problem, is to ensure that commercial fishermen fishing for deepwater snappers and groupers in federal waters of Puerto Rico and St. Thomas/St. John and St. Croix can use the buoy gear with more ten hooks, that is preferred by some fishermen, while eliminating some user conflicts.

These are the alternatives that are included, proposed alternatives that are included, in the document, and I will provide more detail with each one of these alternatives in further slides, but, in the document that you previously saw, there were two alternatives.

The first alternative is the no action, and that is an alternative that is always included in these documents, and this is the baseline, which is basically that the definition of buoy gear that is specified in 50 CFR 622.2 would be retained, that there would be no changes to what we currently have in there.

Then we have Alternative 2, which, at the last April meeting, you also chose as a preferred, and it's modifying that definition as it applied to the commercial sector harvesting managed reef fish in the EEZ of Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/St. John, and St. Croix, to allow up to twenty-five hooks connected between the buoy and the terminal end.

 Now, given that the Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/St. John, and St. Croix fisheries are multispecies, we understand that fishermen may harvest other species while targeting deepwater reef fish with buoy gear, and usually have incidental catch, and this could include council-managed pelagic species as well as non-managed species.

This Alternative 2 then can be a little problematic for commercial fishermen who, on that same trip, are harvesting deepwater reef fish, but they are also harvesting, with that gear, council-managed pelagics or non-managed species, because this means that they would not be able to retain any species other than those council-managed reef fish that were harvested with buoy gear if the buoy gear contains more than ten hooks per line.

This Alternative 2 would make enforcement of this regulation somewhat difficult if there are interventions with buoy gear that have more than ten hooks if there are managed reef fish and other species, and, obviously, this is something that we haven't -- We haven't considered before, but, to avoid those unfortunate complications and those unintended consequences or restrictions to those fishermen that are harvesting multiple species on that trip, the IPT, which is the interdisciplinary planning team, is proposing a new alternative for council consideration, and that's Alternative 3, and that will be new.

 What this Alternative 3 does is to modify that definition of buoy gear in 50 CFR 622.2 as it applies to the U.S. Caribbean EEZ to allow the use of up to twenty-five hooks connected between the buoy and the terminal end, and I will explain a little bit more about this in the next slides, what the U.S. Caribbean EEZ means.

Just very briefly, Alternative 1, no action, one of the specific requirements under this definition is that buoy gear that is being used in federal waters cannot contain more than ten hooks, and so,

in those components of each one of the island-based fishery management plan fisheries, where buoy gear is an authorized gear, for example, the commercial sector harvesting managing reef fish, which is the deepwater snapper and grouper fisheries. The fishers must limit the gear to ten hooks. This is the current situation, and this is what we have in our regulations.

Then Alternative 2 modified the definition just for the commercial sector, and it will be increased, the number of hooks, up to twenty-five, and those fishing commercially in federal waters for managed reef fish can legally use the gear configuration employed by some, the preferred by some, in Puerto Rico waters. Mostly in Puerto Rico water, and, to a lesser extent, in the U.S. Virgin Islands. This alternative will just apply to those fishing commercially for managed reef fish species.

As I mentioned earlier, this Alternative 2 can be a little problematic for those that are harvesting other species incidentally. We all know that, and as you all have told us, the deepwater snapper fishery is very specialized, and you guys are targeting mostly snapper, deepwater snapper, and occasionally some groupers. However, you also notified us that there is incidental catch of different species, although it's in very small numbers.

This alternative would allow for -- Because it would apply not just to the commercial sector harvesting reef fish, but it would allow to -- The U.S. Caribbean EEZ would increase -- Basically, the buoy gear would be authorized, under this alternative, to those fisheries where, in our 50 CFR 622.2 regulation it's authorized for, and those are commercial harvest of reef fish and pelagic species in the island-based FMPs and the commercial and recreational harvest of non-FMP species and non-managed pelagic species in federal waters of Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/St. John, and St. Croix.

Let me explain a little bit more about this. This is not different to what we have currently in the regulations. The buoy gear, as is currently defined in the regulation, is an authorized gear for not only managed species, but also for non-FMP species, and why we are talking about non-FMP species, which are not managed by the council, is because the Magnuson-Stevens Act gives the councils and NMFS the authority to regulate fishing activity to support the conservation and management of the fisheries, and this could include regulations that pertain to fishing for non-managed species.

For example, the regulations in the Caribbean do this in a number of places. For example, when we state that all fishing is

prohibited in a particular area that are important to managed species, for example in a spawning area, and we have seen this in, I believe, in Abrir la Sierra and Tourmaline, where, when there are closures, all fishing is prohibited, but that includes -- All fishing includes species that are managed by the council and species that are not.

For example, in other places, when the regulation says that an explosive may not be used to fish in the Caribbean, in the Gulf, or in the South Atlantic EEZ, that is a prohibition that applies to all fishing and not just fishing for managed species, and so, with that, I am just trying to clarify why this particular regulation talks about non-FMPs.

Specifying allowable gears for non-managed fisheries is another way to limit bycatch of managed species and generally protect habitat for managed species, and so, in this case, there will be managed and non-managed fisheries, and that means listed as FMP or as non-FMP fisheries, and buoy gear is an authorized gear in both of those fisheries, and so, if we're going to change the definition of buoy gear, like we are proposing to do in this alternative, it would apply to all of those that are included in there.

I do want to make a clarification, and this not just for this alternative, but this is also the current situation, is that the buoy gear definition that is included in 50 CFR 622.2 doesn't apply to fishing or possession of HMS species. HMS species are bound by a different set of regulations that are specified in 635.

The MSA, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, says that the Secretary has authority over any HMS fishery that is within the geographic area of more than one council, including the Caribbean, and the HMS species are defined as tunas, marlin, oceanic sharks, sailfish, and swordfish, and I am bringing this up because it's very important for fishers that are -- For deepwater fishers to follow the HMS regulations and to have the permits that they need to have for them to be able to harvest species that are HMS, for example the sharks.

Just to summarize what I just presented, there were three alternatives, and one of the alternatives has just been proposed by the IPT for council consideration, but, in summary, Alternative 2, which is the one that modifies the buoy gear definition just for reef fish harvest, commercial, and Alternative 3, which is the one that would apply to everywhere where the buoy gear is an authorized gear under our federal regulations, would both increase the maximum number of hooks that can be used with buoy gear to twenty-five per line.

This will depend, obviously, on the target and the location, and the location can be Puerto Rico or the USVI islands of St. Thomas/St. John and St. Croix, and also which species are going to be targeted, if the targeted species are deepwater snapper or not, or other incidental species that are going to be retained, in contrast with Alternative 1, which is the current situation that maintains the limit at ten hooks.

Alternative 2 only affects fishermen fishing commercially for managed reef fish with authorized buoy gear, while both Alternatives 1 and 3 affect all fishers using authorized buoy gear in the U.S. Caribbean waters.

This is basically the summary that we include, the kind of analysis that we include in the draft document, and you are all invited to look at that draft document, and, if you have any comments, please let me know.

I kept this presentation short, because we have had -- During the past council meeting in April, we described the fisheries, and we also got a lot of comments about how these fisheries are conducted in each one of the islands, et cetera, and so, in this case, we have a couple of next steps that we want to take, that we would like the council to consider.

For example, consider this new Alternative 3, and if they want to pursue it, and for the council to decide if there are any changes to the preferred alternative. For any changes, the council can provide a motion for that change. Just to remember that, during the past council meeting, it was only two alternatives, and you selected Alternative 2 as the preferred. If you would like to make any changes, this will be the time.

Then, after that is done, the interdisciplinary planning team will finalize the draft amendment, and the final amendment will be presented to the council at the December meeting for final action.

The agenda said that there could be a potential final action taken at this meeting. However, the document is still -- The council still needs to consider this new alternative that was just proposed by the IPT, and the document needs to undergo a further review before we are ready to bring it to the council for final action.

The public can also, and the council can also, have an opportunity for comment at the December meeting, when we are scheduled to take final action for this amendment, and this is all that I have. If you have any questions, please let me know.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Maria. Great presentation. For sure, I would like to hear from Nelson Crespo and from all the people that fish with this gear that are present. I will ask for a five-minute break, and also to read and process the important information that was just presented. Let's take a five-minute break and come back.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, when we come back after the break, whatever you need in the presentation will be shown on the screen.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you, Miguel. Thank you, Carlos.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was presented.)

MARCOS HANKE: Hello, everyone. Good morning again. We are going to start with Vanessa Ramirez, who requested the time for a question, and, after Vanessa, we have Nelson in the queue. Vanessa. Vanessa, can you hear us? Let's go to Nelson Crespo, and then we will come back to Vanessa.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With the Alternative 3, I think we should stay with the Preferred Alternative 2, because to open all sectors to fish for deepwater snappers is not going to be easy, and you're going to impact the fisheries more hard.

MARCOS HANKE: Maria, do you want to comment on what Nelson just said?

MARIA LOPEZ: I couldn't understand what he said. Can you repeat Nelson, please?

NELSON CRESPO: On Alternative 3, allowing the recreational sectors to fish for deepwater snapper with up to twenty-five hooks, and that's correct?

MARIA LOPEZ: No, and so let me clarify Alternative 3 and what this would apply to. Alternative 3, and, as I mentioned earlier, this is not different than what is currently in the regulations and everything that the current definition of buoy gear up to ten hooks applies to -- These are the fisheries that it applies to.

When we did the island-based FMPs, we reorganized the regulations, because we are dividing them by island, and so I wanted to tell you exactly what this applies to. Hook-and-line is -- The buoy gear is included under the category of hook-and-line, right, and so it's allowed for under the Puerto Rico management plan, and it's allowed under the commercial fishery and, for the pelagic

commercial fishery, buoy gear is another one that is a gear that is allowed.

2 3 4

Also, for non-FMP pelagic fisheries, which is something that the council does not manage, buoy gear is an allowed gear. For the Puerto Rico commercial fishery non-FMP, which are species that are not included in our FMPs that are harvested commercial, buoy gear is an allowed gear, and, for the Puerto Rico recreational non-FMP species, buoy gear is an allowable gear, and so those are the species that we do not manage, the council does not manage. However, buoy gear is an allowed gear for that.

In this alternative, the rationale for this alternative is that you have expressed, the fishers have expressed, that, when they harvest deepwater snapper and grouper, sometimes they incidentally catch other species, and they would like to retain them.

Under Alternative 2, the modification of the buoy gear for up to twenty-five hooks, if the fisher is going to use more than ten hooks, it has to be only for harvest of reef fish, and, when I say managed reef fish, I am talking about the deepwater snappers and groupers that you guys harvest with this particular gear.

If you catch any other species incidentally, and you want to retain those species, and you are using that hook that has more than ten hooks, you are not going to be able to retain them. You can retain them if you are using less than ten hooks, because that's what we have in the current regulations, and so this Alternative 3 would allow you to retain those incidental species, of course the ones that are not prohibited, with using this up to twenty-five hooks. Does that clarify it, Nelson?

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Now I understand. So we should select Alternative 3 as the preferred.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson, for the participation. The next one is Vanessa.

 VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Marcos. Vanessa Ramirez, for the record. I think that, already, with the explanation that Maria gave, I have clarified what I wanted to ask, and so thanks. I also vote for Alternative 3.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vanessa. We have Carlos and then Tony.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let me get my notes here.

Maria, I want to talk, maybe specifically, about the recreational sector. I am a recreational fisherman, an ardent recreational fisherman, and I believe that I should be managed, and so are recreational fishers allowed to use the ten hooks with gear attached to the vessels, but not buoy gears? That is my first question.

MARIA LOPEZ: It's not buoy gear -- The buoy gear is not attached to the boat, and so, if that -- I mean, in federal waters, recreational fishers can use hand line, rod-and-reel, spears, et cetera, and so buoy gear is not an allowed gear. That depends on what you call it. If you have a rod-and-reel, if you're fishing with a rod-and-reel, you're legal.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Right.

MARIA LOPEZ: So I don't know what is the configuration of the recreational that you have.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: They use gear attached to the vessel or something like a pulley kind of rig with a big spool on it that goes to the bottom, but it's still attached to the boat, and it's not a buoy gear, but I am kind of concerned about allowing a recreational fisher to harvest just as much fish as a commercial guy, and I don't know if maybe we can consider attaching the bag limit to the recreational fisher. I am not really sure what other species that are not managed -- At that depth of water that they're catching as incidental, and I'm not sure.

MARIA LOPEZ: If I may, Mr. Chair, this action is not -- None of the alternatives are going to be increasing the number of hooks that a recreational fisher can use, and this is for the commercial harvest of managed reef fish of all the other species. When Alternative 3 talks about commercial and recreational harvest of non-FMP species, these are species that we the council are not managing, and these are species, for example -- They're species that are basically not included in our fishery management plans.

For example, when we had the Reef Fish FMP, each one of the FMPs have a lot of species, and the number of species that are managed under each one of the plans is very reduced, and so, if there are any species that are not included, and a recreational fisher harvests those species with buoy gear, they are allowed to do that. Now, let me clarify. Buoy gear, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, my understanding is that it's not used by many persons.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No.

MARIA LOPEZ: But this alternative -- You are correct that, if the council goes with this alternative, this alternative will allow those recreational fishers that are fishing for non-FMP species to fish with up to twenty-five hooks, instead of ten. Not for the commercial harvest of managed reef fish, but just for species that are not managed.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Which is kind of difficult to do. If you're fishing at 1,200 feet, and you catch queen snapper, and are they supposed to release those?

MARIA LOPEZ: Yes. You are not supposed to -- You cannot retain -- I mean, you have twenty-five hooks, deepwater snapper -- I am sorry. You know what? There is a recreational -- I forgot about this. There is a recreational bag limit for harvest of reef fish, and so they would have to abide by that. Let's not forget that.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Right, but queen snapper --

MIGUEL ROLON: Carlos, if I may, let Jocelyn clarify. Maybe she has more to clarify this question. She has her hand up.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: All right.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Sure. I think what Maria was saying is accurate, that we need to just know which -- Where buoy gear is an authorized gear, and then, under Alternative 3, where we change the definition of buoy gear when you're in the EEZ, that means that buoy gear is -- What buoy gear is changes, and so it would go from ten to twenty-five hooks, and that would be the case for every place that buoy gear is authorized.

Right now, buoy gear is not listed when fishing recreationally for managed reef fish, and so they wouldn't be able to use any buoy gear, ten hooks under our current definition. If it were to change to twenty-five, they still wouldn't be able to use it, because buoy gear is not authorized when fishing recreationally for managed reef fish under the island-based FMPs, but, as Maria had said, there is a category called non-FMP fisheries, and the recreational participants in those non-FMP fisheries can use buoy gear.

Under Alternative 3, if we change the definition of buoy gear, just in general, then that would mean that that authorized buoy gear for the non-FMP recreational fishers -- It would allow them to use up to twenty-five hooks. Now, I don't know what those species are that we don't manage, but, as Maria mentioned, there were a number that we took out of management.

Really, the reason, as Maria had explained, for Alternative 3 is this bycatch issue, and so, if we change the definition of buoy gear only when fishing commercially for managed reef fish, and you have bycatch of a non-managed species, you go check the gear table, and you say, okay, what fishery is this, and, all right, this would be the non-FMP commercial fishery, and it says buoy gear, and this gear actually isn't buoy gear, because buoy gear for that fishery is ten hooks, whereas buoy gear for the managed fishery is twenty-five, and so that means the non-managed species would be caught with an unauthorized gear, and, as Maria said, that would mean they would need to be thrown back, for being harvested with an unauthorized gear.

One way to solve for that is to say, well, we can change what buoy gear is for all fisheries where buoy gear is allowed, and so, if you are fishing commercially, and there is bycatch of a non-managed species, can you fish that with buoy gear, and, if the answer is yes, then what does buoy gear mean? Oh, it's same thing, irrespective of the fishery you're operating in, and it's those twenty-five hooks, and then you can retain that species.

It's trying to just make it so that there's a consistent definition of what is buoy gear, but things that you should consider are how much is bycatch an issue, how much problem could we create if we're allowing more hooks across different fisheries, and one thing that Maria did mention, which is important too, is that there is a bag limit for recreational fishers of the managed snappers, groupers, and parrotfish, and so that would sort of -- Even if you're allowed to use more hooks, you wouldn't be able to retain more species, but, again, for the managed species, buoy gear is not allowed when fishing recreationally for the managed reef fish.

It is a little tricky, figuring out where we're changing things, but the idea behind Alternative 3 is that it's a consistent definition of buoy gear across all fisheries, which should allow more retention of bycatch where that fishery, the bycatch fishery, has buoy gear as an authorized gear.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, and I want to correct myself, because I do remember that there is a five-snapper bag limit, and so I'm good.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. I have a follow-up question on this, just for me to totally understand. If the words "commercial and recreational harvest of non-FMP", what is on the screen now - If recreational is eliminated from that, is there any legal complication, any problems by doing that, because the council, in the past, expressed the interest for this gear to be a commercial fishing gear. Maybe I am going around, but I just want to make

sure, Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Sure, and so, as Maria mentioned, with the way that we manage, there are a number of rules that are in place to protect the managed fisheries that apply outside of the managed fishery, and so you can limit the gear used to fish for non-managed species, because that could benefit the managed species.

Maria went through a couple of examples where we have closed seasons for all fishing, because it benefits essential fish habitat, or spawning of managed species, and so we can think about what gears it would be appropriate to allow in the non-managed fisheries, and potentially that could be to protect EFH, or potentially that could be as a way to ensure that we're not going to have overfishing, and so there are opportunities to adjust the gears that are allowed.

Right now, in the table that has the allowable gears, it does say, for the commercial and recreational non-FMP fisheries, buoy gear is authorized, and, for those non-managed fisheries, there is no bag limits, for example, and so persons could go fish with buoy gear. Right now, it's ten hooks for non-managed species recreationally, and I am not sure if that's a problem for the managed species, and I'm not sure if that's a problem for the habitat, but that's the state of the law, and then we need to figure out if we need to change that and whether we should allow even more hooks, potentially, which could have the potential for more bycatch, and I'm not sure, but it seems like it's possible, if you're increasing the number of hooks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. Tony, you were next in line, but I would like to hear from Andy, and maybe we're going to have the benefit of having his input before your participation. Andy.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Marcos. Following up on, I guess, Carlo's comment and Jocelyn's comments, I had similar concerns with regard to the potential for recreational harvest, and I recognize that, obviously, this is authorized under current regulations, and so we would just be kind of repeating the current regulations.

I'm wondering if the council is interested and would want to have a discussion about prohibiting buoy gear for recreational harvest in the EEZ, regardless of if it's a managed fishery or not. Certainly that, to me, seems like something that would be of interest. Even though there are constraints on the bag limit, buoy gear is, obviously, not typically used as a recreational fishing gear.

 The other, I guess, question, and it may be directed best at Maria and the IPT, would be the issue was brought forward specific to kind of deepwater snapper and increasing the number of hooks. If we apply this to all of the fisheries, and not just reef fish, or at least reef fish and pelagics, is there any concerns or potential for increased effort directed at those species, because of the use of buoy gear and more hooks being used?

MARIA LOPEZ: Andy, to answer your question, we don't expect a change, because the fishery has been conducted in this way for some time. We don't really have a good separation between what is harvested in state waters versus federal waters, and there is not a limit to the hooks that can be used in state waters, and so our landings are going to be reflecting the current use.

We are -- Obviously, if there are some fishers that are currently using up to ten hooks, and they want to increase to twenty-five, there could be an increase in effort, but, based on the information that we have received at different council meetings, this is not expected.

At least for deepwater reef fish, the fishers -- This is a very specialized fishery, and the number of hooks that are used depends on current weather conditions and the experience of the fishermen, and the gear is expensive, and so there is a lot of considerations that are done for the decision to increase the number of hooks.

With respect to other fishers -- I'm sorry. For other species, based on the landings and what we have seen, from what we can get from the landings, at least for Puerto Rico, the -- I am going to say 85 percent of the landings that are with bottom line, which is not necessarily just buoy gear, but it's bottom line, but buoy gear is included in that category, and it consists of queen snapper and silk snapper, and so it's a very, very low percentage of the current landings that is other species.

 We don't necessarily know how many people are currently using more than ten hooks in federal waters, but it's uncertain how much the effort will change by doing this increase, but certainly, if the council wants to consider that we evaluate other alternatives, we can certainly do that in the IPT.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Maria. Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you, Marcos. I was going to say that the document that the Regional Office and council staff and the IPT prepared for this meeting does note that it's possible that

some folks are using more than ten hooks, but, because we don't know that with certainty, and that would be non-compliance with the law, what are the effects of allowing up to twenty-five hooks, and so we assume that there is compliance with the law, but evaluate what happens if we increase the number of hooks two-and-a-half times, and how does that affect effort, because there is a lot of different, as you all know better than I do, factors that go into how you fish this gear.

If there was only ten hooks that were in use at a given time, perhaps more sets would be deployed, and so maybe you're using — If you're allowed to have twenty—five hooks per set, perhaps then you would set fewer sets, and I also understand there is issues with current and various conditions, as to how many hooks one would put on a set, and so it's not necessarily the case that persons would always want to use up to twenty—five hooks, and so it seems like there is a lot of uncertainty about how the gear is fished and how it might change over time.

The document that was prepared tries to address that, by saying, well, if we're assuming that folks are using ten hooks, and now we're allowing them up to twenty-five, this is what we assume could be the case, but, if any of these assumptions aren't accurate, then the effects could potentially be less, but sort of a worst-case scenario is that this could mean that there is two-and-a-half times the amount of hooks, and, if the soak times are the same, and the amount of sets are the same, then that could potentially be two-and-a-half times the amount of fishing pressure, which could increase the amount of bycatch, but I don't know that there's a linear relationship between the hooks in the water and the bycatch.

It's just something that is in the document, and we're just trying to figure out what really are the consequences to other species, and then, also, we want to understand if there is any consequences to the physical environment, to the bottom, and, when we've discussed this gear in the past, we've looked at whether or not it impacts the bottom, and we have decided that, based on the floats and everything, and the requirements for the length of the line, that there is not a ton of impacts to the bottom, but that's also something that we would need to think about, and that's addressed in the document that was prepared for this meeting.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, one point to this.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

MIGUEL ROLON: The issue with this is that the fishers, commercial fishers, are already using twenty-five hooks per line and not ten,

and, in essence, all of them are in violation of the Act as it is, and that's why correspondence from several fishers have indicated so, and the chairs of the DAPs also reported that that's the case, in the case of the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

Whether this is something doubling the hooks, academically, it's okay, but the issue is not that. The issue is that they are already using it, and they are in violation of the Act, as written, and so what is the council going to do? Can we or not allow the use of twenty-five hooks, and what Jocelyn is saying is that we need to check whether the environment is affected or not.

The way the environment would be affected is if we are using ten and then we are doubling in the future, but that's not the case. We are already affecting the environment with twenty-five hooks already, and so that's what we need to decide, and the question will be whether we need to reduce that or keep it at ten or not. Anyway, just for the record, those are some of the issues that have been discussed with the fishers.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. We have Tony and then Graciela and then Carlos has a question.

TONY BLANCHARD: What I could see -- I agree with Miguel that if they add more impact to -- Allowing them legally to do. The other part of it is that I could see on the side of the bycatch what's -- That your bycatch may increase, but I can't answer that, because I don't think we have the data on the books to show what kind of bycatch comes out of this type of fishery.

To be honest with you, I really don't know which way to go, because, if you don't have the data stating what kind of impacts we have to the fishery, as looking at bycatch, and we already have twenty-five hooks in the water, according to what Miguel stated that the fishery uses, and I think, before moving forward in any direction, we need to have some type of survey done, or we need to get some type of data stating what kind of bycatch comes out of this type of fishery, before we decide anything. That's just my opinion.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Tony. To your point, there is information on the landings, and we addressed it a little bit. Thank you very much for your concern about the bycatch on this fishery. What is also true is that it's a fishery that is very specific and related, in terms of percentage of the landings, on queen snapper and yelloweye and the other species of deepwater snapper. From my personal point of view, I am not really too concerned about extra bycatch or anything besides what is already happening, and I think the IPT that worked on it did a great job

on this analysis.

I just want to add a comment to what Andy just mentioned about the prohibition of the buoy gear to the recreational, either here or any other method or venue, and we should consider, depending on what they suggest us to recommend us, to pursue that, because the council has been expressing the interest of making the buoy gear a commercial gear, more than anything. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, you already discussed what I had to ask.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Carlos, do you have a question to Andy?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, and, Marcos, you just mentioned it also, but I agree with Andy that we need to have a discussion on maybe prohibiting buoy gear for the recreational fishery. Like I said before, I'm a recreational fisher. If you open the door, I'm going to walk right through, and it's easier for a recreational fisher to use buoy gear with ten hooks, and he can deploy ten buoys faster than a commercial guy with twenty-five hooks, and it will take him longer, and they don't use that many buoys. They only put out about maybe four or five. I think we need to have a discussion, like what Andy said, and look at the recreational fishers' ability to fish like a commercial guy.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy, a question for you. Which way do you recommend for us to address this other part of the story, which is making the buoy gear just for commercial?

 ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Marcos, and I will look to Jocelyn as well to weigh-in here. Because we are modifying the definition of buoy gear and increasing the hooks, I think we have the door open, at this point, to also modify other aspects of that definition, and so what you see on the screen is currently reflected in the definition for buoy gear, and I think we could strike "and recreational", and that would address the concern about recreational harvest of non-FMP species with buoy gear, and it would be focused solely on commercial harvest for both our managed species and non-managed species.

MARCOS HANKE: Jocelyn, do you want to weigh-in?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, thank you. I think we might want to have another action in the document to address the allowable gears, so that we could change to remove buoy gear as an allowable gear in the recreational non-FMP fishery, and that would be one way to do it.

Otherwise, we kind of get into changing the definition of buoy gear, and so we would say buoy gear, when fishing for X species, Y species, Z species, means this, and that can be a little bit more confusing, and so, if we don't actually want buoy gear to be allowed, with any number of hooks, or, in particular, with twenty-five hooks, maybe we remove it from the authorized gears in the table for the recreational non-FMP.

I will note that buoy gear, right now, is an allowed gear for the commercial non-FMP fishers, and, again, I don't know an example of one of those species that is not managed that might be caught with buoy gear, but, yes, we can also rethink where buoy gear is allowed and then how we want to define that, and I think that would be appropriate. If we're addressing the fisheries where buoy gear is allowed, I would recommend doing that in a different action.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. Miguel, you're asking for a turn to speak?

MIGUEL ROLON: No, but, if you want me to speak, I can say something.

MARCOS HANKE: No, I'm sorry.

MIGUEL ROLON: Andy's hand is still up, and so Andy can go, if you're finished, but the council should instruct the staff to pursue this alternative language that Jocelyn is talking about, so we pinpoint the issue of recreational fishers not being allowed to use the buoy gear.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Before we -- I agree with you, and let's instruct the staff to do so, and, also, from my expertise and knowledge about this issue, about the buoy gear in this fishery, and after talking to many fishermen, I think the new alternatives that were presented is on the right track of addressing the issue, the ones that were presented today, the two new alternatives.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, Nelson Crespo is coming in and out, and apparently he has some audio problem, but he wanted a turn to speak before. If he's in, maybe we could allow him to talk?

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. We have Nelson and then Maria.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just agree with what Carlos said regarding the commercial, or the recreational, I mean.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. Now we have Edward Schuster.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Eddie.

EDWARD SCHUSTER: Okay. Edward Schuster, DAP Chair, St. Croix, and I'm in agreement with what Carlos said and what Nelson said. This fishery, or this method of fishing, was developed by commercial fishers and adopted, or copied, by recreational fishers, and so it would be unfair, highly unfair, to not allow the buoy gear as a method of fishing.

It was a trade secret that was given up by fishers, and, just in conversation, to allow the council to know how they fish this type of fish and the method and the way that they fish it, and now it's adopted by the recreational fishers, and so I would be in agreement to not allow recreational fishers to utilize this gear to impact the fishery.

Like we said, as DAP chairs, it's a very expensive fishery. You could go two weeks, and your effort is there, and the fish are there, but the conditions don't allow the fish to bite, and, when the perfect conditions are there, the fishers use only one buoy at a time, if the bite is on, and so, allowing the recreational fishers not to use it, I would be in agreement to that, and only commercial fishers to utilize this gear. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Maria.

MARIA LOPEZ: I want to thank everybody for your comments, and this is very, very useful for the development of this action. As I mentioned earlier, obviously, we are still in the development, and, if the council desires for the IPT to include a new action or a new alternative, a new sub-action, we can definitely look into that.

What we are going to do is, if you give us the go, is we are going to have a meeting with the IPT and present the points that were brought up at this meeting, and then we are going to come up with a way to address the recreational use of buoy gear for non-managed species.

How we end up doing it, if it's as a separate action or a suboption or another alternative or modifying the alternative, is something that we can decide later, but the important thing is that we can incorporate all the suggestions that you have, and the recommendations, and making sure that it's included in the document. I just want to clarify that, as I said earlier, the current definition of buoy gear that we have in the regulations does not -- It's for the commercial harvest of reef fish, and it doesn't include recreational harvest, and this is managed reef fish.

2 3 4

The issue that is being brought up today is regarding the recreational harvest of non-FMP species, and, when I say non-FMP species, let me give you an example. There are some jacks that are not managed in our FMPs that could be caught as a bycatch, or an incidental catch, while pursuing this fishery, for example, and so that will be something like that. We will be addressing that in the document, if you guys desire to do that.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you, Maria. Do you need a motion, or do you need anything else from us now?

 MARIA LOPEZ: I don't think we need a motion for this. I think it's pretty clear what the instructions are. I mean, they're on the record. Jocelyn, did you -- I am going to get some legal counsel on this. Do you think a motion is necessary at this point?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: We don't necessarily need a motion, but I just wanted to confirm that the council intent is to have the IPT look at ways to potentially address where buoy gear is allowed as a gear, as well as how that gear is defined, and so with ten hooks versus twenty-five hooks.

If we're sort of asking folks to go back to the drawing board and come up with additional options for discussion at the next meeting, and that's clear, then I think we can move on without a motion, but, if you wanted, you could have a motion just to direct staff to look into options for considering where buoy gear is authorized and the appropriate definition.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you don't need a motion, as per the comments from Jocelyn and Maria, but just say the council instructs the staff to pursue this, and, also, you need to ask whether there is any other comments before closing the comment period, and then we'll move to the next item.

MARCOS HANKE: Any more comments addressing the comment period time that we have reserved for this? Hearing none, I think the record is clear, and we can pass to the next item on the agenda.

MIGUEL ROLON: The record is clear that the council wishes the IPT to continue the work to incorporate the discussion as of today regarding recreational fishers.

MARCOS HANKE: Correct.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. So next.

MARCOS HANKE: The next item on the agenda is Final Action to Submit the Generic Framework Amendment to the Puerto Rico, St. Thomas/John, and St. Croix Management Plans for Spiny Lobster.

FINAL ACTION TO SUBMIT THE GENERIC FRAMEWORK AMENDMENT TO THE PUERTO RICO, ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS: SPINY LOBSTER REFERENCE POINTS TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

 SARAH STEPHENSON: This presentation will provide a look at the final draft version of the framework amendment to the island-based fishery management plans. Version 3 of the framework amendment and the corresponding changes that would be made to the regulations are available on the council's website for your review.

At the April 2021 regular meeting, the council reviewed the draft framework amendment to each island-based FMP, which would update the spiny lobster management reference points following the accepted SEDAR 57 stock assessments and the stock's change from Tier 4 to Tier 3 under the ABC Control Rule included in each FMP.

Under Action 1, the council reviewed alternatives for setting overfishing limits, or OFLs, acceptable biological catches, or ABCs, and annual catch limits, or ACLs, for the years 2021 to 2023. Alternatives included a variable catch approach, in which the OFLs, ABCs, and ACLs would change each year, and a constant catch approach, in which the values would be the same each year for 2021 to 2023.

Under Action 2, the council reviewed alternatives for revising the years of landings data used to trigger an accountability measure, an AM, for spiny lobster from the process described in the island-based FMPs. Alternatives included using a three-year average of landings and a single year of landings as the AM trigger.

Although it was not included as an action, the framework amendment would also update the maximum sustainable yield, the overfished status determination criteria, and the overfishing status determination criteria for spiny lobster in each island area, based on outcomes from the SEDAR 57 stock assessments.

For Action 1, the council selected Alternative 3 as the preferred approach for setting OFLs, ABCs, and ACLs for spiny lobster for each FMP. This approach sets constant catch values for the years 2021 to 2023. The action included sub-alternatives for the council to set the ACL from the ABC, and the council selected Sub-

Alternative 3b, which set the spiny lobster ACL at 95 percent of the ABC for each island.

The council intent is to ask the Science Center to conduct an interim assessment for spiny lobster, to update reference points such as the OFLs, ABCs, and ACLs for each island, which would require a subsequent amendment be developed. The hope would be to have those updated reference points in place in time for the 2024 fishing season. However, in the event that rulemaking for that subsequent amendment is not in place for 2024, the SSC recommended ABCs for the years 2024 and later, from which the ACLs for those years were derived using that same 95 percent buffer.

The table lists the ACLs for 2021 to 2023, and then for 2024 and later, again in that event that the updated values are not in place by the year 2024.

For Action 2, the council selected Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative for the AM trigger, which would use the average of the most recent three years of spiny lobster landings to trigger an AM under each FMP, and so an AM would be triggered if average landings exceeded the average ACLs in place during those years. The years of landings used to trigger an AM could be adjusted to account for the best scientific information available.

The table below illustrates the years of spiny lobster landings that could be used to trigger an AM under this preferred alternative for each fishing year, and the second column, the years of recent landings used, are based on the assumption that the final landings are not available until two years after the year in which the fishing occurred, and so you can see, for fishing year 2022, the most recent landings available would be from 2020, and so the three-year average used to evaluate whether an AM needs to be triggered would be the three-year average from the years 2018 to 2020, and then you can see how each year progresses after that.

Then, for next steps in the amendment process, following any questions from this presentation, the council could vote to submit the amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for implementation. The council could give staff permission to make non-substantive changes, editorial changes, in the amendment and give the Council Chair permission to review those changes and submit the amendment.

 SERO staff would then start the rulemaking process. The proposed rule would include a thirty-day comment period for the public to provide comments. As mentioned before, since this an amendment to the island-based FMPs, the final rule for the amendment would likely occur in early 2022, once those FMPs are in place and

implemented. With that, I will take any questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sarah. Before I pass it, I want to ask this, about the AM part. This is a good time to discuss the --Because, once we decide which month is going to be used to start the AM, the closed days of the AM, we were not thinking about each island specific, and it was the whole U.S. EEZ.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, if I may, this is the time for final action on the presentation that you received from Sarah. At this time, you need to open the comment period. Then, during the comment period, ask the other people present whether they have any comments regarding this presentation. Then you need to have a motion to take final action. That motion, because it's going to the Secretary, with the caveat of the last slide, then will have to be a roll call vote for this motion, just so you know what you're supposed to do.

MARCOS HANKE: I am going to do that, but I was just asking, because I need to know where, or when, we can address the dates for Puerto Rico, if the council intends to do that in the future, to revisit the dates for the implementation of AMs.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Were you asking specifically about, if an AM is triggered and applied, those closure dates starting from September 30 forward to the year, and is that what you were referring to, like when the AM would occur?

MARCOS HANKE: This is what I am referring to, yes.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay, and so the council can, obviously, discuss that. That would need to be through another amendment. This amendment that we're doing retains the regulations as written for AMs, how they're applied, including that September 30 forward through the year. Then, if that's not enough time, starting with October 1 and moving towards the end of the year. That will remain as specified in the island-based FMPs, until such time it's amended, but that was not included in this particular amendment, and so that would require another amendment.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you. Maria.

MIGUEL ROLON: You have Andy with his hand up.

45 MARIA LOPEZ: Sorry, Marcos. Are you asking me?

47 MARCOS HANKE: I thought you were asking for a turn to speak, or

48 Andy?

MARIA LOPEZ: No, and that was old.

2 3 4

MIGUEL ROLON: It's Andy.

 ANDY STRELCHECK: Sarah has covered most of what I was going to say, and so that, to me, needs to be taken up in a separate action, if the council wants to reconsider when the accountability measures are triggered. We're more than happy to discuss, obviously, the accountability measure and what transpired this year, and then the council can consider whether or not they want to pursue an additional action to the one we're taking final action on today.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Let's focus on what was presented then. Thank you for the clarification. We can discuss about this later on. Council members, any comments or any questions about the presentation?

MIGUEL ROLON: If not, we had Andy again, and I don't know whether he still had his hand up.

ANDY STRELCHECK: I just wanted to comment, Marcos, that I am supportive of the current preferred alternatives and recommend that we proceed to final action with no changes to the preferred alternatives.

MARCOS HANKE: That's a motion from you?

ANDY STRELCHECK: That's my recommendation. Obviously, I wanted to hear if there is other council discussion.

MARCOS HANKE: Any other comments or discussion? Anybody else?

MIGUEL ROLON: You have Tony Blanchard.

MARCOS HANKE: Tony.

TONY BLANCHARD: So moved.

 MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. We need the language that was proposed. Christina, can you put on the screen the language that is proposed? I believe that the intention of the council is very clear, following the discussion by -- Okay. Mr. Chairman, what we have on the screen is the proposed language for the motion.

The council moves to approve the Generic Framework Amendment to the Fishery Management Plans for Puerto Rico, St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix: Modification of Spiny Lobster Management Reference Points with the selected preferred alternatives and to submit the framework amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for implementation.

3 4 5

6

1 2

The question is, to Andy and Tony, if this language reflects the intent of that they want to do, and then we would have to have a roll call vote for this particular motion.

7 8 9

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and, just for the record, Andy, this is your motion? Do you accept the language there?

10 11

ANDY STRELCHECK: Yes, I accept the language.

12 13 14

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Tony, do you accept the language, and do you second?

151617

MIGUEL ROLON: Tony might have some audio problems.

18

19 MARCOS HANKE: He seconded before, and I just wanted to make sure.

20 21

22

23

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. Now, Liajay, for this motion in particular, you have to have a roll call vote, and so that means that, if there is no discussion, then each council member has to vote, after indicating his name, or her name.

242526

MARCOS HANKE: Is there any further discussion? We didn't hear any before. Is there anybody against? Any abstentions?

2829

27

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have to have a roll call vote.

30 31

TONY BLANCHARD: I am still waiting to see the language show up, and it hasn't shown up yet.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. Tony, let me read the language carefully The council moves to approve the Generic Framework Amendment to the Fishery Management Plans for Puerto Rico, St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix: Modification of Spiny Lobster Management Reference Points with the preferred selected alternatives and to submit the framework amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for implementation. The language makes official what Andy proposed before and the one that you seconded. If you agree with the language, now we have to have a roll call vote.

42 43

44 MARCOS HANKE: Tony, do you agree?

45

46 **TONY BLANCHARD:** Yes, and I -- (Part of Mr. Blanchard's comment is not audible on the recording.)

```
MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you, Tony. We are going to make a
1
2
```

vote. Tony, your vote, please?

TONY BLANCHARD: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Nicole. Damaris.

DAMARIS DELGADO: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Marcos, yes. We are just missing Nicole with an

audio problem. Can you hear us now, Nicole?

MIGUEL ROLON: Nicole is not in.

MARCOS HANKE: She's not in, and so we have in favor, we have Damaris, Marcos, Andy, Tony, Carlos, and Vanessa. We have one abstention, one absent, I'm sorry,

MIGUEL ROLON: One absent, yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Absent. The motion carries.

Liajay, for the record, we can add the language MIGUEL ROLON: that incorporates the names of the voting members. We're ready for the next item, Mr. Chairman.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Nicole just sent me a text that her internet went off in her office.

MIGUEL ROLON: Is she in favor?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: She is in favor, yes.

MIGUEL ROLON: Let the record show then that Nicole Angelia also voted in favor, and so it's unanimous.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Thank you, Carlos, for the help with the technical support there and keeping the communication clear.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, you can either have lunch now or take the SEAMAP Caribbean, and it's up to you. The lunch was for 12:30 to 1:30, and so please let us know.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's start the lunch now, unless --

NICOLE ANGELI: Sorry, Mr. Chair, and I apologize. The internet went out in our office just as the roll call started, and so my apologies. Thank you for moving forward, but I would vote in favor of the motion.

MARCOS HANKE: We have that registered already. Thank you for weighing-in and being able to say so. Thank you. The presentation of SEAMAP, is J.J. Cruz around?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Actually, sorry for interrupting, Marcos. There were a couple of additional considerations for the council specific to the spiny lobster amendment that I had on my last slide. For instance, does the council want to give permission to staff to make non-substantive editorial changes and then, also, give permission to the Council Chair to review those changes and then submit, and so just a couple more things for the council to consider.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and do we need -- Do we have a motion for that?

SARAH STEPHENSON: It's in the document, Liajay.

32 MARCOS HANKE: Motion 2 is the council moves -- This motion is presented by whom, Sarah?

MIGUEL ROLON: Nobody at this time, but you need to have a council member to have the motion.

NICOLE ANGELI: I move that the council moves to allow staff to make editorial, non-substantive changes to the Spiny Lobster Generic Framework Amendment. Any changes will be reviewed by the Council Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nicole. Any second?

45 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Second.

- 47 MIGUEL ROLON: At this time, you don't need a roll call. You can
- 48 say, if there is no opposition, that motion carries.

MARCOS HANKE: Is there any further discussion?

MIGUEL ROLON: Tony is raising his hand.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Tony.

TONY BLANCHARD: The only problem I have with that is I really believe that it has to be looked over after the changes. It should be looked over by the Full Council, because this is a council decision.

 MIGUEL ROLON: Tony, in this case, the council decision is already made. These comments are non-substantive changes, and that means a comma here or a period over there, but the essence of what the council approves is already in the motion, and so just trust the staff of the Regional Office and Graciela. They will not deviate from the council intent, in this case.

TONY BLANCHARD: Okay.

MIGUEL ROLON: Don't worry, Tony. Rest assured that, if we find something that you may not like, we will present it to you immediately.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel and Tony. Any further discussion? Any council member against? Hearing none, the motion carries. The next important item, Sarah, do you want a motion?

SARAH STEPHENSON: It's on the screen here for Motion 3, and this would just give the Council Chair the -- Sorry. The council needs to deem the codified text, that regulatory text for the ACLs that would be changing for the regulations, and you just need to agree to those changes and for implementing the amendment. They are in the briefing book, and so I don't know if someone wants to pull that up, so you can look at it.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and we all had a chance to look at the briefing book. Is there any council member that wants to see that again, or should we move along with the motion?

MIGUEL ROLON: Sarah, can you explain what a codified text is, just for the record?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Right, and so these are the regulations that actually get put into the website that tells you what the regulations are, and so the only thing that's really changing for spiny lobster from what the regulations are under the island-based

FMPs, are going to be updating the values for the ACLs, because those are the only management measures that get codified, and so they get put in the ECFR. Does that answer your question?

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, and my point is, Mr. Chairman, is that this is a technical thing that can be trusted, again, with the staff. They are not going to change anything that the council didn't approve or discuss before, and so, in this case, that codified text will reflect, officially, what the council just agreed a few minutes ago.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Would any council member that would like to move the suggested language on the screen?

VANESSA RAMIREZ: So moved.

TONY BLANCHARD: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: We have a second by Tony Blanchard. The Motion 3, presented by Vanessa Ramirez and seconded by Tony Blanchard, reads: The council moves to deem the codified text presented by the staff as necessary and appropriate for implementing the Spiny Lobster Generic Framework Amendment. Any further discussion or any comments? Anybody against it? Hearing none, the motion carries. Sarah, is that it?

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead.

 MIGUEL ROLON: I was going to suggest that you may want to break for lunch, because I don't know whether Dr. Cruz-Motta has already committed for something else before 1:30, and so you can start the meeting promptly at 1:30 with that presentation.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's go for lunch now, and that sounds like a good idea, and people can enjoy a little extra lunch time, and thank you very much for a productive morning meeting. We are on schedule. We're going to start lunch now and come back at 1:30.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Marcos and Miguel, real quick, we talked about, obviously, the accountability measure for this year that was implemented, as well as the potential to revisit the accountability measure timing, and at what point can we revisit that during today's council meeting?

MIGUEL ROLON: We were thinking that, at the enforcement section, the Puerto Rico enforcement section, we wanted to discuss it.

There are a couple of fishers who wanted to join in on the discussion, and they asked me for some time. They are not here, but they asked me for time to speak during enforcement this afternoon, and that will be at 2:30.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Okay. Sounds good to me.

MARCOS HANKE: I want to mention, for the benefit of everybody, talking to fishermen, mainly divers, that fish for conch and lobster, the problem of having the data we have related to the AM of September 30 is that it goes over the state water closed season of conch, which is the two main species that they fish for, and there is a big socioeconomic adverse effect on this group of fishermen, especially on the southwest coast of Puerto Rico, and that's the reason that I made the question in the beginning. Thank you. We are going to break for lunch, and we'll be back at 1:30. Thank you to all.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on August 11, 2021.)

AUGUST 11, 2021

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

- -

The Caribbean Fishery Management Council reconvened via webinar on Wednesday afternoon, August 11, 2021, and was called to order at 1:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Marcos Hanke.

MARCOS HANKE: Good afternoon, everyone. It's 1:30 p.m. We're going to restart the afternoon session for the CFMC virtual meeting, and the next presentation we have online is the SEAMAP Caribbean Gold Copy by J.J. Cruz-Motta. J.J., are you available to present?

SEAMAP CARIBBEAN GOLD COPY

J.J. CRUZ-MOTTA: Good afternoon, Marcos. Good afternoon, everybody. I am here. Let me share the screen with you. Again, good afternoon, everybody. My name is Juan Jose Cruz-Motta, and I work at the Department of Marine Sciences at the University of Puerto Rico, and, for about the last two years, year-and-a-half, we have been working on compiling and collecting all the SEAMAP-C data that we can get our hands on and putting all that data together and trying to make it accessible to everybody.

Before I start, I would like to give you a little bit of background on what is SEAMAP and the use that we can use of that data on an EBFM approach. Very likely, you all are aware of SEAMAP, and it's a cooperative program with the main task of collecting, managing, and disseminating fishery-independent data.

Please note that, in these background slides, I have bolded a few phrases, or words, and those words will be important, as we will focus on those as we go towards the end of the presentation.

The data that we collect in SEAMAP is supposed to be used to follow trends over time, trends of commercially-important species, and not in SEAMAP-C, but in general in SEAMAP, also environmental parameters are collected, and some focus has been done on analyzing the community structure of fish assemblages in the region.

The goals of SEAMAP are those that you can see on the screen. Out of those four, I would like to focus on Number 1 and Number 4. Number 1 is to collect and analyze data on economically and ecologically-important species and their essential habitats to support stock assessment and management needs, and this is very important, with emphasis on ecosystem-based management.

On the other hand, the Goal Number 4 is about maximize the accessibility and coordination of fishery-independent survey data. Please note that these four goals were taken out of the 2021-2025 SEAMAP-C management plan.

On the other hand, just to refresh you on the work that we have been doing in terms of EBFM, EBFM is a holistic approach that recognizes all the interactions within an ecosystem, rather than considering a single species or issue in isolation. This approach requires new analytical tools that look, at the same, at multiple human impacts and multiple species.

 Finally, the last thing that I want to say about EBFM, and we can say a lot of things, but the last thing that I want to pinpoint is that it's a strategic tool for exploring patterns of spatial differences and temporal changes of natural communities and their drivers. This tool can also be used to conduct a risk assessment and ranking policy alternatives.

I am saying this because the EBFM approach is complementary to the traditional single-species approach, for example stock assessment, which is used for tactical management, like, for example, setting annual quotas, and so now we're working, in the council, with this EBFM, which is not an alternative tool, but it's a complement to

what we have already been doing.

The problem that triggered this project, or the issues, were two. The first one was that SEAMAP-C data has been collected since 1991, but it was not easily available to stakeholders, and it was not used a lot for, for example, stock assessments. The second issue is that, for some analysis -- It was used for some analysis, but it was criticized, or the users of the data said that most of the data, most of the species, had low numbers, and, for example, a lot of stock assessments could not be done with the SEAMAP-C data.

 Actually, I am going to give you an example of this, and we are about to do a SEDAR on queen triggerfish, and we have collected only -- In the database, there are ninety-three individuals from 1991 to 2019 for Puerto Rico. Out of those, half of those were collected in the last three years, and I don't think that will be numbers enough to conduct a stock assessment, and so this is just an example of that, quickly.

Here, I just want to say that -- I just want to make a short comment on the low number issue, and that is that, in tropical assemblages, or tropical natural communities, they are generally dominated by few species, and most of the species that you find in tropical assemblages, and the fish assemblages associated to our reefs is not exception, and most of the species that you find in the community are rare. They have naturally low numbers.

What you see on the screen is a dominance graph in which you have, on the X-axis, species rank in terms of their relative abundance, and, on the Y-axis, you have an indication of that relative abundance. Please note that only four species make up more of 5 percent of that relative abundance. The blue line is the east coast of Puerto Rico, and the red line is the west coast of Puerto Rico.

Most of the one-hundred-and-something species that were found in Puerto Rico are naturally rare, and so, in a community that has these characteristics, it would be really, really hard to get enough numbers to do stock assessments, not because we're not sampling hard enough, but it's because, naturally, most species in tropical assemblages are not that common. This is the comment that I wanted to make about the small numbers. It's just a combination of the tools that we're using to sample these assemblages plus the reality, a fact.

If somebody is wondering what were the most abundant, I am just putting here the species. It's two groupers and one snapper and one porgy.

The objective of these projects then were to address those two issues, and it was, one, to compile, curate, and make available all SEAMAP-C data, and two was to analyze temporal trends of that data using a multi-specific approach.

 Objective 1 was related to Goal 1 of SEAMAP, which is maximize the accessibility of the data, and Objective 2 was directly related, or it is directly related, to Goal Number 4 of SEAMAP, which is to support management needs, with emphasis on ecosystem-based management, and what comes next is an example of Objective 1 and an example of Objective 2.

Objective 1, the database, first of all, I want to tell you a few general characteristics of this database. It's a database that has information at individual level of size, weight, sex, and stage of the individual, and those asterisks mean that, for sex and stage, not all entries have that data.

That information was collected, was sampled, using many types of gears, like traps, handline, and longline. The characteristics, or the protocol, the specific method for each one of those, have changed considerably through time, in terms of immersion time, number of hooks, length of the longline, et cetera, et cetera.

Out of that information, then we can estimate or make estimations of abundances and biomasses for species, and that information is discriminated by year, month, depth, habitat, sampling stage, region, and others. Others has an asterisk, because, in addition to the original factors considered in this database, we added others, other factors, such as, for example, proximity to nursery area, whether the data point is within an MPA or not, or, for example, distance to the closest fishing village. Those, we create those to be able to use these SEAMAP-C data in an EBFM context.

Here, in this table, we have a few characteristics, some very general characteristics. The first line is total number of individuals per region, and like, here, we have east Puerto Rico, west Puerto Rico, and the USVI. This is St. Croix and St. John all combined.

 Number of species sampled through the years in each one of the regions, what year we started collecting data in each one of those, how many sampling stations all through the years, number of singletons, and I just wanted to single out this one, because singletons is the number of species where we sampled only once, and so we have only one individual through the entire database, and please note that those percentages are relatively -- It's a

quarter of the species that we have reported, that they have only one individual, and then, obviously -- I just wanted to mention this, because, obviously, for assessment of absolute biomass of abundance, that's totally -- We cannot use that data. However, it can be used from an assemblage or description of the community point of view, since we know, at least, that that species is present in that community.

That has a lot of ecological implication, and just remember that the function of a community is directly related with the diversity, regardless of the relative abundance, and so this gives us important data on diversity, even though we cannot use that data for abundance estimates.

This is the status of compilation, and it's 100 percent for Puerto Rico. We are almost done for the USVI and trying to chase down three years, and we know those years were sampled, but we haven't been able to find the data yet, but I'm pretty sure -- Hopefully we will find those three years that are missing.

In terms of compilation of data, that data will be provided to any -- It will be publicly available through this interface, and this is the web version. The link will be available through the council webpage, and you can see there, in orange, the sampling stations for Puerto Rico, and in yellow are the sampling stations there for the Virgin Islands.

Here, you will have the classical selectors for site, for the Puerto Rico sites and for the USVI, and you could select based on dates or based on species, if you are looking for sampling in particular.

Let's suppose that I want to -- For example, here, I want to see all the stations that were sampled in Quadrant Number 54, which is this one here, and then note that, now, I don't have all the orange dots, and I only have the dots inside Number 54, and, if I go into that selection of sites, then I have here -- What I have here on the left and the right is a summary of the data that you have in that group of sites, and it's basically the relative proportion of all the species that were found in those sites, in terms of biomass and in terms of abundance.

 Also, here, down here, we have detail on the dates that those sites were sampled, and here is some of those graph bars, and here are total abundances and biomass, and these are not discriminated by species, but to give you an idea of the dates when those stations were sampled, and it was between 1991 and 2019. If you go and then click on each one of the sites, the dots within the square,

1 you will have details on what is in each one of those dots.

Like, for example, in this one, we have eight different elements, and then the first element is the species, and we have red hind, and we have four individuals, which, in total, weighed 0.8 kilo. Not show here, if you actually -- Sorry. Let me show the next one.

 The next one is another example, and this is a snapper, and we found only one of these, and this is the weight. What I wanted to say is, if you click on that, on that specific sampling site, you will be able to download the data, the actual data, the data where you will have the weight and size per individual in that site for all the species that were sampled there.

Of course, you can do a broader selection, like all the sites of Quadrant Number 54, and then you will get all the data. Also, you will be able to get the entire data matrix from the council webpage. Once all of this is totally compiled and double-checked, it will be uploaded here, and so you will have the option also to get the entire data, and you will be able to do whatever you want with that data. You can organize it in the way that you prefer.

This is in terms of Objective Number 1. For Objective Number 2, I am going to briefly present in the last five minutes, and I am going to present just an example of how these analyses, alternative analyses, on SEAMAP-C data can be used for an EBFM approach.

Just remembering from the background slides, EBFM focuses on the community structure, the entire fish assemblage, rather than one species. Then it follows trends over time and then tries to identify what are the drivers of those trends.

 To develop this example further, I am going to start with something that is very familiar to most of the people sitting in this meeting today, which is the conceptual model that has been developed, or are being developed, by different groups associated with the council. Here, we have -- I am not specifying which stakeholder did this, but one of the stakeholders created this conceptual model for this specific group of people, and the commercial fisheries is the main node, or is the most important component here, and we know it's the most important only because it received the highest number of connections in this conceptual model.

If you take this one and contrast it with another group of stakeholders, the second group of people then highlighted the biomass, and biomass refers to the biomass of fish assemblages, everything, right, and, also, for them, it was the most important,

because it received -- We identified that component as the most important, because it received the most connections.

One important thing about all these conceptual models that we are developing is that, eventually, we would like to compile all of those, and then, when you have contrasting views of what will be the most -- For example, like the one that I just mentioned to you is what is the most important, and then a quantitative approach is necessary to start to compile, to amalgamate, all these different models.

In this example, we have three models, but, actually, last time I counted, we already have eighteen or nineteen different conceptual models, and a very brief comment on this. Why we need so many is because we want to incorporate as many opinions as possible in the development of these conceptual models, but then I will close that brief comment.

Coming back to this example, we need quantitative data to start to see that, okay, what is more important here and what the data is saying, and how -- Perhaps the two components are important, but how we connect them. Then, coming back here, I am going to -- Out of this spaghetti salad we've got here, I'm going to just extract all the components on your left that affect fish biomass and all the elements that fish biomass takes, which is commercial fisheries, and it's sport fishing, and subsistence fishing.

Please note that this is not that different from the other group of stakeholders, because, actually, the other group of stakeholders, instead of calling this a fish biomass, they call it pelagics, conch, and reef fish, something similar here, and, for them, the important connection was in this sense. Again, we need to build a consensus model out of these two contrasting views, and then here is where we go and get our data.

In this case, the SEAMAP-C data can be useful to build this, to select the specific drivers on the size of this trend affecting fish biomass.

To do that, we're going to -- Don't panic, and we're going to go through this very slowly, but, here at the top, the first thing we're going to do is try to describe patterns of temporal variation, or temporal changes, on the fish biomass of the entire assemblage.

Here, again, we're not focusing on one species, but all 165 species we found in the west region of Puerto Rico, and what you have here, in this square, is not much different from a traditional map. In

a traditional map, you have cities, and let's say it's cities in 1 the United States, and then you can see which cities are closer 3 together and which cities are further apart, and it's the same 4 thing here.

5 6

7 8

2

These dots, if they are very close together, it means that the structure and composition of the fish assemblage is very similar, but, if they are further apart, it means that structure and composition is very different.

9 10 11

12

13 14

15

To give you an example, I am now putting here, in this map, the years, the year 1991, 1992, and 1993. The conclusion from this, or the interpretation of this, is that changes between 1991 and 1992 were bigger than those changes between 1992 and 1993. Why is that? Because the 1991-1992 line is longer than the line 1992-1993.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The other important thing about these maps is that the direction of those lines can also be interpreted. Note that 1991 to 1992 seems to go horizontally, where the line of 1992 and 1993 goes That means that the type of changes that happened vertically. between 1991 and 1992 were different to those between 1992 and 1993. In other words, the species that came or left were different in 1991 to 1992 than 1992 to 1993, or, instead of came or left, the species that we sampled.

25 26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

Anyhow, here, in this first part, I just put all the dates between 1991 and 2005, and please note that it seems that all these years -- The structure and composition of the assemblages seems to be pretty homogeneous, but then, I would say 2001, 2004, and 2005, the assemblages start to change, and please note now where it's 2006 and 2009. Then look what happened in 2010 and 2011. are bigger changes than those that we observed between 1991 and 2005 here. We can keep doing this and complete the whole data series.

35 36 37

38 39

40 41

42

43

Now, what I just did is a graphical representation, and there are no statistics behind this, and then we can apply these tests here called SIMPROF, which allow us to identify groups of years that are statistically different, which are those that are circled in green, and so the first conclusion of the analysis of the west region of the SEAMAP-C data is that the assemblages that we sampled through the years had five very distinctive compositions. We were sampling different structures of those communities, right?

44 45 46

47

48

The first question, and it's a question that we're going to answer later, and not in this project, but down the road, within the EBFM approach, is are these type of changes also seen in the catch data?

Are these changes also observed in other monitoring programs, such as the Puerto Rico Coral Reef Monitoring Program?

The second question then is what are driving those changes? Also, I wanted to mention, and please note how the data in 2018 and 2019 here, these two, belong -- Or is not different from the data in 2006 and 2009. From 2006 to 2019, it seems that there is a cycle, a loop, and like there are changes that come back to a stage in 2006 and 2009, and so it will be interesting to see, in 2020 and 2021, if this keeps coming here, or if it will stay here or do something different.

Describing these types of changes will help understand what is happening with the system, and, to understand what is happening to the system, we need to relate that to the specific species that are going, and what you see here is a graphical representation of a statistical analysis called SIMPAIR, which is designed to identify specific species, or a group of species, responsible for the changes that I just described.

Please note that, in that little group between 1999 and 2005, the two small groupers here were pretty abundant. However, those were decreasing and were replaced mostly by snappers. Any change that happened in this first axis, in the horizontal axis, can be related them to changes between groupers and snappers and these other species on the left.

With this, we can identify species that are important in these changes. More importantly is what are the drivers, and, like, for example, the environmental drivers or anthropogenic drivers or management issues that are responsible for those changes, and, before I give you an example of how we do that, I just wanted to put it in perspective that each region in the blue line here is the same map that I showed you before, but now I have what happened, the temporal changes that happened, in the east.

The line, the blue line, is shorter than the red line only because we started sampling the east in 2009, several years after we started in the west, but what is interesting is between 2009, that you have here, and 2017, the last year we've got for the east, it's also a loop. You can see that you have 2009, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2016, and 2017.

Also, the type of changes are happening in the same direction, and so this is also very interesting, because then, whatever is happening to these assemblages, it seems that it's a large-scale change. Note that, as I mentioned before, we can also test whether these patterns of change are being observed in other data matrices,

like, for example, the catch data, for example the data from the Puerto Rico Coral Reef Monitoring Program, which definitely are targeting different parts of that same community. Anyhow, let's go back to the aspect of identifying the drivers.

MARCOS HANKE: J.J., I'm sorry to interrupt you, but it's 2:05. Can you try to synthesize and get the most important points on the rest of the slides, because you are running out of time.

JUAN CRUZ-MOTTA: Okay. Sure. The only thing that I want to say here is that, the same as we did with the species, you can identify drivers associated with those changes. Note, for the change between 1991 and 2019, in the west region, it seems to be coral cover decreasing and productivity in the water is increasing.

How do I use all that to refine this model that I showed you before? Out of all those potential drivers that the stakeholders said were important, all this, we can say that, yes, environmental variables are important, yes, and productivity and temperature. Habitat is important, yes, and coral cover.

There are elements that were not evaluated in this example, but we do have the data, and we will eventually evaluate that, right, and so we will be able to say, okay, gear type, yes, is important or, no, it's not. Nurseries, yes, it is, or it is not. The final message of this slide is that, using SEAMAP-C data, we will be able to refine and amalgamate the different conceptual models.

This exercise also helps us to identify these things here, things that the stakeholders said were important, but we have no data, and so, next time some agency opens a call for proposals, perhaps it will be ideal to concentrate on this stuff that says no data, that will help to synthesize this model. This is just future work, but that slide you can read, and I will just leave it here, and thank you very much for your time, and I am sorry for the extra seven minutes.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for an excellent presentation, J.J. I think, at some point in time, we should put some more time for you to present and for all of us to know the great job that you guys are doing a little more, but thank you for the presentation. Any questions? I have time for two questions.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, not a question, but J.J., can you go back to the previous slide, where you have -- That one. This is the key to the future action of the council that we discussed in the five-year strategic plan, because these models are okay when you have this spaghetti salad, as J.J. called it, but the actual action

for the council will be, okay, now that we have that, what are we going to do with it, and so this slide here --

You have the variables on the left, and you look at the biomass, and you identify all the species, and then you need to see what the council should do with the management plan that we have in place, where do we have the information, and can we move forward with any of these items in the model, so that we can do something about it, and so just to let you know the importance of having this discussion, and we will have J.J. come back when we have more time, but we can revisit this at the meeting in December, if Dr. Motta is available and has any updates to bring to the table at that meeting. Excellent presentation, and thank you very much.

JUAN CRUZ-MOTTA: Thank you, Miguel, and I would be happy to share further details with you in December. Definitely, yes. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, J.J. I don't see anybody else asking a question.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Mr. Chair, if I may?

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Graciela.

 GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: This relates back to the efforts that are being made by the Science Center and the actual data storage that we were talking about, to actually have it available for the general public, and so sportfishing for MRIP, for the number of years that we had for Puerto Rico, should be available, and it has landings and size composition for a number of species, and maybe subsistence fishing, from the work that Daniel and Juan Agar have been doing, and so, as Miguel said, this is really the key, and this is something that we should all look at.

If we were able to gather most of the information from the Virgin Islands -- The request is open again for anyone who has any kind of datasets that can be shared, and we would really love to collaborate, and so thank you, J.J., and I think that having the clean dataset from SEAMAP, for twenty-seven to thirty years of information, it just makes a big difference. Thank you.

JUAN CRUZ-MOTTA: Thank you, Graciela.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I have a quick question.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. On that same slide, I noticed that, on the right-hand -- Or, actually, on both sides, it says commercial fishing, sportfishing, and subsistence. Are you saying -- Are you considering our recreational fisher a sportfishing?

JUAN CRUZ-MOTTA: This is the view of a particular stakeholder, and I will have to go to that particular group to see if they put them together or not. That is -- Carlos, now that you mention that, that has been -- Different groups of people put it together, and some other people don't, and that's one of the analyses that we will have to do. We will have to say, okay, are we going to do it together or not, but, because they are different views of different people, and this one I used only as an example, but I will have to check for you if that particular group put it together or not. Sorry that I cannot answer your question.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No problem. Thanks a lot.

MARCOS HANKE: Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: We have also knocked on the doors of the HMS groups, and, Carlos, I think that this might address some of your sportfishing questions, but you do have quite a number of sport fishermen that go out for the larger pelagics, and that might not be under management, but that might be significant, in terms of the changes to the fish biomass and the region, and so we will be knocking on those doors. Actually, St. Croix has quite a bit of data from the sportfishing, back in the 1990s and 2000s, and so thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, everyone, for a great discussion. J.J., you are creating the tool for the future for the council, and I really appreciate that. Thank you very much for your presentation. The next presentation online is the Outreach and Education Report from Alida Ortiz.

OUTREACH AND EDUCATION REPORT

ALIDA ORTIZ: Good afternoon, everyone. I will try to make my report very concise and short. We will be talking about the discussion that we had in the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel on July 28 and 29 and the recommendations that came out of that meeting and what we are presenting to the council for approval for discussion.

First, I am going to just make a very short summary of the projects

that we have completed, and one of the probably most important ones that we had been developing for quite a few months is the St. Thomas/St. John MPA outreach strategies.

These were requested by Ruth Gomez and Julian and Tony, so that people who come to the St. Thomas/St. John area know about the MPAs, and so we had a project with Sea Grant, and we have a poster that is going to be placed in the marinas or in any place that Ruth and the people there decide to use it, and the same information is in a fact sheet that will be also distributed along the marinas, and everyone that goes to the island should know about these areas, because many of them are going to be fishing or sailing or just going on a tour, and so they have to know that.

Also, we were requested to have placemats for the local restaurants and for the tourist restaurants, with the common species that we have called them sometimes underutilized, but these are the ones that are available most of the time, and so we are trying to have those species known to the consumers, so that they can request them, so that they learn about them, and then that will give a little bit of time and space for those other species that are overutilized and have to be under strict management measures.

This first one is the local, and some of the species might be similar, or the same ones to the tourism, but then the tourism has other species, and so I want to thank all the support of especially Ruth Gomez and Nicole Greaux, the liaison, that they gave us for this project, and this will be repeated for St. Croix, and we will talk about that later.

The other project that we have finished is the life cycle posters of the Nassau grouper and the mutton snapper. There was one issue in Spanish and English, and the other one is in French, and this is a collaboration, I would say, with the WECAFC in the Caribbean for the spawning aggregation education project that they have, and we have talked with them, and we have made several meetings for these projects, but this is already finished, and I don't know if it is already under printing, but these are the two projects.

Then a little bit about the recipe book, or what is going to be our product for the Sustainable Seafood Consumption Campaign, and, here, I am putting, in one slide only, the composition of the book, and it will have a preface and an introduction and a Chapter 1, Chapter 2, 3, 4, and 5, and then a glossary, and this is a workgroup that includes the chefs, and I includes Diana, and it includes Miguel, and it includes the liaisons, because they have also to work with the recipes, and I think it's going to be a very, very important and different product, because, here, we are putting the

underutilized species, but probably in a different way of cooking, but also learning about the nutritional importance of these species, and it will go to all the different areas in the council jurisdiction, but it will also be placed in the chef schools in the UPR, in Carolina, and the Ana Hernandez Cooking School and restaurant school in Carolina also, and so you will see this in different places.

Here, I have just an illustration of the recipes, and this is for queen snapper, and it was prepared by one Wanda Pantojas, and so we have the recipe itself, and, here, I still don't have the nutritional value, but it will be part of the recipe, and then also photos of the plate, so that people know that it can look very good and that they are edible, all of them, and they taste very good, and they are available, and they are not very expensive, and usually they are more common in our fish markets than all the other species that we request all the time.

Also, we have been working, and we are still in very intensive meetings, with MREP, the Marine Resource Education Program, and we are working on the curricula review of the workshop that will be done in 2023 and see what information the fishers are requesting that could be taken to the workshop, and then, as soon as it can be done, in will be done in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

With NOAA in the Caribbean, the last issues that we were discussing is the soft coral tissue disease that is being very aggressive in the region, but it's been studied all over the place, and I think we should recommend that consistent updates on the situation are presented to the council and to the fishers, because it's something that is all over, and it's going to take a long, long time to work with it, and so those are the issues that we have been discussing.

Now, the way that I am going to present to you the projects and the ideas and the discussion of the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel comes from a document that we prepared in late 2019, the communication and outreach strategies for 2020 to 2025, and our objective there is communication of sound science and data, and it has to do with fish and fisheries and productivity and ecosystems and health governance and socioeconomics and decision-making, all of that.

The improvement of public understanding of the processes and interconnection in the marine ecosystem, and we have to take a look at the food web of the marine ecosystem, with humans inside that food web, because we take out many of the species, and then we are able to change the populations, depending on how much we fish and what species are taken out.

1 2

 Then we will also be working with the legislative, regulatory, and institutional frameworks that, many times, if you put an executive order with all the vocabulary that takes an executive order, and if you put the plan from DNER or DPNR and put the vocabulary and the way that it is organized, the fishers and the general consumers don't really get much out of it, and we have to take that information and put it in a language that they can use.

Then design and production of educational materials that will translate all the stock assessment information and all that ecosystem-based fishery management has to the general public, and we can do that not just from the fishing village, but we have to go to the classroom, and to the classroom from the very elementary levels up to the superior grades, and even the university, and it cannot be only in the biology class or in the ecology class, and it has to be in the geography and social studies and history, so that we learn about the history that we have of the fishers in our daily lives.

Then we will support that partnership and build new ones, especially with NGOs and with local communities and with schools. Right now, we are doing a lot of connections with what is called eco-schools that are schools that the entire curriculum is framed along ecological issues, and we have been giving workshops to these teachers, and they are using the materials that we have produced for the council.

Then, when we say to increase the political awareness and understanding, it's that the governance, and also the decisions that the agencies make that have to do with the ecosystem, that have to do with the fishes that we take out of the sea, that they understand the relationship between the regulation that is recommended, or imposed, and the impact on the ecosystem, and so that is what we discussed as communication strategies.

 Then we have to be very aware who are our stakeholders. When we say outreach and education for the council, most of the time, we think that it is only to the fishers, or to the people involved in fishing, and, yes, they are very, very important, and they are our primary targets, but then the consumers, in general, and it doesn't matter whether they live on the coast or whether they live in the mountains. People from the mountain go down to the coast to buy fish or to eat fish there.

Tourism is an activity, and it's like Cabo Rojo and Fajardo and St. Thomas and St. Croix, and tourism, and the people who go there from different places in the world, have to know about the fishers

and the fisheries and the importance of this activity. Then, the decision-makers and the government agencies, those also are the ones responsible for enforcement, or compliance, with those regulations that protect and that make the sustainability of the resource.

Then education, and you know me, and I am a teacher, and I don't care where I teach or when or at what time, and education has to be from all levels, even from the kids in the first grade that do a diagram or that do an art on fishing and ecosystem issues to those that study fisheries in the university and then become the scientists that we need. We will make that very clear in the discussion of the council.

Then we discussed specific areas of action for outreach and education in 2020 to 2025. Here, we took the information that was given to the council by Michelle Duval, and we took out of there the basic concept of ecosystem-based management and the island-based fishery management plans and the sustainable fish and seafood consumption and the marine protected areas in the council's jurisdiction, and we discussed each one of these specific areas, and then we put out all the ideas that we had for outreach products.

One very, very important, and I think this is the one that we are putting a lot of emphasis now, is this thing of the marine protected areas, because it is very easy to say this area is protected, but, when the people ask why, when, what is the use, and what are you going to do with it, and how does that benefit the ecosystem, and how does that benefit the social community, then that thing has to be put in different ways and different spaces, so that everyone, again, from the mountain to the sea, understands this, and we are following that Executive Order of May 26, 2000, and using that definition.

In terms of the strategic plan, we also have that data that they put out of the fishers and the people who answered the questionnaire were very concerned with the frequency of communication and the variety of tools, and it is not just a poster, and it is not just a fact sheet. The educational resources and how are they moving to improve public awareness of fisheries issues.

Regular in-person outreach workshops and clarity and simplicity of presentations, and so the products that we recommend, or that the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel recommended, are based on the 2025 plan that we had already and then what is coming out of the strategic plan, and we want to make very sure that outreach and education is important for putting out to the public the

strategic plan. The plan is not only for the council, or for the DAPs, or for the fisheries, but it's for everyone.

These are the initiatives that were proposed, and this is what we are presenting to the council right now. First of all, we have the calendar that, for this year, is going to be marine protected areas in Puerto Rico and St. Thomas/St. John and St. Croix. Obviously, the MPAs that are in the Exclusive Economic Zone in each one of these islands, but also some of those that are territorial waters but are important.

Sometimes, when we think of marine protected areas, we think only of the water around, but then the fishes, many times, don't read and don't know where to go, and so the mangroves and the estuaries and the beaches and the rocky shore, and they are all connected to the water, and so we have to take into account where are the marine reserves in Puerto Rico that are governed by the territorial government in St. Thomas/St. John, in St. Croix, and so the calendar will have MPAs from all these islands, and also the location they are and why and when they were established.

Then we will have flyers and fact sheets on different issues of ecosystem-based fishery management. I think that this is a concept that, even if we leave it as fisheries management, this way of thinking about management of a natural resource is the way that should be done for all natural resources. When we exploit a forest, or when we use the trees in the mangrove, or even if it is just to make charcoal, we are impacting the ecosystem, and, if the management of that mangrove is not based on ecosystem-based management, we'll have the same mess that we have been having up until now, and so we are going to put a lot of importance on this.

One issue, or one idea, that came out very, very sensitive to the entire group is the bulletin boards, and this was suggested and requested by Ruth Gomez in our meeting, and it is to have bulletin boards in the marinas in the areas where our fisheries regulations should be learned and distribute them. Consequently, every time there is a new regulation, or every time there is a new fact sheet, it should go to a bulletin board, and the council probably will have to provide some funding for this and work with the marinas and work with the local governments.

Then they also asked, and this was in Puerto Rico, to put signs with pertinent information in MPAs that are identified by the government from the shore, so that people that go -- For example, the one that I can think of is Tres Palmas, and that is one of our newest reserves, and that they know that that is part of a protected area, and these are the reasons, in terms of fisheries,

or in terms of ecosystem-based fishery management, behind that designation.

2 3 4

These signs, we'll also have to talk to each one of the governments, to see where and how -- Where they do have already a design, and the only thing they need is probably support for producing the signs.

 The illustrated materials, they were -- The O&E AP asked for materials that have the technical, the scientific, information and not just on scientific graphics or in boards or photos, but that are more attractive to the community, and so we are calling it illustrated materials, and probably you could call it a comic book, but it's not going to be for the children. It's going to be for everyone, and so we are working with that, for the language, easy-to-understand language, and ecosystem-based management and the fishery ecosystem plan and climate change connection with fisheries.

This last one, climate change, we can have a lot of information even in the newspaper, but then what does that mean? In one way, it's the fishery ecosystem and the other way to the social ecosystem of those fisheries.

There was a suggestion for -- It came first for St. Thomas, I think, and then we thought that it could be to all the islands, wherever it can be done, and it is the murals.

MIGUEL ROLON: Alida, it's not St. Thomas. It's St. Croix that had the idea for murals.

ALIDA ORTIZ: Okay, and so it was St. Croix, but these murals that illustrate some of the issues or some of the facts that we want people to know, and, if they are attractive, if they have good information, it's just in a graph, and you learn the same thing that you would learn in a fact sheet, and so murals is one.

Then, also, there was a recommendation to make the contact again to the newspapers and to the radio and to all the media that the community, the consumers, the fishers, find information, and so we are going to start working with the local newspapers, and they will work with radio stations, and then, the information that is given in a technical document, then we can put it in an easy-to-read, and it's open for everyone, and so these are our initiatives. Now, I would like to Christina to talk to us a little bit about the social media that we have.

MIGUEL ROLON: Christina, before you start, you have five minutes.

You went over the time.

ALIDA ORTIZ: That will be with Christina and then the liaisons have a very short report for each one of the islands.

CHRISTINA OLAN: Thank you, Alida. I will be sharing my screen. Thanks to all. Good afternoon, and my name is Christina Olan, and I am the Social Media Manager for the Caribbean Fishery Management Council. I will give you a brief update on what we have been publishing through our social media pages, in Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and YouTube.

We continue publishing information regarding seasonal closures, meetings, activities, pictures, educational materials, new publications, content produced by other agencies or NOAA, for example, that we are part of. Then collaborations, workshops, our bulletin, lives, and videos.

We have been recently collaborating with AmandOceano, which is an organization composed by students of marine sciences, and they are organizing lives, and so we, along with Sea Grant, we share the Facebook lives, and, for example, we have one regarding mangroves, which are essential fish habitats, and, also, this kind of collaboration is a way to give an opportunity to new scientists, young ones, to express themselves and to share their research with other persons in a very clear and simple way.

Thanks to Andy Maldonado, and he has been collaborating with us on a lot of topics, but especially regarding the hurricane season, and he prepared recommendations for fishers to be prepared for the hurricane season, and so we put those recommendations both on Twitter and Facebook and Instagram, in English and Spanish. All the content that we have been publishing, except the ones that are just for Puerto Rico, we have been publishing it in English and in Spanish.

As we did with Puerto Rico, and we already published a table with fish markets and fishers that are on our islands, and we also did that with St. Thomas, with the help of Nicole Greaux, the fisheries liaison, and, as I mentioned in other meetings, this is a living document, and so, if you find there that we are missing somebody, or a fish market, just feel free to tell me, and we will add that person or fish market, and we will update the document and publish it again.

There are a few things that we have in August, and those workshops will be resumed, and we will start with a recreational fisher education program, and we have been announcing that through our

social media pages. Also, we will have a workshop on the Caribbean small boat permit changes.

We have been publishing the Repaso de PEPCO, and it was a request from the fishers that have been participating in PEPCO, and they requested us to publish the same information that they have been learning through PEPCO.

This is an example of a bulletin, a monthly bulletin, and, with Sea Grant, we updated the seasonal closures table in way that we can also present it as a sign in the marinas. It was an idea from Marcos Hanke, and Marcos already did that in his marina, and also, now, we are going to print that sign and distribute that sign around Puerto Rico. We posted the announcement already, and so the people from the marinas and fishers and administrators can call us, or write to us, and let us know that if they are interested in the sign.

We have new videos also on YouTube, and we have Cooking with Ita and Ta, and the third video -- We will have the premier on Friday, this Friday, and they are Ita and Ta, and thank you. As always, I mention that I am very thankful to all the fishers and agencies and followers and scientists and staff of the council and council members and liaisons and O&E AP members and consumers and teachers and students and NGOs and sea lovers. Thank you, because all of them help us to improve and increase the content that we publish to our social media pages. Any questions or ideas, please let me know. Thank you.

ALIDA ORTIZ: Thank you so much, Christina.

MARCOS HANKE: We have liaisons now, right, Alida?

ALIDA ORTIZ: Well, this is my presentation for outreach and education. If there is any questions right now from the council, I would answer it, because the reports from the liaisons are individual.

MIGUEL ROLON: The report from the liaisons was supposed to be included in the half-hour that we have here, and so let's go to the report of the liaisons, and I believe that, what has been presented by Alida Ortiz, if there is no opposition, we will continue working with her, and with all the collaborators and partners, in fulfilling that list in the next five years.

ALIDA ORTIZ: We have Wilson and Nicole Greaux. Nicole, would you start?

NICOLE GREAUX: Good afternoon. For the St. Thomas/St. John network, we have been going around to the different fish markets, just to talk to the different fishermen, to see if they have any concerns or queries or need more information on the island-based fishery management plans or anything that they might have heard through council review, if they need help with understanding the scientific terminology.

The St. John fishers have been speaking to me a lot about certain concerns they have dealing with fishing vending sites, and also lack of communication with certain things that happen when it comes time for the fishery registration.

We have a potential plan in place to help them out, and so, with the next fishery registration that's coming up next year, we have found a way to resolve their concerns and issues, and I'm really happy about that, and with the communication between both myself and Dr. Havertes, who is our new Chief of Fisheries, helping the fishers with their pre-registration and registration forms, and that was very exciting, giving them information on how to go about filling out different forms that were new to them for this year with the pre-registration.

Then, also, being able to work with Christina and having the different fish vending sites and the fishermen that have agreed so far to be included on that particular project listed for other people that visit the website to get a chance to see where they can find fish for sale on different days of the week.

ALIDA ORTIZ: Thank you, Nicole. Do I have Mavel?

MAVEL MALDONADO: Good afternoon, everyone. I hope that everybody is okay. In the last few months, I've been in contact with the fishermen, and everybody here is very happy with everything that's going on. They have some concerns, as I was saying at the last meeting, with the fish market, but, otherwise, they are good. They are happy with the sale of the fish.

 Here in St. Croix, we've got more fish selling spots than in St. Thomas, and so trying to figure out each one of them and like different times -- It has been kind of hard, but I was able to share my contact with some of them, and, if I am not able to talk to them personally, we're either texting or on the phone, and that's about it.

The concerns that we had for the registration this year, everything went smooth. Whatever hiccups they had, it had nothing to do with the Fish and Wildlife Department, and it had to do like with the

agricultural department division or with the consumers, but everything went smooth, and I was able to be there present, at least three days out of the five, and I was able to help them, and everything was smooth, and, like I said, I have contact with them.

The past few weeks, I wasn't here, but, any concern that they had, the ones that have my contact, they were able to call me, and I was able to direct them to the department that they had to go, and I am seeing what the future holds with my relationship with the fishermen and with the DFW.

ALIDA ORTIZ: Thank you so much, Mavel. Wilson, are you there?

WILSON SANTIAGO: Yes, I'm here. Good afternoon, everyone. I am Wilson Santiago, the Puerto Rico liaison officer, for those of you that don't know me. This year, as the Puerto Rico liaison, we have continued with the educational program for commercial fishers. This year, we made it virtual, and we are planning to start again with face-to-face workshops, probably in November or December of this year. We have to see how the pandemic goes.

We have been distributing educational videos and information for the commercial fishers regarding the federal and state regulations and the social media, the CFMC social media, and a broadcast group for fishers that is in WhatsApp, the WhatsApp app.

We have distributed all the educational materials of the CFMC and Sea Grant, and Sea Grant has given us a lot of educational materials for the fishers, and DNER too, everything for the fishers and the fishing villages.

 Like I said, the educational program for Puerto Rico commercial fishers, we named it PEPCO. In Spanish, we call it PEPCO, and the virtual program, the workshop, we sent certificates to all the participants via mail, with a lot of educational materials, and so, for the program, we are -- Next week, we are having, like Christina said in her report, we are having a continuing education workshop for the commercial fishers about the new regulations of the HMS for Caribbean small boat permits. That workshop is going to be August 18, and we are going to have the presenter from NOAA Fisheries, a contractor from NOAA Fisheries, with the help of Christina Olan, too.

We are coordinating with Sea Grant personnel on another continuing education workshop for the commercial fisher divers regarding compression sickness, and that workshop doesn't have any dates, but it's probably soon that it's going to have a date.

We are coordinating with fishing villages presidents to start PEPCO face-to-face, like I said earlier, starting in November or December of this year, and so, next week, we are starting with Helena Antoun, and we are starting a workshop for the recreational fishers, and that is going to be August 19 and August 26, of this month of this year, and so that is what we have.

The issues and concerns from the fishers, everything that I heard, about the queen and cardinal snapper permit for the state, for the DNER, and fish identification with the common names, and they have issues with the HMS permit for the Caribbean small boat, and that is why we are doing this workshop next week, and another issue that the fishers have in Puerto Rico is for the license and permits and the time waiting for the DNER to respond, and those issues have been sent to DNER personnel, to Damaris Delgado, and they all know about this issue, and we are working on it, and so that is my report. If anyone has a question, I am going to be putting my phone and my email in the chat, for any of you if you want to contact me. Any questions?

ALIDA ORTIZ: Thank you so much.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Wilson. Thank you, Alida, and we have to speed up the process, and I just want to say, very briefly, to thank you, Alida, for being so effective at putting together all the ideas that were approved and mentioned from the council before, in the previous meetings, and to see actually the work that has been done, and keep doing a great job. Thank you very much.

ALIDA ORTIZ: Thank you.

JOSE RIVERA: Marcos, this is Jose Rivera from National Marine Fisheries Service.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, Jose.

JOSE RIVERA: I just wanted to comment to Alida that, in one of her posters, she had the mutton snapper listed as Lutjanus vivanus, and I believe it should be Lutjanus analis.

ALIDA ORTIZ: Can you repeat that, Jose?

JOSE RIVERA: In one of your posters that was talking about the different fish, it was described as Lutjanus vivanus, which is not mutton snapper.

MIGUEL ROLON: That's the chillo.

JOSE RIVERA: Yes, vivanus is chillo, but she was talking about mutton snapper.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mutton is analis. We will take care of that, and thank you very much for that.

JOSE RIVERA: Okay.

MIGUEL ROLON: Alida and I will look at it. That's a mistake.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. That is one of the purposes of those kinds of presentations, that the team and everybody can support and help us out. Thank you. Enforcement issues is the next item on the agenda, and we're going to start with the Puerto Rico DNER.

NASSAU GROUPER DISCUSSION

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman, before we go into that, there are two things that we want to discuss, and one came up this morning, and the first one is that, in the case of the Nassau grouper, you sent a letter to the Virgin Islands administrator, and that letter has been answered regarding the Nassau grouper. We also, this morning, decided to look at the spiny lobster and the closure when we go over the ACLs.

The letter was included in the briefing book, the Nassau grouper letter, and there are some issues here that we need to look at and see if you want to take any action. Personally, I thought that the Nassau grouper -- Actually, I was talking to Jose Rivera, and we all thought that the Nassau grouper was protected everywhere, but it's not. According to this letter, even the ESA does not protect the Nassau grouper, as we thought.

There are two issues here, and one is compatible regulations, because, as well said by Miguel Borges before, in the case of the Nassau grouper, they cannot intervene in the area of jurisdiction of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, nine nautical miles around Puerto Rico and three nautical miles around the U.S. Virgin Islands.

 If we want to protect the species, we need to take some action, and so the paragraph -- The first part of the letter, the last paragraph, you have a statement here that, as a threatened species, the prohibition of take of a species under Section 9 of the ESA does not automatically apply to Nassau grouper. Fisheries have not taken regulatory action to extend those protections to this species, and so we need to ask, here, if that can be done or not.

1 2

The other statement, in the same paragraph, is that NOAA Fisheries concluded that authorizing the fisheries off Puerto Rico and off St. Croix was not likely to adversely affect Nassau grouper and authorizing the fisheries off of St. Thomas/St. John is likely to adversely affect, but unlikely to jeopardize, the continued existence of Nassau grouper.

Anyway, that is for you, and then you cannot do much about ESA, except for requesting some action, but, in the case of the management plan, you do have responsibility, and so those two questions are open for discussion, and then that will be followed by the other thing about the spiny lobster, and so the first question is the status of compatible regulations in the government of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands regarding the Nassau grouper and whether they plan or have anything on the agenda for the future to adopt compatible regulations to protect the Nassau grouper.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Actually, I think it's pertinent to ask if Jocelyn can answer this question, but what the council can do and what is the route to address this issue that we thought we were much better -- That we had much more protection.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, we need to hear from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands first, because they already sent a letter to you with the legal advice received by the Regional Administrator on this one, and so we can expand later, but, at this time in the agenda, you have Puerto Rico and the USVI, and so we need to hear from them first.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for your guidance, but it's just that, for me, this got out of guard, and I am really worried with this situation. Go ahead, Puerto Rico DNER.

MIGUEL ROLON: We are all worried.

 DAMARIS DELGADO: If it's okay, I would go with some of the numbers that we have of interventions of the Rangers, if that's okay, or I don't know if you just want to have a discussion on the Nassau grouper and other stuff.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's focus on the Nassau grouper now.

DAMARIS DELGADO: Okay. Well, we just want some support from NOAA

about the protection of the species, and we have been trying to get more support from Miguel Borges with regard to the state waters, and, whatever you could do for us, it would be appreciated.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: That's not the point. The question about enforcement was addressed at the July 21 meeting. What we need to hear is whether we are going to do something extending the protection to the Nassau grouper by any action in the federal government or the local government, and, the way it is now, the Nassau grouper is only protected when you catch a person catching the fish, if the fish is in their boat, in the EEZ, period, and that's it.

If you catch the fish, and you cannot prove -- Let's say that the federal government intervenes with somebody within nine nautical miles of Puerto Rico, and that's the case, and, if they can do it, they have to prove that that fish came from the EEZ, and that is -- According to people that I have talked to, and Miguel and others expressed the issue at the meeting, and it's almost impossible.

The first question is do we need to -- Addressing the letter from Mr. Strelcheck, do we have any way to extend the protection to the Nassau grouper, regarding ESA, and, in the case of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we already took action, at least in the EEZ, where we prohibited goliath and Nassau grouper, and let's stick to Nassau grouper, to protect the species.

When we started this, when the fishers asked questions to us several years ago, it was a generation-and-a-half was the extend to protect the protection to the Nassau grouper, and the darned thing is sexually mature at twenty-two years old, and so you may need to have thirty-four years to declare the fish ready to open, one-and-a-half generations.

Those are the questions that we have with the Nassau grouper. The Nassau grouper is supposed to have an international component, but that's another story, because we are telling everybody and his brother throughout the Caribbean, NOAA Fisheries and the council and others, to protect the Nassau grouper, and yet, here in the U.S., we have millions of dollars and a lot of brainpower, and a lot of people, and we cannot protect the Nassau grouper effectively, and that's what the fisher who called me -- He was a little bit -- Well, not happy about it.

He is asking the council what can we do, and so the first question is whether there will be compatible regulations in the local governments' jurisdiction for the Nassau grouper, and second is, if not, then what can we do on the federal government side, if anything, to protect the Nassau grouper, using the MSA and the ESA, and that's where we are with the Nassau grouper.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Andy is requesting for a turn to speak.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Marcos, and let me say a few words, and then I think it would be helpful for both Manny Antonaras and Jocelyn to also speak. All of you have the letter before you that I sent a week or two ago.

The issue here boils down to we have both state and federal regulations that prohibit harvest under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and we have to establish that Nassau grouper was taken in or from the EEZ, and that doesn't necessarily mean that we have to observe that it was taken in or from the EEZ, but enforcement has to have a way of providing evidence to determine that a violation has occurred.

We do not have authority, obviously, to enforce the territorial laws, which I think was another component of this conversation, and so, specific to, obviously, the issue at-hand, the Magnuson Act, or even territorial laws, obviously prohibit harvest, but we have an enforcement challenge before us, and so I would like Manny Antonaras to speak to that and anything else with regard to enforcement first, and then maybe we can get into a discussion of the Endangered Species Act and what can or can't be done, in terms of future work.

MARCOS HANKE: Manny.

MANNY ANTONARAS: Thank you, Marcos, and, just to follow-up on what Andy Strelcheck had said, the difficulty in trying to prove a case at the dock, or in state waters, is exactly that, and we have to show -- We have to be able to prove that the Nassau -- That the fish was harvested in the EEZ, and this is often the case with most of the things that we enforce under Magnuson.

 Sometimes we are -- We do have -- Under the ESA, we don't have to prove EEZ harvest if there is a take prohibition in place for species that are listed as endangered. In this case, with Nassau being threatened, we don't have any take prohibitions which would allow OLE to make a case at the dock without having to prove that EEZ nexus, and so, for purposes of this discussion, under the

current regulation, the Magnuson regulation, we would have to prove that the fish was harvested in the EEZ.

The other point that I was going to make was that, even if we have -- Even if a territory has a compatible law, a compatible law with the federal law, we still would not have OLE authority to enforce territory laws, as it stands.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have Julian and Tony.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and I'm organizing myself here. Julian first. Go ahead, Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Good afternoon. Julian Magras, for the record. I am a little bit confused on the whole compatible regulation thing, because, back in 2005, when we went through the Sustainable Fisheries Act, and we had to take the 30 percent reduction, and we put all of these seasonal closures in place, which are compatible both federal and local, and I don't understand why it cannot be enforced by either law, and it doesn't need to be proven that it was caught in federal waters, because it's a compatible regulation that was done by the council, which is federal.

It gets very confusing, and this issue is not only about the Nassau grouper, but it happens with all the seasonal closures, when they go into effect on the three-month closures, and we have the issues where fishermen are continuously -- Not only commercial fishermen, but recreational fishermen, commercial fishermen, charter fishermen, and they continue to bring in these species that are closed.

We look at the Nassau grouper as one individual that the guy called about, but it's way more than that, and there is also a law about filleting the fish at-sea, and so the fish cannot be filleted at-sea. That was one of the things that was part of that whole document, and so I don't understand, and I think we need to have some more face-to-face discussion, and hopefully it happens in December, so that we can lay the case down on a sidebar or something about this whole process and how it's being done, because we are putting the rules in effect, and then we are not doing nothing to enforce them, and so the fishers just look at us, when we talk to them, and they laugh that you guys can't do nothing, and nothing is being done, and there is no enforcement.

Every document that we have done, from conceptual models to the five-year strategic plan, enforcement came out as number-one to the top, and here it is that we have issues that can be addressed right at the dock, right at the dock, and it happens in the United

States all the time, and you don't have to be on the water. You just sit at the dock when that boat comes in, and you search them. You search their catch, and you will be able to stop a lot of the illegal activity that is going on.

Trust me. Once the message gets out that the first boat has been checked, and they have been given a fine and everything, it's going to slow right down. They are going to get scared, and we need to sit down as a group, and we need to look at this more carefully, because we already have a lot of compatibility rules in place, but we just need to figure out, as a group, how we can enforce them. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian. Great points. Tony.

TONY BLANCHARD: I would have to agree with a lot of what Mr. Magras has said there. To my understanding, and just an example, the regs on the Nassau grouper is possession. You don't actually have to be the guy that catches the fish, but you just have to be in possession of that fish in order to be in violation. Correct me if I'm wrong.

Number two, what is the local government -- What is their take on all of this? What are they willing to do, because, if you've got some guys that are abiding by the regs, and then you have those that ain't abiding by the regs, the only one that is suffering the wrath here, for lack of a better description, is the men that are following the rules, and so why should I follow the rules, when everybody else ain't following the rules?

At the end of the day, I agree with him, and we need to come to some kind of consensus, or agreement, as to how these regs are being enforced, because, just like him, my understanding of how the regulations is being enforced, and how they can be enforced, is two different things, because, like he said, I don't understand.

If you're in possession of the species, and you get to the dock, this species, to the best of my knowledge, is listed as threatened, I believe, and you come to shore, and you cannot do anything about it, and that's just an example for the Nassau, and I agree with him that this is happening with other species, and, at the end of the day, the guys that play by the rules seem to be the guys that get penalized, and not necessarily the guy that don't really care.

 I'm not saying that there is only -- Just like him, there is a certain sector of individuals doing it, and I just think that, across-the-table, there is nothing being done, and, at the end of the day, the guys that are playing by the rules of the game are

the ones that are suffering, and so we need to come to some kind of consensus agreement or something to get these regs enforced.

2 3 4

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I have, in the chat, very close to this, Nicole Angeli, stating that Julian is correct, and the 12 VRR 316.14(e) specifies that the possession of Nassau grouper is prohibited year-round in the territory, until the CFMC determines that it has recovered. That is what we were saying before. In the case of the U.S. Virgin Islands, the law is there at the federal level and the local level. Enforcement will be the issue.

In the case of Puerto Rico, I have not seen it, and maybe Damaris has some letters to the language, but I haven't seen compatible regulations on the Nassau grouper, and so those two issues are the important thing. If we concentrate on the letter that we have, we can have -- I would like for the Chair to follow the list of people who want to comment, and there is a bunch of people here, and I will send you the list, and then we can talk a little bit more when they finish.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and I have here a bunch of people. I have Carlos, Vanessa, Loren, and Manny. I would like to give the opportunity to Loren Remsberg and Manny Antonaras, and, please, Carlos and Vanessa, let's hear from them, because they might give us some important information to clarify this discussion. Loren Remsberg, please.

LOREN REMSBERG: Thank you, Marcos. This is Loren Remsberg from NOAA's Office of General Counsel, in the Enforcement Section. I thought it might be helpful to clarify, in case there is confusion about what it means when there is compatible regulations for a species in the territory and in the EEZ under the Magnuson Act.

The Magnuson regs require us to show -- In order to prove a violation and assess a penalty, we have to show that that species was harvested in the EEZ or it was possessed in the EEZ, and so, if we can develop that evidence, even if it's at the dock, we can charge that violation federally.

 If a territory has a compatible regulation, that does not give the federal government any authority to penalize someone, because we don't have authority to bring an action under a territorial law. We can only bring an action under a federal law, at least under the Magnuson Act.

If there is a compatible territorial prohibition that covers that species, that violation can still be prosecuted, but it just needs to be prosecuted by the territory, and so it's really a matter of

jurisdiction, and separate jurisdictions, but it doesn't mean that nothing can be done. It's just more of a question of who can respond, and so I wanted to clarify that, in case there was any confusion. Even when regs are the same, these are separate jurisdictions, and so who can act on it depends on the facts and what can be proven.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I also would like to read, for the record, that Graciela found the regulation that we have in Puerto Rico, and what it says is that any person that possesses, offers to sell, or individual or species within a federal schedule, which is the Nassau grouper, will be in violation of the regulation, including people that are importing, and they have to demonstrate, et cetera, et cetera.

So the issue is not compatible regulations, and those two governments, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, do have compatible regulations, and it's a matter of enforcement, and the issue of enforcement, as stated by everybody here, calls for some action, and so we don't need to do anything else except for looking for ways to legally enforce the law, and we have heard from everybody in the federal government that are here that they cannot go into the local area of jurisdiction to enforce federal laws.

There may be a memorandum of understanding, but, usually, the memorandum of understanding works one way, and they deputize local government enforcement agents to enforce the law in the EEZ and not the other way around, and so this is really the issue that needs to be discussed. I have Nicole Angeli also to add to the list.

MARCOS HANKE: I have her on the list, but I need to go first to Carlos Farchette.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: I spent -- As you all know, I spent half of my life in law enforcement with DPNR, and a solution to this is that we need to get community involvement, just like all other police work. The officer has to get someone that can trust them, and get an informant, and give them the name of the person that they believe, or they know, is filleting those fish or bringing them in, or the color of the boat, which is what I used to do as an officer, and, that way, you can pull a surveillance on a particular boat, because what you're doing now is there's someone out there filleting fish, and that's looking for a needle in a haystack.

If someone can get working with someone -- I mean, I'm retired for twelve years, and I still have my informants, and so there has to be a local issue, and I do believe that, if the federal agent is

working on a patrol boat with local officers, he can assist with prosecution, and I know it's different between what he is authorized to do in territorial waters as opposed to EEZ, and so I know that Manny and the attorney and all of those are correct to what they say.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. I have Vanessa, but, Vanessa, please hold on for a second. I have Manny Antonaras that requested, and then Jocelyn, and then I will go to Vanessa.

MANNY ANTONARAS: Thank you, Marcos, and thank you, Loren. I actually wanted to follow-up a little bit on the compatible regulations, and I think Loren did an excellent job explaining that. Just to add to that, if one of our folks is at the dock, and, right now, we do have a federal officer who is assigned to USVI, specific to this case, who will be off of field training at the end of this month.

In a scenario like Julian or Tony explained, where we have somebody at the dock, and, for example, we do have our officer there, if we are not able to establish a federal violation, and we can't prove that the fish were harvested in the EEZ, and the USVI does have a compatible regulation that says you cannot possess Nassau in the territorial waters or at the dock, at that point, our officer can work with a local officer to bring that case through the USVI, and that's something we do regularly with all of our partners. I am really looking forward to partnership with the USVI and with Puerto Rico and continuing the partnerships.

Then the other point, as Carlos mentioned, and I couldn't agree more with what Carlos said about informants and working with the community for community policing, because, oftentimes, we do get complaints. If those complaints are not specific enough, it is very difficult, even with having an officer and an agent in the USVI and Puerto Rico, to respond to something, and we are a lot more efficient when we have specifics.

 As Carlos said, a color of a boat, location where the subjects may be coming in, time of day, time of year, all of those specifics, help us. Just to bring something forward that says this is occurring, it's very difficult to follow-up on that sort of thing, and that's all I have. Thank you, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Manny. Let's go to Nicole.

NICOLE ANGELI: Thank you so much. I would have covered some of this in the report at our time allotted as well, but, at this time, all of our local law enforcement are still on the COVID taskforce

and called to the VIPD, and so, for any violations of this sort, 911 should be called immediately, and they will patch through to environmental enforcement, so that they can deploy their environmental enforcement officer.

Local environmental enforcement was not notified of this incident, and so I just wanted to make it clear that 911 is the correct number to call, at this time, for any fisheries violations that you might see while you're out. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Jocelyn,

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you, Marcos. I was just going to say things that Loren and Manny had already said about what happens in state waters, because I had heard some confusion as well about what the federal government can do in state waters, but, really, it's just keeping clear that the federal authority is to enforce federal violations, and, if they're in state waters, they would have to just establish that whatever is occurring was a violation of federal law.

As Manny had said, if it looks to be that what is occurring might be a violation of some compatible state law, it would be an issue of referring it to the state entity, and so I just wanted to make sure that everyone was clear about that, because I had heard a little bit of confusion there, but I think Loren and Manny did an excellent job explaining the different jurisdictions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Edward Schuster.

EDWARD SCHUSTER: Edward Schuster, for the record. I think, if my memory jogs me correctly, with this Nassau grouper and how long we've been involved with this issue with the Nassau grouper, and Julian and Jimmy Magna, the whole group from 2004, and the word "possession" was put in there to actually give -- I want to believe that I am correct in what I say, but, if I'm wrong, I stand to be corrected.

Roy, when he was in his position, he put the word in language of "possession", because he made the remark and said there are no fence lines to stop the fish from going in federal waters and local waters, and so he put the word in there of "possession". If you are in possession of a fish that is protected, whether federally or locally, you're in violation.

 It's just like a sea turtle, and so, if you're saying to me, if I caught the sea turtle in local waters, and it's protected federally, I can't be prosecuted? I mean, to me, it's like we're

just pissing away our time in the wind. I mean, then here it is that you want a fisher to risk his life, or his livelihood, out at sea, and, when you live in a small fishing community, it's very hard, and, yes, I know you have informants, and Carlos said it for this thirty-three years that he's been in law enforcement, but it's very hard, in times like this right now, to narrow it down to who the person is.

Then, when you go out to sea, and you're fishing, twenty or thirty miles from shore, or however many miles, you're in no-man's-land, and they're at war at-sea, and you're at war back at land, when you come back, and you've just risked your whole life and your livelihood and your family's livelihood.

 I think there is something that needs to be done. Whether the local enforcement gets involved with the federal agency and get it moving, or else all of our hard work, from way back in the MSA, with that 700-page document, has gone down the drains. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: We have Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you, Marcos, and so I can speak to some of the language that's in the regulation, and this is also in that letter, where we quote the regulation, but it's unlawful to fish for or possess Nassau grouper in or from the EEZ, and so what possession helps with is if a fisher is in the EEZ waters, and the fish is onboard, and that's a violation, and so you don't have to catch them in the act of harvesting.

Then the "in or from the EEZ", that's also explained in the letter, and that would allow enforcement to establish a federal violation if they could establish that the fish came from the EEZ, and that is what the federal law prohibits, and so there might be state laws that also prohibit possession of Nassau grouper, or harvest of Nassau grouper, but, when you're in the state waters, you have to figure out if you're looking at that state violation or if you can establish that it's a federal violation, for example because you can somehow establish the fish came from the federal waters.

There is this protection that goes from the state to the federal waters, where the rules are the same, but it's a question of who enforces the protection and what are the facts. Is it a violation of the federal law, or is it a violation of the state law, and I can let Manny and Loren say anything else on those points, but that's really kind of what we're talking about, is how do we get that protection throughout those waters, and it's relying on both the state and the federal law as complements to each other.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jocelyn. Miquel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Just that you have Andy and others raising their hands.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Andy.

 ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Marcos, and thanks, Jocelyn, for that further clarification. I wanted to, I guess, first lead by I really appreciate hearing from the fishermen and the frustration that they are conveying on this issue, and we responded in writing, in terms of kind of our jurisdictional authority, but it really seems, to me, that the crux of the problem isn't so much the regulations, or even our regulatory authority, but our limited ability to actually have staffing and resources to conduct the enforcement, and that's no slight to the USVI or Puerto Rico, or even our own Office of Law Enforcement, but it's just that we have limited resources to conduct that enforcement.

We certainly have the ability, if officers are present, to take enforcement action, and, obviously, it's a little more complicated, under the Magnuson Act, in terms of the burden of proof of determining whether or not Nassau grouper came in or from the EEZ, and we're working with the territories in that instance.

We did note, in the letter as well, that, under the Endangered Species Act, we haven't taken additional steps to impose further regulatory actions, and that certainly could be done. It likely would take some time for our office to do that, and that then removes the MSA kind of burden of proof requirement, and it would make it a federal violation to be in possession of Nassau grouper, regardless of the area which that event occurs.

I guess I would point out that, in doing that, you still have to have the resources and officers available in order to conduct that enforcement, and, without that, I think we're faced with a similar situation that we're taking about now and the challenges with just enforcing regulations, given the limited availability of our officers.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Christina, do we have anybody else that I am missing?

CHRISTINA OLAN: I still see Edward, Julian, Andy, and Miguel with raised hands, and I don't know if they want to add comments, in the case of Edward and Julian and Miguel, if they also want to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Which Miguel?

CHRISTINA OLAN: Miguel Rolon.

MIGUEL ROLON: Julian is first, and then you have Eddie.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Go ahead, Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, for the record. If at some point we can put this on the agenda again, for the December meeting, so we can have some further discussion, I would greatly appreciate it, and maybe we can have a sidebar with local enforcement, federal enforcement, and whichever fisher representatives are there, and all of the DAP chairs who are normally at the meetings, so we can have a little discussion, because I think we need to take the focus off of Nassau grouper and look at all the compatible regulations with the seasonal closures that are in place, and have some kind of discussion and see, at that time, with all the brains and the lawyers and everybody, if maybe we can put something in writing and see what can happen, bringing it up to the higher level after all of us sit down and discuss it, and so I'm just throwing that out there. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: If my memory is good, Tony is the next one that had a hand raised.

MIGUEL ROLON: It was Eddie that still had the hand. When you finish, lower your hand.

EDWARD SCHUSTER: I lowered my hand. Sorry about that.

MIGUEL ROLON: So it's me now. The whole issue boils down to this. Possession is covered in the EEZ as well as in two local areas, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The point is, who is going to enforce that, because, right now, if I'm in the EEZ, or in the Government of Puerto Rico's jurisdiction, or in the Government of the Virgin Islands' jurisdiction, in possession of the darned Nassau grouper, I am in violation of the federal government and/or the local law, and so who is going to enforce that?

We already heard from the National Marine Fisheries Service that they cannot go into the area of jurisdiction to enforce the laws, period, and they don't do that. If you are going to have the Endangered Species Act amended somehow, or ask for an amendment to extend protection to the species of the Nassau grouper, then, as Andy said, you can have a federal government person enforce the law wherever that fish is, and you don't have to prove that it's

in the EEZ, because the ESA trumps the MSA, in this case.

However, if you do that, once you have a species in the ESA, it's a long process to get it out, but, in the case of the Nassau grouper, I wouldn't worry about the long process, because, by the time that thing is able to recuperate or recover, I will be dead or out of a job, but we need to start the process now.

The immediate thing now is how can we enforce the laws that are protecting the Nassau grouper at this time? Do we need to ask National Marine Fisheries Service to consider extending protection to the species that we call Nassau grouper under the ESA? Those are the two issues that we need to discuss about.

Some people talked about a memorandum of understanding, and the memorandum of understanding that we had for enforcement before is, as I said, deputizing the local government to enforce the law in the EEZ, and not the other way around, unless we have something like the ESA change.

The other issue that was presented by Julian, and, if you agree, we can have a whole morning to just discuss compatible regulations and ask to two local governments to come prepared to discuss that, and it's not for the Nassau grouper only, but for all the other species that are in need of protection in both jurisdictions, local and federal.

The question to the council, at this time is do you want to pursue this by just emphasizing the need of enforcement, and then look for ways that we can enforce it? We at the council can do little things. For example, Natalia and Diana and I, we are going to put, on our webpage, a hotline again for enforcement. In the case of the Virgin Islands, you can call 911, as Dr. Angeli just mentioned, and you can do the same for Puerto Rico, and, of course, you have the number that is already on the webpages of the National Marine Fisheries Service. That will take care, at least in my mind, of the issue of enforcement, or it will be at least one step in the right direction of enforcement.

Then the second question is do you want to ask the action agency to extend protection to the Nassau grouper? Especially, if you look at the letter, the word "take" is the key word for the Nassau grouper, and what we get from doing that is then allow the federal government to go all the way to the shoreline to intervene anybody with possession of the Nassau grouper. You don't have to talk all at the same time, but let us know what --

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. On the same lines, I would like

to read, for the record, a question that Michelle Scharer just posted. We need to know what is the timeline for NOAA to take regulatory action, along the same lines that you just explained. Jocelyn.

4 5 6

1

3

MIGUEL ROLON: She is talking about ESA, by the way.

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17 JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Sure. Thank you. As Andy said, there is some authority that, if NOAA Fisheries wanted to extend the take protections under Section 9 of the ESA to threatened species, there is the ability to do that. I don't really know what that timeline would look like or what sort of information the agency would need to determine that that would be an appropriate next step, but that's something that we can look into as the agency is considering necessary efforts to protect the species and ensure conservation and recovery under the Endangered Species Act, but regulatory process, sort of extending those the protections, and that's how that would occur.

18 19 20

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Tony.

2122

23

2425

2627

28

29

TONY BLANCHARD: I would have to agree with Julian. I think we should table this until the December meeting. I think we need to get the local governments into the same -- Onto the same playing field and figure out how this so-called problem will be dealt with, because this is not just about the Nassau. This is about all the other regulations that we have on the books that are federal as well as local as well as the other regs. I think we need to come to the table in December with the local governments and figure out how this works.

303132

MARCOS HANKE: I have Andy. Thank you, Tony. Andy.

33 34

35

36

37

38 39 ANDY STRELCHECK: I just wanted to comment on timing. I certainly can talk with our Protected Resources Division Chief, but it would expect that this would be several years in the making, in order to do this, and it's not because it wouldn't be a priority. We have a whole slew of listing actions, critical habitat designations, that are under legal timelines, and so those, right now, are taking priority, from a protected resources standpoint.

40 41 42

43

44

Nassau grouper critical habitat is one of those actions that we'll be working on, but I can commit to getting back to Miguel with a general idea of timeline, if we were to move forward with any sort of regulatory actions.

45 46 47

48

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Miguel, I have a question for you. I think it's a good idea that we address, many times, making a

working group, with let's say representatives from the USVI, from Puerto Rico, one from the federal government, to have a report and to discuss this in detail in a smaller group, to support the discussion in the next council meeting, and do you think that that's a good idea?

MIGUEL ROLON: In the case of the Nassau grouper, we have everything that we need right here on the table. The only thing that we need to do is to ask the question of whether there will be enforcement or not of the Nassau grouper within the area of jurisdiction of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, as well as the EEZ.

The Nassau grouper is protected under the two local jurisdictions and the federal government, but what we are lacking here is the actual enforcement of the law, and, in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, they have enforcement people, and so ask them to go ahead and enforce the law. In the case of the EEZ, we already have that, and so what we are looking at is the lack of enforcement of a particular law and regulation that is trying to protect the Nassau grouper.

However, the other issue about the possibility of changing the ESA, that's something that need to wait. As Andy said, let's wait and check on the regulatory action timeline, because, as he said, there is a lot of other things that ESA takes care of, and remember that sometimes what you ask is not what you want, because now you have a species under the ESA protection, and it's very difficult to get it out.

Let's say that a miracle happens, and the Nassau grouper is all over the place in five years. Then to take it out of the ESA is a little bit difficult, and so we don't need more regulations at this time. What we need is to enforce the regulations that we have, and the word "possession" has been mentioned by everybody, the lawyers and Julian and others, and so let's concentrate on that one.

However, what Julian and Tony are talking about is a little beyond that, and so probably what we can do is to have a session at the council meeting in December where everybody will be present and look at possible compatible regulations, and I will talk to Julian later, and others, and Graciela, of course, and we are going to compile a list of those species that are under regulations and see which ones have compatible regulations and which ones are lacking compatible regulations, not only in the federal government, or in the local government, but also in the federal government.

Sometimes you may have a regulation that applies to a species that are shared by the local and federal jurisdictions, and then you need federal compatible regulations, and so, going back to what you were saying, and we have taken too much time, is, if the directives are clear, we will put together, with the Chair, an agenda item, and give ample time for discussion, that will address all the species that are under regulation that would need compatible regulations and all the issues that are being brought to the table by the chairs of the DAPs and Council Member Tony Blanchard, and we can sit down at the next meeting and discuss it.

Then, from the meeting, we can decide the next steps to follow. At that meeting, probably we will have a timeline that is needed for amending the ESA, if we need to, or incorporate the protection to the species of Nassau grouper, if we need to. If you agree with that course of action, we can go ahead and do it and then go to another item.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Is everybody in agreement with what Miguel just explained? Hearing no comment, let's do that, and let's go for the next item on the agenda, the next item for discussion. We had deviated from the Puerto Rico DNER report.

SPINY LOBSTER DISCUSSION

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, I suggest that we leave the report for the December meeting and discuss the other one, which is the pressing one, which is this explanation about the spiny lobster issue. Local fishers -- I don't see anyone here, but they asked me to bring this to your attention, and Andy is ready to discuss it.

The issue is that we already have a regulation that calls for closure of the spiny lobster whenever we go over the ACL. The ACL, the way that we do it, we have the average of the three years. In the case of Puerto Rico, we are supposed to close as many days as needed to compensate for the catches that went over the established limit, starting on December 30 backwards, all the way to January 1, if needed, and then, the following year, will start in October. Hopefully that will never happen.

In this case, the spiny lobster season had been shortened, and now we have the closure, and that is an in-season closure, from August 22 to September 30, and October 1 will be the first day of the continuation of the season, and that's where we are at this time.

The fishers who called my office, they were asking me whether the Government of Puerto Rico will have compatible regulations, making this closure effective from the shoreline to the edge of the EEZ,

and my answer was we don't know. I sent a note to Damaris, and so this is the time to ask the local government whether they intend to have any compatible regulations, but, as of now, the area where the spiny lobster closure is effective is the EEZ surrounding Puerto Rico, and I believe that Andy has his hand up.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Miguel, and you did a great job kind of describing what occurred this year, and so the accountability measure was triggered, based on average landings for 2017, 2018, and 2019 exceeding the catch limit. If you recall, obviously, 2017 was a hurricane year, and we also recognize that last year was impacted by COVID regulations, and the average landings were then reviewed and assessed to determine how much harvest would need to be reduced and take into consideration some of the recent landing trends.

We determined that that August 22 to September 30 timeframe was needed to close the fishery to reduce catch levels, in order to constrain the catch limit. Certainly we would be supportive of Puerto Rico adopting compatible regulations for the closure, but, at this point, our authority only lies with closing federal waters of the EEZ, in response to the accountability measure being triggered.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. This is a question for the Puerto Rico DNER. Damaris, do you have any comment about the intention, or not, to adopt, at this time, the closure in the state waters?

DAMARIS DELGADO: Yes, I do. We do not intend to expand that closure to our state waters. We have prepared, from the lab, the Fisheries Research Lab, a report to the Secretary, to the DNER Secretary, recommending not to extend that prohibition to state waters. We are in the process of having the Secretary sign a letter with regard to that.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Damaris.

DAMARIS DELGADO: You're welcome.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy, about the discussion on the dates on the lobster, do you want to follow-up on that? Any questions or any guidance from the council? Anything you want to say about that?

ANDY STRELCHECK: Well, I believe it was you, Marcos, earlier, that was commenting about wanting to reconsider when the accountability measure is -- The start date of the accountability

measure.

As Miguel described it, it starts on September 30 and works backwards, and then October 1 forward, if that closure isn't sufficient, and so, if the council wants to consider alternatives to when an accountability measure is triggered and how we specify the closure dates, that would need to be taken up in a new amendment action to the island-based FMPs.

Given the history of landings for spiny lobster, and the spiny lobster ACL that we approved earlier today, there is a high likelihood that we will be exceeding the catch limit for spiny lobster in future years, if previous landing trends continue into the future, and so I think it's a good idea to revisit the accountability measure, and I would also suggest that the council look at other options, such as a fixed seasonal closure, to ensure that you're not exceeding the catch limit on a regular basis.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Would any other council member like to comment? I have Vanessa, and, after the discussion, somebody please put a motion on the floor to move this along, if it's the intention of the council. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a comment, and, also, it's presented by two commercial fishermen in the area, and they have lobster traps between the ten and fifty miles, and, because of the size and the amount of those traps, and the line between them, it's very difficult for them to move all of that equipment inside the nine miles or bring that equipment back to land.

They asked if they can take the traps every two weeks, just to clean the equipment, because it's necessary to clean it and not to be just leaving it there for the days of the closure, and so they are asking if there is any way, or any permit, or any letter that they can have so that, when they are cleaning the traps, they don't be asked by enforcement if they are harvesting or something like that. That's just to clarify for them.

MIGUEL ROLON: If I may, Mr. Chairman, very quick, if they are in the EEZ with lobster, they are in violation of the Act, and so they had better remove those lobster traps out of the EEZ.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Yes, that's what I suggested, but the thing is, for the amount of traps and the line, and it's, obviously, long between them and it's very hard for the boats that they have to practically take everything out or move that inside the nine miles, and so they only have the chance to leave those traps inside the

water, but they are going to get dirty, and they, of course, are going to be fishing in there, and they don't want all the lobster that can get in to die or something.

MIGUEL ROLON: They have to start removing the traps now. That happened before, and the answer that we got from the enforcement people in National Marine Fisheries Service, and they are here, and they can repeat it again, is they have to remove it, because they will be in possession of an animal that is prohibited at that time.

The other thing is that we might need a -- That will come in the law, in the regulations, but we will need a rationale from Puerto Rico for not having compatible regulations, given that they have exactly the same information that the federal government has.

The other point, Marcos, is that, in the case of the spiny lobster, the reason why you have the September date backwards is because we adopted the U.S. Caribbean approach, given that, in the case of St. Thomas/St. John, the top months are Christmastime, the same as in St. Croix. However -- And twelve days were closed in St. Croix, and the people didn't know it, but it was closed for twelve days starting on December 31 backwards.

Then we applied that to Puerto Rico, because, in the case of the U.S. Virgin Islands, it's better for them to close starting September 30 backwards, but, as you and I were talking before the meeting, in the case of Puerto Rico, probably they should pick another month, because those are high-yield months, according to the information that the fishers are giving to us.

One thing is what the people tell you, and the other thing is what the people report, and, if you look at every month, every year, the last three years, those are the dates that came up to be the dates that have to be closed in the EEZ to compensate for the overage these past three years, the average that we have.

If you want to revise that, for the island-based FMP of Puerto Rico, and it's not necessary for the island-based FMP of St. Thomas/St. John and St. Croix, and that's for them to talk about it, but then your motion, or action here, will be to ask the staff to look into this matter and maybe prepare some documents for you to consider, not necessarily at the December meeting, but in due time, when they are ready and they can present that to us after this meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: Miguel, just to move the process along, a motion would be required now?

1 2

MIGUEL ROLON: Ask Jocelyn about whether you need a motion or not.

MARCOS HANKE: Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thanks. I just recommend motions when you want to be clear what exactly you're asking the staff to do, and so what I have been hearing is we're sort of looking at only changing the time of when the closure occurs for Puerto Rico, but you could have a motion that clarifies that and that just gives clear direction to staff as to what you want, or you could just provide a statement as to what you're seeking, but just motions help with the record, so that we all know what the action items were, but it's not necessary one way or the other.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL ROLON: In this case, given the importance of this, number one, it would be good to have a motion, and, also, appearances are important, because you are closed now, and, if you have a mixed reaction to change that, it doesn't look good for anybody, and so, in this case, a motion to say to examine the time of starting closures in the spiny lobster fishery in Puerto Rico will be what you want, and so language to that effect will do the trick, and I believe that, especially members from Puerto Rico, should put together a motion, and we can put it on the screen by Liajay, and you can vote on it. Make it simple and to the point and move forward.

MARCOS HANKE: Liajay, can you put the screen and capture the language that Miguel just said, to see if there is any council member who will move the motion, the recommended language?

 MIGUEL ROLON: The council to instruct the staff to examine the time of starting the closure of the spiny lobster in Puerto Rico and report back to the council with the appropriate documentation. Then I need a mover and a seconder, and, if you like the language, or if you want to change it, this is the time.

MARCOS HANKE: Is there anybody that would like to move this suggested language?

VANESSA RAMIREZ: So moved.

MARCOS HANKE: Do we have a second?

DAMARIS DELGADO: Second.

1 MARCOS HANKE: Second by Damaris. Is there discussion on the 2 motion?

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: Clarification, Mr. Chair, if I may?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

GRACIELA GARCIA-MOLINER: So it would be only for the spiny lobster 9 in Puerto Rico?

11 MIGUEL ROLON: At this time, yes.

13 MARCOS HANKE: Yes. At this time, yes. Any further discussion? 14 Is there anybody in opposition?

16 ANDY STRELCHECK: Marcos, I have a comment, and Carlos wants to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Andy.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Marcos. I guess a couple of points. One, I mentioned the potential for looking at a fixed seasonal closure rather than just examining the starting time of the closure, and the reason that I am suggesting this is that it potentially provides more certainty to the fishermen, in the event that accountability measures are triggered on a regular basis and doesn't result in, obviously, the seasons changing as much or as large from year-to-year.

The other question, I guess, would be for Miguel, in terms of kind of the staff direction, and so, at this point, it sounds like the motion would not be for an options paper, but simply just for presentation and information to be brought back to the council, and so I want to clarify that.

MIGUEL ROLON: It's exactly that.

MARCOS HANKE: We have --

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, you have Daniel Matos that asked for a chance to talk about clarification with the spiny lobster no closure in the local government.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Daniel. We have the motion open. Daniel.

MIGUEL ROLON: Marcos, we can't say it's a motion and then let 47 Daniel talk about it, because they already decided to do that.

MARCOS HANKE: Let me see here, and I don't see any other council member commenting. Let's finish the motion. Any other comments from -- I have Maria Lopez. Maria.

MARIA LOPEZ: Just for clarification on the motion, just to make sure that we know what we are going to be looking for, what you - What the council is intending is for staff to evaluate the timing of the application of the accountability measures for spiny lobster in Puerto Rico, and is that what you're saying?

MARCOS HANKE: Correct.

MARIA LOPEZ: Just for Puerto Rico, and just for spiny lobster, and this is the timing of the accountability measures?

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes. Puerto Rico and the timing of it and the spiny lobster.

MARIA LOPEZ: Okay.

MIGUEL ROLON: As Andy said, we are not asking for an options paper, because, as know, an options paper has all kinds of implications. What we just want to know is the status of this, and you can come back to the December meeting and tell us this is what you have, this is the day you have for last three years, and let us know.

MARIA LOPEZ: Okay. Thank you.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: I think it would be useful if you could have that reflected in the text of the motion, because the phrase "examine time of starting closure" doesn't necessarily link it to the AM, and so, if you were to state something, if this worked for the person that proposed the motion, and for the seconder, perhaps something along the lines of "to examine when AMs would be applied under the Puerto Rico FMP for spiny lobster".

 Right now, just so everyone is aware, the AMs say that they start from September 30 and move earlier to the beginning of the fishing year, and then, if they need additional time for the closure, it then goes from October 1 towards the end of the fishing year, and so we would be looking at perhaps a different start time.

MIGUEL ROLON: Jocelyn, can we just let -- Can you dictate the appropriate language slowly, so that Liajay can write it? "The council instructs the staff to examine when AMs will be applied --"

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: I think you could then say, "to spiny lobster" and then "under the Puerto Rico FMP".

MIGUEL ROLON: Is that okay, Jocelyn?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Sure. You could maybe add "examine alternative times when AMs", and then maybe change "would" to "could", and so examine alternative times when AMs could be applied, and then that conveys that you're seeking different potential options for when it might make sense to apply the AMs.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much.

MIGUEL ROLON: For the record, is that okay, Jocelyn, that the council instructs the staff to examine alternative times when AMs will be applied to the spiny lobster under the Puerto Rico FMP and report back to the council with the appropriate documentation, and that's okay?

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Yes, and just to note that "would" was changed to "could", and so "examine alternative times when AMs could be applied to spiny lobster under the Puerto Rico FMP".

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. Then, Vanessa and Damaris, do you agree with the new language?

DAMARIS DELGADO: Yes.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Excuse me, Miguel, but I think that Maria has something to say about the motion. I see something in the chat.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Maria.

34 MARIA LOPEZ: It's not about the motion, and I can wait until you are finished.

37 MIGUEL ROLON: Then go ahead and vote on it, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Any further discussion? Any opposition to the motion? Hearing none, the motion carries. Vanessa, just because I couldn't hear you very well, you accepted the language that is on the screen, correct?

44 VANESSA RAMIREZ: Yes, correct.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I had a question.

48 MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

1 2

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Does this mean that -- I don't understand what we're trying to do, because I thought that Puerto Rico and the USVI already determined, when we have an overrun, when the AM would start, and are we changing that now, and would it change for anything else that somebody may say, well, I would prefer that you start the closure at this date for other species that there's an overrun, and I'm not really sure what's going on.

MIGUEL ROLON: This is for the spiny lobster only in the case of Puerto Rico. All the rest stay the same, unless we find different at the December meeting, but, at this time, the question that the council wants to ask is whether there is an area to change the time when the AMs will kick in for the spiny lobster in Puerto Rico only. Then, if St. Thomas/St. John and St. Croix, by the December meeting, wants to do something else, then fine.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: But why, is what I'm not sure. Why would Puerto Rico want that?

MIGUEL ROLON: Well, because they found that, in the case of Puerto Rico, that period is important for the fishery, something that I don't know, and that's why I believe that, until you have this information in front of you, you don't know whether this is good or bad. My point is that the mere fact that somebody tells you that something that is happening out there doesn't cut it for the MSA, and you have to prove that it's in the best available data.

This motion, the only thing it does is to ask the staff to provide those alternative times and then come back to the December meeting and say this is what we found, and it could be a PowerPoint presentation, and it doesn't necessarily have to be an options paper and all that, because then we have more time and other things to do, and so I believe that your question is very important, but that's where we are at this time.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay.

MIGUEL ROLON: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you have four hands. You have Andy. Andy, go ahead.

ANDY STRELCHECK: Thanks, Miguel. Now that we've passed the motion, to help staff with some direction, it would be helpful, if there's any time periods that council members would like us to explore, or, for that matter, to avoid -- Certainly we're well aware of wanting to avoid closures during major holidays like Christmas and Easter, and I heard, obviously, rationale earlier from Marcos about some of the complexities of spiny lobster closing

with divers also harvesting queen conch, but, if there is other things that you would like staff to consider, I think it would helpful to at least briefly talk about that now, so that staff have some direction and can bring that information back to the council in December.

MIGUEL ROLON: Okay. For the record, in the case of Puerto Rico, what happened is that, the divers who go after lobster, they alternate with the queen conch, and the queen conch is closed within those days, and, actually, Puerto Rico is the only one that moved the darned closure to October the 31st. Now you have October, September, and August closed for the queen conch.

 Then the scuba divers, commercial scuba divers, they switched to spiny lobster, to compensate for the loss of catches of the queen conch during those days, and that's the issue that Marcos wanted to convey to the group here, and that is why we need to get this information to the council.

Regarding the timing, we do not pretend that you will have all of this information by December, and so I would rely on Graciela, especially, and Maria, to put together the timeline as they see fit, and so if we can have the information by December, fine, but I believe that this will take a little more time, and remember that they are working with the island-based FMP implementation and other things, and so that's why the intention of the council is clear, and it will be also clear that we need some time to put this together and present a good paper, a good document, for the council to discuss it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. That is exactly my point, and I was kicked off of the meeting, but I am back. Maria.

MARIA LOPEZ: Thank you for the turn to speak. I just wanted to remind the council that, back in 2016, the council created an amendment to some of their plans to modify the timing of the AM closures, and this is why we ended up with the September 30 backward date.

With the alternatives that were analyzed, there were several different dates, and a lot of information that was provided by the DAPs about the different -- Also from the landings, from the landings data about the different species that were fished during which months, which were the months with the highest landings, which were the months with the lowest landings, and then also socioeconomic considerations as to when those closures would occur.

There was also the opportunity for each one of the islands to choose the closure time that was better for them, and so the date of September 30 was chosen by the three islands as the general date to close, and, included in that document, there is a rationale for that. Now, we can use that information that we already have in this amendment, because, as I said, we already analyzed different dates, and bring this to the council again for Puerto Rico, so that they can reevaluate the selection of that date to adapt to this new information. Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead.

MIGUEL ROLON: That's exactly why I said the appropriate documentation, but we have all the elements of judgment already here, all the information, and this is a matter of copy-and-paste and put it in a PowerPoint presentation, and then you can shoot at it in December.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. We have Jocelyn, Andy, Daniel, and Vanessa with raised hands. Jocelyn.

JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO: Thank you. I apologize. I am a culprit of a former raised hand, and so I have nothing to add. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Andy.

ANDY STRELCHECK: The same with me. I took my hand down.

MIGUEL ROLON: So you have Vanessa and Daniel.

MARCOS HANKE: Daniel.

DANIEL MATOS: Yes, I'm here.

MIGUEL ROLON: Wait. You have Vanessa first, to this point, and then Daniel, who wants to clarify the issue, and so Vanessa goes first.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Vanessa, go ahead.

 VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to clarify, as Miguel and you do, about why we are trying to look for this, to Carlos. Of course, we have a lot of divers, especially on the west side of the island, and practically we have until the twelve miles for the divers.

Once this same closure for the two most commercial targeted species coincides, practically, we have those divers looking around in a small area of the nine miles, and some of them usually just can't fish for nothing, because they only know how to fish for lobster and queen conch, or at least for the price, and so that's why we are looking for this measure and this information, to clarify and help them to diversify and also to check out how we can help them. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: Now you have Daniel.

MARCOS HANKE: Daniel.

DANIEL MATOS: I am here. Hello, everyone. I am sorry, but I have some problems with the internet, and I wasn't hearing everything, but, when I tried to answer and talk, I had a lot of problems, and I'm so sorry.

There are three factors to avoid the closure of the spiny lobster right now. Number one, as you already discussed, we have probably 200, or 300, divers, commercial fishers, and they are divers, and, right now, there is the closed season for the queen conch, and so, if we close now, these commercial fishers will have a lot of problems, and so it's a very big socioeconomic problem.

Number two, we observed the landings for the last five or six years, and, because of the Hurricane Maria, and later the earthquakes off the south of Puerto Rico, and the COVID-19 pandemic, we have probably 7,000 less commercial trips from 2019 to 2020, and so we understand the fishing pressure has decreased significantly for all fishery resources, including the spiny lobster.

The number three factor is the carapace length, and we have studied the carapace length average from 1990 to 1999, and, for these ten years, the carapace length was ninety-six millimeters, and then we compared the year 2000 to the year 2009, and the carapace length increased from ninety-six millimeters to 103 millimeters.

Then we compared 2010 to the year 2019, and the carapace length for these ten years -- The carapace length average increased to 106 millimeters, and so the carapace length showed us to increase for the last thirty years. Also, the spiny lobster landings in the east coast is very good, and the lobster are larger. In the south, we see the same thing, and so we don't see signs to overfish the spiny lobster right now, and so these three factors are the

result to not close right now.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Daniel. We have Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Mr. Chair, I already had my turn.

MARCOS HANKE: I am letting myself go through what I am receiving through the texts here and on the chat. I'm sorry. Is there anybody else that would like to participate? Hearing none, I think we have the record clear and straight, and the motion was approved, and the next item on the agenda, and we apologize with the enforcement, and we discussed most of the enforcement issues before, among all the agents, and we're going to get a little more detail about the reports for the enforcement for the U.S. Coast Guard, the USVI, Puerto Rico, and National Marine Fisheries Service/NOAA in December.

We're going to go for the next item on the agenda, and thank you for the patience of everybody. I know that we are a little late, but this was a very, very important issue for the local fishermen. The next item on the agenda is Exempted Fishing Permits, EFP.

EXEMPTED FISHING PERMIT (EFP) UPDATE

SARAH STEPHENSON: I do not have a presentation, and I was just going to give a quick update to inform the council of an exempted fishing permit request that the Southeast Regional Office received from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center lab in Panama City, Florida.

Just as a quick reminder, an EFP is required for any fishing activity that would occur that would otherwise be in violation of the MSA or other fisheries laws and their implementing regulations, which is not considered part of like an exempted educational activity. For example, an EFP could allow an applicant to collect fish out-of-season, to get scientific data, so that we could better manage the species.

NMFS Panama City Lab is requesting an EFP to continue collecting information on the population size and abundance, the life history characteristics, and habitats of deepwater snappers off the western, northern, and southern coasts of Puerto Rico. An EFP for similar work was issued last year, and that expired on August 1 of this year. The new EFP would be valid from the date of issuance through August 1 of 2023, and so it would be almost a two-year permit.

The proposed research would use NMFS staff, or NMFS-contracted

observers, and commercial fishers on commercial fishing vessels to deploy video cameras on deepwater fishing gear and to collect samples of black, blackfin, cardinal, queen, silk, and wenchman snappers.

The project objectives are to use underwater video to collect size and abundance data and describe benthic habitats of the deepwater reef fish species off the three coasts of Puerto Rico to collect biological samples to determine reproductive cycles, growth estimates, and the age and size at sexual maturation of the commercially-important snapper species.

A total of 270 trips would be conducted during the two-year project period, forty-five trips per region per year, and so the region is the western, northern, and southern coasts, and then approximately forty of the trips each year would be in federal waters, and the rest would be in Puerto Rico commonwealth waters.

Sampling trips would occur at depths of 328 to 2,133 feet, or 100 to 650 meters, within one to twelve miles of the coast, and they would use hook-and-line gear while adrift, and so no anchoring would occur.

The EFP would exempt the project participants from select snapper and grouper seasonal closures from part of the Bajo de Sico area closure and from the combined grouper/snapper/parrotfish bag limit. The bag limit exemption would apply to any individual on the vessel without a valid commercial fishing license, such as the applicant or the contracted observers.

The request for this EFP was received in May, and a notice was published in the Federal Register on July 1. The thirty-day comment period closed on July 30, and one comment was received. The commenter just requested that NMFS elaborate on what is meant by allowing contracted fishermen, commercial fishermen, to be given the fish for personal use and consumption after the samples are collected.

They also stated that they couldn't find information on the socioeconomic impact evaluations of choosing commercial, rather than say recreational, fishermen to support the EFP, and they also stated that technology exists capable of 3D modeling the reinsertion of deepwater fishers and the scope of the project should be expanded accordingly.

Both the current and the proposed EFP applications and documentation are available on our website, which I will drop the link to that in the chat, and NMFS, as the action agency, will

move forward with getting the EFP in place. Once in place, a copy of the issued permit will also be available on SERO's website, and, with that, I will just take any questions that you may have.

MARCOS HANKE: Any questions? Hearing none, thank you, Sarah. We have a five-minute public comment. Is there anybody from the public, Liajay, Christina, or Miguel, that would like to participate?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carlos does.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos Farchette?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

16 MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I will wait, if there's somebody from the public that wants to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Anybody else? Go ahead, Carlos.

OTHER BUSINESS

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am going to go —— I am going to go outside of my jurisdiction here for what I'm about to say, and I want to apologize to DNER, but it's been on my mind for a while, for years, and I will probably get in trouble, but, like John Lewis said, it's going to be good trouble.

All this talk about spiny lobster brought me to the point about what is happening in Puerto Rico state waters with the spiny lobster, and I would like Puerto Rico to seriously consider prohibiting trammel nets to harvest spiny lobster in state waters. They could consider a buyback program, which St. Croix did when they prohibited gill and trammel nets.

We bought them back from the fishermen, so that they could use the funds to invest in a different method of fishing, and one thing that Puerto Rico's government can do is promote the use of lobster traps by those people that are using those trammel nets to harvest lobster. That's all I have. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. Nelson Crespo, did you want to speak?

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Carlos, for your comment, and I want to add a little bit more regarding this

issue. I have been saying this for a long time, and nobody has ever made a real attempt to address it. I know this is a local issue, but it's really important to pay attention to this.

As a commercial fisherman, I would like to catch as much as possible, but we have to recognize that, in a fishing year, no matter how good it is, it's a dangerous to the fishery and to the ecosystem, and this year is a clear example of this. Many of the lobster lose their legs, et cetera, and the quality of the product is not the best.

A number of undersized lobsters that, without enforcement, for sure are not going to go back to the water, and I don't want to mention that, in some locations, they catch turtles and other species in danger. The number of dead fish already -- Fish that are already damaged is considerable, and this, at the end, affects all of us. In addition, the deepwater snapper -- I fish lobster with only pots, and I have fished with trammel nets, because I know how harmful they are. I ask for this council at least to carry out studies on this fishing gear, in order to verify what I am saying. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson. Just for general information, the internal -- The locals made the same recommendation a few years back, and they have been consistent on that matter. Anybody else from the public?

MIGUEL ROLON: You have Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMIREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Carlos, for bringing this point up at the table. I just want to make a comment. In 2019, some fishermen -- Many of us go to public hearings that the government has in the capital, just to check out what options that we can get about this, and many of the presentation were great, and there were many suggestions, but, practically, everything stayed there, and we don't hear nothing about that project anymore.

I know that the one that presented decided that they have to make some changes, especially taking information about how many fishermen, commercial fishermen, are still doing this art, and, also, because they have to take in that many of those that are using this are already from the first or second generation of fishermen, and it will be hard for them to learn another kind of art, but they were thinking about also to give like a special permit and many things that we put on the table in there, but, practically, after 2019, I don't hear anything about that. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vanessa. Anybody else from the public? Hearing none, Miguel, do you want to say something before we pass to Other Business?

MIGUEL ROLON: No. I'm okay.

MARCOS HANKE: I don't think we have any other business on my list here, and we are ready to adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much.

MIGUEL ROLON: Wait. You have the Next Meetings in the agenda.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, and I'm going to go there. Let me finish. Under Other Meetings, and we don't have anything else under Other Business, but we need to announce and establish the next date for the next council meeting. Miguel, can you help me on that?

NEXT MEETING

MIGUEL ROLON: We did that last year, and the same dates still are true for this year. It's the 7th and 8th of December, and it will be a hybrid meeting at the Marriott Courtyard in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The Governor of Puerto Rico presently has stated that there will be a regulation in place now, and we don't know whether the darned regulation will be in place by December, but anybody coming into Puerto Rico as a guest of the hotel has to be vaccinated and has to prove, and they are working on a digitized system, has to prove that he has a certificate of vaccination or has a weekly test for determining whether he is COVID free or not.

In this case, Diana already sent, to the federal folks, the information, via an email, and it will be distributed also to everybody, to see how many people will be coming to the meeting and staying at the hotel, and we have until September 30 for you to get us that information, because we need to close the contract with the hotel.

In addition, we have taken note of some of the issues that you want to discuss in the agenda, and one that is agreed on is that we will have, on December 8, the second day of the meeting, from 9:00 to 12:00, a full discussion on compatible regulations, and so I will encourage especially the two local governments to bring the documents regarding your regulations in place at that time, and those from Dr. Angeli and Damaris, and, of course, Graciela will put together the list of regulations that we have at this time compatible.

For example, the spiny lobster is compatible throughout the range,

in terms of the carapace length, and not necessarily all the others, but that is one example that we need to discuss.

2 3 4

In addition, at that time, we are going to look at the compatible regulations and enforcement issues regarding not only the Nassau grouper, as we discussed today, but all the other species, and we will have the presentation by the three chairs of the DAPs, by Graciela and any other scientists from the local government of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and for managers to tell us what are the present regulations and what are the intentions of the local governments regarding compatible regulations.

I know that, in the case of the Virgin Islands, we have been working with it for some time, and, in Puerto Rico, they are revising the regulations in place and the actual law, and the local fishing law, and that's all we have, Mr. Chairman, and the meeting will also have virtual capabilities, and so you will be able to join in the meeting via Zoom, as you do right now. That's all.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miguel, since the VI has this key with a QR code, and will Puerto Rico be able to read that, or do we have to do --

MIGUEL ROLON: Can you ask that again? You have the QR code, yes?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, I have a QR code, and so I wondered if Puerto Rico would read that, or do have to offer a vaccination card.

MIGUEL ROLON: In the case of Puerto Rico, they are implementing — You are talking about the vaccine, and so you have to bring your certificate, the vaccine code. Once Puerto Rico has the code, probably people can join in, and it will be similar, according to the newspaper today, as the one that they are implementing in New York, in New York City, but we will keep you abreast of the regulations, and probably, by November, we might have something else, updates on the situation, according to the Governor, and so we will make sure that Diana will send you the latest requirements to travel to Puerto Rico.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sounds good.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for a great question, Carlos, and thank you, all. Anybody else, one more time, that needs to speak or to ask something, before I adjourn? Hearing none, a turn to speak from Robert Copeland.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Good evening, and sorry for the last-minute

question here, but I just wanted to confirm that the dates for the next meeting are the $7^{\rm th}$ and the $8^{\rm th}$ of December.

MIGUEL ROLON: Yes, they are.

MARCOS HANKE: That is correct.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Okay. For you guys' awareness as well, like last year, those dates coincide with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council as well. Was there any potential of moving these dates? If not, I completely understand, but I just was wanting to put that out there, that they coincide with the South Atlantic Council as well, which is another seat that I sit on.

MIGUEL ROLON: We cannot move it. The contract is already in.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Understood.

MIGUEL ROLON: We can keep you abreast of anything that comes up and make sure that the Coast Guard is well informed of anything that will happen at the meeting. Also, if we need information from you, rest assured that I will convey any questions to you, so that you will have the chance to answer it.

LT. ROBERT COPELAND: Yes, please do, and I will brush up on anything that I need to, especially in regard to the Nassau grouper. I have written some notes down here on my end, to see if I can do anything from the Coast Guard standpoint or whatnot, but I will make sure that I am prepared for any questions that may come from the December meeting, but thank you very much for your time.

MIGUEL ROLON: I really appreciate it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Anybody else? Hearing none, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much for your patience and great participation, and I will see you guys in December, the $7^{\rm th}$ and $8^{\rm th}$, in Isla Verde, Puerto Rico, for the ones that are going to attend in-person. Thank you.

MIGUEL ROLON: For the record, it's 4:35.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 11, 2021.)

45 - -